OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

THIRD SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT

---

3 EDWARD VII., 1903

VOL. LXIII

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTY-NINTH DAY OF SEPTEMBER TO THE TWENTY-FOURTH DAY OF OCTOBER, INCLUSIVE



OTTAWA
PRINTED BY S. E. DAWSON, PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1903

ERRATA

VOL. VI.

Col. 13457, seventh line from top Heading, for 'Desjardins—Allumette wharf, $7,500,' should read: 'Deschambault, wharf, $5,000.'

Col. 13505, twenty-fourth line from top, Heading, for 'Further amount required for Archives, $3,000,' should read: 'Compiling historical data of Acadian families in Canada, $1,400.'

Col. 14589, twenty-fifth line from bottom, 'Vical Kingsmill,' should read 'Nicol Kingsmill.'

House of Commons Debates

THIRD SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, September 29, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 259) to amend the North-west Territories Act.

Mr. SPROULE. Explain.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court of the North-west Territories, as at present constituted, consists of four puisne judges and one judge of the Supreme Court. The intention is now to have a court constituted with five puisne judges and a chief justice. The second section of the Bill provides for cases reserved for consideration by the full court. As the law now stands a judge reserving a point for the consideration of the full court cannot be a member of the court unless his presence is necessary to constitute a quorum. The intention is that when a point is reserved in a criminal case the judge sitting at the trial in the criminal case who reserved the point may form part of the court before which the reserved case is taken. I may say that the last amendment is suggested by the judges of the Supreme Court.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any demand from the bar or the people of the North-west Territories for an additional judge ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where is he to be stationed or to reside ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is an almost unanimous request from the bar of the North-west Territories for the appointment of this additional judge, and I may say that it is supported by the Attorney General of the North-west Territories. No provision is made for residence at the present time. There will necessarily have to be a division made so as to make provision for the district in which Macleod is situated, but I am not sure at the present time where the residence will be.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DISTURBANCE AT SAULT STE. MARIE.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (North Victoria). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to draw the attention of the House and of the country to a statement of the conditions as they seem to exist at Sault Ste. Marie, in the Province of Ontario. I notice in the morning paper the following telegram :

> Toronto, Sept. 29, 1.00 a.m.—Col. Buchan commanding the military district in which Sault Ste. Marie is situated, has just received an urgent telegram requesting the immediate despatch of troops to the Soo.

I do not know what the condition of affairs may be, but at all events it is quite evident that there is a considerable disturbance. The point I wish specially to emphasize this morning is the facility with which the people of Canada are calling upon the troops to suppress disturbances on any and every occasion. I presume the troops called for here will only be some volunteers from the city of Toronto and other districts, and probably the permanent corps of the country. Sault Ste. Marie is situated in the Toronto military district. I desire to know what steps have been taken in the premises, or if the government has been advised as to what steps have been taken by the military authorities in that district? I know that the military authorities act independently of the government under the regulations and orders, but still the commanding officer should apprise the government of whatever steps he may take. While the situation there may be, and doubtless is, a very trying one, and while there may be rioting, I think all communities should be encouraged to depend on their own local authorities to as great an extent as possible. I have therefore the honour of asking the right hon. Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he has in his possession any information regarding the situation at Sault St. Marie, and whether it is such as to justify the calling out of the troops?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden) this morning, and therefore he may have information which I have not at this moment. But I can give to my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) the information which I have myself. Yesterday I received, personally, several telegrams, all coming from the same party, from the party in charge of the works at Sault Ste. Marie, Mr. Coyne, representing that there were disturbances and riots, that the property of the corporation was threatened, and asking that the government should supply troops to quell the riot. We had to inform him that under such circumstances the government had no authority to act, that it was for the local magistrate, the civil power in charge at Sault Ste. Marie, to determine whether the presence of troops was necessary, and if necessary to call for them. Whether any steps have been taken in that direction by the local authorities at Sault Ste. Marie I have no information at this moment. I may say that there is a disposition to call very often upon the government to send troops. Perhaps the people are unduly scared, but I do not think for my part that there was a very serious condition at Sault Ste. Marie. There was a small disturbance, but in so far as my information goes it was not of a very serious character, and nothing but which could have been controlled by the local authorities. If the citizens and police are powerless to quell rioters, of course they have a remedy by law, but whether they have availed themselves of it or not I do not know.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria).

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 235) to provide for the construction of a National Transcontinental Railway.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, before the Bill is read a third time, I would like to offer a few remarks in regard to the general scope and character of the measure which has been introduced by the government as embodied in this Bill and in the contract annexed to it. The discussion has been so thorough on almost every phase of this measure and of the alternative scheme which I had the honour to propose in this House some weeks ago that it will not be necessary now for me to go very minutely into the subject, nor indeed could I, without devoting an enormous amount of time for that purpose, undertake to answer in detail all the criticisms which have been addressed to my own proposal by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. It is needless to say that if I should go beyond the confines of this House, and attempt to answer the criticisms of the same character which have been made outside, I would be compelled to inflict myself at still greater length upon the patience of hon. gentlemen at this very late date in the session. There is, however, one aspect of the question, referring more particularly to my alternative proposal, which has been dwelt upon in very great detail by hon. gentlemen opposite. I refer to the question of the cost of the alternative scheme which I have suggested. I will not attempt to answer all these gentlemen, as perhaps under other circumstances I might be inclined to do, but, as all of their extended criticism has been summed up in the speech of the Postmaster General—which I regard as embodying on behalf of the government all criticisms of that character which could possibly be made upon my alternative proposal—I shall take the speech of the Postmaster General as a fair type of the criticism which has been addressed to the House and the country, with regard to the proposal which I had the honour of making some few weeks ago. In the first place, the House and the country should know, that my hon. friend (Hon. Sir William Mulock) explained that he especially desired to make a perfectly fair and business-like comparison between the cost of the scheme as embodied in this Bill, and the cost of the scheme which I outlined. Let it be understood also that the Postmaster General repeatedly adopted the figures which have

been presented to the House by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. In order, that I may do no injustice to the Postmaster General in that regard I will quote three passages from his speech. At page 9755 of 'Hansard' the hon. gentleman used the following language :—

> Ours is a very modest one. At one time we had it attacked as being a scheme of great magnitude ; but when compared with the proposition of the leader of the opposition, its dimensions are considerably lessened. It only contemplates the building of a railway from Moncton via Quebec to the coast, a part of which is to be operated by a railway company, and which will only cost the people of Canada $13,000,000.

At page 9760, the hon. gentleman used the following language :—

> Our scheme, limited to an investment with the exception of a few years at the commencement when we pay interest or forego rent, involves a cash outlay by this government, not to be recovered, of not exceeding $13,000,000.

At page 9776, repeating practically the same language, he said :

> I am ashamed of our modest scheme, involving an expenditure of only $13,000,000.

There can be no doubt therefore, as to where we have the Postmaster General with regard to the figures which have been submitted to the House by the Minister of Finance. Further than that, it is to be observed, that by adopting the figures of the Minister of Finance, the Postmaster General has estimated the 400 miles from Moncton to Quebec at $25,000 per mile, equal to $10,000,000 ; and he has fixed the 1,475 miles from Quebec to Winnipeg at $28,000 per mile, or equal to $41,300,000.

My hon. friend the Postmaster General dealt one by one with the items of cost which in his judgment were included in my proposal, and I must take up a little time in also going over one by one the points in the argument of that hon. gentleman in that respect, in order that I may show to the House and to the country, the degree of fairness which the Postmaster General wished to import into this discussion.

In the first place, in estimating the cost of the Canada Atlantic Railway, extending from near Montreal to Depot Harbour on the Georgian bay, he stated—by what authority I do not know, and on what data he left the House in ignorance—that that railway would cost the people of Canada $17,000,000. We have it on the authority of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair), that that railway including steamships could have been acquired for $12,000,000, and the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) has stated (page 9718, 'Hansard') that that railway was offered only a very short time ago for $11,000,000. I myself believe on good authority that the Canada Atlantic Railway could have been bought during the present year for $12,000,000 in cash, and that that sum would have included the steamships as well. Now, the Postmaster General was not at first inclined to touch at all on the alternative proposal I made with regard to the line from Montreal to the Georgian bay. It will be remembered that I distinctly stated, that as to this matter, as well as to all matters involved in the scheme which I proposed, I would act only on the best expert advice and assistance that could be procured in Canada, or on the whole of this continent. However, in the course of the speech of the Postmaster General, I interjected a remark which made it necessary for him to consider the cost of a railway from Montreal to the Georgian bay, and he then estimated such a line as costing no less a sum than $15,000,000. That is to say, a railway 360 miles long from Montreal to the shores of the Georgian bay, would cost $41,600 per mile according to the estimate of the Postmaster General ; whereas, a railway, through an unknown and trackless country in the northern parts of Ontario and Quebec would cost, according to his estimate, only $28,000 per mile. That will give to you, Mr. Speaker, and to any gentleman in this House and this country who desires to estimate at its proper value the argument of the Postmaster General in that regard, a true indication of the fairness and the businesslike manner in which he sought to approach the question of the comparative cost of these two projects. Let us look at the argument of the Postmaster General in another aspect.

This line, 360 miles in length through the settled part of Ontario, from Montreal to the shores of the Georgian bay, is to cost $15,000,000, while 1,875 miles of railway from the city of Moncton to the city of Winnipeg are to cost in actual cash outlay, not to be recovered, $8,853,000, and no more. Is there one hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, outside of the Postmaster General, who would dare to get up in this House or on any platform in this country and present that as a fair and accurate comparison of the cost of these two schemes ? Further than that, according to the view of the expert put up by the government to answer the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, this road is to be built for the purpose of transporting to the seaports of the St. Lawrence and of the Atlantic the whole grain trade of the west ; and, according to that same expert, it can only accomplish that provided it is built in the most modern manner, is equipped by the most approved system, and has grades which do not exceed four-tenths of one per cent per mile ; and it is suggested to the people of this country that a road of that character can be built through the northern parts of the provinces of Quebec and Ontario for $28,000 per mile. Why, the capital expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway has run up to between $50,000 and $60,000 per mile ; and the Postmaster General himself, estimated the cost of the road along the northern shore of Lake Superior now operated by the Canadian Pacific Rail-

way at about $50,000 per mile. My hon. friend, the Postmaster General, treated the road from Moncton to Winnipeg as costing absolutely nothing after it was once completed, and after the period of non-payment of rental had ceased. On the same basis, if he had desired to make a fair comparison of these two schemes, he surely would have estimated that the Canada Atlantic Railway, if acquired by this country, paying as it does, 5 per cent on its capital, would not only cost this country nothing, but would afford a small margin of annual profit on the transaction. Yet, according to the estimate of my hon. friend, one road is to be put into this fair comparison at $15,000,000, and the other is to be put in at absolutely nothing beyond the loss of rental during the first seven or ten years.

The next portion of my scheme which the Postmaster General dealt with was the line from North Bay to Fort William, which he estimated as costing the country $38,040,000. At page 9769 of 'Hansard' he dealt pretty fully with the character of that road; and it is just as well that his language should be placed before the House, in order that we may have a thorough appreciation of the view he takes as a lawyer of the compensation that ought to be paid for a public work acquired by the government. He said:

> Everybody knows that the 634 miles operated by the Canadian Pacific Railway between Fort William and North Bay is about the most unprofitable piece in all Canada. Everybody knows that the Canadian Pacific Railway have an alternative route from Duluth to Sault Ste. Marie, and a distance of nearly 400 miles, which they would be only too glad to use if they could get rid of the expensive north shore piece of railway. The hon. gentleman proposes to take out of the Dominion treasury $38,000,000 and hand it over to the Canadian Pacific Railway for the purchase of its railway from Fort William to North Bay. Every day it runs a train from Fort William to North Bay, it loses money. I am not in a position to say how much, but an hon. gentleman opposite—speaking with, I do not know what authority—suggested that $1,000,000 is the annual loss in operating the railway between Fort William and North Bay.

My hon. friend, speaking not only as Postmaster General, but as a lawyer, has taken the ground that if we expropriate a railway, which is an expensive road to maintain, which is losing money every year to the company operating it, we are to pay not only the value of that road, but the cost of it. Well, Mr. Speaker, I thought that every infant in the law knew that when the government expropriate a property in the interest of the country, it pays not what the property cost, but the actual value of it to the person from whom it is taken. That is a principle which my hon. friend the Minister of Justice would not controvert for a single moment, because he knows that it is supported by authorities so absolute and so numerous that no lawyer could dispute it. But the hon. Postmaster General says that although this is a losing road, although it is practically valueless to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, although to be relieved of it and to get running powers over it on a basis of rental would be of great advantage to the company, yet if we undertook to expropriate that line we would be obliged to pay the cost of it. Why, Sir, this matter was argued out in this House years ago. We argued it out in the discussion on the acquisition of the Drummond County Railway. We took the ground, which was not disputed, that the true basis on which the government should pay for that railway was the value and not the cost. Further than that, we took the ground with regard to the Drummond County Railway, which I am prepared to take with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway from North Bay or Sudbury to Fort William, that if the company sought to be paid compensation on the basis of cost, it would be only fair and proper, in the interest of the country to take into consideration the subsidies which have been paid by the country to the company towards the building of the road. Why should a railway company receive the cost of a public work expropriated by the country when a part of that cost has already been borne by the country? We took that ground with regard to the Drummond County Railway, and it is a sound principle to adopt with regard to any work expropriated by the government in the interest of the country. But notwithstanding that, the Postmaster General puts in this road as part of my scheme at $38,040,000. I would like to know why he puts it in at one single dollar, if he adopts the argument of the Minister of Finance. What was my proposition in regard to the acquisition of the line from North Bay or Sudbury to Fort William? My proposition was that either the absolute right of ownership or the absolute control of running rights should be acquired by the people and that equal running rights over that line should be given the three great railway systems of Canada, the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern Railway. My proposition also involved the necessary consequence that these roads shall pay for that running power. How would that be accomplished? In the first place by the exaction from them of a rental to cover the interest on the expenditure, and in the second place by making them pay, upon what is known among railway men as a wheelage basis, the cost of maintenance and operation. So that if my hon. friend the Postmaster General had desired to make a perfectly fair comparison, if he had dealt with my proposition as he did with that of the government, he would have put it down as costing to the country not one cent, because the whole cost of the line and its operation would necessarily be borne by the

three railways to which I have referred. Yet the Postmaster General, with these fair, business-like methods of his, makes my scheme involve an expenditure of $38,040,000 to the people without return, whereas similar propositions—the line from Moncton to Winnipeg for example—are dealt with by him upon an absolutely different basis.

He was troubled also wih regard to my proposition because he said it would result in Americanizing the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway, he feared, would build its line from the 'Soo' to certain western connections and bring all its traffic through American territory. My hon. friend had better not distress himself very much on that point until he can make up his mind to vote for, instead of against, certain safeguards proposed from this side with regard to the Grand Trunk Railway. Here is a line of railway, the Grand Trunk Railway, which has one terminal in Chicago and the other in Portland. It has a great railway system in Canada, and it has done a good deal of work in developing Ontario, and I do not blame it for one moment for looking after its own interest with regard to its own terminals; but I say that the government and the people must also look after their own interests. When we insisted in committee of this House on imposing in this very Bill conditions and restrictions which would prevent the Grand Trunk Railway from taking the freight that may come over the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and from carrying that freight to its own terminal at Portland, was my hon. friend the Postmaster General distressed at the prospect which now alarms him? No, he stood up and voted like a man to throw out the very resolutions that we proposed as safeguards to the people. This is the same gentleman who is anxious, almost to the point of distress, because forsooth he says my proposal will result in Americanizing the Canadian Pacific Railway. If he believed that, he did not appreciate my proposition, because I distinctly said that the Canadian Pacific Railway should have exactly the same running rights as it has at present over that road, in common, however, with the Canadian Northern Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway under the independent control of the government. The Canadian Pacific Railway would have no more cause than it has now to do what the Postmaster General suggests. It would have less cause because it would operate and send its trains over this road between North Bay or Sudbury and Fort William at a very much less cost to itself than is involved in the operation of that line at present.

My hon. friend the Postmaster General really excels himself when he comes to deal with the line from Port Arthur to Winnipeg. I had suggested that it would be wise for the government to give some assistance in improviding one or both of the lines from Fort William and Port Arthur to Winnipeg. I suggested that as a good business investment for this reason, that if you have a hundred million bushels of grain, as you may very soon have, for export, and if you can, by a fair expenditure, reduce the cost of carrying that grain by one cent a bushel, you will save the people one million dollars every year. Therefore I thought it right and proper that the government might spend two million, or even three million dollars in improving these lines, giving the government absolute control, reducing the rates, and by this means saving to the people possibly a million dollars per year. That was my proposition, but how does my hon. friend the Postmaster General torture it? He puts the cost of that proposal at no less a sum than $26,263,549. He says that I propose to buy both these lines, that it will be necessary to buy them both. We would have to acquire, he says, the Canadian Pacific Railway between Fort William and Winnipeg, which would cost $15,638,549, and the Canadian Northern, which would cost $10,625,000, making a total of $26,263,549. Then comes the following mysterious paragraph in his speech which appears in the revised 'Hansard' and therefore must have been carefully considered. I will give it to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister as a conundrum with which he can deal, when he comes to speak on this question, if he should speak on it:

> Now the purchase of these different roads and the construction of two pieces would aggregate in all $841,015,549.

I do not know really what my hon. friend was driving at, but he was about as near the mark as anywhere in his speech.

He is distressed also at the idea of this country using a railway to Fort William in rivalry with other roads. It would be disastrous, he says, to acquire a line from Fort William to Winnipeg and use that in rivalry with other roads. But will his memory carry him back four years, when he stood up and voted for a proposal to acquire the Drummond County Railway and running rights over the Grand Trunk Railway from Lévis to Montreal, for the purpose of operating that road in rivalry with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway? Now he is distressed because hon. gentlemen on this side suggest that, in the interests of this country, it might be advisable to grant aid to these two railways from Fort William to Port Arthur and Winnipeg. Why even if we did acquire a line of railway as part of the Intercolonial and operate it all the way from Moncton to Winnipeg in rivalry with the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, we would only be doing exactly what we are doing now with the Intercolonal. Is not the Intercolonial from Halifax to Montreal operating in rivalry with the Canadian Pacific Railway; and

from Lévis to Montreal is it not competing with both the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway ? What is the reason that there should be rivalry and competition between government and private roads in the east and not in the west ? The people in the maritime provinces are very well satisfied to have the Intercolonial operate there in rivalry with other roads, and I suppose the people of the west would be just as well satisfied to have the Intercolonial operating there in similar rivalry. So far as the question of principle is concerned, I challenge my right hon. friend the Prime Minister or the Postmaster General to point out one single distinction in principle between doing that in eastern Canada and doing the very same thing in western Canada.

But, if my hon. friend the Postmaster General excelled himself when he dealt with the line from Fort William to Winnipeg, he more than excelled himself and everybody else when he came to deal with the prairie section. He adopted the estimate of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) who, at page 8586 of 'Hansard,' stated that the aid proposed by the government in the shape of a guarantee for construction of the prairie section not exceeding $13,000 a mile would cost the country nothing. That is distinctly the basis on which the Minister of Finance proceeded, and it is the basis which has been adopted over and over again by the Postmaster General. But when he deals with my proposal, does he deal with it in the same way ? How should he deal with my proposal ? My proposal was simply to give to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway similar aid for the prairie section to that which the government propose to give under this Bill. The Postmaster General himself makes that perfectly plain when, at page 9771 of 'Hansard' he says that my proposal is for the same assistance to the Grand Trunk Pacific as the Canadian Northern receive, namely, a guarantee of $13,000 a mile. But how does he deal with the cost of the guarantee when he desires to make an extravagant estimate of the cost of my proposal ? He puts it at $13,000,000, as against nothing for exactly the same aid under the government's proposal. Let us look at it for a moment. We have the estimate of the Minister of Finance as follows : Eastern section, including interest during construction, will cost $54,609,676 ; loss of rental, seven years, $11,468,030 ; aid to mountain section, $2,924,000 ; Quebec bridge, $2,000,000. He adds to that for aid to the prairie section under the government's proposal just nothing. So, the total cost of this, including the prairie section according to the estimate of the Minister of Finance, will be $71,001,706. And the Minister of Finance tells us that the total cost to the country will be less than $13,000,000, which is just the sum that the Postmaster General estimates will be the cost under my scheme of aid to the prairie section alone. And this is the gentleman who desired to make not only a business-like but fair comparison of the cost of the two schemes.

Now, the hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir William Mulock) proceeded to deal with the mountain section. He represented the cost to the country of the mountain section under my scheme at $30,000,000, that is, for 600 miles at $50,000 a mile. Of course, I would not deal, even in passing, with the fact that, whereas the Minister of Finance put the length of the mountain section at 480 miles, the Postmaster General adds a trifle of 120 miles to it when he makes an estimate of the cost of the mountain section under my proposal. That was perfectly convenient for him to do, and I do not complain very much about it ; it was only a trifle compared with his other exaggerations. He represents me as deliberately adding a cost of $30,000,000 to that of the scheme which the government proposes. I thought I had made myself perfectly clear with respect to my proposition as to the mountain section, and I believe I did make myself clear to every hon. gentleman in this House and to every man in the country except the Postmaster General. My scheme was this : I said that I believed that, from Edmonton or from some point west of Edmonton to the Pacific coast, there was no necessity for more than one new line. I said the Canadian Northern had as good a right to be regarded as a transcontinental railway as had the Grand Trunk Pacific. Knowing the ways of railway promoters, I apprehended that the Canadian Northern Railway would come to this government for exactly the same aid for a line to the coast as that which was proposed to be given to the Grand Trunk Pacific ; and I said that, inasmuch as it seemed to me that only one line was necessary, I would impose on these two companies the obligation of joining their lines at Edmonton or at some point west of Edmonton, and that any aid given by this country for a line west of that point should be for a line to be operated, under independent control if necessary, and used by both these companies as part of their transcontinental lines. I believed, and still believe, that, in making that proposal, I was saving this country the cost of aid to a second transcontinental line. I said further—and I repeat it now—that the government had the whole situation, and will have the whole situation, in its own hands, if it acts wisely. Let us suppose that the two companies cannot come to an understanding for the operation in common of that road from Edmonton or some point near Edmonton to the coast. What will happen ? The government, in the first place can refuse to give aid until this understanding has been reached. That is the first part the government has to play. In the next place, if the government sees fit, it might itself build the line from Edmonton or some point west of Edmonton to the coast on condi-

tion that these companies shall use it upon exactly the same stipulations that I have already referred to in respect of the line from Sudbury to Fort William, that is, they must pay a rental which will free this country from any burden for interest on the cost of construction, and they must also pay the cost of operation, and maintenance upon a wheelage basis according to the user by the several companies. With such a proposition, what should my hon. friend the Postmaster General have put in as the cost to the country under my proposal of the line from Edmonton to the coast, adopting the same basis which he has used for estimating the scheme of government? He should have put it in at not one dollar, because every cent of interest would be recouped to the country. But, instead of that, he puts it down at $30,000,000 and represents me as absolutely proposing to build that line. And so he sails gayly back to the east, carrying with him the $38,000,000, the $26,000,000, the $30,000,000 and the $15,000 not to speak of the $841,000.00 as to which we are not very clear up to the present time.

Now, my hon. friend the Postmaster General then proceeded to deal with my remarks concerning the proposed colonization road in the northern part of the provinces of Quebec and Ontario. He estimates for me not a first-class road—he is good enough in this instance to estimate what he calls a cheap colonization road, and he puts it in at only $20,000 a mile or $28,000,000 for a total of 1,400 miles from Quebec to Winnipeg. That is to say, this cheap colonization road would cost under my scheme as he presents it, just $15,000,000 more than the government's scheme is to cost the country in all. A first-class road from Quebec to Winnipeg, a road with four-tenth per cent grades, if we are to take even his estimate of my proposed line from Scotia Junction to Sudbury, would cost $40,000 a mile. Surely that is not a high estimate; it is an absurdly low estimate for a road with four-tenth per cent grades. I do not believe it could be built for $60,000 a mile. But we will take his own estimate, the estimate which he has placed on the line as proposed by me from Scotia to Sudbury, of $40,000 a mile. Then we will have:

Quebec to Winnipeg, 1,475 miles at $40,000 a mile	$59,000,000
Moncton to Quebec, 400 miles at $40,000 a mile	16,000,000
Mountain section (according to the estimate of the Minister of Finance)	2,924,000
The Quebec bridge (according to the same estimate of the Minister of Finance)	2,000,000
That is a total of	$79,924,000

This is without taking into consideration interest during the period of construction and ten years loss of rental; and the hon. Postmaster General is going to do the whole of that for $13,000,000 while he puts down the cost of a cheap colonization line from Quebec to Winnipeg at $28,000,000. I repeat that we can only stand amazed at the unusual moderation and fairness of my hon. friend the Postmaster General.

Now in respect to this so-called colonization road, I pointed out in the speech which I had the honour to deliver in this House some time ago, that I did not believe that the project of building colonization roads through that country and the project of building a short direct through freight road could be carried out on the same lines. Colonization roads should be built in short sections at a time, as the needs and requirements of settlement and of the people demand. Such a road should not be built as a direct through line but should be built into those portions of the country where it is found that it will be most useful for settlement; whereas a through line if it is to give the shortest and best practicable route would naturally disregard considerations of that kind because it is designed to create the most direct route for the transportation of the products of the west to the Atlantic sea-board. Therefore I said at page 9002 of 'Hansard:'

> So far as the line from Quebec to Winnipeg is concerned, I am not disposed to minimize the possibility of that northern country. Looking at the history of the great west, there may be a great flood of settlement into that country north of lake Superior, some day or other, at least up to a certain point west, but I do not think we know enough to justify us at present in saying that there will or will not be, because I do not know how far that country is capable of competing, in the early future, with the magnificent country we have in the North-west. I have some doubts as to whether or not that great northern country may compete as early as we would desire with the great western country. But I am not disposed to minimize its importance in any way, and to my mind the rational way of dealing with the proposed line from Quebec westward is this: First, thoroughly exploit and explore that northern country, realize and understand its capabilities and possibilities for settlement and colonization and build such railways as these conditions and requirements may demand. Build only after you have obtained the fullest possible information, and obtain that information with the least possible delay. You may find curious conditions surrounding you when you get into that country. You may find that the road which is the most direct line to the Pacific coast, will not be the road that will open that country for colonization. You may find it necessary to have a road running in one direction for colonization purposes while any future line to the coast must take a very different direction.

I adhere to that, and I say further that I believe, that the best method of opening that country by colonization roads will be by building these roads gradually from south to north and by connecting the existing settlement of the provinces of Quebec and Ontario with the settlement that may take place in that northern country. Not only will that be in the interest of the people of both provinces but I believe it will be the way in which settlement can best be opened.

Our people would not desire to go two or three hundred miles away from all settlement and to make their homes on the line of a through transcontinental railway, where many of the trains would not stop and where they might not get the accommodation they would desire because it might be expensive and difficult to give such accommodation on a through line of that character. If you build colonization roads from the centre portions of Quebec and Ontario into that northern country you will keep settlement as it advances, closely in touch with the people in the central part of the provinces and in that way will be more likely to accomplish the colonization of that country. By this method you will attract settlers and it is the only businesslike method that can be suggested.

My hon. friend the Postmaster General entered into a long discussion upon my suggestion of an additional transcontinental line in the future. I did not propose the immediate construction of a transcontinental line, but I wish to tell the hon. the Postmaster General and the people of this country that I did not and I do not shrink from the possibility of a further transcontinental line built by the government and operated by the government when it is called for by the requirements of the Canadian North-west. Let the hon Postmaster General, who shrinks from that possibility, think for a moment of the language of the expert of the government, who said at page 8523 of 'Hansard,' that within the lifetime of persons within this House we might have three or four transcontinental lines. If he wants extravagant language let him look at the words of the expert of the government and not at my modest statement that I believe at some time in the future it might be necessary to have a transcontinental line built and operated at the cost of the people of this country. I do not shrink from that responsibility, although the Postmaster General appears to do so. When he takes that position he takes entirely different ground from the expert of the government, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and from that of the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell,) who stated, at page 8953 of 'Hansard,' that the number of transcontinental lines which we might have to build in the future was absolutely unlimited. Let my hon. friend also look at the language of the hon. Minister of Finance, who also, at page 8562, looked to the possibility of several more transcontinental roads. Let him also consider the words of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, who at pages 9516 and 9518 of 'Hansard,' dwelt on the immense possibility of that country in the raising of stock and grain in the future. Let him also read the language of the hon. Minister of the Interior. Let my hon. friend the Postmaster General not thus shrink from the possibility that at some time in the future the people of this country may be called upon to build another transcontinental line and may answer the call.

My hon. friend the Postmaster General grew merry over my proposal to equip the Georgian bay, the St. Lawrence, and maritime ports. At page 9777 of 'Hansard' he actually derides this proposal, and in effect declares—and I think the attention of the country should be called to it—that it is no part of the policy of the government of this country to spend one single dollar upon the Georgian bay ports, or upon the St. Lawrence, or Atlantic ports. I say that after having examined the language of tht Postmaster General, and I will show to the House and to the country how I gather that distinct enunciation of policy from the language of the hon. gentleman. The hon. Postmaster General is making a fair comparison—he has stated that over and over again—between my proposal and the proposal of the government. He calls attention, at page 9778 of 'Hansard' to the fact that the debt of the harbour of the city of Quebec amounts to $5,803,538, and he calls attention to the fact that the debt of the harbour of the city of Montreal amounts to $8,054,156. He does not go into the cost of the equipment of other ports, he does not give the figures in regard to them, because he has not the figures before him, but he takes the figures which he has, and he deliberately adds them to the cost of my proposal, and adds not one single dollar to the cost of the government proposal. He is either making an unfair comparison, and I cannot charge him with that, or else it is not the policy of the government to spend one dollar on the equipment and development of the Georgian bay ports, the St. Lawrence or the Atlantic ports. If there is any answer to that, I would like to know what it is. We have a member of the government, put up by the government to criticise the financial part of my proposal, deliberately adding $5,803,538, the debt of the harbour of the city of Quebec, and $8,054,156, the debt of the harbour of the city of Montreal, to the cost of my proposal, and not one dollar for any of these works does he add to the proposal of the government. Is it not an accurate and necessary deduction from that to say that not one dollar does the government propose to expend on the development of the Georgian bay ports, the St. Lawrence or the Atlantic ports ? Either that is the policy of the government or else the hon. Postmaster General has made a deliberately unfair comparison. I leave the hon. gentleman and the right hon. leader of the House to say which of these alternatives he desires to accept.

My hon. friend also became somewhat merry over my proposal in regard to the consideration by this government of the project of erecting elevators or warehouses, and he said that it was absolutely absurd, because the government could not undertake to com-

pete with private enterprise. Has the hon. Postmaster General been so long in his office that he does not know that he is competing with private enterprise in the Post Office Department at the present time in the forwarding of parcels? Does he not know that he is competing with private enterprise in carrying on a savings bank business? Does he not know that the government is competing with private enterprise in its binder twine factory and in its railways? I did suggest the proposal as a project that the government should immediately enter into; I suggested it as a project that the government should consider, and I pointed out that in the western states there was practically state-ownership of elevators, and that when farmers put their grain into these elevators they received a certificate to which the credit of the state is attached. I do not know whether that is the case or not, but I am so informed. I have not had an opportunity of investigating the subject carefully.

Mr. McCREARY. I do not know that there are in the grain-growing states of Minnesota, Dakota, Wisconsin or Iowa state-owned elevators. There are farmers' elevators, but I know of no state-owned elevators.

Mr. SPROULE Are there none at Duluth?

Mr. McCREARY. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) has perhaps misunderstood me a little. I do not think my information went so far as to say that there are state-owned elevators, but my understanding is the state takes such control over them that the certificates issued for grain deposited in these elevators bear upon them the stamp of the state, that farmers receiving these certificates can look to the whole credit of the state to see that they are paid and that, in fact, they are practically regarded as negotiable instruments by the farmers of the west. I would defer to the superior knowledge of my hon. friend from Selkirk in regard to that, but I am informed by people who profess to be conversant with the facts that such a condition exists in some of the western states, and possibly that information may agree, to some extent, with the information that my hon. friend has upon that point. I would not suppose that it was a very radical thing after all to suggest that the government should consider the economic saving in providing elevators or warehouses at a minimum cost, instead of having farmers themselves provide them at a minimum cost. I think perhaps my hon. friend from Selkirk will agree with me in that view, although he may have some modifications to suggest. For example, if it should cost a cent a bushel to warehouse grain for a certain period of time, and if by such assistance as the government could give to the farmers of the west that grain could be stored for a quarter of a cent a bushel during the same period of time, surely a suggestion of that kind is not so utterly absurd that the government should not take it into consideration. That was all I asked. I did not put this forward as a proposal. I put it forward as something which I thought the government should consider. I adhere absolutely to that opinion, notwithstanding the sneer of the hon. Postmaster General, and I think it is a suggestion which the government will have to take into consideration in the not very distant future.

The hon. Postmaster General, after demolishing very much to his own satisfaction, my proposal, proceeded to deal with the line from Quebec to Moncton. He includes, in the cost of my proposal, for his part of the scheme, $10,000,000. I believe I did, in addressing the House somewhat hurriedly the other day, near six o'clock, speak of a line from Lévis to Moncton. I was not aware that I had done so until I was afterwards informed of it by the hon. Minister of Justice, and having been informed of it by the hon. Minister of Justice in the course of his speech, I said that I intended the line to run from Rivière du Loup to Moncton, because Rivière du Loup brings you past the extremity of the state of Maine, and, according to my view, you can make just as short a line by building from Rivière du Loup to Moncton by the best practicable route, as by building a new line from Lévis to Moncton. Whatever necessity there may be for colonization roads through the rear parishes of the counties of St. Lawrence, I do not know. If there is any need of colonization roads, I would be prepared to give it all due consideration; but for the project of a short line from Lévis to Moncton, what I intended to propose was a line from Rivière du Loup to Moncton, if it would give the people of the maritime provinces and the maritime ports a better fighting chance for the trade of the west, and I so expressed myself in my speech. I propose to build this line as a part of the Intercolonial Railway, to keep it as a part of the people's railway, and not to hand it over to the Grand Trunk Pacific. My hon. friend the Postmaster General, no doubt through inadvertence, puts in the whole line from Lévis to Moncton, and charges my scheme with $10,000,000 as the cost of that line.

Let us bear in mind just this. The whole enterprise of the government is to cost $13,000,000; that whole enterprise of the government includes this line which according to the Postmaster General is to cost $10,000,000 in my proposal; therefore, if you eliminate this $10,000,000, you have $3,000,000 left for the construction of all the other lines proposed by the government. That is a fair argument, is it not? This section is included in the proposal of the Postmaster General which is to cost $13,-

000,000 ; this section, according to him, is to cost $10,000,000, and therefore there are $3,000,000 left to represent the country's cash out of pocket for all the rest of the government proposal. Let us see what this wonderful government and this wonderful Postmaster General are going to do with that $3,000,000. I will give here an estimate, according to the Minister of Finance, of the rest of the proposal, and I will give also my own estimate.

The line from Quebec to Winnipeg, according to Mr. Fielding's estimate will cost $41,300,000, but according to the Postmaster General's estimate of $40,000 a mile for a line from Scotia Junction to Sudbury, which I adopt as fairer, it would cost $59,000,000 ; the loss of rental and interest, according to the Minister of Finance, would amount to $11,468,030 and according to my estimate it would be $17,176,033. The mountain section, according to the proposal of the Minister of Finance, which I adopt for this purpose, would cost $2,924,000. The Quebec bridge, according to the proposal of the Minister of Finance, and I accept his figures for the purpose of this part of the argument, would cost $2,000,000. Therefore you have a total estimate of the cost of the balance of the undertaking, according to the Minister of Finance, of $57,692,030, and according to my estimate of $81,100,033. This is how it would stand :

	Fielding Estimate.	My Estimate.
Line from Quebec to Winnipeg....	$41,300,000	$59,000,000
Loss of rental and interest..	11,468,030	17,176,033
Mountain section.. ..	2,924,000	2,924,000
Quebec bridge..	2,000,000	2,000,000
	$57,692,030	$81,100,033

But the Postmaster General is so much of a born financial genius that he is going to accomplish all this for $3,000,000. The fairness, the moderation, the business-like nature of his claim are so obvious that I am inclined to leave the matter here. I would think, however, that if my right hon. friend the Prime Minister should ever have occasion to select a new Minister of Finance there cannot be the slightest doubt as to where the choice should lie.

My hon. friend the Postmaster General had various other objections of a more or less detailed character to my scheme. He objected to the buying of existing lines. He wanted to build lines and spend money ; he thought the people of this country were very much opposed to the buying of old lines. I was under the impression, until I heard him speak, that he is a member of the government that bought an existing line from Lévis to Ste. Rosalie, and paid for it very much more than it was worth. Apparently he cannot be the same gentleman who so strongly advocated that scheme when it was submitted to this House by the present government. He characterized my scheme as a 'patchwork scheme.' I think he used that designation several times in the course of his somewhat voluminous remarks. Let us see to what extent it is a patchwork scheme and to what extent all railway enterprises in this country are patchwork schemes, if this is one. My scheme contemplates the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to the Georgian bay, either by the purchase of an existing line or by the construction of a new line. Does that make the Intercolonial Railway a patchwork railway ? If so, it must be very much more of a patchwork railway at the present time, because it only enjoys running rights from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal. My proposal contemplates the building of a line from Scotia Junction to Sudbury. Does that make it a patchwork scheme ? Surely not.

Mr. HEYD. Does not the Canada Atlantic Railway run right through—Oh, yes ; you are right.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think my hon. friend (Mr. Heyd) misunderstood me. I intended to suggest, and I believe I did suggest, that for the purpose of connecting the Canada Atlantic Railway line with the present Canadian Pacific Railway line between North Bay and Winnipeg, the most convenient route would be from Scotia Junction to Sudbury.

Mr. HEYD. All right.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Surely that is not a patchwork scheme so far. Then my proposal contemplates the acquisition of this line from Sudbury, or from North Bay, if necessary, to Fort William, and the user of that line under proper and independent control by three different Canadian systems, and by the Intercolonial Railway. Does the user of this one line, sufficient for the purpose of three railways ; does the user of this one line by three railways make this proposed scheme a patchwork scheme ? If so what about the Canada Atlantic Railway at the present time, which runs its trains over the Grand Trunk Railway to Montreal ? What about the Canadian Pacific Railway which runs its trains from Toronto to North Bay over the Grand Trunk Railway ; what about the Dominion Atlantic Railway, in Nova Scotia, which runs its trains for 45 miles over the Intercolonial Railway, and has running powers for 15 miles more ; what about the Intercolonial Railway itself, which runs its trains on the Grand Trunk from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal ; what about the Canadian Pacific Railway, which runs its trains over several leased lines in this country ; what about the Grand Trunk Railway, which, if I am not mistaken, does precisely the same thing ? Are these patchwork systems ? If these are not patchwork systems, then what I am advocating is not a patchwork system, and if my system be a patchwork system, then it is

just as good a patchwork system as the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway, the Dominion Atlantic Railway and dozens of American lines which can be named.

Then, the next proposal I made was to obtain proper grades between Lake Superior and Winnipeg. There is nothing of a patchwork nature in that, so far as I am aware. There is a proposal to aid the Grand Trunk Pacific to build in the west. Is there anything of a patchwork nature in that ? If so, it characterizes the government scheme just as much as mine. Is there anything of a patchwork nature in the proposal that two railways should use in common a line from Edmonton to the coast, if it is sufficient for the purposes of both ? If so, exactly the same argument could be applied to dozens of railways on the North American continent. My hon. friend (Mr. Charlton), the expert of the government, pointed out to us the other day that the Wabash enjoyed running powers over the Grand Trunk. Is that a patchwork system ? Is it a patchwork system to have grain brought by the Canadian Pacific Railway from western points to Fort William, thence by steamer to Georgian Bay ports, and thence by three different railway routes to Montreal, and by the Intercolonial Railway to Halifax and St. John ? Let me point out to my right hon. friend that if that is a patchwork system, it is the very patchwork system which was endorsed by his late Minister of Railways, when the Intercolonial Railway was extended from Lévis to Montreal. The scheme contemplated then was, that the Grand Trunk should get traffic on the shores of the Georgian bay from the great west, bring it to Montreal, hand it over to the Intercolonial Railway, and that the Intercolonial Railway should transmit it to the maritime ports. Is my scheme a patchwork scheme ? What then is the nature of the scheme which was then introduced to this House by the very government of which my right hon. friend is the First Minister, and in which the Postmaster General is a minister ; a scheme which was heralded at the time as the very acme of wisdom and of statesmanship so far as railway development is concerned. Moreover, what does the government policy contemplate ? It contemplates a line owned and operated by the Grand Trunk Pacific from the coast to Winnipeg ; a line owned by the government and operated by the Grand Trunk Pacific from Winnipeg to Moncton and with running powers over the Intercolonial Railway to Halifax or St. John—or, what is much more likely, the transmission of that traffic by the Grand Trunk Railway to Portland. I do not suppose that the Prime Minister or the Postmaster General would regard that as a patchwork scheme, but nevertheless it is quite as deserving of the appellation as the proposal which I made to the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, coming down to a real comparison between the cost of these two schemes, let us see what they actually involve. I would suppose that for the purposes of this comparison I would be entitled to place upon the line from Moncton to Quebec and upon the line from Quebec to Winnipeg at least the same estimate of cost that has been placed by the Postmaster General upon the line which I suggested from Scotia Junction to Sudbury. I know of no reason why a line, not with the grades suggested by the government, but even with fair grades, can be built from Moncton to Winnipeg at less cost than a line from Scotia Junction to Sudbury. I have not heard one word in this House to convince me that a line from Scotia Junction to Sudbury would cost one dollar more per mile than the line from Moncton to Winnipeg. On the contrary, from what I have heard in this House during this discussion, I think it may be safely assumed that, with the same grades and the same general character, the line from Moncton to Winnipeg would cost considerably more per mile than a line from Scotia Junction to Sudbury. However, I will give the Postmaster General the benefit of the doubt, and will place on the proposal of the government the same estimate of cost that he has placed on my proposal of a line from Scotia Junction to Sudbury, that is $40,000 per mile. On that basis, the line from Moncton to Quebec—400 miles in length at the lowest estimate, though I believe it will be much more than that—will cost $16,000,000. The length of the line from Quebec to Winnipeg has been variously estimated ; but I take the estimate of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance 1,475 miles, which, at $40,000 per mile, will cost $59,000,000. The cost of the Quebec bridge, I put at the estimate of the Minister of Finance, $2,000,000. For interest during the period of construction, I adopt the basis of the Minister of Finance, although the figures are of course larger, because the cost is larger ; I put that at $4,838,250. This makes a total so far of $81,831,250. The interest on the eastern division for seven years, during which no rental is to be paid, will amount to $17,176,033 ; and the interest on the eastern division for three years, during which rental may not be paid, or if not paid will be added to capital, will amount to $7,365,442. So that you have, as the cost of this railway, on what I believe to be a low and moderate estimate, no less a sum than $106,389,725. I have not included in this a dollar for interest on the rentals of the eastern division ; I have simply taken the rental which is not to be paid, and computed it for seven years. I might have made some additions to this estimate, but I leave it as it is, excluding all doubtful items and all items on which there might be controversy ; and I take as my basis exactly what my hon. friend the Postmaster General estimated as the cost of my proposed line from

Scotia Junction to Sudbury. As any hon. gentleman in this House will see, in making the calculation on that basis, I have gone on perfectly fair and legitimate lines. I have taken the Postmaster General at his word, and adopted his estimate of $40,000 per mile, which he applied to my proposed line from Scotia Junction to Sudbury, although I believe the government line through the northern country will cost very much more. And when I give this estimate to the country, I do not wish to be understood for a moment as expressing my belief that that line built at that cost could have such grades or be of such a character as the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has said are absolutely necessary to ensure the carriage of grain. The cost would probably be increased fifty per cent if you attempted to construct a road of that kind. I am only estimating a road with fair grades as the hon. Postmaster General did when he put the cost of the road from Scotia Junction to Sudbury at $40,000 a mile.

Now let us see what would be necessary under my alternative scheme to give a complete and perfect connection between the east and the west, and to bring the two great railway systems of the west and the three great railway systems of the east into close connection with each other, at a very early day. In the first place, you would have to build a line from Jacques Cartier Junction to Coteau, thirty miles, which at $40,000 a mile—there is no dispute between us as to the cost of that—would amount to $1,200,000. The acquisition of the Canada Atlantic Railway I estimate at a cost of $12,000,000. I estimate it at that, because I believe that if the Canada Atlantic Railway could not be acquired for that amount, a road from Montreal to the Georgian bay not exceeding 360 miles in length could be built for the total of these two sums which I have named, $13,200,000. Therefore, if we cannot make fair terms with the Canada Atlantic Railway Company, I believe that sum would be amply sufficient to build a railway from Montreal to a port on the Georgian bay. A line from Scotia Junction to Sudbury, 104 miles at $40,000 per mile would cost $4,160,000. The line from Sudbury to Fort William, 555 miles, at an outside cost of $45,000 a mile, would cost $24,975,000. Betterments from Sudbury to Fort William might cost $3,000,000, and on the line from Fort William to Winnipeg, $2,130,000. That gives a total cost of $47,465,000 to accomplish the results which I have pointed out. That leaves a balance between the cost of this portion of my alternative scheme and the cost of the government scheme of something like $60,000,000; and that $60,000,000 could be applied in many efficient ways toward the improvement of the transportation facilities of this country. A portion of it could be appropriated towards those colonizations roads in the north of which I have spoken. A portion could be applied to the equipment of the Georgian bay ports. A portion might even be applied to the improvement and development of our canals. A further portion could be devoted to the efficient equipment of the ports of Quebec and Montreal, as well as the ports of St. John and Halifax. And after you have done all that, you would still have many millions of dollars to the good.

With regard to the proposal of the government itself, while I do not at the present moment attempt to deal exhaustively with the defects which might be pointed out—this has been done very fully in the course of the debate—nevertheless there are one or two characteristics so important that I think they should be mentioned even at this stage. In the first place, there is an absolute lack of knowledge as to the eastern section, an absolute lack of any information which can give us a fair idea of what it would cost. I asked members of the government across the floor the other day whether there was one of them who could state the cost of the eastern section within $40,000,000, if it is to be built on a four-tenths per cent grade, and whether or not, if prepared to make such an estimate, they could present to the country any data upon which it could be fairly based. I failed to get any reply. I do not think that my right hon. friend, or any man on that side, is able to make an estimate and support it by sufficient data within the figures I have given. If we are to build a road with a four-tenths per cent grade, which is the grade my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says it must have—the cost of a road with such a grade, with proper curves, to give it the solidity and character necessary for the hauling of trains such as my hon. friend from North Norfolk describes, is a matter of so much intricacy and detail that we cannot say we have any requisite information before us. My hon. friend from North Norfolk the other day spoke of hauling trains of 2,000 tons over that railway at a cost of $1 per mile. My hon friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker), who followed him, showed that on a railway which he mentioned, having as low grades as any railway in America, the cost of hauling a train load of 576 tons was $2 per mile, and the inaccuracy of the hon. member for North Norfolk to whom my right hon. friend the Prime Minister pointed as a great expert on railway transportation, in that regard indicates that if he is so far away from the actual facts in a matter of that kind, the government itself cannot be very near the actual truth as regards the cost of construction.

In the next place we had a commission appointed for the purpose of investigating this question. No one can read the language of the Order in Council without concluding absolutely that the commission was appointed to deal with this very question of transportation. Yet while that commission will be

at work, and before we can have any information from it, we are to spend $120,000,000, perhaps $150,000,000, without any data or information from that source.

Then I have pointed out the absence of safeguards to preserve Canadian traffic for our Canadian routes. I have pointed out that the Grand Trunk Railway is really in control of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, and designedly so by the Act of this government, which obliges the Grand Trunk Railway to hold $24,900,000 capital stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway stock, which it may acquire at any nominal price that may be agreed upon between the two companies, and that the Grand Trunk Railway can take over the freight at Winnipeg, North Bay, Gravenhurst or Quebec and carry it to Portland without violating a single stipulation in this contract. That is certainly a grave defect. I have pointed out again that the distance from Quebec to Portland is less than 318 miles, and from Quebec to St. John, the shortest possible route, even taking the estimates of my hon. friend, is from 470 to 490 miles, and from Quebec to Halifax, the shortest possible route claimed by my hon. friends opposite, is 586 miles. Even if you make the tolls the same, the Grand Trunk Railway will get all the tolls from Quebec to Portland, whereas to Halifax or St. John it will get only a very small share of the tolls. Therefore it is of prime importance that the Grand Trunk Railway should be bound by some restrictions in the contract. It has both its terminals in the United States, and you cannot blame it for taking its traffic to Portland if it can make more money in that way than by sending it to St. John or Halifax. But I blame the government for not stipulating in this or some supplementary contract that that traffic cannot be carried by the Grand Trunk Railway to its American terminals, but, in consideration of the aid given to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, must be carried to Canadian ports.

Then this scheme of the government absolutely fails to take into account our great inland water ways, on which we have spent some $80,000,000. They propose to side-track the water ways. According to their experts, the whole of the western grain will be brought over this railway, because it will be the cheapest route. Well, what then is to become of our water ways ? or, if the combined rail and water route is the cheaper, what is the object of spending $120,000,000 to $150,000,000 on this scheme ? If the grain will go to the western shores of the Georbian bay and be transported thence by water or by combined rail and water to Quebec and Montreal, why should the country be saddled with an expenditure of $120,000,000 to $150,000,000 on building this road to Moncton? The government can take either horn of the dilemma they chose. Either this road is going to accomplish the wonderful things claimed for it, or it will not. If it should, what will become of the $80,000,000 spent on our water ways ? On the other hand if it should not, and we continue to use the water ways, of what utility will be the road ? If we are spending this enormous sum of $120,000,000 or $150,000,000, as estimated by the ex-Minister of Railways, when will we be in a position to equip the Georgian bay ports, to develop our canals and to do anything effective for the ports of Montreal, Quebec, Halifax and St. John ? It will be an enormous expenditure and will leave us in an absolutely helpless condition for many years to come, so far as the development of our inland water ways is concerned.

Further than that, this new road will strangle the Intercolonial by leaving it with its present terminus at Montreal. There can be no doubt in the mind of any one who listened to the debate on the extension of the Intercolonial from Quebec to Montreal, that the proposal then was to bring the Intercolonial then to Montreal in order that it might compete for western traffic. Well, it was brought to Montreal and has not secured very much of that traffic. What is the reason ? The reason is that it has no western connections. True a contract was made with the Grand Trunk Railway, which was heralded to us as absolutely securing to the Intercolonial a very large portion of the western traffic, but so far we have not secured that traffic, let the reason be what it may. We have two railways coming to Montreal and one very close to Montreal—the Canada Atlantic Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. So far as the Canada Atlantic Railway is concerned, it brings its grain from Coteau principally by steamer, and the Intercolonial has no connection with the point to which that grain is brought in the city of Montreal. The Grand Trunk Railway brings grain to Montreal. It has its own connections to Quebec and to Portland, and it takes the grain to either one or the other. The Canadian Pacific Railway also has its eastern connections. But the Intercolonial remains at Montreal, absolutely helpless so far as competition for western traffic is concerned. If, instead of leaving it in that position, you extend the Intercolonial to the Georgian bay, you create for that road an entirely different condition of things. You then have the Intercolonial, the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk and the Canada Atlantic, all competing on the eastern shores of Georgian bay for the traffic that comes from the great west. That traffic is brought by steamers, by independent lines, and the Intercolonial would be on equal terms with these other railways in competing for that traffic. Is there any good reason why the Intercolonial should stop where it is, at Montreal ? We have talked a great deal about government ownership, but I repeat what I have already

asked—what are you going to do with the Intercolonial ? Do you propose that it shall have no development in the future ? If you propose to continue to own it, surely the proper policy is to develop it, not to let it stand still. Any railway that stands still in this progressive age becomes inert—it dies or is absorbed. That is what will happen to the Intercolonial if left in its present condition. But if you give it the extension that I have proposed under this scheme you will secure to it, and thus to the maritime provinces, a fair share of the western traffic. For if the Intercolonial once secures a connection with the Georgian bay ports, it will carry the traffic it secures to the maritime provinces, because it cannot carry it elsewhere.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). At recess I was speaking of that feature of the government proposal which leaves the Intercolonial with its western terminus at Montreal, with no western connection and helpless to compete for western traffic. In that connection it might not be out of place for me to refer to some remarks made by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) which are to be found at pages 10288 and 10289 of the revised 'Hansard.' I am quoting now from the remarks of the hon. gentleman at page 10289, where he says :

> The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, which will lease our line from Winnipeg to Moncton, will have that line fed by the Grand Trunk Railway and by its own western traffic. There will, therefore, be trade and traffic to go over it. But who will there be to feed the Intercolonial Railway, which the hon. gentleman would bring to Winnipeg ? Will the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Canadian Northern Railway ? Certainly not. You run your Intercolonial Railway to Winnipeg and there you stand. But where are you going to get your freight ? Will the Canadian Pacific Railway hand it over to you ? Not at all, because they will use their own road. Will the Canadian Northern Railway ? Certainly not, because they have a road of their own to use. Where then are you going to get your freight ?

My hon. friend the Minister of Customs in the first place does not seem to realize that this is exactly the position in which he proposes to leave the Intercolonial at Montreal, with no western connection. The Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canada Atlantic Railway all run from Montreal west, but no one of them has direct connections with the Intercolonial except the Grand Trunk, and that railway has eastern connections both at Quebec and Portland which make it to its own interest that it should not hand traffic over to the Intercolonial at that point ; but my hon. friend, who is thoroughly alarmed at the prospect which will face the Intercolonial at Winnipeg, is absolutely satisfied with its position at Montreal although that railway was extended from Quebec to Montreal, at an expense which has been estimated in this House at from 15 to 20 million dollars, for the express purpose of securing a portion of western freight. Let me point out also, so far as these railways in the west are concerned, that the Canadian Northern at present has no connection with the eastern part of Canada, but that it would have such connection under my proposal. It would connect with the Intercolonial at Sudbury and there would be every reason why that railway should hand over to the Intercolonial at Sudbury freight to be transferred to the seaboard, in so far as freight is to come around the north shore of Lake Superior by rail. I pointed out that the Intercolonial having once arrived at Winnipeg would not necessarily stop there. I stated as part of my proposal, subject to the advice and opinion of the best expert railway men we can get in the country, that the Intercolonial Railway, having once arrived at Winnipeg, would not stop there, but would eventually proceed to the Pacific coast whenever it appeared that the requirements of the people of the west and of this country as a whole should require such an extension. Let me point out that in the opinion of very capable and competent men in this country the traffic will come across Lake Superior ; that it will be gathered on the western shore of Lake Superior, will be freighted across that lake and will be then taken by railways at the eastern shore of Lake Superior. At the risk of wearying the House I would like to read a portion of a letter which has already been read by my hon. friend from North Lanark (Mr. Rosamond). This letter is from Mr. Robert Meighen, who advances arguments pointing to the couclusion that in the future we may expect very much the larger portion, in fact all of the grain traffic of the west to come to the east via Lake Superior. After stating, in the first place, that he does not propose to give any opinion one way or another with regard to the proposals before parliament, but merely to give his views as a business man, he says :

> I have put my views on record in the public press nine years ago that but a small portion of the products of Manitoba or the North-west Territories will ever be brought round the north of Lake Superior by an all-rail route to tide-water. My opinion has not changed—you will never bring but a small portion of the products of our prairies by either the Grand Trunk Pacific or the Canadian Pacific by an all-rail route, and only a small portion can ever be brought to tide-water by our Canadian canals.
>
> The farmer begins to dispose of his yearly crop of wheat from about the first to the tenth of September, and by the close of navigation if the transportation facilities in the interior to Fort William are adequate, two-thirds of the crop will have gone forward to the lake front by close of navigation, say 12th December.

You can operate vessels from Fort William across the lake to Georgian bay ports up to the 12th December. What we require is elevating facilities east of the lakes the same as they have at Buffalo. We require low grade double track railways from Montreal to the said Georgian bay ports ; when that is accomplished you will freight the wheat across the lakes from Fort Wiliam east to the elevators at from three-quarters to one cent per bushel. The railways wil carry the wheat from Georgian bay ports to Montreal for 3½ cents per bushel or less, winter and summer ; you will have our lake elevators acting as large reservoirs for holding the immense body of grain that will be shipped across the lakes before navigation closes, which will act as freight for our railways during the winter months to Halifax and St. John, our winter ports.

The balance of the Manitoba crop, or the Territories, will be held either in the farmers' hands, or in the interior elevators, or at Fort William until navigation opens on the first of May.

From the foregoing you will observe that a railway round the north of Lake Superior as far as being a factor in diverting the products of our North-west through the all-Canadian channel, in my opinion will be a failure.

The fact of the matter is we are a great many years behind the times ; we should have had elevator facilities at Georgian bay ports ; we should have had a fleet of vessels on the lakes to carry the grain from Fort William to Georgian bay ports ; we should have been far as being a factor in diverting the products of our North-west years ago ; what is the position to-day ?

Mark my words, a considerable portion of our North-west grain in the near future will be diverted to the south to be shipped from Duluth to Buffalo, and from there by American railways to tide-water. By the policy we have adopted, and what we have neglected to adopt, we are furnishing transportation for our American railways ; we are placing our western people in touch with the American middleman ; we are doing our business by the back door.

In a word we will never be in a position to handle the products of the North-west until the transportation in the prairie provinces is capable of handling two-thirds of the crop and delivering it at the lake front, say Fort William, before navigation closes, and the facilities for freighting the wheat across the lakes to our elevators, and railway facilities of the proper kind, as I have described for carrying the wheat from the lake elevators to Montreal and Quebec during the season of navigation on the St. Lawrence, and to St. John and Halifax after close of navigation. But you will never bring but a small portion of the Manitoba crop round the north of Lake Superior by an all-rail route to tide-water. A double-track low grade railway from Montreal to say Midland or some other Georgian bay port will be capable of handling two hundred million bushels of wheat during the year, and as I have said, place an engine to 80 cars on a railway such as I describe, and you can haul it to Montreal. However the contents of 80 cars will be condensed into a much smaller number, but the amount of grain that will be contained in 80 of our present cars will be hauled by one engine from the lake port to Montreal.

I can assure you I look upon the present state of affairs, as far as the transportation question is concerned, as presenting anything but a bright future. I am afraid that before you are much older, you will see a very considerable portion of the products of Manitoba and the North-west Teritories diverted to the south of us.

I would point out that if the views of this gentleman, who has given this question a great deal of study, are correct, then we may expect an enormous amount of the grain traffic of the west, in fact practically all of that grain traffic, to come to the western shores of Lake Superior and then the extension of the Intercolonial to the eastern shore of Lake Superior will give that railway the opportunity which, as the Minister of Customs said, is so much to be desired, of competing on equal terms with other railways for the grain traffic of the west. The hon. the Postmaster General referred with some scorn to my proposal as to the erection of elevators, yet this gentleman, who is familiar with the business affairs of the country, familiar with the problem of transportation, expressly lays stress upon the necessity of having large elevators not only on the western shore but on the eastern shore of Lake Superior. As the hon. the Postmaster General thinks it so absurd a thing that the government should enter into competition with private enterprise, let me point out to him that this government has already done that. They have erected an elevator at Halifax, following in that regard the example of the late government. There, however, they are not competing with private enterprise in one sense as there is no other elevator in Halifax. But the government went further and erected an elevator and terminals at an enormous cost, in the city of St. John where that elevator and terminals are expressly in competition with the elevator and terminals of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Further than that, the policy of the government, as announced by the Minister of Railways of the day, declared that these terminals and that elevator at St. John were built for the express purpose of securing a considerable portion of the grain traffic of the west, in competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Therefore when we suggest that the government should erect necessary elevators on Lake Superior and elsewhere on the St. Lawrence route and at maritime ports, we are in that only suggesting the continuation of a policy which has already been entered upon by the Conservative government of years ago and by the present government since they came into power.

The next point of criticism I wish to make upon the proposal of the government is that there is no return of any kind for the vast expenditure that is contemplated. There is no control secured by this measure over rates in the west or in the east beyond the general control of the law of this country applicable to all railways. In that regard the railway policy of the government falls far short of that which was entered upon some two or three years ago by the gov-

ernment of the province of Manitoba, which, in return for aid ganted to railways, obtained stipulations in the form of a contract as to the control which it should exercise over rates. We are told that certain very low rates are to prevail upon this road from Winnipeg to Quebec, or to Halifax, or St. John, but when any suggestion is made that some stipulation should be placed in the contract as to the actual amount of these rates, that there should be some guarantee to the people of this country that the rates so suggested shall be the rates at which the products of the west shall be carried over the road, we are met at once by the government with a refusal to insert any such stipulation in the contract.

The next criticism which ought to be made upon this railway policy of the government is that it aims by means of a short continental route to develop at the same time the great northern country of Ontario and Quebec for colonization purposes. I have pointed out that the development of the country for colonization cannot be accomplished by the construction of a short through route, and I believe that to be the fact, because a short through route, even if practicable for the purp se indicated from Winnipeg to Quebec and Moncton, is not likely to be, in fact cannot possibly be, the kind of road which would best be suited for the development of a country for colonization purposes.

Further than that, the proposal of the government pledges the credit of this country to the extent of between $100,000,000 and $150,000,000 for the construction of this railway upon data absolutely insufficient and utterly wanting in the important details that we should have before an enterprise of this kind is entered upon. The construction of this railway from Winnipeg to Quebec and Moncton as a grain carrying road can only be regarded at the present time as an experiment, because we have not that accurate information that such a road can be built for the purpose with any hope of its being operated upon a reasonable basis. We cannot believe that such a road can be constructed at such a cost as would result in rates that would meet those by the lake and rail route.

In regard to the alternative proposition which has been suggested by myself, I want to say in the first place that it does not propose to proceed with any measure of railway extension until ample information has been obtained on all essential points. It was made a condition precedent to the proposal that I submitted to the House that we should secure the best expert advice and assistance before proceeding with so great a scheme as this. In the next place, I say that it secures effective control of rates as far as the commerce between the east and the west is concerned by the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to western points. In the fourth place, it aims at utilizing and developing the great inland water ways of Canada and demands equipment as speedily as the resources of the country will permit of the Georgian bay, St. Lawrence and maritime ports. In the fifth place, the Intercolonial Railway having been extended at a great cost to Montreal, my scheme aims at giving it further extension towards the west to such points as will enable it to secure western traffic and looks to the ultimate extension to the Pacific coast. I wish to say that I have the support of two very important members on the other side of the House as to the extension of the Intercolonial Railway westward. In addressing this House during the last session the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), as will be found at page 3676 of 'Hansard,' spoke as follows :

> I believe that the government made a mistake in not having bought the control of the Canada Atlantic Railway some time ago. The Intercolonial Railway should have been extended from Montreal to Depot Harbour on the great lakes so as to give an outlet by the government road from the great lakes to the sea-board.

Exactly the policy which I have been advocating in this House during the discussion upon this Bill, and exactly the policy which was put forward by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) in regard to future railway extension in this country. Further than that, my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) also spoke along the same lines. I find at page 8741 of 'Hansard' of this year that in speaking in regard to this very measure he used the following language :

> But there is one thing I do wish to say, and that is in connection with the proposition made by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) in regard to the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to the Georgian bay, in order that that railway might participate in the traffic which comes over the lakes. I have a strong sympathy with that idea ; but I recognize that this scheme is in no sense a barrier to the final carying out of that great project.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, if it is in no sense a barrier to the carrying out of that great project, and if the extension of the Intercolonial Railway is a part of the project of the government, I trust that the hon. Postmaster General, or some hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, will be good enough to add to the cost of the government proposal the cost which they have already assigned to that part of my proposal which contemplates the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to the shores of the Georgian bay. As has been suggested by some of my hon. friends around me, I imagine that the cost of that part of my proposal, when it comes to be investigated from the standpoint of hon. gentlemen opposite will be found to be very much under the sum of $15,000,000 or $17,000,000 which has been so assigned by the hon. Postmaster General in connection with my pro-

posal. In the next place the proposal which I have made to the House takes into account the necessity of developing the great country north of Quebec and Ontario and it aims at accomplishing this by colonization roads built as the requirements of settlement demand so as to bring the newly developed regions into closer touch with the other portions of the settled provinces. It contemplates the necessity of building colonization lines into that country as the requirements of settlements may demand. We believe that the colonization of that country can be best undertaken and carried out by roads which advance gradually, but as rapidly as may be necessary, from the settled points in Ontario and Quebec into these northern regions as settlement proceeds and as these parts of the country are opened up. We do not believe that a through road, a road designed for the carriage of through freight can accomplish colonization and settlement in those portions of the country as rapidly as roads built for the purpose and constructed along the lines which I have already indicated. In the next place my proposal aims at bringing immediately two great railway systems of the west and three great railway systems of the east into almost immediate connection with each other over Canadian territory. The Canadian Pacific Railway, one of the systems of the west and of the east has of course already connection along the north of Lake Superior. The utilization of a line so built will enable the Grand Trunk Railway in the east and the Canadian Northern Railway in the west to get the connection with other portions of the Dominion which it is eminently desirable that these two roads should have. In the next place my proposal aims at the development of our railway system not only through the unsettled northern portions of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec but also through the settled portions of Ontario and Quebec which in many respects are in need of further railway development in order to give them that position in connection with the commerce of this country to which they are reasonably entitled.

When we can have the commerce of this country carried cheaply by the great lakes and through the settled portions of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec to the ports of Montreal and Quebec and the maritime provinces; it is not desirable that we should enter into the experiment of building a railroad through northern Ontario and Quebec, with the idea of making it answer the purpose of a short through transportation route, as well as the purpose of a colonization road. We have every reason to believe that this railroad cannot fulfil these two conditions; but by extending the Intercolonial Railway, which is already of so much importance to the people of the maritime provinces, to the shores of the Georgian bay and, if necessary, further west, even to the Pacific ocean; we bind together the whole of Canada by a road which will be owned by the people themselves and over which they can have control. And lastly, Sir, I may say that the extension of the Intercolonial Railway, even to the shores of the Georgian bay, must necessarily—for the reasons I have stated over and over again, and which are so succinctly stated in the letter of Mr. Meighen—must necessarily bring a very considerable portion of the western traffic, not only to the ports of Montreal and Quebec, but also to the ports of Halifax and St. John. I am sorry to have detained the House at so great length, and I will bring my remarks to a conclusion by moving the amendment, notice of which has already been given by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I beg to move, seconded by Dr. Sproule:

That all the words after 'that' in the main motion be left out and the following substituted therefor:—

1. It is not expedient to ratify the agreement set forth in the schedule to the Bill now before this House entitled: An Act respecting the construction of a National Transcontinental Railway.

2. That the government has failed to lay before the House such information as would justify parliament in committing the country to the agreement as a whole and especially to that portion of the agreement which provides for the construction of nearly nineteen hundred miles of railway constituting the eastern section of the railway therein mentioned.

3. That the government in declaring its policy in the speech from the Throne at the opening of the present session gave a direct and specific pledge that it would immediately appoint a commission of experienced men to report on the whole question of transportation and terminal facilities.

4. That in pursuance of this pledge the government on the 19th day of May, 1903, by an Order in Council touching the questions affecting transportation in Canada further declared its policy in the following words:—

'The questions to be considered are complicated and involved, including among the objects to be sought the transportation of western products from place of production to the markets of the world.

This involves the consideration of their transportation:—

From place of production to Canadian seaports.

From place of production to the western ports of Lake Superior.

From the western ports of Lake Superior to Canadian seaports.

From Canadian seaports to Europe.

From place of production through Canadian ports on the Pacific.

As it affects the products of the eastern provinces of Canada it involves their movement:—

To the seaports.

From the seaports to Europe.

It is obvious that before any satisfactory conclusion can be reached upon these questions a thorough and comprehensive inquiry should be made regarding:—

The conditions of original shipment and the possibilities of improvement in the conditions surrounding such shipments.

The storage requirements of lake, river and ocean ports.

The harbour facilities of the inland lakes, rivers and Atlantic and Pacific ports.

The conditions with regard to the navigation of the St. Lawrence route, and, generally any improvement, enlargement or other matters affecting the more economical and satisfactory uses of any Canadian channel of transportation by land or water.

In making any such investigation attention should not be confined to routes and facilities which are at present utilized but, if necessary, new surveys should be made to determine whether any more economical and satisfactory channels of transportation by land or water can be opened up.

The forces operating against the attainment of all Canadian transport, namely,

Competition by United States railways ;

Competition by United States vessels from Lake Superior ports ; diversions of Canadian products through eastern outlets to Boston, Portland and other United States ports, should be investigated, and the best and most economical methods used by our competitors should be carefully studied and reported upon.

In these circumstances it devolves upon the Dominion government to consider and adopt the best possible means of promoting such measures as may enable Canada to control the transportation of its own products, and it is thought that the most efficient method of conducting such an inquiry and obtaining the required information is by means of a commission of competent and experienced experts.'

5. That no such inquiry or investigation has been conducted or held and the 'required information' referred to in the Order in Council above quoted has not been obtained or laid before this House.

6. That this House is of opinion that the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway should continue to be owned and operated by the government of Canada.

7. That the government system of railways should be developed and improved in the province of Quebec and in the maritime provinces and should also be extended from Montreal westward to such point or points as will enable it to transport to eastern Canada and to our national ports on the St. Lawrence and on the Atlantic the rapidly increasing products of our great western country.

8. That by

(a.) Developing and extending the government system of railways either by the construction of new lines, or sections of railway, or by acquiring and improving existing lines of railway ;

(b.) Securing under government control and direction or where expedient under government ownership, common haulage or running facilities in sections where one railway can usefully accommodate several systems ;

(c.) Giving, if and where necessary, material aid by way of guarantee or otherwise, to railway construction in the great west, and to colonization railways in the older provinces.

(d.) Enlarging and improving our canal system, developing our magnificent lake and river routes and thoroughly equipping our national ports on the great lakes, the St. Lawrence and the Atlantic sea-board ;

(e.) Perfecting a system of elevator warehousing, and creating free terminal facilities, and

(f.) Securing absolute and thorough control of rates in consideration for assistance thus given;

We would open up new territories, provide for our products the best and cheapest transport to the Atlantic and Pacific sea-boards, connect without delay the great railway systems of the east and of the west, relieve any threatened congestion of traffic and secure the transportation of our products through Canadian channels while at the same time we would stimulate and promote interprovincial trade between the various communities by whom the cost of such national undertakings must necessarily be mainly borne.

9. That the management of government railways and of all railways under the control or direction of the government should be freed from party political control, influence and interference.

10. That for the purpose of accomplishing these results the government in accordance with the policy laid down in the Order in Council above recited should avail itself of the best expert advice and assistance before seeking to commit the country to expenditure upon any national transportation scheme or project.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has devoted the greater portion of his not at all short speech not so much to an attack on the measure which is now before the House as to a defence of his own policy. It is rather significant that on the third reading of this Bill, which has been before the House for two months, the hon. gentleman should feel himself called upon to devote so much energy and so much time to defend a scheme which, in my opinion, he never was called upon to lay before parliament. The hon. gentleman seems to be conscious of the weakness of the policy which he brought to the attention of the country as an alternative, so he says, to the project of the government. I call the attention of the House to the fact that my hon. friend spoke, and his conclusion came after his speech, as night follows day, and his conclusion resembles his speech about as much as night resembles day ; because, if you take the amendment and compare it with the speech, you will find that the amendment has no connection at all with the policy which we have heard dilated upon by the hon. gentleman.

Sir, if anything were needed to justify the policy which the government have introduced to the attention of the House and this country as a necessity of our present situation, there would be justification—nay, there would be complete vindication—in the attitude and conduct of the opposition from its initial step to this last stage. It was remarkable that in the debate which took place on the original resolutions introduced by the government—a debate which lasted some three weeks, in which the whole of the opposition participated from the leader down through all the ranks of the party, in which the policy of the government was subjected to microscopic and minute fault-finding, in which hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House vied with each other as to which could show the greatest ingenuity in splitting hairs and weighing grains of sand—the opposition as a whole never dared to concentrate their criticism in an amendment, so that we could have a line of cleavage clear and distinct between them and the government. It was no less remark-

able than when it came to the turn of the leader himself to speak, he rose and delivered a carefully prepared speech, and after having spoken the better part of three hours, he sat down without moving an amendment. The farthest he would go, the most he would dare, was simply to throw out as a feeler some suggestions or ideas, not by way of affirmation, but like the legs of a spider spreading in all directions, but against which immediately some of his followers commenced to kick most vigorously. During those three weeks we had words in abundance, torrents of eloquence, speeches in endless streams; but to those speeches there was no conclusion, and the words were wholly negative. But at last, after the opposition had been taunted in a most admirable speech by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) at having no policy to offer but simply indulging in negative criticism, the speech of the hon. member for Toronto was interrupted in order that notice might be given to us of the tenor of an amendment which should be moved by the hon. leader of the opposition, who was unfortunately absent at that time—not on the third reading of the Bill, but on the concurrence of the resolutions. At last we have that amendment. Let us compare it with the speech of my hon. friend. In the speech which he delivered some time ago he was most precise as to his policy. It was genuine, we understood what it meant. First of all, it meant an extension of the Intercolonial Railway from Montreal to the shores of the Georgian bay. This was a counter proposition which everybody could understand. Next his proposition was to buy the section of the Canadian Pacific Railway from North Bay station to Fort William. This also was a specific undertaking which everybody could understand. If that proposition, which was advocated and defended with great eloquence, were embodied in this resolution, we could understand it; we would have a line of cleavage. But what is the tenor of the resolution of my hon. friend? He has contended that the Intercolonial Railway should be extended to the shores of the Georgian bay; but this is not what he says in the resolution. In the resolution he says this:

> That the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway should continue to be owned and operated by the government of Canada.

Well, who has put that in issue? Who has heard in this debate of any proposal to sell the Intercolonial Railway to anybody? And what is the reason for affirming that the Intercolonial Railway must continue to be owned and operated by the government? Then, he says:

> That the government system of railways should be developed and improved in the province of Quebec and in the maritime provinces, and should also be extended from Montreal westward to such point or points as will enable it to transport to eastern Canada and to our national ports on the St. Lawrence and on the Atlantic the rapidly increasing products of our great western country.

There is not a word here to the effect that this should be done by the acquisition of the Canada Atlantic Railway. This is what the government propose to do—to extend our railway communication westward, so as to bring the trade of the western country to the St. Lawrence and to our maritime ports. But my hon. friend is a wily politician. He wants to give just enough to his followers to enable them to say: See where we are; we are in favour of developing the trade of the country and bringing it to our eastern ports; but we do not want to commit ourselves; we speak, but we do not work and do not act. My hon. friend will pardon me if I say that he reminds me of the old fable—I say it without offence—of the bat who one day fell among the birds, and said, 'I am one of yourselves—look at my wings,' and the next day he found himself among the rats, and said, 'I am one of yourselves—look at my claws.' When my hon. friend asks his followers to declare themselves, he is rather chary. He is careful to keep to generalities for which all can vote but on which no one need commit himself to anything in particular. But since my hon. friend has today devoted a great deal of energy and time to a discussion of the policy which he will not dare to put in the form of an amendment, perhaps it will not be amiss if we give some examination to what he calls his policy. And I may say to my hon. friend that I shall be much surprised if, when we come to examine what he so complacently calls his policy, the country does not come to the conclusion that it is not practicable and will not bear criticism.

Let me come to the question of the acquisition of the Canada Atlantic Railway as an extension of the Intercolonial to the shores of the Georgian bay. There is a gap between the terminus of the Intercolonial Railway at Montreal and the commencement of the Canada Atlantic Railway at Coteau. How does my hon. friend propose to fill that gap? He has gone deeply into the subject, and that point has not escaped him. He has given us a plan, and what is that plan? That having acquired the Canada Atlantic Railway from the shores of Georgian bay, not to Coteau, but to somewhere in the state of Vermont, we should build an extension of the Intercolonial from Jacques Cartier Junction to Coteau. But my hon. friend seems to forget that at this moment between Montreal and Coteau there are already two lines of railway—one built by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the other built several years before by the Grand Trunk Railway; and that between these two lines, for three-fourths of their length, there is not a distance of more than half a mile. They run within sight of each other, and any

passenger can see the trains racing with one another almost every day. Between these two railways and the river there is a distance of not more than one mile. Does my hon. friend seriously contemplate building another line of railway in this distance of 30 miles, when we could be accommodated in another manner? In another part of his speech my hon. friend has advocated the acquisition by this government of that section of the Canadian Pacific Railway betweeen North Bay and Fort William, and making it a common highway. Does it not occur to my hon. friend that if we acquired the Canada Atlantic, it would be more reasonable for us to acquire one of the existing lines between Coteau and Montreal? It seems to me that this part of my hon. friend's scheme cannot bear criticism. However, in view of the great improbability of Canada acquiring and operating the Canada Atlantic Railway, this is not of very great importance.

I come now to the main proposition of my hon. friend. He proposes to acquire the Canada Atlantic Railway as it exists to-day. But though the government may acquire the Canada Atlantic Railway, it certainly could not operate it. How could you expect that a Canadian government could possibly, with any advantage to the country, operate the Canada Atlantic Railway. It is within the knowledge of everybody that at this moment three-fourths at least of the business of the Canadian Pacific Railway and three-fourths of the business of the Canada Atlantic Railway is American business. It is business connected with the western states and carried to its destination in the eastern states. The Canadian government could not compete for that business if we were to acquire that railway. At present the manager of the Canada Atlantic Railway has connections and agents in Duluth, Milwaukee, Chicago and other points in the west, and in New York, Boston and other cities in the east, collecting freight in the east for the western states and in the west for the eastern states. Now, would it be possible for the Canadian government to maintain those agents in American cities and keep connections there in order to collect that trade now passing over our territory? That trade is an advantage to our country and we want to keep it. In my opinion we must be the carriers by the valley of the St. Lawrence, not only of the products of our own North-west but of the American North-west and also the traffic of the eastern states. That American business we would lose. Not only that. In order to secure that trade, the Canada Atlantic has to maintain a fleet of steamers on the lakes. I doubt how far it would be advisable for a government to become not only railway proprietors but also navigators. We would have to manage a fleet of steamers. There is something more. The fleet maintained on the lakes for the purpose of supplying traffic to the Canada Atlantic Railway is composed in part of American bottoms. It would be impossible to have the trade we have to-day unless it was carried in American bottoms. We can carry Canadian freight in Canadian bottoms, but you cannot take freight at Duluth, Chicago or Milwaukee or any of the western ports and bring it to Depot Harbour except in American bottoms. The bonding privilege of the Americans has been so devised as to make that a necessity. Therefore the Canadian government would have to become the owners of a fleet of steamers under American register. How would that work? The whole thing is so beset with difficulties that it would be impossible to carry it out as a government enterprise. Of course if you want to give up the American business and confine yourself to the Canadian business, the scheme of my honourable friend might be workable, but there is not a man in this country, not even my hon. friend, who would be willing that Canada should part with this American business. On the contrary we want to increase it. Therefore in my opinion, the scheme of my hon. friend in so far as the acquisition of the Canada Atlantic Railway is concerned, is not practicable.

My hon. friend asked a moment ago what are you going to do with the Intercolonial. His scheme would be to bring the Intercolonial to the shores of North Bay, but our scheme is to bring it, not merely to the shores of the Georgian bay, but to the city of Winnipeg, the heart of the provinces.

Another part of his scheme—one which, I think, he will have some difficulty in getting even his own friends to agree to, and I am not surprised that he would not put it into the concrete form of an amendment and ask his followers to swallow it—is this. He has seriously proposed that the Canadian government should acquire the Canadian Pacific Railway line between North Bay and Fort William. Why should he propose such a scheme? First of all, we ought to be thankful on this side for his having proposed the idea, made as it is, because it is a justification of our policy. But he admits that we must have railway communications between the east and the west. This is the very basis of the scheme we have submitted. My hon. friend has acknowledged that the basis is a good one. He justifies our scheme by proposing that we should acquire that part of the Canadian Pacific Railway line. But he does not want to have that connection between the east and the west in the way we desire. He has a scheme of his own. In what respect is it superior to ours? We have proposed to build a railway between the east and the west. In what respect is his scheme to buy the Canadian Pacific Railway from North Bay to Fort William superior to ours? Is it from the point of view of expenditure? Will the plan he proposes be cheaper

than ours ? We have been told that that section of country between North Bay and Fort William has cost at least $60,000 a mile and in parts $80,000 a mile. I think my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) said that portions of that section had cost $80,000 per mile. He proposes that we should acquire that line, and what does he propose that we should do with it. He does not propose that we should use it at once but that we should spend more money to improve it. Is that a proposition which will commend itself to any intelligent electors—that we should acquire that railway, and after acquiring it for heaven knows how much, we should at once put more money into it in order to make it acceptable? We know the character of that country. It is all rocky. Between Sudbury and Fort William it is granite. You would have to bore into that granite and spend perhaps $50,000 and more per mile in order to make the road more acceptable. Is there any advantage in such a scheme over the one we proposed, namely, that we should built a road ourselves? My hon. friend did not give us any figures. In that he was very wise. He was judiciously vague and would not take any responsibility for any details. And I say that, in point of smallness of expenditure, it is impossible to show that this scheme would be superior to ours, while, in every other way it is inferior. It is inferior to our scheme, for instance, because the character of the country through which the road proposed by my hon. friend would run is so inferior to that of the country through which the road as proposed by us would run. On the north shore of Lake Superior you have nothing but bleak rock. It is impossible to raise even a potato or a turnip in that section of the country—it is nothing but rock and water and is absolutely barren ; whereas, we have abundance of evidence to show that the proposed route for this road is through a fertile country with abundance of timber. But that is not all. My hon. friend has shown a great deal of concern as to the trade going to maritime province ports. He shed a tear the other day over the idea that, under our scheme, the trade would probably go to Portland. But that is only his hypothesis. That the trade under his scheme would go to Portland is not hypothesis, but certainty. The communication between the east and the west, under my hon. friend's scheme would be by the line between North Bay and Fort William. But when you get the traffic from the west to North Bay, you have only the existing roads, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway. That being so, the traffic must go to Montreal in summer and to Portland in winter. By our scheme we have the intention and the possibility of bringing this trade to the maritime provinces—and we believe we have the certainty as well. These are some of the reasons which make the scheme of my hon. friend absolutely impracticable.

But I must say that my hon. friend deserves some gratitude at our hands, because he has paid the tribute of admiration—involuntarily I admit—to our scheme. I know that, in his speech, he condemned our scheme in toto. But, having condemned it in toto, he accepted it piecemeal. The hon. gentleman in speaking afforded a curious psychological study. It was a case of the contest of conscience with party exigencies. Party exigencies said : You must condemn the scheme. And he condemned it. But my hon. friend is a lawyer, and a good lawyer. He has had experience of course, with the recalcitrant witness, the witness who would swear a certain version of the facts which my hon. friend thought not in accordance with the probabilities of the case. And he would proceed to examine that witness. He would not take issue with him at once, would not contradict him flatly, but would proceed gently to get an admission upon a minor point, then another, and another, until he had a statement of the facts as he conceived them to have been. Such a struggle as that did conscience carry on, quite apparent to those who had the pleasure of listening to the hon. gentleman. The recalcitrant witness, party exigencies, gave a total condemnation of the scheme. But after this witness had proceeded, conscience spoke in the heart of my hon. friend—for I believe he is a man of conscience as well as a man of common sense—and conscience fortified by common sense spoke : You have condemned the whole scheme, but don't you think you have gone a little too far ; don't you think there is some merit in the scheme? For instance, you have condemned absolutely the Moncton line. Don't you think the Moncton line is a necessity. Don't you think we must have another road between the maritime provinces and the west ? That the trade of the country cannot be confined to a single line between the western prairies, Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces? And the unwilling witness answers: Yes, I admit that ; I might build that—yes, I would build that road between Moncton and the west ; but I would do it only as part of the Intercolonial. I might quote the remarks of my hon. friend to prove that I have not misunderstood what he said, but perhaps it would be better to pass on. Having secured this admission, conscience proceeded with the cross-examination. Well—said conscience—don't you think that, after all, this section of road in the northern part of Quebec and Ontario must be built some time and that it ought to be built ? Yes, was the answer. I think that that line of railway ought to be built, but I would build it as a colonization road. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not care very much whether it is built as a colonization road or as a through road provided it is built. Then conscience goes on : Surely that is not all ; you must know that it is imperative at this moment that we should have another means of communication by rail between the

east and the west and that the government is right in proposing that a line should be built covering these two points. And the answer is: Yes; but I do not want to build the road; there is a road already built and I propose to buy it. Well, I do not care very much whether it is made one way or the other so long as it is done. Then conscience said: The prairie section must be built; the prairies are developing so rapidly and so thoroughly that present railways are inadequate and the people who are going in there must have means of communication. And again comes the admission: Yes, that road must be built—but it must be built north of existing railways. Well, north or south is not a point that has yet been settled. The point settled is that there must be a road, and it is for the engineers to say whether it is to be built north or south. Then conscience went on to say: The mountain section has to be built. Yes, he had no objection to that, but simply said: I would force the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern to unite in building that road and if they would not agree I would build it myself. Well, if the hon. gentleman accepts the mountain section, the prairie section, the sections between Winnipeg and Quebec—whether colonization or otherwise—and the road to Moncton what is it that he does not agree to? He does not agree to it without qualification. But, when he has put in all these qualifications, the admissions are there just the same.

Now, my hon. friend says we have not sufficient information as to the character of that country. It is true, we have not instrumental surveys; but I maintain—and would appeal to hon. gentlemen on the other side and I would appeal to my hon. friend himself—we have all the information as to the character of the country that is at all necessary for our present purpose; all the information, all the knowledge, to justify us in saying whether that road should or should not be built. I stated in my opening speech on this subject that there were mountains of information; I do not retract a word I said—there are mountains of information. The eastern legend tells us that when the mountain would not come to Mahomet, Mahomet went to the mountain. But our Mahomets on the other side would not go to the mountain, and so we had to bring the mountain to them, or, at least as nearly that as possible. Of course we could not bring this mountain of information and lay it on the Table, the Table is not strong enough to bear it. We had to summarize it in the form of a pamphlet printed and placed in the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite. And if they had taken the trouble to peruse it, they would have learned that the character of the country through which this road is to run, which has been so greatly misrepresented, is a country equal to some of the best parts of the older provinces, a country with a great future. But my hon. friend to-day made an argument which he has repeated several times, and which I have always heard with some surprise from him. He has told us that we have not been consistent because we decided on this railway before we had received the report of the transportation commission which we had appointed?

My hon. friend says that we promised that report before any steps would be taken with regard to this transcontinental railway, but upon this point I take issue with my hon. friend. It is not exact on his part to say that we had promised a report of this transportation commission before we would bring up our policy with regard to a transcontinental railway. This question was before the House twice during the present session. We discussed it on the debate on the address and again on the 26th of May. During the debate on the address, I stated, speaking for the government, that this transportation commission was to be appointed for the purpose of obtaining information with regard to lake transportation and terminals and connection with the lakes, but we did not require further information with regard to a transcontinental railway as we had all the information in regard to that which we required. As my hon. friend has made that the text of his motion to-day, it will be perhaps better that I should once more furnish the evidence upon this point and call the attention of my hon. friend and of the House to the information which we gave him upon this very subject. The speech from the Throne had this paragraph:

> The great influx of population into our North-western territories and the very large additional areas of fertile land which are being brought under cultivation combine to further press upon us the need for increased transportation facilities for the forwarding of our grain and other products to the markets of the world, through Canadian channels. The whole question of transportation and terminal facilities continues to occupy much attention, and my government will immediately appoint a commission of experienced men to report on the subject.

My hon. friend thought that there were two different ideas in that paragraph and he asked for an explanation from the government on this point. We told him that he was right; that there were two ideas, one with regard to the transcontinental railway and another with regard to water communication. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) very properly raised the question in the debate on the address and I answered as follows:

> The question asked by my hon. friend is quite legitimate. There are two ideas involved in this paragraph. In the first place, the rapid filling up of the North-west territories makes it absolutely indispensable that measures be promptly taken for opening up ways of communication into the prairie sections and for the extension of those communications to the sea-board. Numerous projects have been placed before us, but up to the present the govern-

ment have taken no position. The matter is one of too great importance, involving too many risks, involving large demands, for the government to lightly jump into new undertakings of any kind, and we thought it desirable to wait the opening of parliament in order to consult our friends and have the benefit of the advice of parliament before taking any steps. But we give due warning to the Canadian parliament—and I think it is not out of place—that new efforts have to be made by the Canadian people to meet the new requirements resulting from the development of our country.

Now you see there was an indication as plain as language could make it that we made a difference between water transportation and transportation by means of a new railway.

But the subject came up later on on a motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) on May 26th. My hon. friend became impatient and wanted to know what was the policy of the government in regard to this transportation question, especially in regard to this commission. He made a speech and concluded with these words :

I think therefore, Mr. Speaker, that under the circumstances, I am justified in asking the Prime Minister to take the House and the country into his confidence with regard to this matter, and to make that announcement of policy which it seems to me should have been made long ago in this session whch has already occupied nearly three months ; and to state to us fully and frankly what we are to expect from the government in the shape of a policy on a question of so much importance to the most vital interests of the country.

I answered, speaking for the government, in this way :

In my humble judgment, the transportation question under existing conditions, resolves itself into three different parts. First of all there is the question of water transportation, chiefly connected with the terminals. Then there is the transportation question for the new and rapidly growing settlements in the prairie sections ; and then there is the question of transportation from the prairie sections to the sea-board. With regard to the first, this is the question which we had chiefly in our minds when at the opening of parliament we declared that the transportation question was engaging our attention, and that we intended to appoint a commission to deal with the subject. We have been carrying on works of great magnitude at all parts of our great water system, in order to develop it and to make the transportation of the products of the west, and of the products going from the east to the west cheaper to the producer and to the consumer. We have works on the great lakes ; we have works on the St. Lawrence ; we have works at Port Arthur and Fort William, and it is possible that we may require some more. We have works at the head of canal navigation at Port Colborne which are now under construction ; we have works in the city of Montreal which have been carried on both by the Harbour Commission there and by the government ; we have works at Sorel and Three Rivers carried on by the government ; we have works at Quebec and we have also extensive works in St. John, New Brunswick. Now, I think it may be said that all these works have been carried on, not under any general system, but chiefly from the local point of view of each particular place. We deem it of the greatest importance to have, if possible, all these different works carried on under a general comprehensive system. Before we ask for more money to be expended upon them, we think that it is advisable to have the report of a commission of the best experts that we have in the country in order that we may be able to lay before parliament at this session or next session a comprehensive plan, as to what should be done in these different localities or in other localities in order to meet the object in view.

Nothing could be plainer, it seems to me, than the fact that it was the intention of the government that the commission should deal with water transportation and terminals. I proceeded to say :

There is another feature of the system of transportation to be considered. At the present time the west is filling very rapidly. Next year the valley of the Saskatchewan will be one of the greatest producing areas of the country. It is of immediate necessity therefore that another artery in the form of a railway should be built in order to afford the settlers not only an outlet for their products, but a means of bringing in what they require from the eastern provinces. Probably this week, certainly at an early day, it will be the duty of the government to lay on the Table of the House certain resolutions with regard to this railway. But apart from that, there is another scheme which has been engaging the attention of the House and the country at large. It is generally accepted, I believe, at the present time, that we must have another trunk line to connect the producing centres of the prairies with the tidal waters of the east. This is the point which my hon. friend had chiefly in view when he spoke a moment ago. I may say to my hon. friend at once that the government are not connected, though he implied that they were, with any scheme which has been proposed. We are considering the matter, but I am not prepared to say that we can at this moment lay on the Table the conclusions at which we have arrived ; but we shall deem it our duty to do so before the session is over.

Now, Sir, there was an intimation as clear it seems to me as language could make it, that we required the transportation commission to inquire into the subject of water communication, and did not require any more information with regard to the transcontinental railway which we have proposed. In view of the attitude which has been taken that we must have the easiest possible new means of communication between the east and the west it seems to me that it would be idle for me to spend any more time in justifying our course in this regard. It has been justified not only by our hon. friends on this side of the House but still more by the attitude of our hon. friends opposite in this respect. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition stated this morning that we have in the contract failed to provide proper safeguards in order to ensure the trade of the west going by way of Canadian ports. My hon. friend said nothing new this morning. That point has been met over and over again, it was answered completely

the other day by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) and therefore nothing is left for me to add to what has already been said. I do not need to say another word upon it. My hon. friend says that he looks upon this scheme as an alternative one to the water route ? If the plan which my hon. friend proposed some few days ago were adopted would that be an alternative to the water route ? Suppose we were to acquire control of the Canadian Pacific Railway from North Bay to Fort William, as my hon. friend proposes in order to establish communication between the east and the west, would that be an alternative to the water route? No, Sir, the water route and the railways have to go together. One is not an alternative to the other. They are a necessary complement to each other. My hon. friend stated a moment ago that we must have water communication. Since we have been in office we have done more than any other government have done to improve our water communication. We have spent in the neighbourhood of $16,000,000 in improving the water communication and as a result up to this year, up to this moment, there has been more grain transportation upon the St. Lawrence than in any year for the last thirty years. No one proposes that if we open this new railway, ofr which we are askin a grant, that water communication shall be closed. They depend upon each other. It is true that the water communication will be closed for six months in the year; blt the people will have the rail communication, and their business will not be closed down as it was before the railway era. There was a time when the merchants of Quebec, of Montreal, and of Toronto at the close of navigation were obliged to close up everything, and sit with their arms folded until the following spring. But as soon as the railway era came in it was possible to make every day a working day whether it was summer or winter. My hon. friends from the North-west Territories and Manitoba understand the situation better than I do and I appeal to my hon. friends from Manitoba on both sides of the House to say if in the winter time the business of forwarding their produce is not closed down just as was the business of the men of eastern Canada many years ago. From the time that navigation is closed the people of the west are helpless. They have to wait until the following spring. At the present time the Canadian Pacific Railway can take a certain amount of grain out of the west in cars, but when we have another railway opened it will be possible for the farmers to ship their grain all the year round. Some of my hon. friends believe that railway transportation will be as cheap as water transportation. That is a problem of the future, but at all events, whether it be as cheap or not as cheap, the farmers of the west will have the benefit of this railway all the year round, and not only the farmers of the west will have the benefit of it but also the producers of the eastern provinces. It must not be forgotten that this railway is not designed to transport only the grain of the west. There is something else to be carried than grain. This railway will transport everything that civilized man wants. It will transport the produce of the west which is largely cereals; but it will transport also the commerce of the east.

I do not propose to say much more at this stage when we have had this scheme debated for two months. My hon. friend said to-day at the opening of his speech that he had not much to say which was new and in so far as that goes he said what was perfectly true. He had not much to say that was new and I shall not have much to say that is new. But, what I want to impress upon the people of Canada at this moment is that the policy which we have proposed is one which is imperative and that we would go back upon our own record if we were to go back upon the policy which has been devised for the construction of this transcontinental railway. And, that is not all. My hon. friend a moment ago derided my hon. friend the Postmaster General, and I think derided also my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who stated that within the lifetime of some of us here there would probably be two or three transcontinental railways.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not deride them. I cited them as evidence in my own behalf.

The PRIME MINISTER. If my hon. friend cited them as evidence in his own behalf he should sit down and say no more. He had better support our scheme then. If my hon. friend thinks that we must eventually have more than one line why should he not accept this immediately ? If he thinks that, why should he throw cold water on this scheme ? We must have more railways than one. We are just on the fringe of our obligations if we want to be true to our destiny. The nineteenth century has been a century that has been remarkable for the marvellous development of the United States. During the whole period of that cycle of time the United States has been the great centre of attraction for all the world, but a new star has arisen upon the horizon, a star not in the orbit of the American constellation but a star standing by itself resplendent of the western sky, and it it towards that star that every immigrant, every traveller, every man who leaves the land of his ancestors to come and seek a home for himself now turns his gaze. We have now a duty in consequence to perform, a duty which is imperative. We must commence here and now, not to-morrow, nor the day after to-morrow, but at this moment, if the Canadian people want to be true to the destinies of the Canadian nation, the construction of this railway. It will cost some money, but

money is not an object at this moment. The treasury is affluent and I think the energies of the Canadian people in the eastern provinces and in the west are adequate to provide all that is necessary to cope with this new problem, and it is with this object that I have for the last time to appeal to all who claim to be patriotic to stand by the policy which we have put before the House.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, the right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier), in his closing remarks, said that a new star has arisen but he did not say whether it was in the east or in the west. I presume that he meant that it indicates the approach of the wise men. If that which we have before us is an indication of their wisdom I may be excused if I would say that I have great doubts as to whether that star has arisen yet or not. That star indicated an overflowing treasury, an abundance of wealth and a desire on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to spend it and spend it freely. I leave it to the people of Canada to judge whether or not it is another evidence of the wisdom of the government. The Prime Minister described the speech of the leader of the opposition, as being not so much an attack upon the policy of the government, as a defence of his own policy. Well, in so far as it was a defence of his own policy, it was an answer by the leader of the opposition to allegations made against it which were devoid of fact and logic. Gentlemen opposite indulged in all kinds of wild statements about the proposition laid down by the hon. leader of the opposition, and it was the duty of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) to refute these statements. But, it is not the policy propounded by the leader of the opposition that is on trial before the people of Canada to-day. It is the policy propounded by the government that the people of Canada have to consider, and notwithstanding that, it may truly be said that the Prime Minister applied himself to-day, not to defending his policy, but in trying to detract from the acceptance which the policy of the leader of the opposition has found from the people of Canada. The policy proposed by the leader of the government commits the country to the expenditure of millions of dollars, to an increase in the public debt, and to heavy burdens which must be borne by the people for many years in the future. And, Sir, the country will judge the government by the policy which they have laid down, and not by the policy of the leader of the opposition. The right hon. gentleman taunted us, that we have never dared to crystallize our opinion, by moving an amendment. Why, Mr. Speaker, there is an amendment in your hands now, and there was an amendment moved not so long ago in this House, setting forth the opposition's views on this question, and how in the face of that, the Prime Minister could make such a statement, is something that I cannot understand. One of our amendments has already been dealt with, and another very cogent one is before the House now, and it must be voted upon by the ministers and their supporters whether they like the ordeal or not. The right hon. gentleman told us, that the policy of the opposition was many-sided. Well, we are not ashamed to say that it has many-sided virtues, and we are quite confident that its many-sided virtues will receive the commendation of the people of Canada. The trouble with the policy of the government is, that it has only one side, and the only side it has is that it burdens the country with an enormous expenditure. Let us inquire into a few of the many-sided advantages which the proposition of the leader of the opposition will confer upon the people of the country. It develops the transportation routes now in existence ; it increases the transportation facilities which we have been spending money to perfect for years past ; it does not side-track the wealthy towns and cities of Ontario and Quebec as does the government scheme; it assists in building them up and bringing trade through them; it confers benefits on the people of Ontario, of Quebec and the maritime provinces; it builds up the great ports of the Georgian bay, and of Lake Huron and of Lake Superior; affords accommodation to the people of Manitoba and the North-west right through to the Pacific ocean. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the policy of the leader of the opposition is many-sided, and every side of it has a virtue in it, and every virtue it possesses will commend it to the intelligent judgment of the people of Canada. I regret that I cannot say the same for the policy of the government. We are told that no madder scheme could be conceived, than that the government should operate the Canada Atlantic Railway. We were asked, where would that line get its freight if it did not depend on the United States for it. But, is that an unmixed evil ? If we have the United States supplying that line with freight would that fact alone not aid it to give a better service for the transportation of home freight ? Would it not add to the earning powers of that line ? Would that be any objection to the scheme ? Why, Sir, I believe that is an additional recommendation in favour of the proposal that we should take over the Canada Atlantic Railway. And, if the Canada Atlantic Railway is handling the freight of the western states to-day, why should it not handle it if the road passed under the control of the government ? I submit these considerations to the right hon. gentleman in the hope that he may revise his opinion in this respect. Then the right hon. gentleman told us, that the essence of the government scheme is another railway between the east and the west. Let me point out to him that we are going to get another railway into the North-west in a very short time, without a

dollar of cost to the people of Canada. I see it stated that the Canadian Pacific Railway is double tracking its line both east and west from Rat Portage, and they hope in the near future to have a double track from Port Arthur to Winnipeg. That affords practically another railway into the country, because when they reach Lake Superior, the great distributing centre of that western country, it is taken by the lake fleet of steamers and transported to the Georgian bay, where there are a dozen railways ready to carry the produce to the east, and distribute it to the markets of the world. That double track line will give to the people of the North-west, without the expenditure of a dollar, all the advantages that the most sanguine could hope from the government scheme, which is bound to cost us millions and millions of dollars. Let me ask the right hon. gentleman, if the scheme proposed by the leader of the opposition does not contemplate giving additional railway accommodation to the people of the western country ? In what light does the right hon. gentleman regard the purchase of that portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway from North Bay to Sudbury, or Port Arthur. If three railway companies used that one track which is only used by one company now, would there not be three railways going into that country, instead of one as at the present time, and we can secure all that for less than one-third of the cost entailed by the scheme of the government. The right hon. gentleman has asked if the plan proposed by the leader of the opposition is cheaper than the plan proposed by the government. Well, the data furnished by the leader of the opposition to-day ought to be satisfactory evidence on the point that his scheme would cost at the outside $60,000,000 to bring it to its full fruition, as compared with at least $120,000,000 which the road proposed by the government would cost. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, have calculated that the government proposal will cost all the way from $13,000,000 to $120,000,000. Of course the $13,000,000 estimate is only the interest upon the expenditure involved in the undertaking, but if you apply any reasonable calculation, you will find that it will cost $120,000,000 of somebody's money to build that road. It will, therefore, be seen that the cost of the scheme proposed by the government will be at least double the cost of the scheme proposed by the leader of the opposition, and will afford no greater advantages. Indeed, in my opinion, the government scheme at double the price, will not be so advantageous for the people of the country as that proposed from this side of the House. I believe, Sir, that the more the people understand the scheme proposed by the leader of the opposition, the more it will meet with the approval of the people.

The line proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition, the right hon. gentleman says, is through a barren, rocky, country, while the other is through a fertile country. It is well enough to say that it is a fertile country, if you judge the whole by a few miles here and there where a traveller, a trapper, a pleasure-seeker, a trader or a timber seeker has been. I do not think the right hon. gentleman has a sufficient data regarding the country through which this road is to run, to speak of its character with confidence. There must be at least 400 or 500 miles of that territory of which we know nothing. We have comparatively speaking no information about the country ; we are going it blind. It may be full of muskegs, rocks, and mountains of rock, like a portion of the country through which the Canadian Pacific Railway runs around Lake Superior. In the one case we have overcome the difficulties, we know what the railway is and what it has cost ; but we do not know what the other will cost. The right hon. gentleman says railways must always be the complement of the water stretches—that the two must work together. Well, surely, the two working side by side are more likely to work together than when one runs through the interior of the country. He says of the scheme of the leader of the opposition that for six months of the year part of it is frozen up. It is true, the water stretches are frozen up, but the railway will run all the year round. If the scheme of the leader of the opposition is carried out, there will be three railways carrying grain around Lake Superior where there is only one at the present time. If we had grain elevators on the ports of Lake Superior and the Georgian bay, the grain coming from Manitoba would be carried around Lake Superior by these three railways in the winter. Surely these railways would be the complement of the water stretches, and the people would have more benefit from them than they would from a single railway running through the interior of the country, where there are no elevators and will not be for years, for the storage of grain. The right hon. gentleman said that the policy of the opposition is a psychological study—a study of a struggle between conscience and duty on the one hand and policy on the other ; a study to decide whether they will follow the dictates of conscience or the dictates of expediency. Well, I regret that I cannot return the compliment to the right hon. gentleman, because there seems to be neither conscience nor expediency in his policy. It is a matter, as he said himself, of imminent haste, of going it blind, without any debate between right and wrong, between conscience and expediency, between wisdom and unwisdom ; but he has mapped it out, and he is going to force it through. There is no psychological study in that. The right hon. gentleman says that we have all the information in regard to the character of that country that we want ; we have mountains of it. I have

here the mountains of information laid on the Table of the House, and what is it? A small pamphlet containing 179 pages, with one map. That is the mountains of information given to the House to justify it in supporting this scheme. Let me read a few of the 'sources of information' of which this is the nearest epitome:

The iron belt on Lake Nepigon——

That is supposed to give the information we require to build the railway——

—is the title of a report on some deposits of iron ore recently found on the east shore of Lake Nepigon.

Barlow, Dr. A. E.—Report on the geology and natural resources of the country included by the Nipissing and Temiscaming map-sheets. Annual Report Geological Survey of Canada.

Beatty's lines.—Exploration line of 1870 was drawn from the north-east angle of Lake Nepigon in a south-easterly direction to a point near the southern end of Long Lake and then in an easterly direction to the '46-mile post' just south of the height of land.

Bell, Dr. R.—Report of an exploration in 1865 between James bay and Lake Superior. Report of Progress, Geological Survey of Canada.

Exploration of Churchill and Nelson rivers.

Away up on the Hudson bay, hundreds of miles north of where this railway will run. This is the information which the right hon. First Minister regards as of a most valuable character.

Report on the geology and resources of the country lying on the north-western side of Lake Superior.

Then we have something about 'the Laurentide Axis'; something about 'the Quebec end'; 'obstacles few'; something about the flora of the country, which would be most valuable for those who want to build a railway to know—what kind of flowers there are in the country, whether they are beautiful or otherwise; whether they will furnish a beautiful bouquet for each engineer who goes through. This is the kind of information which the government has furnished. It is rather a burlesque. Then we have something about the Hudson bay basin, which this railway will not touch, though it is expected to cross the height of land nine times. Then, we have something about the Ontario reports, something about the timber limits, the reports published and the geological surveys. This is what the right hon. First Minister characterizes as the mountains of information to enable this House to determine whether or not it should go on with this undertaking.

An hon. MEMBER. Read some of it.

Mr. SPROULE. It may be worth while to read a little. Here is what it says with regard to the Laurentide Axis:

The Laurentide hills proper do not extend to Hudson bay. They form a belt of hills varying from 100 to 200 miles in breadth, skirting the St. Lawrence valley and forming a divide between the great alluvial and marine plain or basin of Hudson bay from that of the St. Lawrence. It is a comparatively narrow belt. North of this fringe of Laurentide hills lies the comparatively level and gently sloping country of the Hudson bay basin.

That is all the information we have about that. Then we have the following about the Quebec end:

The woodland region as a whole throughout Quebec and Ontario, along the height of land, varies but little in its general level, some sections of it, more especially in the eastern portion, between the St. Maurice and the city of Quebec, is rocky, hilly and well timbered, while other sections for long stretches consist of rolling clay and sandy loam and well timbered lands.

The more mountainous and hilly section in Quebec is that from the city of Quebec to the headwaters of the St. Maurice river, but here we have in the latter river a great wide valley which affords a natural and remarkably easy highway into the north and interior of the woodland region.

North-western Quebec—From the surveys made along the northern border of the counties of Champlain, St. Maurice, Maskinonge, Berthier, Joliette and Montcalm in the vicinity of the height of land, it has been ascertained that this region comprising the sources of the Ottawa, Gatineau and St. Maurice rivers, consists of many comparatively level sections constituting a generally level plateau. Many of the streams flowing into the Hudson bay basin have their source here also; the higher woodland being more to the east and south-east.

It is important for us to know that these rivers have their sources up there. That is very valuable information when we are considering the building of a railway through that country. Then we have Mr. Gillies' statement, which gives us a comparison between Hudson bay basin and Scotland. Of course it is important that we should know all about Scotland and be able to make a comparison:

Mr. Gillies, who for eighteen years was Hudson bay factor at Fort George, about 235 miles north of the foot of James bay, volunteered the following statement regarding the capabilities of that portion of the Hudson bay basin:—'I have no doubt that any crop that grows in Scotland can be successfully grown at Fort George.'

That is all Mr. Gillies has to tell us, and very valuable information it is, on which to build a railway. Then we have an opinion with regard to the obstacles, and we are told that the obstacles are few:

For a distance of 700 miles, from Lake Kapitachuan (Upper Gatineau division) in a westerly by north-westerly direction as far west as White Earth lake near the confines between Nepigon and Lake St. Joseph divisions (Div. IX. and X. respectively) the line runs through a generally flat sand and clay country, where hills appear sparingly scattered with occasional ridges protruding through the drift or soil-covered country.

That is another valuable item of information. Then we have some information about the Hudson bay basin, which, if this road ever reaches there, may be of some value:

Whereas the country drained by the streams flowing south into Lakes Superior and Huron constitute a narrow and rocky hydrographic basin, for the most part, fit for cultivation and

agriculture only in limited areas, the central portion of the hydrographic basin of Hudson bay, north of the great lakes is covered with soil consisting of clay and sand, in which vegetable mould forms a large percentage, thus rendering the land most desirable for the cultivation of crops when ordinary drainage is effected.

It is valuable to know that the country is covered by soil consisting of clay and sand. What else would it be covered with ? That is valuable information on which to judge whether it is advisable or not to go on with this undertaking.

The evidence afforded by the flora or native plants of the district along the proposed railway line affords an excellent criterion to agriculturists and others in making an estimate of the capabilities of the district in question.

Very valuable information this for the government. Then we have a description of the mineral possibilities :

The metalliferous belt of Huronian rocks which carries nickel, copper, silver, gold, iron and other minerals of economic importance occurs prominently throughout a large section of the line of the proposed railway. After crossing the Canadian Pacific Railway in the Sudbury region this great mineral belt proceeds in a northeasterly direction to Upper and Lower Lake Abitibi north of the height of land. This mineral belt is quite wide in the districts of Algoma and Nipissing, extending close to the boundary of the Thunder bay district. In the latter district two large areas of similar mineral bearing rocks occur which lie also close to the height of land.

But the Prime Ministetr told us that that section of country was largely a fertile clay belt. Well, that is not the kind of belt in which you are likely to find mineral deposits. They are generally found in a rocky section of very little value for agricultural purposes, so that this report contradicts the assertion of the First Minister, who was describing this section as a sort of paradise for agricultural settlers. Its soil, he said, was equal to the very best in Ontario. Then we have the farming operations described :

The various farms of the different lumber companies carrying on business along the headwaters of the various streams which flow into the St. Lawrence and Ottawa rivers, as well as the gardens and farms scattered throughout the hydrographic basin of Hudson bay, at the Hudson bay posts (such as at Abitibi, Brunswick House, Frederick House, Mamattawan, Mattagami, &c.) form excellent criteria from which one can easily ascertain the possibilities of the whole region from an agricultural standpoint, leaving no doubt whatever that the basin can support a vast population.

There is nothing about minerals there :

From a careful study of the altitudes comprised in the Quebec to Winnipeg region and south as well as north, it can be readily seen and affirmed that the boldest expression of the Laurentide hills occurs along the southern border of their line outcrop.

Not much information in that. I do not know that that was not well known before, and in any case it is little value to parties proposing to build a railway. The capabilities of construction are thus described :

The construction of the National Transcontinental Railway, crossing the cereal-growing district south of Hudson bay, between the great lakes and the foot of James bay, will open up for settlement a generally level tract of country, not only well timbered and well watered, but also producing a dense growth of plants which predicates capabilities of an agricultural nature, dairy, farm and stock-raising products, which can support a mixed population, including agriculturists, manufacturers, lumber merchants and all those varied classes of a community dependent on such natural resources as are found within that basin.

It is estimated that the marine sediments of the Hudson bay basin, consisting of clay loam, sandy clays and various other soils and surface deposits, fit for agriculture, is at least twice the area covered by the agricultural lands in Ontario between Ottawa and Lake St. Clair.

Then we are given some information about the timber limits :

Timber Limits.

The Laurentide hills which will ever be a source of immense revenue to the country, not only from their valuable timber limits and capabilities for producing more when re-forestation on a large scale is established in this country, but also from their untold mineral resources, forming a comparatively narrow belt of rugged hills, separate two distinct agricultural basins the larger of which lies to the north.

The new railroad will widen the eastern belt of habitable land, and as soon as the country realizes the immense wealth which is lying dormant in the great undeveloped basin south of James bay, where practically all the cereals can be raised successfully which are now raised in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, so soon will its people seize it and inhabit the same.

We are next told about mineral occurrences :

In the report of the royal commission on the mineral resources of Ontario and measures for their development, presented by order of the legislative assembly, Toronto, 1890, reference to the occurrence of iron and copper on Abitibi lake, is given, pp. 23 and 24 respectively, also of the mineral resources of various districts comprised within the railway belt in question.

That is valuable information for the building of a railway.

For altitudes of lakes, rivers and various locations along the proposed line of the Grand Trunk Pacific, see Mr. J. White's recent work entitled : 'Altitudes in Canada,' issued by the Geological Survey of Canada as publication number 745, 1901, pp. 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 227, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175.

For projected or trial lines and branches of Canadian Pacific Railway, see also pp. 47-69, including the following :—

(1.)—Lake Manitoba to Lake Nipissing, p. 69.
(2.)—Lake Manitoba to Mattawa, p. 68.
(3.)—Lake Windigoostigwan to Manitou lake, p. 54.
(4.)—Lake Nepigon to the height of land, p. 51.
(5.)—Nepigon river to Long lake, p. 50.

In this report I also find a mention of trees found along the line of the National Transcontinental Railway. It appears that

they have found some trees there, and it is valuable we should know about it. Then we are given the following meteorological observations :

Average summer temperature at all the principal points between Quebec and Fort Simpson (from returns kindly furnished by Mr. R. F. Stupart, director of Meteorological Service at Toronto).

	In 1895.
Moose Factory, James Bay	61°
Quebec	63°
Rimouski	55°
Chicoutimi	60°
Winnipeg	62°
Norway House	59°
Oonikup	60°
Edmonton	60°
Athabasca Landing	55°
Dunvegan	57°
Port Simpson	55°

These are specimens of this 'valuable information.'

Report on Moose River Basin, with map,, by Dr. R. Bell, 1883.

Surveys.

The reports of the geology of the basin of the Moose river and adjacent country by Dr. R. Bell issued in the Report of Progress of the Geological Survey of Canada for 1880-81-82, contains not only the results of the surveys and explorations made by him in 1881, but also those of 1870, 1875, 1876 and 1877. Together with the results of a geological exploration of the Upper Ottawa and Lake Abitibi region made by the late Walter McOuat of the Geological Survey in 1872.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Better read the whole book.

Mr. SPROULE. This information is so valuable that I wanted to lay it before the country. We have been told over and over again by hon. gentlemen on the other side that this report is so full, so comprehensive, and deals so directly with the question that it is all that is required. I simply want to enable the electorate to judge whether it is so or not, and I cannot do that without placing on 'Hansard' a fair share of what is in the book. It proceeds :

These results are embodied in a coloured map showing the topographical and geological features as known to date.

That is most valuable information.

The areas of Huronian rocks which are those which carry the nickel, gold, silver, copper, and other economic minerals are delineated on the map in question so far as the surveys allowed. A large proportion of the area covered by the map is coloured Huronian.

And what other colour would they make it ?

Eastern Belt.

The more easterly of these belts—the Great Belt—will be traversed for more than one hundred miles in its trend from the north channel of Lake Huron towards Lakes Abitibi and Mistassini.

Second Belt.

The next belt to the west, begins in Minnesota and is traceable from the south-easterly shores of Lake Nepigon in a north-east by east direction to the area of flat-lying evenly-bedded limestones of the Albany river basin.

That is most valuable information, no doubt.

Third Belt.

The third belt is almost parallel to the last mentioned——

Well, it will have to run either in that direction or in some other.

—and lies to the north and north-east of Lake Nepigon.

Western Belt.

The most westerly belt is that which crosses the Canadian Pacific Railway track at Wabigoon, having a breadth of nearly twenty-five miles——

That is a most extensive tract of country.

—and strikes to the north-east in line with the Gloucester House area of similar rocks near Martin's Falls on the Albany.

There we have the eastern, second, third and western belts dealt with and how much information is there in all that ? After that a few lines are given to Fleming's Canadian Pacific Railway surveys. Then, at the beginning of chapter 15 we have the following :

Height of Land Crossings.

Divide.

The line making the height of land or 'divide' between the waters which flow into the St. Lawrence river basin and those flowing into the Hudson bay basin crosses the proposed line of the National Transcontinental Railway as projected at the following points :—

Nine crossings are estimated. We can imagine what the gradients and curvatures will be. The crossings are enumerated as follows :

First crossing.—In division III or upper Gatineau division just south of Lake Matchi Manitou.

Second crossing.—Takes place a little south-west of Lake Kiemawisk in division IV or upper Ottawa division.

Third crossing.—About 45 miles west of the second crossing in division IV. (upper Ottawa river), about 20 miles east of the inter-provincial boundary line between Quebec and Ontario, a little north-east of Lake Mattawa Gosik. The height of land then trends in a south-westerly direction for some 200 miles and crosses the Canadian Pacific Railway track between Ramsay and Ridout stations a little east of Chapleau station via way of Fort Mattagami.

The Canadian Pacific Railway track runs along and close to the height of land in the rough country north of Lake Superior as far west as Amyot station, and thence takes an almost due northerly direction along the 85th meridian and crosses the projected line of the Grand Trunk Pacific five times in a distance of 125 miles in the Long lake district.

Fourth crossing.—Takes place at a point about 20 miles from the western edge of division VII., Mamattawan division.

Fifth crossing.—Takes place just at the junction of divisions VII. and VIII., Mamattawan and Long lake divisions.

Sixth crossing along the projected railway line takes place in division VIII. (Long Lake

division), about 18 miles south-east by east of the Hudson's Bay Company's post at the northern extremity of Long lake.

Seventh crossing is about five miles south of the Hudson's bay post just mentioned and occurs in the centre of the VIIIth or Long lake division.

Eighth crossing.—Occurs at the western extremity of the VIII or Long lake division, about 15 miles west of Big lake.

The projected railway line and the height of land then nearly coincide with each other throughout division IX. or Lake Nepigon division.

Ninth crossing.—Takes place on the 89th meridian at a point about twenty (20) miles east of the extreme westerly portion of the Nepigon division, and about twenty miles south of the White Water lake.

The height of land thence takes a sudden south and south-westerly trend towards Lake Superior, where it is crossed by the Canadian Pacific Railway track at Savanne station.

That is the information—the line crosses the height of land nine times. And yet this is to be a railway without any troublesome grades or curves. Yet, it is to go zig-zagging across the height of land like a snake fence. And it is to traverse the sources of these rivers where there must be swamps, muskegs, and rocks. And this is a sample of the mountains of information given to the House. Upon that, how can any one judge whether it is wise or otherwise to build this road ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. What page is the hon. gentleman reading from ?

Mr. SPROULE. From page 164 of the 'mountains of information.'

Reforestation.

It appears to me that in view of the thousands of square miles of territory belonging to the province, capable of growing the finest pine, but which has either been destroyed by fire or cut and removed by the lumbermen, it would be desirable to know something of the natural laws in accordance with which, unaided even by us, this wide domain will again be clothed with groves of pine as good, if not better, than those that have been destroyed or removed.

That is valuable information, and will be of great help to us in building a railway. I wonder how many dollars it will save to the country to have this information placed before us. That great country is to be reforested, the forest having been destroyed either by fire or the ruthless lumbermen. The great need is to learn the natural laws of reforestation in order to decide whether the country shall spend $100,000,000 in building this railway.

For although the time for planting young trees may not as yet have arrived, it may well be that in view of the rapid exhaustion of their timber limits, that the time has really come when it may be only prudent to nurse and protect the young pine trees which the hand of nature has planted and which are springing up by thousands in many places. The lands of this description, which are contiguous to leading lines of railways and navigable rivers, are specially deserving of this care and attention on the part of the government, and would, I believe, handsomely repay all the expense that might be required to do so.

Opening up a settlement of the country.

In my judgment, notwithstanding the difficulty of getting in supplies and materials in order to the construction, the railway can be built for little more than one-half the money north of the height of land that would be necessary to make a line with equally good grades along the north shore of Lake Superior.

Notwithstanding the difficulty of getting in supplies, in this gentleman's judgment this railway can be built for one-half the money north of the height of land. It is most important to know that. Then, there is a good deal about bush fires. And, of course, this is valuable information in building a railway :

The bush fires which have passed over the greater portion of the territory on and beyond the height of land——

Yet, we are told, that is a country of valuable tracts of timber.

The bush fires which have passed over the greater portion of the territory on and beyond the height of land within the last twenty or thirty years cannot fail to attract the notice and attention of every traveller—indeed so recent have they often been that the bush or young forest has rarely had anything like the time necessary to attain full growth. Bush fires, looked at broadly, as one of the forces or phenomena of nature, rather than in the light of mere accidental occurrences are, when confined to a wild and uncultivated region, by no means the unmitigated evil they are generally supposed to be.

Then we have :

The quantity of aspen poplar in this territory is very great, and may in view of the employment of the pulp of this wood for the manufacture of paper become extremely valuable. The tamarack too though much less in quantity (unless we include the diminutive ones found in the muskegs), will also be of some value whenever the country is opened up. Tamarack of the size suitable for telegraph poles is very common and more rarely such as would make railroad ties were met with. The largest tree of this kind rarely exceeded six feet in circumference.

He found some that would make railway ties but more that was fit for telegraph poles. One report says that the country is all burnt over and has been for fifteen years past and the other that there is valuable timber up there that would make telegraph poles and ties but that some of these are in muskegs. Then there is gypsum up there :

The gypsum beds situated below the junction of the Mattagami and Missanabi rivers have been already described in former reports. I found pieces of gypsum on the coast about half way between Moose Factory and Albany, and was informed by one of my Indians from that part of the country that it could be seen in place at the bottom of a bay not far off when the tide was out.

That is valuable information given by an Indian in that country. He does not tell us where this is but it is important that we should know it because we are going to build a railway there. Then we come to the question of rock exposure. There are few rocks :

Probably in no part of Canada is there a smaller proportion of rock exposed at the surface than in the low belt of country south of James bay, and very few parts with so little bare rock as the second plateau or belt. In the third plateau, or that which constitutes the height of land, the proportion of rock is greater,——

And yet they are going to cross the height of land nine times and to open up a country with an alluvial soil, well fitted for agricultural purposes where the people can go in and have happy homes and rich farms and cultivate everything that will grow either in Ontario or Quebec. But he says :

—and here the possibilities of finding the metallic ores associated with or contained in the Laurentian or Huronian rocks, may be about as good as they are on the north shore of Lake Huron.

Now we know what the north shore of Lake Huron is that it is practically an uninhabited belt, a mineral belt it is true, but this report says that the height of land is the same and that the rocks are there in larger proportion than in the lower plateaus, and we are told in the same report that this railway is to cross the height of land nine times.

I can only say that in hurrying across this height of land (as I was obliged to do) I did not happen to see any. I heard reports, however, (originating with the Indians) that some such ores may be found in the vicinity of Lac Seul, and I do not think it by any means improbable.

That is valuable information got from an Indian second-hand. It is like the fables of the ancients; it is got second-hand, but it is a valuable thing to know. Then he says :

I saw and examined the deposit of brown hematite and spathic ore at the Grand rapid on the Mattagami river. This has been previously visited and described by Dr. Bell, and a specimen brought back by him was assayed by Mr. Hoffmann of the Geological Survey and reported to contain upwards of fifty-two per cent of metallic iron. I found this iron ore, as it seemed to me in the form of lenticular masses or beds interposed between the limestone strata of the Devonian rocks, which appear in place here for the first time as we descend the river.

It is very important that we should know that we have good iron beds there, because it may enable us to attach greater value to the country.

Then there is the temperature, the report gives us that :

Those who think that the weather is always raw and cold on the coast of James bay, may be surprised to learn that a few days before my arrival at Moose Factory, the thermometer recorded nearly 92° of heat in the shade. As this is one of the stations for taking meteorological observations, both the instrument and the reading was doubtless correct. At Albany, I was assured by Mr. Broughton that it was 94° in the shade.

And of course the House should know it. At Moose Factory on James bay it was 92 degrees and at Albany 94 degrees. Of course we should know that, because it will help us very much in building the railway. Then we have this third plateau and its soil and climate :

It is only from observations recorded at the Hudson Bay Company's posts, from the statements of parties who either live or have lived in the country, and from our limited experience, that we can obtain any knowledge of the climate of the two latter divisions of this territory. As regards the crops which may or may not grow in the territory, much contradictory evidence has been given. Neither is the climate the same in all parts of the territory.

That is contradictory, it does not correspond with the information given by the right hon. gentleman, that we are going to open up such a valuable tract of land for settlement by the farmers of this country.

On suitable soil properly prepared, and with judiciously selected seed, I am of opinion that wheat, oats, barley, and possibly rye, may be grown with more or less success on the second belt or plateau.

Then he talks about the hilly country and the drift covered regions. Dr. Bell has spoken of this. The report says :

As Dr. Bell very justly remarks, the surface, even in the height of land, is almost always covered with loose material of some kind. On this second plateau, the loose material still consists of drab or light-coloured clays, overlaid occasionally by gravel or sand. In these clays, as already remarked, pieces of limestone from the Devonian strata to the north may always be found, decreasing, however, in size and number as we recede from James bay and ascend toward the height of land. I am of opinion that careful analysis and microscopic examinations of the gravels, sands and clays found on or about the height of land would probably throw some light on their origin.

That a very large proportion of the clay and other loose materials found on this upper plateau must have come from the north and that it has been carried or transported in some mysterious way up hill, partly from the shores of the Hudson bay, and partly from the lower plateau, admits almost of demonstration.

It is necessary that the House should know where that clay comes from. It must come from the region of Hudson bay, because we have a suggestion advanced as to where it comes from. Then he talks about peat, about the Laurentian rocks and about the catch of fish, pickerel and pike. He says:

Pike, pickerel and white fish are found in the rivers in limited quantity, and the last is caught in the bay along the coast. Sturgeon are caught in the Abitibi river, two of which I saw near Singed Marten creek.

We all want to know that we can get pike, pickerel and white fish in this country.

These are extracts from the report of Mr. E. B. Borron. Then we are told about climate and game, and about track surveys checked. We are told a little about the physical features of the country:

The most noticeable feature of the west coast of James bay is its extreme flatness. Looked at from a distance there is no distinct shore line, but the water and land seem to merge into each other. A strip varying in width from one to three miles and partly covered with grass and low shrubs extends along the coast from the Kapiskau to the Moose river, except for a few miles north and south of Cockispenny point, where the shore is fairly high and dry and the trees come to the water's edge.

Then we have 'clay, sands and shells.' It is well we should know about the kind of shells to be found in that country, about 'surveys and instructions.' We come then to 'fish,' 'the kind of timber,' 'soil,' 'mountain ranges,' 'crops,' 'coal,' 'clay escarpments,' 'fish and minerals.' This report contains a selection of items of that character from the reports of geologists and a great deal of it is the imperfect information derived from the Indians. A great deal of it is only guess work, and very little is definite and can be relied upon. Yet, these are the mountains of information which have been given us in regard to the country through which this railway must pass. I have given a good many items from this report, and I do so because I think it desirable that we should know the character of the information which is given to this House to enable it to judge whether it is wise to pass this Bill or not.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Read pages 42 and 46.

Mr. SPROULE. I will leave the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell) to get up and read the rest of the book if he likes. I have read from page to page so as to give what may be taken as fair samples of the information afforded us, to show how indefinite it is and to show that practically there is no definite information at all; that the data is not reliable, that most of it is collected from the Indians that it is guess work and that it has no relevancy to the information that we want to enable us to judge as to whether it is wise to build this railway or not.

This all important measure that we are dealing with now should have, in my judgment, been referred to in the speech from the Throne. I want to draw attention to one of the features of this session that I have not referred to before. Constitutional government means that the government of the day, when they propound any great policy, refer to it in the speech from the Throne when parliament is called together, and draw the attention of the country to the fact that they propose to deal with the question. It does not matter whether the policy involves a heavy expenditure or is far-reaching in its importance, but in so far as it is interesting or important to the country or is important in other respects, whether it relates to transportation, or to the economic pursuits of the people, or to any other lines of activity in which the country is engaged, our form of constitutional government demands that it should be referred to in the speech from the Throne. Yet, we are asked to commit the country to an expenditure of $100,000,000 or $150,000,000 in carrying out a policy which is not of sufficient importance to be referred to in the speech from the Throne. Is that constitutional government? Coming from the Reformers, who always pride themselves upon living up to the principles of constitutional government, it seems to me that it is more objectionable still. I say that they have abandoned constitutional government in that respect. They have refrained from taking the people as well as the representative of the Crown into their confidence and they have failed to disclose in the speech from the Throne the important policy which we are now dealing with in this House at the tail end of the session. It was not sufficiently important to be referred to in the speech from the Throne, but they can bring it down at the tail end of the session and ask us to deal with it in the dying hours of the session. This policy looks as if it were designed for the destruction of the trade of Ontario as far as I can judge. Taking a comprehensive view of the government in power, it would appear to me that they have a sinister design against Ontario, because it is evident that they are striking at Ontario by taking an unfair census of the country, a census which allowed them to reduce the number of the representatives of the people, and thereby reduce the strength of the voice of Ontario in this House. They struck at Ontario again by the Redistribution Bill, by which they have endeavoured to lessen the power and influence of Ontario in this House. Ontario gave a majority against this government and they cannot forget that. They keep that in view, and their desire is to curtail her strength, to destroy her power, to leave her helpless, to manacle her, first by the census, second by the Redistribution Bill, and third by this great transcontinental railway. If successful this railway would mean the destruction of our fleet of merchant marine which now plies on the great lakes. We are told that if this railway is built up to the standard announced by the railway expert of the government (Mr. Charlton) it will be capable of handling all the produce of the west. If so, it will destroy our lake marine, and in proportion as it is successful it will starve out the existing carrying routes that are so valuable to the province of Ontario. If successful, it means the destruction of our inland shipping; it means the destruction of our ports on the Georgian bay; it means the weakening of the financial strength of Ontario, and it means the decreasing of the population of that province. Our towns,

our cities, and our farming districts will be side-tracked by this road. Toronto, London, Hamilton, Windsor, Guelph, Owen Sound, Meaford, Kincardine, Collingwood, Midland; the commerce of all these towns and cities, will be decreased in volume, and the reduction of their business interests will ensue. But we are told, that we will have a railway to Toronto by way of North Bay. Yes, we may have a branch line into Toronto, but all the same it means that Toronto is side-tracked, and any town in Canada that it was proposed to treat in such a way would fight almost to the death against it. If this line is successful it is not only going to injure our Ontario towns and cities, and our ports on the Georgian bay, but it will destroy the ports of Kingston and of Peterborough and the harbour of Montreal as well. It was said by the Minister of Finance, that a railway would be built from the main line to Montreal. Perhaps so; but Montreal will cease to be on the highway of commerce; Montreal will be on a branch line, and Montreal must lose a large portion of her present great trade. So it is with the other cities and towns in Ontario and western Quebec; the trade will be carried by them rather than through them, to their detriment if not to their destruction.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If the new railway does all that, it is going to be a great success.

Mr. SPROULE. Remember that I said 'if' it met all the expectations which hon. gentlemen opposite claim for it, and the expenditure of this enormous sum of money would not be justified unless that railway proves a success. In proportion, as it is a success, then it will side-track these cities and towns of Ontario, destroy our merchant marine on the lakes and destroy the trade now coming to our harbours. You must remember that the steamers plying on the lakes must have return cargoes, in order that they may be operated successfully. When the boats arrive at Owen Sound they tranship their grain to the elevators and they take the reaping machines, and the mowing machines, and the other manufactured products of the east, back to the markets of the west. At the present time these steamers have cargoes both ways, but if this line carries the grain from the west to the east, then our merchant marine can only have trade in one direction, and every one knows that such trade is not profitable.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS: It will not dry up the lakes.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, that is a kind of a side issue, and it seems to me that it does not require any high degree of intelligence to make such an observation. As between the scheme proposed by the government and the scheme proposed by the leader of the opposition, there is the important distinction, that the scheme proposed by the leader of the opposition, carries in its train none of the evils which characterize the project of the government. The scheme of the hon. the leader of the opposition, brings trade to our ports and builds up these ports; it assists Ontario; it assists our merchant marine, and it assists to build up our cities and towns, whereas the other scheme side-tracks them. There is another difference still. The scheme of the opposition will not cost half the money that the government scheme will cost, although the results from the scheme of the leader of the opposition will, in my judgment, be far more advantageous to the people of Canada. Surely if we can get as much good from an expenditure of $60,000,000 as we can from an expenditure of $150,000,000, it would be the part of wisdom to select the scheme which is the least burdensome upon the people of Canada. Then again, as regards our scheme, we are dealing with things which we know about. There is no uncertainty about it; every foot of territory which would be traversed by railways, as proposed by the leader of the opposition, is well known, and we have the data with reference to it in our possession. On the other hand, uncertainty, the want of knowledge; the indefiniteness of the information surrounding the government scheme, all alike condemn it, and ought to cause us to pause before we embark upon such a hazardous venture.

The Lake Superior ports are important to us; they have their elevators. The Georgian bay ports are important to us; they also have their elevators. If we build railways between Port Arthur and Winnipeg, we can bring down the produce of the great north-western country and put it into the elevators; and during the winter time it will be distributed to Ontario, to the extent to which it is needed there, and the rest will go eastward to the sea-board. But the project of the government does not contemplate the carrying of a bushel to the elevators on Lake Superior or the Georgian bay, but contemplates carrying everything to the eastern ports. Therefore it does not put the people of Ontario on the same level, so far as profits are concerned, with the people of the other portions of the country, and to that extent it is unsuitable. As I said before, the Canadian Pacific Railway is now double-tracking its railway between Port Arthur and Winnipeg. When that is done, there will be practically three railways into that country, because I am told that a double-track railway can carry three times as much as a single-track railway. There will be no danger of blockades in that country when the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern Railway are double-tracked and fully equipped. We have many lines of railway built in the North-west already, and we require many more. At the same time we want the east to go hand in hand with the west, because we need our

railways to be competitors with the waterways of the country. When the water-ways are frozen up, the railways can distribute the grain from the elevators, so that the traffic will go on in the winter as well as in the summer.

This scheme attacks the credit of our country ; it will be a fatal blow to our credit if hard times come again, as no doubt they will come in due time. The undertaking is too great for us. It will heap up the debt of our country to an enormous extent. It will minimize the power of the government to assist other important railway projects. The government tell us that the federal parliament must always in the future grant subsidies for the building of railways, not only in the newer provinces, but in the older provinces as well. If we are obliged to borrow so much money for the construction of this road, where is all the money to come from to assist other railway projects in the future, in Ontario, in Quebec, in the maritime provinces, and in Manitoba and the North-west Territories ? I am afraid that our debt will be piled up so high that the government will find themselves very much crippled when demands are made upon them for other railway subsidies in the future.

For these reasons we are justified in asking the government to go slowly. For these reasons we are justified in supporting the amendment proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition in preference to the proposal of the government. For these reasons I support the resolution. It is right that we should delay in order to get more information. It is important that we should have surveys made. It is important that we should not commit the country to such a heavy expenditure. It is important that we should not destroy the influence and power of the province of Ontario, that portion of the country which must pay the greater bulk of this money. In every dollar of indebtedness incurred for this undertaking forty-five cents must be paid by the province of Ontario, according to her population. That province must pay $45,000 in every $100,000. She must pay $45,000,000 in every $100,000,000. I want the people of Ontario to know this, and to realize what it means to them in the future. I want them to know what they are committing themselves and their children to in supporting the government in this undertaking. I want the members of this House from Ontario who are supporting the government to be prepared to defend their conduct of to-day when they go back to the electors and when this subject is under discussion. The province of Ontario is sometimes spoken of as the milch cow of confederation. I want the people of Ontario to know that they are paying forty-five cents in every dollar of the cost of this undertaking, so that they will be able to estimate whether the government have done right or wrong in committing the country to the heavy expenditure which this Bill will involve if we consent to its third reading at the present time.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a good deal of pleasure to the criticism of the right hon. leader of the government and to the remarks of the hon. leader of the opposition in moving his amendment to the third reading of the Bill. The leader of the government said that after all there was not much difference between the scheme of the government and that of the leader of the opposition in the matter of expense, though he claimed that the government's scheme was the best on the whole. His first criticism of the remarks of the hon. leader of the opposition was in reference to his advocacy of the extension of the government railway from Montreal to the Georgian bay. He criticised that because it involved obtaining possession of either the line of the Grand Trunk Railway or that of the Canadian Pacific Railway between Montreal and Coteau, or the building of a rival line. As our policy involves utilizing portions of the Canadian Pacific Railway around Lake Superior, we could in the same way obtain running rights over the Grand Trunk from Montreal to Coteau. Why should we not do that, without building or purchasing another road ? Perhaps in that respect the suggestion of the right hon. gentleman has a certain advantage over the proposition of the hon. leader of the opposition. However, the important thing is to have a government road from Halifax to the shores of the Georgian bay, with means of communication with the western prairies. It means the acquisition of the Canada Atlantic Railway. That could be all done for $11,000,000 or $12,000,000, or at the utmost $15,000,000. As to that portion of the proposed government road from Moncton to Quebec, we hear very little of it at the present time. It seems to have dropped out of sight altogether. I wonder at our hon. friends in the maritime provinces allowing themselves, like the little boy, to be told by the government: Just close your eyes and open your mouth and we will drop a plum into it. Just say nothing and we will build that section from Quebec to Moncton. But I think that section has passed out of the probabilities that are likely to occur for a generation or two in this country. It is not at all likely that the next generation or two will see a road built from Moncton to Quebec.

The right hon. gentleman criticised my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, because he proposed an alternative scheme to his proposition to build a road from Quebec to Winnipeg. The proposition of my hon. friend was to build colonization roads into that country, according as its requirements demanded, with moderate gradients and equipment. In criticising that scheme, the right hon. gentleman did not seem to

realize the difference between building a road such as he contemplates, and one to be built gradually as settlement required, into that region which is described as so valuable by our friends opposite, in the northern part of Quebec and Ontario, and which would accomplish all the purposes for which it is needed and would cost far less. The scheme of the right hon. gentleman simply means an expenditure four or five times that necessary to carry out the proposition of the leader of the opposition. What are the probabilities ? I have shown that it will be impossible to build any road from Winnipeg to Quebec with modern gradients at a cost that is within the means of this country. The right hon. gentleman asks why, instead of acquiring from the Canadian Pacific Railway that portion of its line between North Bay and Port Arthur, not build another line which will open up a beautiful agricultural section of the country. I wonder where the right hon. gentleman gets his information. From Winnipeg east, as far as the prairie extends the country is flat, but once you strike the Laurentian ranges and go eastward towards Lake Nepigon, it is a costly country through which to build a railway, not nearly as favourable as the country from Port Arthur to Winnipeg by the north of the Lake of the Woods. From Wabigoon to the prairie country east of Winnipeg is full of granite ridges and morasses. Hon. gentlemen will find it described in the report of Sir Sandford Fleming, made in 1877, and to which reference is made in pages 103, 104 and 105 of the government blue-book, and that reference is the only valuable information given in this book on the National Transcontinental Railway. This report of Sir Sandford Fleming deals with the surveys and preliminary operations on the Canadian Pacific Railway from 1871 up to 1877, made by order of the Canadian government. They cover that section of the country from the north side of Lake Nepigon westward to Sturgeon lake. On page 206 of Sir Sandford Fleming's work will be found a report on the exploratory survey made from the River Pic to the River Nepigon, along the northern coast of Lake Superior and on other surveys made in the year 1874 by Thomas Jefferson Thompson. Let me remind the House that in 1873 and 1874 there was a survey made westward towards Winnipeg. There was a survey made by Sir Sandford Fleming from Winnipeg down to Lake Superior. In his report here he says : 'We have found an excellent route along the whole line of the road from Winnipeg down to Lake Superior.' Speaking of the gradients running eastward he says that in no case do they exceed 26 feet to the mile. That is a fact. We have a road now between Winnipeg and the head of Lake Superior with gradients, none of which are in excess of 26 feet to the mile, and the Canadian Pacific Railway are at present, as was stated by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), doubling their tracks and reducing the gradients on that road to four-tenths per cent, or in other words to 20 feet per mile. There can be no better line of road got. It is at least equal to the Northern Railway which runs from Winnipeg to the head of Lake Superior, and you can get no road from Winnipeg to Lake Superior with gradients better than that. But at what expense to the people was that got ? For about 37 miles on that road, on section 15, built by Mr. Whitehead, some of it cost $250,000 per mile on account of the filling. On Cross Lake 1,000,000 yards of earth were put in at a cost of 28 cents per cubic yard. At Lake Deception there were over 500,000 yards and at another lake, Darlingford Bay, over 500,000 yards put in at 28 cents per yard. They managed to get a good road that way, but at an enormous cost ; and according to the reports of the engineers who surveyed that section, Sir Sandford Fleming and the engineers under him, they got a most favourable line of road from Winnipeg down to Lake Superior. But it was only at an enormous cost. On section B there was an enormous expenditure. Let me tell the right hon. gentleman that Sir Sandford Fleming advised that the most feasible line of road for the purpose of connecting the eastern section of the province was from Port Arthur up to Lake Nepigon and thence down by the route at present taken by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Let me quote from the report, to be accurate, what work had to be done on 117 miles of that road :

> The following are the approximate quantities in cubic yards of banks and cuttings for the distance of 117 miles from Peninsula harbour to Red Rock, also lineal yards of tunnels :—
>
> Embankments, cubic yards, 3,443,860, per mile equal to 29,434.
>
> Cuttings, cubic yards, 2,779,350 per mile equal to 23,755.
>
> Lineal yards of tunnel, 13,350, equal to 7½ miles.

And then there are the bridges. And after obtaining all this, the surveyor who was upon that section of the road says that in order to obtain a road such as he has shown you with the amount of excavation, the amount of earth to be removed, the amount of tunnelling that ought to be done in that section of the country, the only difficulty in railway construction along this valley would be in obtaining practical gradients. He says : 'my opinion is that seventy or eighty feet to the mile could be obtained. Now, grades of seventy or eighty feet to the mile are simply of no use for a modern railway competing for traffic with a rail and water route. The hon. gentleman says that we shall have two main lines of railway which will be occupied in the winter, when the lakes are frozen, carrying the produce of the west to the Atlantic seaboard. Does the right hon. gentleman not know that to move freight in that country in winter costs about 40 per cent more than

in the summer? If he will ask the men who operate the Canadian Northern or the Canadian Pacific Railway, or the parties who run railways in Minnesota he will learn that their instructions to their subordinates are not to take out a train more than is absolutely necessary; to run the passenger trains even though they must be run at a loss, but not to carry a pound of freight if it can be avoided, because every pound of freight carried when the temperature is 25 or 30 degrees below zero is carried—no matter what you get for it—at a loss to the road. So you cannot expect any freight to be carried in winter. The only time when it would be possible to compete with the rail and water route would be in summer. The plan of my leader is the only practical plan. It is the plan that is seconded by every intelligent man, every intelligent man connected with transportation between this section and the North-west. The main point of that plan is to get your freight from the west by the cheapest way to the ports at the head of Lake Superior. There are already two roads running from the prairie country to the head of the lakes. They carry 30,000,000 or 40,000,000 bushels a year. Double track either of them and they can carry from Winnipeg to the head of Lake Superior 250,000,000 bushels a year. If you have means of carrying the freight to the head of the lakes there need be no difficulty in transporting it eastward. The plan of the leader of the opposition is upheld by Mr. Robert Meighen, who has been connected nearly all his life with the transportation business, and with buying grain in the west and bringing grain to the east. Having arranged to get your freight carried to the head of Lake Superior, encourage lines of steamers to bring it down to Georgian bay. Have elevators at the Georgian bay ports. Get two-thirds of the crop down during the summer, if you can, to the eastern shore of Georgian bay. Then, during the winter, you can take that by rail to Montreal, or, if possible, to St. John or Halifax. That is the only practical scheme. No one in his senses would think of carrying grain, whatever may be said by the right hon. gentleman, through by rail from Winnipeg to Quebec and from Quebec to St. John and Halifax. The road proposed by the right hon. gentleman between Quebec and Winnipeg may be useful for colonization purposes. If it is to be used as a colonization road, it may have grades of sixty or seventy feet to the mile, and, with those grades it can be built for one quarter of the money that it would be necessary to expend in order to secure grades of twenty feet to the mile.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock:

Hon. Mr. HAGGART.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. At six o'clock I was dealing with the practicability of the route between Winnipeg and Lake Nepigon; I was showing that it is almost impossible to obtain a route with modern gradients between these points. The report which has been brought down, as I stated before, is not a full report. It was seemingly prepared by an officer of the Geological Survey, and in it attention is drawn to a report of Sir Sandford Fleming in respect to the practicability of the route, but the reports of Sir Sandford Fleming are simply referred to, and not given in full. I might remind the House that the surveys in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway took up the time from 1872 to 1878. The result of the surveys was the obtaining of a practicable route from Winnipeg to Lake Superior. The practicability of railway construction on the prairies was also established and three or four different passes, the Tête Jaune, the Pine River pass, the Simpson pass and the Peace River pass were shown to be practicable and good routes to the Pacific coast. In dealing with this question when it was before the House some time ago, I stated that the government ought to have a settled policy in reference to this matter. At that time an application was before parliament from the Grand Trunk Railway for permission to build a railway to the Pacific coast. I advocated the granting of that right to the Grand Trunk Railway, and I am in favour of it at the present time. My opinion was that that road should be built on a route entirely different from those which are now occupied by other railway roads. If you remember, Sir, I advocated at that time the construction of this road as far north as possible, and I thought that the least southerly route which could be adopted by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway should be the route recommended by Sir Sandford Fleming, that is one that crosses the Red river at a town north of Winnipeg, then crosses Lake Winnipeg and proceeds towards the coast either by the Peace River pass, the Tête Jaune pass, the Pine River pass, or the Simpson pass. I think that there is room in this country for such development as I advocated at that time. That would not interfere with present enterprises, with the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Canadian Northern Railway. It would be a route which would open up an immense tract of country to the north of both of those lines. I felt that with the usual subsidy, or with the subsidy which is to be given to the Grand Trunk Pacific for the building of that railway a road could be profitably constructed by the people of this country. But instead of that we have a line which virtually parallels the Canadian Pacific Railway, virtually parallels the line which we have subsidized to Edmonton, for we cannot possibly have Edmonton an objective point of the Grand Trunk Pacific line and

keep that line from running within 20 or 30 miles of the other road. I object to it then on the ground that the proposed location of the line is one that interferes with enterprises now existing in this country, and on the ground that there is no necessity for the building of duplicate lines in that particular section of the country. Then too I was in favour of the development of Ontario and Quebec not by the line proposed by the right hon. gentleman, a line from Quebec to Winnipeg involving an enormous expenditure of money, but by local or Dominion subsidy to local lines for the purpose of developing Ontario and Quebec. I have an opinion, as I said at that time, in the section of country which lies between the head of Lake Nepigon and Quebec there may be land which will be capable of development in the interests of this country, but it can be developed only by colonization roads. There is no necessity for the expenditure by the people of this country of the enormous sum of money which the government propose to spend for the purpose of building a road which, according to the statements of hon. gentlemen on the government side of the House, will be built on commercial principles, with the lowest possible gradients. The building of such a road involves the expenditure of an amount of money of which we can form no estimate, and I would ask what is the use of the railway and Canals Department? Why is it that the right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has not an estimate from that department as to the probable cost of the road. We are asked to go into an undertaking, to enter into a contract with this railway company without knowing what the probable cost of that railway will be; without knowing what the government should have learned from the department which ought to have been able to furnish them with an estimate of what the actual cost would be; without a scintilla of evidence as to the expenditure that would be necessary for the construction of that particular road. That is why I object to the scheme. It involves an expenditure to my mind of not less than $125,000,000. We are bound to build a first-class road from Winnipeg to Moncton, and to construct such a road will involve an expenditure far in excess of any estimate which may be furnished the government. That money to my mind could be expended in works of utility, in works that would facilitate transportation of this country in a far better manner than that proposed by the government. What is the plan proposed by them? To build a road from Quebec to Winnipeg. But what do we find in the Order in Council from the Minister of Public Works providing for the appointment of a commission? The right hon. gentleman says: Oh, it was only for the purpose of finding out and examining the different ports and deciding on what ports of Lake Superior, Georgian bay and the St. Lawrence expenditures should be made. This is what we find in the report of the hon. Minister of Public Works:

> This involves the consideration of their transportation:—
>
> From place of production to Canadian seaports.
>
> From place of production to the western ports of Lake Superior.
>
> From the western ports of Lake Superior to Canadian seaports.
>
> From Canadian seaports to Europe.
>
> From place of production through Canadian ports on the Pacific.
>
> As it affects the products of the eastern provinces of Canada it involves their movement:—
>
> To the seaports.
>
> From the seaports to Europe.
>
> It is obvious that before any satisfactory conclusion can be reached upon these questions a thorough and comprehensive inquiry should be made regarding:—
>
> The conditions of original shipment and the possibilities of improvement in the conditions surrounding such shipments.
>
> The storage requirements of lake, river and ocean ports.
>
> The harbour facilities of the inland lakes, rivers and Atlantic and Pacific ports.
>
> The conditions with regard to the navigation of the St. Lawrence route, and, generally, any improvement, enlargements, or other matters affecting the more economical and satisfactory uses of any Canadian channel of transportation by land or water.
>
> The minister further states that in making such investigation attention should not be confined to routes and facilities which are at present utilized, but, if necessary, new surveys should be made to determine whether any more economical and satisfactory channels of transportation by land or water can be opened up.
>
> The forces operating against the attainment of all Canadian transport, namely:—
>
> Competition by United States railways;
>
> Competition by United States vessels from Lake Superior ports.

Has the right hon. gentleman carried out his pledge to this House? Has he carried out the promise which he put in the mouth of His Excellency? No, he now limits the scope of that commission to the question of what ports on Lake Superior and on the Canadian water route expenditures should be made upon and on the facilities for transportation on the canals and the St. Lawrence. The promise made by the right hon. gentleman to this House was that the whole question of transportation from the prairies of the west to the Atlantic and from the Atlantic ports to Great Britain would be considered by a commission and reported upon to this House in order that this House might consider the whole question. Fancy entering into a contract with a company without even an estimate from the department which has charge of transportation, the Department of Railways and Canals, as to what the cost would be. The right hon. gentleman then is mistaken in his statements and mistaken in the speeches which he quotes to this House. Fortunately we have here the

report of the Minister of Public Works upon which this commission was to be founded. We have not had a scintilla of evidence, we have not had anything in the shape of a report as to what the expenditure will be on this undertaking. Fancy undertaking an expenditure involving, as we say, about $125,000,000, and that figure is within the mark, or two or three times the amount of revenue taken from the people two or three years ago, without having a bit of evidence as to what the cost of the undertaking is to be. That is one reason why the opposition object to this undertaking. We have no evidence as to what it will cost and we have no evidence as to what the liability of the people will be in reference to this undertaking. We have no engineering reports. Why should we enter into a contract without them? The late government with Sir Sandford Fleming engaged upon the surveys, and he had as many parties in the field as he possibly could have at that time, received no information from 1872 to 1878 which would justify them in entering into a contract for the Canadian Pacific Railway except between those points which I have mentioned. We built the road which it was necessary to build in order to connect Lake Superior with Winnipeg by means of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We commenced building the portion of the road in the Rocky mountains which we were bound to do under the agreement with British Columbia. We began these portions of the road. We had not complete evidence after even a six years survey. These hon. gentlemen are entering into a contract for the purpose of building this road without a survey from Winnipeg to Quebec and with only the partial survey of Sir Sandford Fleming which he made when he was building the Intercolonial Railway from Quebec to Moncton. These are the reasons why we object to this proposition. We do not know what the cost of the undertaking is to be and we do not know what the liability of the country is to be in reference to it. Surely the parliament of Canada are delegating powers which it is not in the public interest to grant when they give the government power to enter into a contract when the government cannot tell within $25,000,000 or $50,000,000 or $75,000,000 what the cost of the undertaking will be. Then, the right hon. gentleman talks about the probability of freight being carried from Winnipeg to Quebec. Let me give a few examples to show the absurdity of the statement that freight can be carried profitably for that distance. Freight is carried from Winnipeg to the head of Lake Superior at the present time for ten cents per hundred pounds or about six cents a bushel for every bushel of wheat. It has been carried from the head of Lake Superior to Quebec during the present season by boats for three and one-half cents a bushel. The rate for the 410 miles between Winnipeg and the head of Lake Superior is six cents a bushel.

I venture to say that this rate hardly pays the cost of transport for that 410 miles. Then, it costs nine and a quarter cents to take the wheat from Winnipeg to Quebec. Does the right hon. gentleman pretend to say that with the most favourable gradients that it is possible to get upon that road it will be able to carry wheat to compete from Winnipeg to Quebec with the rate at the present time of nine and a quarter cents per bushel? It would not pay. As I stated before, the rate for 410 miles to the head of Lake Superior is six cents per bushel and for the 1,200 odd miles to Quebec it will cost three times as much or eighteen cents a bushel. It is at present being carried for nine and a quarter cents a bushel. Any railway man, or any man who has studied the transportation question at all will say that no road constructed between Winnipeg and Quebec can successfully compete with the carriage by rail and by water. The right hon. gentleman says that there are five months in the year when it is impossible to carry freight by water or by part water and by part rail and that at these times of the year we will have two roads hauling grain from Winnipeg to Quebec. It will not pay at all. Where the thermometer goes down to 25 or 30 degrees below zero no railway can carry grain at a rate within forty per cent of the rate which would prove profitable during the summer season. The right hon. gentleman spoke about the Canada Atlantic Railway. He said that it was impossible if the Intercolonial Railway were extended to Georgian bay for it to be put in the position of the Canada Atlantic Railway, that is to own steamers, because he said that the American government insisted that wheat from Duluth to the Georgian bay must be carried in American bottoms. I do not think so. I think a British vessel with British register can go to Duluth, Milwaukee or Chicago just the same as an American vessel can.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). They do it anyway.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. They do it anyway and they can do it just the same as an American vessel which carries freight from those ports to the Georgian bay. The right hon. gentleman said that the Intercolonial Railway could not go to American ports and compete for freight to be carried over our own railway lines.

Mr. McCREARY. The vessels have to fly the American flag.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. They do not, I beg your pardon.

Mr. McCREARY. Yes they do.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. A British registered ship can load at Milwaukee and carry to any British port. It is not at all necessary that it should carry the American flag. British ships have just as much right to

carry grain as American vessels have because it does not interfere with the coasting trade at all.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Don't they carry freight from New York to Liverpool now ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Don't they do it from New York to Liverpool, from Boston to Liverpool and from other American ports ? As long as it does not interfere with the coasting laws of the United States, that is by carrying grain or passengers from one American port to another, a British registered ship can go to Milwaukee, Chicago, or Duluth and load grain for a Georgian bay port as well as an American vessel can.

Mr. McCREARY. As a matter of fact has not the Canada Atlantic Railway Company seven steamers, four of which are registered in the United States and fly the American flag ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not know whether they have or not, but I believe some of these vessels that are carrying to Depot Harbour belong to Mr. Booth himself and that they are carrying grain from Duluth and Milwaukee. They have just as much right to do so as an American vessel, so long as they do not interfere with the coasting laws of the United States, and our Canadian vessels, have a right to trade with American ports under similar regulations. The Prime Minister said there were 12,000,000 bushels of wheat carried on the Canada Atlantic via Depot Harbour to American seaports, but what is to prevent that being carried on Canadian railways to Canadian ports ? There are 20,000,000 bushels of Canadian grain exported via Port Arthur and Buffalo, and there are only 12,000,000 bushels of American grain carried via Depot Harbour, some of which goes to Montreal and some to Boston. If we could carry all the grain which is grown in the North-west, on Canadian railways we would not need to carry American grain at all, and it is the duty of Canadian statesmen to divert through Canadian territory, that traffic which is now going to Buffalo. The feeling is growing in this country that we ought to have a government railway, and that it is the only means by which we can equalize freight rates on Canadian roads. The Grand Trunk Railway Company had for its object at first, the building of a road towards the north. I was in favour of that, and I am in favour of assisting them to do that now so long as they do not interfere with existing railroads. I would be in favour of aiding the Grand Trunk liberally towards that end. That is the policy of the leader of the opposition. He is in favour of a government-owned railroad having its terminus at some point which would enable it to compete successfully with other railroads in Canada for the purpose of obtaining freight to Montreal, or to the ports of the maritime provinces. The only possible through-freight that can possibly be obtained for St. John and Halifax, is the freight which comes to the Georgian bay ports, and which is carried by the Grand Trunk Railway, or the Canadian Pacific Railway, or the Canada Atlantic Railway, or by a government-owned railway if we had one, to these points. That is the only possible way, of increasing our traffic with the maritime provinces, and for that reason I am in favour of the proposition of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. I shall not deal at any length with the location of the government line, or its cost, or the probabilities of its success. I have already shown the absurdity of building a road such as this from Winnipeg to Quebec. I would be in favour of a line of railway which would go north of Lake Winnipeg, which would give us a through-route, and which at the same time would open up new tracts of wheat growing country in the North-west and Manitoba. But with regard to this eastern section, it should be the policy of the government to divert most of this traffic through Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces to the sea-board. I cannot understand the policy of the government in building a road from Winnipeg to Quebec of the description and design which they propose, and which if built up to the standard described, will cost an enormous amount of money. I trust that the country through which it is proposed to build the new line is suitable for agriculture ; I hope it is a country abounding in minerals, and that it has, what is perhaps more valuable still, extensive waterfalls which can be developed for manufacturing purposes. I heard my hon friend from North Lanark (Mr. Rosamond) tell how a nephew of his who had been examining the Lake Abitibi country over to the north of Lake Nepigon, found that there was a territory there, two or three hundred miles long and fifty miles wide, comprising excellent cultivable land, and that underlying the whole of that territory there were immense deposits of the best lignite coal. If that be the case, it will solve the fuel difficulty in this country, and it will enable the locomotives to be supplied with fuel. But even all that is no justification for this enormous expenditure. The statement of the Minister of Finance, that if the present surplus continued for a few years it would cover the whole cost of that railway, is simply nonsense. How are they to recoup the people of the country for the expenditure ? They propose to appoint a commissioner to issue debentures for the sums expended and they imagine that the mere paper debentures will be a return to the country for the money expended. It is like a friend of mine who always thanked God that a Bill was paid, when he gave a note for it. If when Julius Caesar landed at Dover, a penny was placed at compound interest ; that original deposit and the interest thereon would to-day build all the railroads in Canada. It looks as

if the Minister of Finance were trying an experiment of that kind, when he issues debentures to recoup the people of Canada for the money that is expended on this road. It is true that from Winnipeg to the coast we have a mortgage upon the Grand Trunk, for the money expended on the construction of that section. That is some kind of a security ; but what does it amount to ?

There is to be expended $13,000 on the prairie section and $30,000 on the mountain section. For that we are to get security to the amount of 75 per cent on every $100 expended in the construction of the road. Besides that we are to have security on what ? The rolling stock of the road to the extent of $15,000,000. The parties who will supply the rolling stock will take the precaution of having security on it, and it is only the balance that will be liable as security to the government. We have no security on the undertaking from the Grand Trunk Pacific or from the Grand Trunk, which does not appear in the contract at all. We have only the security of the $5,000,000 worth of rolling stock, which is to be earmarked for the eastern division of the road. We have of course the security of the road on the money we advance for the building of the western division from Winnipeg to Port Simpson, and we have the security of the road from Winnipeg to Quebec for the amount expended on that road. Will the undertaking, after it is finished, be worth the amount expended upon it ? I do not believe it will be, nor do I believe the road from Quebec to Moncton will be either, if it is ever built, which I do not believe it will be. Nor do I believe it will be possible to obtain a route for a first-class road from Quebec to Winnipeg. I do not believe that section of the road will be worth one-quarter of the money expended upon it. And what security have we that the road will be operated ? The security of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company. Who are they ? A couple of senators and a lot of others who have formed themselves into a corporation for the purpose of making this agreement. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company are in no way bound by it. Their guarantee would not amount to anything, even if you had it ; but they take care not to enter into the undertaking at all. Suppose that there is a deficiency ; suppose that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company are not able to work the road, the whole undertaking will be flung back on the hands of the government. What would be the yearly cost to the government of such a road, extending from Moncton to Quebec and from Quebec to Winnipeg, a distance of nearly 1,700 miles ? We can judge to some extent from our experience of the Intercolonial, which passes through a comparatively fertile and well settled section of country. If you want to develop the northern country, do not expend the money in any such manner. There are a dozen ways in which it could be better expended. Assist the Grand Trunk Railway, if you like, to obtain an entrance into the North-west, and if possible get them to pass north of lake Winnipeg. As I said before, in a speech I delivered in this House, I am favourable to the scheme if the right hon. gentleman will see that the railway goes as far north as possible. It is possible to develop that section of the country. Let the road be built, and let generous assistance be given to those who build it ; but do not pledge the credit of the country for the enormous sum required to build a railroad from Winnipeg to Quebec. As I have said before, I believe that much of the land which appears to be barren in the northern parts of Quebec may turn out, from its mineral and other resources and its water-powers in the lacustrine districts, to be as important as any of the settled portions of this country. It is within my experience that lands which twenty or thirty or forty years ago were considered entirely worthless have turned out to be much more valuable than the best farming lands in the country. It is possible that such lands may be found in the northern country. But develop it gradually. Make your expenditure upon commercial principles, and with the judgment and intelligence that ought to guide you in the matter. Let us have surveys of the country made. As I have already stated, we spent six or seven years in making surveys before we entered into the contract for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and they were only partial surveys at that. We are now entering into a contract which involves a much more enormous sum of money, and we have not a survey between Quebec and Winnipeg, nor have we any means of knowing what the expenditure for that road may be. Let us proceed slowly in regard to it. One thing we do know, that Manitoba and the North-west are an immense wheat field, with enormous capabilities. At present the Grand Trunk Railway has no direct connection with that country ; and in order to divert it from forming American connections, let us assist it along the line of the proposition which the company placed before this House at the beginning of the session. I believe there is no justification at all for that portion of the proposed road from Quebec to Moncton. According to Sir Sandford Fleming's report, it is impossible to get a line with fair gradients in that section of country. The only route suitable for a railroad is that followed by the Intercolonial. Why build a second Intercolonial Railway for the purpose of taking freight from the other portion of that railroad in the maritime provinces. Develop the road which you have at present. Do not destroy the towns and villages which have been built along the line of the Intercolonial Railway, in the hope of getting a shorter route from Quebec to Moncton. If you get

it, you cannot carry freight on it either one way or the other, to a greater extent than you can now on the Intercolonial Railway. Leave well enough alone. If the country is rich and there is an immense surplus which it is necessary to expend for the purpose of justifying the enterprise and the aspirations of the young men of the country, the money can be expended in no better way than by cheapening transportation from one part of the country to another. That is what constitutes a nation. A nation which has cheap transportation from one part to another will eventually become a great manufacturing country. The question of transportation is the great question which should exercise the minds of the government of this country. Expend your money in a justifiable manner for the purpose of affording cheap transportation from one end of the country to the other, and you will do more good than can possibly be done in any other way.

I am with the right hon. gentleman when he says that time is of the essence in this country, that we should seize our opportunities, that if we allow five or ten years to pass it may be too late to secure what we want. The opportunities may then be gone elsewhere, and it may take twenty-five or fifty years to recover the advantages we may have lost. Those were always my ideas, and in that respect I am with the right hon. gentleman, but I do not believe in the scheme on which he proposes to expend so much public money. When the surveys from Winnipeg to Quebec come in, and when he finds it impossible to get the gradients he expects, I trust that he will abandon his scheme and resort to the plan proposed by my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, of building colonization roads into that country. In my opinion, it will be impossible to get there the gradients which will enable us to compete for the carriage of heavy trade from the west. But I believe that in the northern part of Ontario even up to Hudson bay, and in the northern part of Quebec, there are immense tracts of country in which will be found valuable agricultural resources and mineral deposits. And because I look forward to the development of that country, I am opposed to a scheme which can only end in failure and thus retard the development we have so much at heart. What I object to is our entering into a contract with a company of which we know nothing, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, consisting of a couple of senators and some others connected with the Grand Trunk Railway for the purpose of building a transcontinental road. We have the statement of the Minister of Justice that he would take care that the Grand Trunk Railway was a party to the contract, and that members of the House of Commons and the Senate would not be allowed to participate directly or indirectly, in this scheme, or belong to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. While for the purpose of incorporation, it was necessary to have these parties apply for the Bill, yet when the contract was made between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and the government, he would see that no senator or member of the House of Commons was a member of that corporation. Well, I have not seen that the names of those senators and members were eliminated from the Bill. However, I promised that I would not deal with the details, but simply with the measure in its general features, and my opinion is that a more senseless contract it would be difficult to imagine. Fancy if hon. gentlemen opposite were in opposition and we proposed entering into a contract for an expenditure of an unknown sum of money, entering into it blindly, without surveys, without even a report from the Railway Department or any other department, without any estimate of the approximate cost of the undertaking, what a howl they would raise. I have entered my protest a couple of times already against this measure. I know what the result will be. I believe that the Moncton section must be eliminated. I do not believe that any government in its senses will undertake the construction of that line of road, and I believe that after the surveys are made between Quebec and Winnipeg and it is found what an enormous sum of money that section will cost, it will have to be abandoned, and the government will have to come to the proposition of the leader of the opposition, and build colonization roads into that country.

House divided on the amendment of Mr. Borden, Halifax.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Lancaster,
Ball,	LaRivière,
Barker,	Lefurgey,
Birkett,	Lennox,
Blain,	McGowan,
Borden (Halifax),	McIntosh,
Boyd,	Morin,
Broder,	Osler,
Bruce,	Reid (Grenville),
Cargill,	Robinson (Elgin),
Clancy,	Roche (Marquette),
Culbert,	Sherritt,
Fowler,	Simmons,
Gourley,	Sproule,
Haggart,	Thomson (Grey),
Hale,	Tolton,
Halliday,	Wilmot,
Henderson,	Wilson.—37.
Hughes (Victoria),	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Angers,	Lavergne,
Archambault,	LeBlanc,
Beith,	Logan,
Béland,	Loy,
Bernier,	Macdonald,
Bickerdike,	Mackie,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	Maclaren
Bourassa,	(Huntingdon),
Brown,	Macpherson,

Bruneau,	McCarthy,
Campbell,	McCool,
Copp,	McCreary,
Costigan,	McEwen,
Davis,	McGugan,
Delisle,	McIsaac,
Demers (Lévis),	McLennan,
Demers (St. John),	Marcil (Bagot),
Dugas,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Emmerson,	Meigs,
Erb,	Mignault,
Ethier,	Morrison,
Fielding,	Mulock (Sir William),
Fisher,	Oliver,
Fortier,	Paterson,
Gallery,	Préfontaine,
Gauvreau,	Proulx,
Geoffrion,	Puttee,
Gibson,	Ross (Ontario),
Gould,	Ross (Rimouski),
Harty,	Schell,
Harwood,	Scott,
Heyd,	Stephens,
Holmes,	Stewart,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Sutherland (Oxford),
Johnston (Cape Breton)	Talbot,
Johnston (Lambton),	Tobin,
Kendall,	Tolmie,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Turgeon.—75.

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Calvert,	Taylor,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd.),	Tupper (Sir C. H.),
Dyment,	McCormick,
Charlton,	Tisdale,
Sutherland (Essex),	Northrup,
Cowan,	Pringle,
Riley,	Earle,
Lang,	Brock,
Ross (Victoria),	Kidd,
Lemieux,	Bennett,
Grant,	Carscallen,
Christie,	Clare,
Lewis,	Ganong,
Russell,	Johnston (Cardwell),
Douglas,	Kemp,
Wright,	Lavell,
Sifton,	MacLaren (Perth),
Carroll,	Monk,
Reid (Restigouche),	Robinson (Northumberland),
Champagne,	Rosamond,
Roche (Halifax),	Vrooman,
Thompson (Haldimand and Monck),	Ingram,
Hyman,	Gilmour,
McColl,	Ward,
Fraser,	Bell,
Guthrie,	Porter,
Wade,	Smith (Wentworth),
Parmelee,	Pope,
Fitzpatrick,	Clarke,
German,	Avery,
Belcourt,	Calvin,
Madore,	Casgrain,
Ross (Yukon),	Cochrane,
Lovell,	Hackett,
Bureau,	Kaulbach,
Laurier (L'Assomption),	Kendry,
Girard,	Léonard,
Power,	Maclean,
Tucker,	Richardson,
Malouin,	Roddick,
Smith (Vancouver),	Seagram,

Amendment negatived.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). I do not propose to make any lengthened remarks or to go into any discussion of the Bill generally. The government in their wisdom have seen fit to pass the Bill. The opposition have criticised it to the best of their ability. With the government must rest the responsibility. But I do propose to make one more appeal to the government on behalf of the manufacturing interests of this country. I hope the government will see their way to provide that all goods coming into this country for the betterments on this road for the next fifty years shall pay duties, as other imports do. I think that every day is showing us more clearly the position we are in as regards our fiscal policy. It must be almost a satisfaction to the Minister of Finance, with his free trade theories, to find that the woollen mills in Peterborough have lately shut down, mills that have been running for more than twenty years. We are now face to face with a serious condition of affairs financially. I do not mean that this is true of Canada particularly—I speak of the whole world. There seems to be a feeling of unrest and uncertainty which has upset the calculations of the soundest and shrewdest financiers. There is a feeling of unrest that has not been known on this continent or in Great Britain for twenty years past, and the worst feature seems to be that no one is able to explain why it is. But, though none seem to be able to give the reason, it is there ; and, almost before we realize it, we are going to be in the midst of a commercial crisis—not in Canada alone, for I believe that we in Canada are going to escape it, perhaps, better than any other civilized country in the world. But it behooves us, I think to look to ourselves now, and to decide whether we are going to protect our manufacturers and our industries, or whether we are going to let them be slaughtered. The balance is so little that turns a profit into a loss. Our factories in Canada have been very fully employed, almost overworked ; but they have been working, many of them, as I know, practically at a loss. The result in some branches of our industry is that many factories have to shut up, and I think that many more will have to close before many months have passed, unless we look our position squarely in the face, and make up our minds that we are going to protect our manufacturers to the very best of our ability. We must put them on an equal footing with the manufacturers of the south of us, or our industries are going to be ruined. Do not let us make any mistake about that. The position stares us in the face. You may have the theory of free trade, but it is worth nothing when you come to deal with practical affairs. There is nothing more sensitive than capital, and, if it once gets the idea that it is not being protected, that it is not justly dealt with, that it is liable to be destroyed through lack of proper laws, that we are likely to have an overflow of production from the country to the south of us, the

moment production overtakes consumption as it is doing—in fact already has done in many lines—it will withdraw from industry. If our manufacturers have not assurance that they will be protected, they are going to withdraw from business. The ship of industry will be thrown on her beam ends. With capital withdrawn from manufacturing we shall be compelled to rely upon our agriculture simply. Now, no country ever made a success of itself unless it was a manufacturing country, unless as it increased in wealth its industries were diversified. I say that if this agreement goes through as it now stands, if the material to be used in the betterment of this railway for fifty years—and I have shown that the betterments in ten or fifteen years will cost more than the original construction—if that material comes into this country free of duty that will be a most severe blow to our manufacturing industries. Some members of the government maintain that the government have this in their own hands, and that only if the government import direct will the goods escape duty. I say, and my contention has been backed up by eminent legal authority, that under this Act the government have not the power to import material free of duty, but will be compelled by the Grand Trunk Pacific to import it free of duty, because, under the agreement they only pay interest on the lowest possible cost of construction. I appeal to the government to reconsider this clause and to protect our manufacturers to the very fullest extent. If they do not do that, I feel certain that no Act that has been passed in this House for many a year will be such a detriment to the prosperity of the country as will this, because the price of importation of railway supplies for the benefit of that road will, in a measure, govern the prices of importation for all the other railways. Therefore, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Broder :

That all the words after the word 'that' to the end of the question be left out and the following substituted therefor :—'The Bill be referred back to a Committee of the Whole House with power to amend the same by striking out section 33 of the Bill as reported and substituting therefor the following' :—

'Notwithstanding anything contained in section 17 of the said contract, all materials or supplies of any kind which are not the products of Canadian labour and which are imported for the purpose of the construction of the said eastern division by or on behalf of the said commissioners or by or on behalf of any contractors, workmen, agents or servants for the construction of the said eastern division, or for the improvement, replacement of structures or otherwise upon capital account for betterment of the said eastern division as in clause 16 of the said contract provided shall be liable to the usual customs duties provided by the statutes in that behalf and shall be included in and form part of the "cost of construction" mentioned in section 15 of the said agreement, or of the capital account or betterments mentioned in section 16 of the said agreement, as the case may be.'

In moving that amendment, I do appeal to the government to reconsider the position they have taken and further to amend this Bill so as to protect our manufacturers and make it quite clear that all goods imported into Canada for the capital account of this railway shall be subject to pay duty, as provided for now under section 33, so far as concerns the original cost of the road. I cannot see why, when the government have accepted the position that material coming in for the original construction should pay duty and that this shall be added to the capital account on which three per cent interest is to be paid, they should not extend that agreement and make it include all material brought in for betterments. There is more reason to apply it to the betterments than to the original construction, because we do not know how in the next fifty years, the duties may change, and it is most important that there should not be an exception on the statute-books covering such a large import as will be made under this clause. There is no reason why this company should be treated in any different way from others. And if it should happen that our duties are raised all round, then the clause in the Bill as it now stands will appear all the more as a glaring inconsistency, and will be all the greater danger to our industries.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I do not desire to follow the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) in the general discussion of the fiscal policy into which he entered ; I prefer to confine myself to the particular point which is the subject of his motion. My hon. friend has again said that the goods imported for the betterment of this railway on its completion will be imported free of duty ; that they must be imported free of duty and that he has presented to this House legal opinions in confirmation of that view. I must again state that the hon. gentleman is in that respect mistaken ; he has produced no legal opinion to say that one penny's worth of these goods must be imported free of duty. He has presented legal opinions dealing with the adjustment of the capital account between the government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, a very distinct and separate question. The position of the government with respect to these importations, if importations are to be made, will be precisely the same position as that occupied by the government for many years with respect to the Intercolonial Railway. That is to say, if the government desire to import goods from abroad for the use of the Intercolonial the government may either pass these goods through the customs house free of duty or may, if they see fit, allow them to pass in as private importation and duty may be paid ; the matter is entirely optional with the government. The position in which this matter will be left as it now stands is exactly the same as that occupied by the government in relation

to the Intercolonial now and for many years past, the same as it was during all the years when the fiscal policy of hon. gentlemen opposite was in operation. There is no change whatever. The government have the privilege if they so wish to bring goods in free without having them go through the form of passing through the customs house. As a rule the government does not avail itself of that privilege but has in some instances, chiefly with regard to importations of rails, availed itself of it. But it is a pure matter of option and there is not a line in this contract which obliges the government to import a penny's worth free of duty. The government may exercise that right if it so wishes just as it may in relation to the Intercolonial. Inasmuch as there is no change in the position, and as the law is left exactly in the same position under this Bill as it has been for many years, we see no reason for the change which the hon. gentleman proposes.

Mr. ANDREW BRODER (Dundas). I wish to say a few words in reference to what might be called the 'blue-book railway.' So far it is only in the blue-books and the mountains of information that the hon. gentleman has presented to the House and to the country are not so hard to find as the hon. gentleman might suppose. I desire to read from this interesting document a clause in one of the reports of the engineer's or officers who were asked to report to show how they intend to get information. He says here on page 72, speaking of the north country around the region of Hudson bay :

> It would be the means of opening up a country hitherto shrouded in a very considerable degree of darkness, and enable us to obtain full and reliable information.

The idea of any person building a railway in order to get information in regard to any locality ! That is the proposition, that we will build this railway in order to get information about a certain country through which we intend it to pass. If you look at this map what do you find ? You find a red line drawn across the map from Moncton to Port Simpson. I want to call the attention of the right hon. gentleman to this. A great deal has been said about being free from American influence. We are to go away to the north away from the contamination of these Americans whom hon. gentlemen opposite were courting a few years ago. Does the right hon. gentleman not know that when he lands at Port Simpson he is right close to the disputed territory in reference to the Alaska boundary, right within reach of American influence ? I do not for a moment pretend to admit or to say, as a public man or a member of this House, that Port Simpson is not entirely within Canadian territorry. But when you get to Port Simpson you are very close to the disputed territory about which negotiations are at present going on. Thus hon. gentlemen are going right into trouble instead of out of it and it is well to consider all these things when we are talking about a railway of which the government seem to know very very little.

I wish to call the attention of the right hon. gentleman to another point. When freight comes from the west to the great lakes it is virtually common property because there you get competitive rates. But it is proposed to build this road out of reach of that competition so that it will be impossible to obtain cheaper rates owing to any competition that might exist at the great lakes. It is being made impossible for this country to solve this question which every Canadian is anxious to have solved, the obtaining in a reasonable way of cheaper transportation for the products of Canada. Not one of the gentlemen who have advocated this scheme from the right hon. gentleman down to his most humble follower has been able to prove that this proposal will lower the freight rates of this country one cent per hundred pounds, that cannot be done under the proposed scheme and that is a question that should be solved by this House.

While I am on my feet I wish to say further that the Finance Minister takes a peculiar position in disputing the contention of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) in reference to the position of the government in regard to the duty on importations for the betterment of this road. The Minister of Finance says that the government will be in the same position as they are in with reference to the Intercolonial. Is that a fact ? Who will have the control of the purchasing of supplies for the betterment of this road ? It will not be the government but the contractors, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, and they will be able to claim the right to have that advantage, under that contract, of freedom from duty in reference to any importations for the betterment of this road and they will force hon. gentlemen opposite to carry out that contract. The government are not in the position the hon. Minister of Finance says. Why ? Because the government are the absolute owners of the Intercolonial, but in the other case, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company have a right to purchase the goods and hon. gentlemen opposite would be forced to carry out this provision.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is not so. The Grand Trunk will not have the power to make these importations. It is the government and the government only which will have that right.

Mr. BRODER. Then I wish to ask this simple question. Why did hon. gentlemen opposite take so much credit for the clause obliging the builders to buy all their materials in Canada ? If you are going to do it why do you have to put a clause in

the Bill pledging yourself to do it and why do you take any credit to yourselves for that? The clause has no meaning; it is merely clap-trap, if what the hon. gentleman now says is true, so you had better quit blowing this horn about buying everything in Canada. There is nothing in it.

I do not care which horn of the dilemma the hon. gentleman takes. He is welcome to it. It will not hurt the horn, but I do not know what would become of him. There ought to be no doubt at all on this point, and it is an easy matter to fix it in such a way that there would be no doubt. I think we have a perfect right to deal with Canadian interests and to deal with them in a permanent way. This report to which I have already referred advocates the building of roads not from east to west, but from north to south, for the purpose of opening up the country. That is what ought to be done. I want to say before I sit down that this road, if it is built, will not solve the problem that is before this country. Every man knows that if you add anything to the transportation charges of a country it is virtually a direct tax upon the producers of the country. If there is one factor more important than another in the settlement of our North-west, and in the opening up of these vast regions that we all anticipate will be opened up, it is the question of transportation, and there is no question that will affect the interests of the people who are there and the people who will eventually go there so much as the solution of this question in the interest of the people, and in the direction of securing cheaper rates from the west to the east. This road will not give the people cheaper rates. You are putting the road away outside of the region of competition to commence with. The question to be solved is how the grain or the produce of the west shall be put into the eastern markets at as low a rate as possible. This road which is proposed will not solve that question. This road, as the right hon. gentleman said in introducing the Bill, is not a purely commercial road. It has, according to the right hon. gentleman, its national features, which he took so much pride in speaking of before the House and the country. He laid great stress upon the national features of the road, but he failed to show that it will in any sense solve the problem that ought to be solved by parliament in the interest of the people generally.

Mr. GEORGE. TAYLOR (South Leeds). Mr. Speaker, just one word. The right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier), in referring to the leader of the opposition this afternoon, made the statement that if he purchased the Canada Atlantic Railway and its steamships, those steamships, in order to carry grain from Duluth to Depot Harbour, will have to sail under the American flag. I was surprised that the hon. Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson), who ought to know better, and probably does know better, did not get up in his place, call the right hon. leader of the government down, and say: You are making a mistake. He does know better. I have been shipping grain from Canada to the United States for the last three years, and I can ship in a Canadian bottom or in an American bottom. A Canadian vessel can go to a United States port, load with coal or grain, and deliver its cargo in any port in Canada, and for the right hon. gentleman to get up and try to mislead the House in respect to this as he did before in reference to the bonding privilege——

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) is all wrong. If grain is carried from an American port to a Canadian port it can be carried in an American or a Canadian ship, but if bonded freight is taken from Duluth to Boston it has to be carried in an American bottom.

Mr TAYLOR. The right hon. gentleman is wrong again, and the hon. Minister of Customs will certainly contradict him, because American grain can come in an American or Canadian bottom to a Canadian port in bond. It is immaterial what boat it is carried in, whether an American or a Canadian boat. If it comes in bond it is loaded in a Canadian or American car, and it is sent through in bond. The hon. Minister of Customs will verify the statement I am making. The right hon. Prime Minister ought to know better and any hon. gentleman occupying his position ought to know what the laws governing the bonding privilege are. The hon. Minister of Customs will verify my statement, and I call upon him to verify or contradict the statement of the right hon. Prime Minister. I shall wait for the hon. Minister of Customs to answer my question.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I was not listening to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR. May a Canadian vessel go into an American port, load with grain, bring it to a Canadian port in bond, put it in an elevator and have it shipped out in Canadian or American cars in bond to Boston or to another American point of destination?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It can do whatever is allowed to be done under the coasting laws of the United States.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is simply contradicting the statement made by the right hon. Prime Minister. I could not possibly have a better answer when I call upon one of the business men in this business government to contradict another member of the government. But it is the same story from beginning to end. When the Bill was introduced the people were led to believe that we were at the mercy of the United States

in respect to the bonding privilege. It was said that if this road were not built for six or seven months of the year we were at the mercy of the United States, because, if the American government should choose to abrogate the bonding privilege we could not ship a pound of goods from Canada by way of an American ocean port. This statement was made by the right hon. leader of the government, knowing that we had a Canadian railway running through Canadian territory to Canadian ocean ports. Now the right hon. gentleman comes down with a blue-book containing a map, as my hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder) has said, locating the line from Moncton to Winnipeg across the state of Maine. Yet, the right hon. gentleman tells the people of this country that this is to be a Canadian railway. I simply rose because I was not disposed to allow the statement of the right hon. Prime Minister or anybody else to go uncontradicted to this country that Canadian boats carrying the British flag have not the right to go to an American port and bring grain to a Canadian port either in bond or for sale in Canada.

Mr. J. D. REID (South Grenville) Mr. Speaker, I feel, before allowing this Bill to pass, that I should enter my protest against the clause that my hon. friend (Mr. Osler) proposes to amend, and that I should make a further appeal to the right hon. Prime Minister and his colleagues in behalf of the labouring classes of this country. It is very amusing to members of this House, who have listened to hon. gentlemen opposite in days gone by pretending to be friendly with the labouring men of this country, when we find them now coming down with a Bill which has not been prepared by the solicitor of the government but by the solicitor of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, containing this clause :

No addition shall be made to the cost of construction or to the capital of construction account in respect of customs duties in cases where there is direct importation of material or supplies by the government.

The Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) makes a statement that the government may or may not allow the duties to be imposed. That is no doubt true, but clause 37 says :

The company shall purchase the materials and supplies required for the construction of the western division and the equipment of the whole of the said line of railway from Canadian producers, when the same are produced in Canada, and when such material and supplies can be purchased in desirable quantities and of equal quality suitable for the purposes required.

Here is the important part :

And for prices and upon terms equally advantageous with those procurable elsewhere.

If you put the two clauses together, the result is that the contractor can get prices from foreign manufacturers, and he can go to the Canadian manufacturer and say : I can get these goods in free of duty, and the Canadian producer has either to accept these prices without the duties added, or else he loses the order.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It would not be true if the contractor said that. He could not get them in duty free.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not wish to cast any doubt on the word of the Finance Minister, but at the same time, I would remind him that it is the courts of the country that will construe this clause, and they may hold against his opinion. Why is the government afraid either to make this clear, or to leave it out altogether. If a Canadian producer has to accept prices in competition with foreigners, he will have to cut down the wages of his mechanics who are employed in the manufacture of these articles. We have at present in Sault Ste. Marie, a state of affairs which we all regret, but which gives us an illustration of what may happen in the future if this clause is left in the Bill. The 'Soo' works were intended to produce steel rails, and with this clause in the Bill. they would have to meet the competition of foreign manufacturers who are ready to unload their surplus stock on Canada, at prices lower than they sell for in their own country.

Mr. McCREARY. They cannot fill their orders now.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That is because the duties are so uncertain.

Mr. FRASER. They have seven dollars a ton.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The government of this country is responsible for what has happened at the 'Soo,' because they would not give sufficient protection.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). What protection on steel rails did the Sault Ste. Marie Company ask for ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. You tell.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). I can tell.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. member (Mr. Johnston) knows that there is trouble in his constituency. Let me ask him if he is willing to have the duties increased for the protection of the industry in Sydney, or is he satisfied with existing conditions ?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). I will say to hon. gentlemen, that the people who are operating in my constituency got the very duties they asked for. Let me say further that a few years ago a concern in my province came to the Conservative government, stating they were prepared to manufacture steel rails and asking for a duty, but that application was rejected.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. gentleman knows that the people in his constitu-

ency were hounding the government here for months to get protection, and stating that if they did not get protection their mills would be closed down.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). And they got it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The government gave a remedy to a certain extent by granting a bounty, but if this clause is retained in the Bill, these mills in Sydney will probably close down, because they cannot compete with the foreign manufacturers who are ready to unload their surplus stock on the Canadian market.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). That is not answering my question. I asked the hon. gentleman what protection the people operating at Sault Ste. Marie asked on steel rails.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. gentleman can answer that himself when he is making his speech. In addition to steel rails, there will be enormous quantities of nails and spikes used in the construction of this road, and if this clause is retained in the Bill, the mills at Montreal and perhaps in Sydney, will not be able to supply these articles to those constructing the road. I object to this clause because it will have an injurious effect on the condition of every workingman in Canada. If the employees in Canadian manufactories are obliged to take a small wage, they will not be able to pay good prices for their clothing and other necessaries of life, and so every mechanic engaged in supplying these necessaries will be injuriously affected. I cannot understand why this clause was inserted in the Bill, execept it was done at the instance of the Grand Trunk solicitor, who, looking far ahead saw that the privilege to import free of duty, would effect an enormous saving to the Grand Trunk Company. I believe that the government are not doing their duty by the workingmen of this country, if they retain this clause, and I am satisfied that when they appeal to the country the result will be disastrous to them.

Mr. M. K. RICHARDSON (South Grey). There is abundant evidence that there is a very important element of doubt as to the legal construction which may be put upon this section. While that element of doubt exists, it must have a very damaging effect on the manufacturing and other industries of this country. If the government have it in their power, as I believe they have by accepting this amendment, to eliminate that element of doubt, thus giving a degree of stability to the industries of Canada which would tell immediately and for years to come on the advancement of the country in various directions, why cannot they accept it? It is evident that this provision has been imported into the contract entirely in the interest of the Grand Trunk people, that it has been put there at the instance and by the action of their own solicitors. It is clear, from the evidence produced in this debate, that while this element of doubt exists, it will have a depressive effect upon all the industries of Canada, not only in manufacturing, but in mining and agricultural industries. We have in section 37 of the contract a provision that:

> The company shall purchase all material and supplies required for the construction of the western division and the equipment of the whole of the said line of railway from Canadian producers——

But the conditions following that are such as to nullify it almost entirely. It just means this, that Canadian manufacturers and producers shall have the great privilege of competing on equal terms with the manufacturers and producers of any other country in the world, nothing more or less:

> —when the same are produced in Canada, and when such material and supplies can be purchased in desired quantities and of equal quality suitable for the purpose required and for prices and upon terms equally advantageous with those procurable elsewhere.

And only on these conditions will it apply. The conditions are so onerous as to nullify the very pretense which the section makes of protection to manufacturers and all Canadian producers. It would appear to me to be almost imperative on the part of the government to accept any amendment which would eliminate this element of doubt in this section, which must have a very injurious effect on Canadian industries, Canadian wealth, and Canadian advancement. I do not intend to occupy any time on this matter. I simply desire to point out that Canadian manufacturers and producers should not merely be put upon an equal basis with those of other countries. If we are to get nothing else out of this railway project, which involves such an enormous outlay of public money and such an enormous increase in the debt of the country, we ought at least to have this much out of it, to give Canadian industries that stability which is so much needed and which would warrant the investment of capital in this country in many directions. The government profess at times to have an interest in protecting our home industries; and here is a great opportunity for them. If this railroad project is to be of any use to this country at all, here is the way and the only way which I can see at present by which we can get any good out of it, and that little modicum we ought to have at least.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Osler.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Lancaster,
Ball,	LaRivière,
Barker,	Lefurgey,
Bell,	Lennox,
Blain,	McGowan,

Borden (Halifax),	McIntosh,
Boyd,	Morin,
Broder,	Osler,
Bruce,	Reid (Grenville),
Cargill,	Richardson,
Clancy,	Roche (Marquette),
Cochrane,	Rosamond,
Culbert,	Sherritt,
Fowler,	Simmons,
Gourley,	Sproule,
Hackett,	Thomson (Grey),
Hale,	Tolton,
Halliday,	Wilmot,
Henderson,	Wilson—39.
Hughes (Victoria),	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Angers,	Kendall,
Archambault,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Beith,	Lavergne,
Béland,	LeBlanc,
Belcourt,	Logan,
Bernier,	Loy,
Bickerdike,	Macdonald,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	Mackie,
Bourassa,	MacLaren
Brown,	(Huntingdon),
Bruneau,	Macpherson,
Campbell,	McCarthy,
Champagne,	McCool,
Copp,	McCreary,
Costigan,	McEwen,
Davis,	McGugan,
Delisle,	McIsaac,
Demers (Lévis),	McLennan,
Demers (St. John),	Madore,
Dugas,	Marcil (Bagot),
Emmerson,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Erb,	Meigs,
Ethier,	Mignault,
Fielding,	Morrison,
Fisher,	Mulock (Sir William),
Fortier,	Murray,
Fraser,	Paterson,
Gallery,	Préfontaine,
Gauvreau,	Proulx,
Geoffrion,	Puttee,
Gibson,	Ross (Ontario),
Gould,	Ross (Rimouski),
Harty,	Schell,
Harwood,	Scott,
Heyd,	Stephens,
Holmes,	Stewart,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Talbot,
Johnston	Tobin,
(Cape Breton),	Tolmie,
Johnston (Lambton),	Turgeon—78.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. G. O. ALCORN (Prince Edward, Ont.). The amendment I am about to propose, Mr. Speaker, refers to clause 7 of the Bill, which authorizes the Grand Trunk Railway to acquire, hold, guarantee pledge and dispose of stock, bonds and debentures or other securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, subject to the provisions of the agreement between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, and upon such terms as are specified in a resolution to that effect passed by the directors of the said company and sanctioned by a majority of the shareholders. The clauses of the agreement which relate to this subject are clauses 26 and 27. They are as follows :

The capital stock of the company shall be forty-five million dollars, of which not more than twenty million dollars shall be preferred and not less than twenty-five million dollars common stock.

The company undertakes that the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada shall acquire and take the said common stock to the amount of twenty-five million dollars, except shares held by directors, not exceeding one thousand shares, and shall hold the same during the term of the said lease, and so long as any of the bonds guaranteed by the government under the terms of this agreement shall remain outstanding unpaid.

Hon. gentlemen will be familiar with the contention raised by this side of the House with reference to the number in which the stock should be acquired and held by the Grand Trunk Railway. We on this side have contended, as set forth in an amendment proposed by the hon. the leader of the opposition, that the Grand Trunk Railway should be compelled to subscribe for this stock in the ordinary way and incur all the liabilities incident to such subscription. In other words, that they should pay for that stock in cash at par, either in one payment, or in instalments as called upon, in the ordinary way. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice, in reply to the hon. the leader of the opposition, objected to the term 'subscribe' for and argued that the Grand Trunk Railway should be at liberty to acquire that stock by any means; and that all that was necessary was that they should be compelled to hold it during the time specified in the agreement. In my opinion, the proposition of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, is one of vast importance to the project and to the people of this country, namely, that a fund should be expressly provided in this agreement, out of which the liability of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway for its 25 per cent share of the cost of construction of the western division might be met. In the agreement there is no clause providing for any fund out of which that 25 per cent of the cost of construction may be paid. Surely there can be no reasonable objection to a provision of that kind, and I am at a loss to understand why the government, if it is guided by any ordinary business ideas in this matter, should object to it. The amendment which I beg to move, is as follows :

That section 7 be amended by striking out all the words after the word 'three' in line 42 down to and including the word 'company' in line 44 and by inserting instead thereof the words : 'subscribe and pay in cash at par for common stock and for preferred stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific Raiway Company, and may acquire, hold, guarantee, pledge, and dispose of preferred stock, bonds, debentures, or other securities of the said Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.'

As I have said, it is in my opinion of the utmost importance that these words 'subscribe and pay for in cash' should, as suggested by my hon. friend the leader of

the opposition be embodied in this clause, and the Grand Trunk Railway should not be allowed, as it will be if this amendment be not adopted, to acquire the common stock by any other means. It is evident that if the Grand Trunk Railway should hold the total $25,000,000 of common stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, less $100,000 the entire control will be exclusively in the hands of that company. It will have absolute control. It may appoint every director on the board. All the employees and agents of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will be subject to its control and may be appointed and dismissed by it at will, and the object of my amendment is, in the case of such an event, to compel the establishment of the fund I have spoken of, out of which the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway may be in a position to construct its share of the western division.

The PRIME MINISTER. I shall not surprise my hon. friend if I tell him that I cannot accept his amendment and I am sure he will not expect me to go over the arguments which have already been made at length against it.

The House divided on the amendment of Mr. Alcorn.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Lancaster,
Ball,	LaRivière,
Barker,	Lefurgey,
Bell,	McGowan,
Blain,	McIntosh,
Borden (Halifax),	Morin,
Boyd,	Puttee,
Broder,	Reid (Grenville),
Bruce,	Richardson,
Cargill,	Roche (Marquette),
Clancy,	Rosamond,
Fowler,	Simmons,
Gourley,	Sproule,
Hackett,	Thomson (Grey),
Halliday,	Tolton,
Henderson,	Wilmot,
Hughes (Victoria),	Wilson—35.
Kaulbach,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Angers,	Kendall,
Archambault,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Beith,	Lavergne,
Béland,	LeBlanc,
Belcourt,	Logan,
Bernier,	Loy,
Bickerdike,	Macdonald,
Bourassa,	Mackie,
Brown,	MacLaren (Huntingdon),
Bruneau,	
Campbell,	Macpherson,
Champagne,	McCarthy,
Copp,	McCool,
Costigan,	McCreary,
Davis,	McGugan,
Delisle,	McIsaac,
Demers (Lévis),	McLennan,
Demers (St. John),	Madore,
Dugas,	Marcil (Bagot),
Emmerson,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Erb,	Meigs,
Ethier,	Mignault,
Fielding,	Morrison,
Fisher,	Mulock (Sir William),
Fortier,	Murray,
Fraser,	Paterson,
Gallery,	Préfontaine,
Gauvreau,	Proulx,
Geoffrion,	Ross (Ontario),
Gibson,	Ross (Rimouski),
Gould,	Schell,
Harty,	Scott,
Harwood,	Stephens,
Heyd,	Stewart,
Holmes,	Talbot,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Tobin,
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Tolmie,
Johnston (Lambton),	Turgeon—75.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. WM. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I have an amendment which I desire to propose at this stage; and, inasmuch as the principle of this amendment was discussed in Committee of the Whole I do not intend to deal with it at great length on this occasion. I may say that in connection with this amendment the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) took the ground that it would limit the powers of the Railway Committee in regard to the control of rates. To show that there was no force in that, it is only necessary to read the amendment. The object is not to limit the control of rates but simply to provide that the rates on this road shall not be any higher than those charged, or at any time to be charged, on the Canadian Northern Railway system. Nothing can be more important in connection with a new road than the rates to be charged to the people who have to ship their produce over that road. We have heard many objections offered in the past to the rates charged on the Canadian Pacific Railway. It has been declared that the agriculturists in the west were merely farming on shares with the Canadian Pacific Railway. And still the very men who made those assertions admit that the Canadian Pacific Railway was neither better nor worse than other corporations, and that other corporations placed in similar circumstances would do what it has done. On that reasoning, if this Grand Trunk Pacific Company comes to deal with the farmers who have no competing line—and it is provided that this line shall not be built within less than thirty miles of the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Canadian Northern—the farmer along this route will be placed in exactly the same position as were the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west in relation to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and will have to pay the rates demanded for the shipments of their products to the head of the lakes by this road. It is important that a safeguard should be provided to protect the farmers from exorbitant rates. The Minister of Justice, when he took the position that this amendment would limit the power of the railway commissioners to control rates, was

asked in what respect this would be the case, replied that, according to this amendment we would be practically binding ourselves to follow the rates on the Canadian Northern Railway. That is not the intention at all. The Grand Trunk Pacific can charge lower rates than the Canadian Northern if they desire to do so; the idea of the amendment is that the rates on the Canadian Northern Railway shall be the maximum. And the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, when introducing his Railway Bill, stated the duty of the commission would be not to raise the rates but to lower the rates when it was possible to do so. So, the objection raised by the Minister of Justice is not a valid objection at all. Now, those hon. gentlemen in this House who have spoken in favour of this Bill, particularly the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) have taken the position that this road, when it is constructed, will be able to haul grain at the rate of five cents a bushel from Winnipeg to the port of Montreal. If that is the case the government should have no objection to incorporate this amendment in its agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific people. But the very best evidence that the government and its supporters have no faith in that arrangement is the fact that they have rejected this amendment which merely provides not for a five-cent or six-cent rate which these gentlemen declare can be had over this road from Winnipeg or Brandon to Quebec—but simply that the rate shall not exceed the rates on the Canadian Northern. The rate now charged by the Canadian Northern is ten cents per hundred pounds, or six cents per bushel, from Winnipeg to Fort William. If these hon. gentlemen are not ready to make it part of the bargain that the charge for hauling grain over this road shall not exceed six cents per bushel from Winnipeg to Fort William, how can they expect to convince us that the grain can be hauled from Winnipeg to Quebec for five cents per bushel ? Hon. gentlemen opposite take the ground that the Canadian Northern are losing money in carrying grain from Winnipeg to Fort William at six cents. If that is a fact, what reason is there to expect that this new railway can carry grain a thousand miles farther east for the same amount of money. Now, however, they aver, as the reason why the Grand Trunk Pacific would carry grain cheaper than it is carried at the present time, that its fixed charges will be low. But as a matter of fact, the fixed charges of the Canadian Northern are lower than those of any railway on the American continent today. The Grand Trunk Pacific will have a capitalization of $45,000,000. That, together with its bonding issue will make an amount of $95,000,000 on which fixed charges will have to be paid. This will amount to something in the neighbourhood of $50,000 a mile which will, for many years, prevent a reduction of rates upon the road unless parliament takes steps at this incipient stage, to fix rates which shall not be exceeded. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) stated that if he thought this road would charge exorbitant rates he would support the amendment, but that he had every confidence in the enterprise that the rates would be reasonable. I must say that the hon. gentleman evinces childlike simplicity and every confidence in this corporation—very much more than he ever had in the Canadian Pacific Railway. But he admitted that the Canadian Pacific Railway was not treating the people worse than any other corporation placed in similar circumstances would treat them. And, if the hon. gentleman believes, as he declares, that the corporations were bleeding the farmers white, that they were charging the farmers such exorbitant rates that the effect was that the agriculturists were farming on shares with them. I think I can, with every confidence claim the hon. gentleman's support to my amendment, which simply declares that the rates shall not be higher than those charged by the Canadian Northern. The reason why I select that road is because, under its arrangement with the Manitoba government, its rates are under control of that government, and have been reduced four cents per hundred pounds during the last two years. Now, we on this side expect that this road is going to carry very little grain to the east by the all-rail system from Winnipeg to Quebec, Moncton, St. John or Halifax. But, practically all the grain that will be carried will have to go to a Lake Superior port, provided that branch is built which the Grand Trunk people have taken the power to build to Nepigon Bay. Therefore, my amendment limits the rates which shall be charged to Lake Superior ports, realizing as I do that the bulk of the grain will be shipped by lake and rail route, even after this road is constructed; because it is impossible, as pointed out by practical men in this House and out of it to carry grain all rail. We want to protect our farmers so that they shall not be charged exorbitant rates for the carriage of their grain to the head of navigation. Therefore, without taking up further time, I move, seconded by Mr. Boyd :

That all the words after 'that' to the end of the question be left out and the following substituted therefor :—The Bill be referred back to a Committee of the Whole with power to amend the same as follows :—

That in the transportation of traffic from or to points on the said western division by way of Lake Superior, whether such traffic be between points in Canada or be export or import traffic, the rates of transportation to be charged by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company shall not exceed the lowest rates then being charged by the Canadian Northern Railway on the lake traffic by way of Lake Superior between the same or corresponding points.

Houses divided on the amendment of Mr. Roche (Marquette) :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Lancaster,
Ball,	LaRivière,
Barker,	Lefurgey,
Bell,	McGowan,
Blain,	McIntosh,
Borden (Halifax),	Morin,
Boyd,	Puttee,
Broder,	Reid (Grenville),
Bruce,	Richardson,
Cargill,	Roche (Marquette),
Clancy,	Rosamond,
Culbert,	Simmons,
Fowler,	Sproule,
Gourley,	Thomson (Grey),
Hackett,	Tolton,
Henderson,	Wilmot,
Kaulbach,	Wilson—34.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Angers,	Johnston (Lambton),
Archambault,	Kendall,
Beith,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Béland,	Lavergne,
Belcourt,	LeBlanc,
Bernier,	Logan,
Bickerdike,	Loy,
Bourassa,	Macdonald,
Brown,	Mackie,
Bruneau,	MacLaren
Campbell,	(Huntingdon),
Champagne,	Macpherson,
Copp,	McCarthy,
Costigan,	McCool,
Davis,	McCreary,
Delisle,	McGugan,
Demers (Lévis),	McIsaac,
Demers (St. John),	McLennan,
Dugas,	Madore,
Emmerson,	Marcil (Bagot),
Erb,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Ethier,	Meigs,
Fielding,	Mignault,
Fisher,	Morrison,
Fortier,	Murray,
Fraser,	Paterson,
Gallery,	Préfontaine,
Gauvreau,	Proulx,
Geoffrion,	Ross (Ontario),
Gibson,	Ross (Rimouski),
Gould,	Schell,
Harty,	Scott,
Harwood,	Stephens,
Heyd,	Stewart,
Holmes,	Talbot,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Tobin,
Johnston	Tolmie,
(Cape Breton),	Turgeon—74.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (King's, N.B.). I desire to move an amendment to section 7, which is so very defective that it is necessary, in order to perfect it, to move a number of amendments. The amendment which I propose is somewhat akin to an amendment moved by the hon. member for Prince Edward, Ontario, except that it goes further and is a sort of complement to that amendment. It relates to the common stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company which is to be acquired by the Grand Trunk Railway. The objection to the Bill in this particular is that under section 7 of the Bill and section 11 of the charter it is possible for the Grand Trunk Railway Company to acquire the common stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company without paying therefor any money or giving therefor any consideration which would be at all commensurate with the value of $24,900,000 of common stock. This we believe to be entirely wrong ; we believe that this common stock should be paid for in cash or in the equivalent of cash in order that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company will be able to complete their railroad and its equipment without having to float as large an amount of bonds as they would otherwise have to float ; that is without adding so greatly to the indebtedness of the company as they would be obliged to do if they did not receive par value for this common stock. It has been pointed out in this House that this objection existed, and I do not desire to take up much time in discussing the matter now, because I suppose that the government have hardened their hearts in respect to this matter and do not propose now to amend any portion of this contract or this Bill. At the same time I do propose to point out what has been urged already, that by allowing the Grand Trunk Railway to acquire this common stock we impose a very much greater additional burden on the people who use this road in the additional freight rates that will be required. Under the Bill as it stands there is no way of fixing the value of the privileges which may be taken in exchange for this common stock. It has been pointed out even by hon. gentlemen opposite that the guaranteeing of the bonds by the Grand Trunk will be a sufficient consideration for this $25,000,000 of stock. Then there is the additional feature that the possession of this $25,000,000 of common stock gives the Grand Trunk the absolute control of the Grand Trunk Pacific, so that the Grand Trunk Railway will control all the officials of the Grand Trunk Pacific and will be able to violate all the conditions supposed to be imposed on the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway by the contract as to the carrying of freight over Canadian soil to Canadian ports without rendering themselves liable to any penalty. The Grand Trunk Railway, controlling all the officials, can easily induce these officials to persuade shippers to route their freight over the Grand Trunk to Portland and it will be absolutely impossible to trace such an action or to prevent it, and so I say that by allowing the Grand Trunk Railway to acquire this common stock in this way the government is putting this power in the hands of the Grand Trunk, which will enable them to violate with absolute impunity the agreements of the contract which has been entered into by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. Now, Sir, I trust that the

government, even at this late day, will permit this amendment to pass, that they will accept this amendment, because if they do that they will have given an earnest of their desire to make this railway which they propose to build with such an enormous amount of the people's money, a truly Canadian line, which will carry Canadian freight all the way from the west to Canadian ports, and build up this Canada of ours into a nation. I therefore beg to move:

That all the words after the word 'that' to the end of the question be left out and the following be substituted therefor:—'The Bill be referred back to a Committee of the Whole House with power to add the following as a sub-clause to section 7.

'Notwithstanding anything in this Act or in the said agreement contained, His Majesty the King, acting in respect of the government of Canada, shall not be bound or obliged to perform, carry out or fulfil any of the covenants, undertakings, conditions or stipulations in the said agreement contained on behalf of His Majesty the King, acting as aforesaid, unless and until the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada shall have subscribed for the common stock of the Grand Trunk Railway Company payable in cash at par to the amount of not less than $24,900,000.

I regret that there are not more members from the west in the House, because I think they would all certainly vote for this motion.

Amendment (Mr. Fowler) negatived on the same division.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). Mr. Speaker, I rise to propose an amendment to the seventh clause in the following words. I move seconded by Mr. Rosamond:

That all the words after the word 'that' to the end of the question be left out and the following substituted therefor:—The Bill be referred back to a Committee of the Whole House with power to amend section 7 by adding thereto the following subsections:—

Notwithstanding anything in this Act or in the said agreement contained, His Majesty the King, acting as aforesaid, shall not be bound or obliged to perform, carry out or fulfil any of the covenants, conditions or stipulations in the said agreement contained on behalf of the Dominion of Canada, unless and until the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada shall have entered into an agreement with His Majesty the King, acting as aforesaid, by which the said Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada shall covenant and agree as follows:—

(a.) That the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company so long as the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada shall hold the common stock of the said Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to the amount of $24,900,000, shall perform, fulfil and carry out according to the true intention and meaning thereof, all the provisions of this Act, and of the covenants, stipulations and conditions in the said agreement contained, which according to the terms thereof, ought to be performed, fulfilled or carried out by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

(b.) That neither the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, nor the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada shall in any matter within its powers, directly or indirectly permit, advise or encourage the transportation of traffic by routes or at rates other than those in the said agreement, provided that each of the said companies shall in all respects and in good faith use its utmost endeavours to fulfil the conditions upon which public aid is granted and accepted, namely, the development of trade through Canadian channels and through Canadian ocean ports.

I will only speak briefly on this amendment, as the subject was so thoroughly thrashed out in committee, but I will state that the object is to provide a security on the part of the Grand Trunk Railway Company that the terms and conditions which have already been agreed to by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company shall indeed and in truth be carried out. I presume that we can predicate the duty of the House to be, that, the government having entered into a contract with the Grand Trunk Pacific, which is subject to the ratification of the House, to endeavour to the best of our ability in order to safeguard the interests of the people, to throw every protection they possibly can around these interests so that the real and true intent of the contract may be in fact carried out. When we look at the contract it requires but a moment's consideration to see that it is a contract simply between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, a contract in which there are a certain number of covenants and stipulations made by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, but we must not forget, that, although there are many covenants and stipulations on the part of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, in order to estimate the value of the covenant there are two conditions which must not be overlooked. In the first place, as to the extent of the covenant we want to see what is really undertaken by the party covenanting, and in the second place, we want to see whether the financial standing of the party giving the covenant is sufficient to secure the carrying out of the obligation. I do not intend to discuss the question of the covenants, because that has been practically settled by the various divisions which have so far taken place here, but it is quite in order to call attention to the fact that, even assuming that these covenants made by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company are expressed to an extent which is satisfactory to the people, practically we have no financial obligation on the part of the Grand Trunk Railway Company which can give us any remedy at all in so far as they are concerned. When we consider that we are making a contract with a company whose whole line when completed will be mortgaged for every single dollar that it costs to build the line, I think no further comment is necessary to show of how little value the covenant of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company really is. In fact, the government of the country is in this

position: If the government claims that the covenant of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company is really a valid financial obligation, and one upon which the people can rely then the Grand Trunk Railway Company is not assuming any risk whatever in guaranteeing 25 per cent of the obligation necessary to construct this road. If we look at the position of the Grand Trunk Railway Company we find that that company, by the Act being enforced to accept practically the whole of the stock, we have the Grand Trunk Railway Company controlling the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company without any obligation whatsoever. It seems to me that if we could throw on the canvas a picture of the interest that the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Railway Company really have in this particular contract, and if the picture could be drawn according to mathematical scale, showing the true interests of all these parties, it would be found that the interest of the Grand Trunk Railway Company looms up very large indeed, while, on the other hand, if we could have thrown on the canvas a picture of the obligations asssumed by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, it would be found that the obligation assumed by the Grand Trunk Railway Companay is in reality very trifling. If the government should vote down this amendment, it must be on the ground that the covenant of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company is a good covenant, but if so, it is perfectly evident that the Grand Trunk Railway Company is assuming no liability whatever practically in guaranteeing the amount of the bonds it undertakes to guarantee. Therefore, as to this subclause (a), I think we are justified in assuming, that, as the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, which after all is as clay in the hands of the potter as between itself and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, the Grand Trunk Railway Company should covenant that it, itself, will see that the child of its creation shall carry out the contract which has been entered into. Another feature of the contract is as to the carrying of trade through Canadian channels and through Canadian ports. I will not occupy the time of the House in reading clauses 42 and 43 of the contract, which provides that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company shall see that freight is routed through Canadian channels and through Canadian ports. Subclause (b) of the amendment which I moved provides that the Grand Trunk Railway Company shall do in fact itself what the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company is bound by the contract already made with the government to do. It also provides that the Grand Trunk Railway Company, itself, shall not in any roundabout way defeat the true intent of the agreement by itself doing what the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company would be liable under its covenant for doing. Therefore, without occupying the time of the House further, I submit this amendment which is in effect to secure to the people of Canada the covenant of the Grand Trunk Railway Company that in these two respects the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company shall carry out the contracts, covenants and agreements which it has made with the people of this country. While under ordinary circumstances it might not seem reasonable or fair to exact such a covenant from a third party, the Grand Trunk Railway Company, I submit, that as under the terms of this particular contract it is provided that the Grand Trunk Railway shall hold the stock and shall in effect be the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company in every sense, except liability, the amendment is not unreasonable.

Amendment (Mr. Northrup) negatived on the same division.

On motion of Mr. Lancaster, the debate was adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—COASTING PRIVILEGES.

The PRIME MINISTER. I beg to move the adjournment of the House. In reference to a certain point, as to which my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and myself do not agree, let me quote the following from an Act of the congress of United States, of February, 1898.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in congress assembled, that no merchandise shall be transported by water under a penalty of forfeiture thereof from one port of the United States to another port of the United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the voyage, in any other vessel than a vessel of the United States.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is quite correct with regard to coasting, but carrying from an American port to a Canadian port is a different story.

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

The PRIME MINISTER. We will continue this Bill and after that we will take up some other Bills and then go into supply.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, September 30, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

RECEPTIONS OF PETITIONS.

Certain petitions praying that Bill (No. 235) to provide for the construction of a

National Transcontinental Railway should not become law; having been read by the Clerk at the Table.

On the question—Is it the pleasure of the House to receive these petitions?

Mr. O. E. TALBOT (Bellechasse). I wish to ask, Mr. Speaker, if hon. members who present petitions of this kind in the House are responsible for the authenticity and genuineness of the signatures attached to them. I notice that on one of these petitions presented yesterday by the hon. member for Prince Edward; out of twenty-five signatures, there are twenty-one written by the same hand and in the same ink, and without any evidence as to the witnessing of these signatures. Are the members who present these petitions responsible for that?

Mr. SPEAKER. It certainly would be irregular that the signatures on petitions presented to this House should be signed by the same person. Petitions should be signed by those whose names are supposed to be attached to them. Rule 84 says:

Petitions to the House shall be presented by a member in his place, who shall be answerable that they do not contain impertinent or improper matter.

The petitions were received.

QUESTIONS.

IMPERIAL SERVICE ORDER.

Mr. CLARKE—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. On whose recommendation were the Imperial Service Orders and medals, recently issued to members of the Dominion and provincial civil service?

2. Under what system was the selection made in each case; and is the same authority responsible for all decorations and medals issued?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Imperial Service Order is a new order created by His Majesty the King for rewarding long and faithful performance of duty in connection with the civil service in different parts of the British empire. Of course, I need not say that the conferring of the Order is a prerogative of His Majesty the King, after advice is tendered to him by His Excellency the Governor General, who has previously consulted his ministers and who are responsible.

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE, 1903.

Mr. CLANCY asked:

1. What was the total amount of revenue collected for and during the fiscal year 1903?

2. What was the total expenditure for the fiscal year 1903?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The final figures for the fiscal year recently closed have not yet been made out.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

MR. F. L. CHEVRIER—MISS EDNA CHARBONNEAU.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. Is F. L. Chevrier, son of Mrs. L. D. Chevrier, employed in the Customs Department in Montreal? If so, what salary does he receive?

2. Is Edna Charbonneau, niece of Mrs. L. D. Chevrier, employed in the Printing Bureau? If so, what salary does she receive, and on whose recommendation was she appointed?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). I do not know who Mr. F. L. Chevrier's mother is, but there is an officer of that name employed in the Custom's Department in Montreal, who receives a salary of $900 a year, and I consider him a very efficient officer.

The PRIME MINISTER. With reference to Edna Charbonneau. I have no information that she is the niece of Mrs. L. D. Chevrier, but she is the daughter of a widowed mother with four children. She is employed in the Printing Bureau and is paid $5.50 a week. She was appointed on good recommendation.

DIRECT IMPORTATION BY GOVERNMENT.

Mr. OSLER—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. What classes of goods, and what value, have been imported direct by the government of Canada in each fiscal year for the three years ending 30th June, 1903?

2. If duty had been collected on such imports by the government, what would have been the amount of the duty collected on such imports in each year specified above?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson.) The value of 'articles imported by, or for the use of, the Dominion government, or any of the departments thereof, or by and for the Senate and House of Commons' free of duty during the undermentioned fiscal years are respectively as follows: 1901, $1,646,337; 1902, $2,607,664; 1903, $1,407,060. The inquiry cannot be further answered at present. A special classification of invoices at various ports of entry, requiring time for its preparation, would be necessary before all the information asked for could be furnished.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

Mr. PORTER—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Has W. McLeod, C.E., made his report upon the work assigned to him in regard to the location, feasibility and cost of construction of the south-eastern terminus of the Trent Valley canal, to determine which route is preferable, that proposed to terminate at Port Hope or that at Trenton?

2. If such report has not been made, when may it be expected to be made?

3. Will such report, if made or when made, be laid upon the Table of this House?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding).

1. Mr. H. A. F. McLeod has reported on the feasibility and cost of construction of the south-eastern terminus of the Trent canal.

2. Answer to No. 1 disposes of this question.

3. Yes.

CANADIAN NATIONAL GALLERY.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria) asked :

1. How much has the government already expended within the last seven years for pictures, paintings, and other works of art for the Canadian National Gallery, or for other purposes ?

2. What sums have been expended for the works of Canadian artists ?

3. Under whose supervision are these works of art selected ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland) :

1. $9,250 for pictures, &c., $3,635.58 caretaker's salary, and $1,964.81 for repairs, &c.

2. $1,720 for painting, &c., and $330 for statuary.

3. On the recommendation of two members of the Royal Canadian Academy and a representative of the Department of Public Works.

THE DISTURBANCES AT SAULT STE. MARIE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the day are called, I would like to ask the government whether they have any further information as to the disturbance at the Sault, which would seem to have been of a somewhat more serious character than was anticipated by my right hon. friend yesterday. I observe from the newspaper reports that two men were shot, one named Dault, from Lake St. John, Quebec, and another named Grenier, from Ottawa. The report states that Dault was shot in the neck and Grenier in the leg. Another report indicates that one of these men was very seriously injured. It has even been reported—I do not know with what truth—that he has died. It would also appear that some portion of the permanent force of the country has been called out. I would like to ask my hon. friend what is the total force, whether permanent or militia, now engaged in subduing the disturbance, and under what circumstances they have been called out. There is a further newspaper report to the effect that a bulletin has been placed on the door of the company's offices in the following terms:

Officers and employees of the Consolidated Lake Superior and Subsidiary Companies : The president and directors in New York have been unable to raise money to pay to-day the wages and salaries now due the men and officers of the company. Advice received from New York this morning indicates that our president and directors have a plan to raise the money to not only pay the men, but to start up the works, that seems to promise success. The plan has the endorsement and promise of support of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Premier of Canada, and the Hon. Geo. W. Ross, Premier of Ontario, and it is expected to produce the necessary money within thirty days. While we regret very much the inability of the company to pay to-day, the fact remains that there is not money to pay with. There seems to be only one thing left for the men to do, and that is to accept the offer of work elsewhere, leaving their checks with friends, responsible attorneys, or business men, to collect and send to them when the company pays them. Bear in mind that your wages will have to be paid ultimately, and constitute a just obligation against the company, which all the property and other assets of the company will ultimately be liable for. Any men who cannot get free transportation to new work can no doubt get enough money advanced on their time checks by business houses to pay their way to their new work.

There are just these points on which I would like my hon. friend to give information. What is the situation in Sault Ste. Marie with respect to this disturbance ? What portion of the permanent force has been called out ? What portion of the militia force is also on duty there ? At whose instance have these forces been called out ? And what truth is there in the statement affixed to the door of the company's offices that some plan has been proposed to the government, which has the endorsement and the promise of the Prime Minister, by which it is expected the necessary money will be obtained to pay the men their wages ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The statement which my hon. friend has read with regard to a plan for raising money has not been submitted to me, and I do not know exactly what it means. I have only to say that no plan of any kind for raising money has been submitted to me, either directly or indirectly. With regard to the condition of things at Sault Ste. Marie, the last information that I have personally received is from Mr. Dyment, a member of this House, who wired me late last evening to this effect :

Trouble here has somewhat subsided. Don't anticipate further rioting after arrival of troops to-day. Many arrests made. Policemen injured and two rioters shot, but not fatally. Troops now guarding government canal and allied companies works.

As to the other question, it will be answered by my hon. friend the Minister of Militia.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir F. W. Borden). The municipal authorities at Sault Ste. Marie applied, under the clause of the Militia Act providing for such a contingency, to the senior military officer there, the colonel of the 97th regiment, for protection. The company at the Sault was accordingly called out by that officer, and I think a company was brought from the adjacent village of Thessalon. Finding the matter more serious

than he thought he could cope with, the senior officer applied to the district officer commanding, at Toronto, Col. Buchan. Col. Buchan notified the Adjutant-General here that he considered it proper immediately to despatch sixty of the permanent force to the Sault, which, I presume has been done, and that he had given orders to draft some two hundred men from regiments within the city of Toronto. That is all the information which I have to give. I have had no report as to the shooting; but from what I gather from the newspapers, I believe the shooting has been done by the police officers, and not by the militia. All the proceedings have been done in the regular way, under the clause of the Militia Act, to which I have referred, through the senior officer at the Sault, and the district officer commanding at Toronto.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the Militia Act provide for the calling out of the permanent force in that way?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I believe it does.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman may be right; I was not aware of it. Of course, I am not very familiar with the provisions of the Act, but my recollection was not in accord with that. The hon. gentleman has not stated how many of the active militia are on duty there outside of the permanent force.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think about 100. I think there are four companies in the 97th regiment, numbering about 200 men. Two of the companies were called out, but they did not turn out in full strength. I am not aware that the 200 men who have been drafted from the different regiments of the city of Toronto have yet been sent forward. They are held as a reserve in case of emergency.

Mr. BENNETT. I may say that they went up yesterday afternoon. I saw the train pass at Orillia.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the day are called, I would like again to call the attention of the government to Bill (No. 3) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900, which was introduced by my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and was referred at the instance of the hon. Minister of Finance to a special committee. I believe that a good deal of work has been done by the committee in re-drafting the Bill; but it will be absolutely impossible for it to be dealt with this session unless it is removed from public Bills and orders and placed among government orders. As the Bill was referred to a special committee at the instance of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, I had expected that it would have been transferred to the government orders before this. I would like to ask the intention of the government with regard to it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have already intimated, in reply to a question that was asked a day or two ago, that it is the intention of the government to bring the question forward, in order that the committee may present the measure to the House and the House may have an opportunity of discussing it. It will be placed on the government orders for that purpose at an early day.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the third reading of Bill (No. 235) to provide for the construction of a National Transcontinental Railway.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is not necessary for me to tell the House, in view of the several votes which have been cast by me on this measure, both yesterday and at earlier stages of the debates which have taken place upon it, that I am opposed to the third reading of this Bill. Notwithstanding the amendments which we think it in the interest of the people to propose or the force or strength with which we may advocate them, it is evident that the government are determined to carry the Bill through as it is. Several amendments to section 7 of the Bill now before the House were voted down, and I propose to submit an amendment which, though not the one I would have submitted in the first instance, I think should in the present conditions be accepted. Under that section the Grand Trunk Railway may hold securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, but there is nothing in it to guard the rights of the people. Its sole object seems to be to enable these two companies to deal with these bonds and securities as they may see fit in their own interests. That section was amended in the Committee of the Whole by the addition of three subsections. The first of these subsections, subsection 2 in the Bill, provides that the Grand Trunk Railway shall guarantee the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway for the balance required for the complete construction of the western division. Subsection 3 provides that the Grand Trunk Railway shall hold $24,900,000 of the common stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway; and by subsection 4 the Grand Trunk Railway must hold the said common stock during the entire term of lease mentioned in clause 20 of the agreement, and so long as any of the bonds guaranteed by the government remain outstanding and unpaid. In an earlier part of the debate the government, for some

reason I cannot understand, refused to make it one of the conditions of the bargain that the Grand Trunk Railway shall be liable for the covenants of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. One would think that if the government expect the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway to carry out its agreement, they would certainly make the Grand Trunk Railway bind itself as surety, in every way responsible for the carrying out of the contract. But the government took the position that there was no necessity to do this, because, by the very nature of this transaction, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway would not fail to carry it out. I do not think that that will be satisfactory to the people. If the government are so certain that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will carry out its contract, and if the Grand Trunk Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway are acting in good faith, none of the parties should object to such a provision, and I cannot understand why it was not agreed to. However, all the amendments we proposed to section 7 have been voted down, and consequently there is in that section no protection for the public at all. The Grand Trunk Railway may acquire the stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway for nothing, and in such an event the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway would not have the means to carry out its obligations. The only thing left is to insist that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway shall not give away its stock for nothing—that so long as the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway has not fulfilled all its obligations to the government it shall not be allowed to make a present of its stock to the Grand Trunk Railway. By such a provision we will be placing the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway in a solvent position. We will put it in such a position that it will be more likely to carry out its contract with the government, and make that profit out of the venture which it must reasonably expect. The only thing, therefore, that is left apparently for us to do is to move that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway shall not be allowed to make any disposition of its stock to the Grand Trunk Railway without getting cash for it at par value in return, so long as its agreement with the government remains unfulfilled. Otherwise we might be met some day with this plea from the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. That company might say to us: We cannot do what we agreed, because we have not the means. The Grand Trunk Railway refuses to do what it was called upon to perform under our contract, and as it was not compelled to pay cash for the stock it got, we are without any means to go on with the undertaking. I would beg to move, therefore:

That all the words after the word 'that' to the end of the question be left out and the following substituted therefor, 'the Bill be referred back to a Committee of the Whole House with power to amend the same by adding to section 7 the following subsection:—

Notwithstanding anything in the Act incorporating the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company the said company shall not, until it shall have paid and satisfied all bonds and debentures guaranteed by the Dominion of Canada and performed all the covenants and conditions of the lease in the schedule of this Act referred to, issue any common or preferred stock of the said company otherwise than subject to the payment in cash of the full amount of the stock so subscribed.

My amendment amounts to this, that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway should not be allowed to beggar itself for the benefit of the Grand Trunk Railway. It is the Grand Trunk Pacific that is responsible to us, and this company should not be allowed to make itself insolvent before it has satisfied its obligations to the people of Canada. I can not, for the life of me, see what objection there can be to this amendment. It is not as if I were opposing the scheme. It is true that, if I were free to have my own way, I would not have the country become a party to this bargain. At the same time, I recognize the fact that the government, in insisting upon putting the scheme through, accepts the responsibility for it. I am trying now, without prejudice, to make the scheme as little unworkable and as little unfair to the people as I can. There is only one company that is under obligation to the Dominion of Canada for the carrying out of this contract and it is our duty to safeguard the assets of that company and keep it as solvent as possible, so that it may be able to carry out its contract with us. After the Grand Trunk Pacific has done all it has contracted with the government, representing the people, to do, it can give away its stock if it chooses—that is its own business perhaps. But it surely is our business to provide that these assets shall not be given away so long as obligations to the people on the part of this company are unfulfilled. We must not leave this company in the position to say: We are honest and desire to carry out our obligations, but the Grand Trunk Company have our assets and we are financially unable to do what we agreed to do. The other amendments to section 7, though, I submit they were proper amendments, have been voted down by this House, and the section stands as it did. But, in respect to the matter I have been dealing with, it seems to me quite clear that that section is imperfect, and that it would be improved by amending it as I propose. This company, the Grand Trunk Pacific, make a contract with the people of Canada, and they make a contract also with the Grand Trunk, which is a sort of side partner. Surely it is open to us, and not only open to us but our bounden duty to see to it that the Grand Trunk Pacific—being the only company responsible, for the government refuse to make the Grand Trunk responsible—shall keep itself solvent and shall not make presents of its stock until it has fulfilled its obligations to the people. The people should not be

kept wondering and undecided whether they are dealing with the Grand Trunk or the Grand Trunk Pacific. It is not necessary to weary the House with a further discussion, for this matter has been debated both on the second reading and in Committee of the Whole, so that the people are in possession of the facts and discussion in the country can go on. And I must say that the more the discussion has gone on among the people, the more the people have said the opposition are right and the government wrong. The opposition is perfectly right in determining not to leave the job so long as there is any opportunity left of setting right in any particular this contract which the government forces upon the country.

Amendment (Mr. Lancaster) negatived.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Lost on the same division.

Mr. SPEAKER. Lost on the same division as last recorded yesterday.

ORDER IN THE HOUSE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). If I may be permitted, I would like to ask my right hon. friend (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to co-operate with you Mr. Speaker, in maintaining better order during this forenoon. I do not think it is in keeping with the decorum of this House that when an hon. gentleman on either side is speaking, six or seven others should be carrying on conversation almost at the top of their voices, as has been the case for some minutes past. I think that my right hon. friend, and you, Sir, in particular, must see to it that there is a little better order kept in the House. I refer at this moment particularly to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, although, as I said on a previous occasion, I have noticed the same thing on this side, and I deprecate it as much here as there. But during the last fifteen minutes when my hon. friend from Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) was speaking, I noticed at least half a dozen gentlemen carrying on conversation in tones almost as loud as those of my hon. friend in addressing the House. I do not think we should conduct the business of the House in that way. Some restraint should be put upon hon. gentlemen; and I, for my part am prepared to support you, Mr. Speaker, to the utmost of my power, so far as this side of the House is concerned, in putting a stop to this undesirable condition of things. I trust the right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will support you with regard to the other side.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am afraid the sinning is not all on one side——

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have said so.

The PRIME MINISTER. And my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) acknowledges it. I have no hesitation in saying that, for my part. I shall be glad to co-operate with him, and with you, Mr. Speaker, in preserving order. I suppose that if we maintain order we shall reach prorogation all the sooner—and it ought to be sufficient inducement for us all to behave. If my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) says that he will take care of his own side, I will try to take care of ours ; and you, Mr. Speaker, will take care of both.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know that I said I would take care of my own side ; I do not know that they require much care. But I said that I would endeavour to support you, Mr. Speaker, so far as my own side is concerned, and that is what I suppose you would desire.

Mr. SPEAKER. For my part I will do my best to maintain order.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. RICHARD BLAIN (Peel). Before the third reading of this Bill is carried, I wish to occupy the attention of the House for a very short time to move an amendment, which applies to section 8, it is as follows :

> That all the words after the word 'that' to the end of the question be left out, and the following be substituted therefor : 'the Bill be referred back to a Committee of the Whole House with power to amend section 8 by adding thereto the following words :—
>
> 'Provided, however, that the surveys and plans, showing the most favourable route and the best practicable grades and curvatures that can be obtained, together with an estimate of the cost based thereon, shall be first submitted to the parliament for approval.'

It seems to me that this is an amendment that should meet the approval of both sides of the House. When this Bill was first introduced by the Prime Minister, the leader of the opposition challenged the government to state within ten million dollars what the cost of this work would be. I listened with great attention to the whole debate, lasting many weeks, and I have not heard any member of the government attempt to answer or to solve that question. I am quite sure that the people of Canada will regret very much that the parliament of Canada propose to expend in the neighbourhood of one hundred or one hundred and twenty million dollars without first laying upon the Table of the House some closer estimate of what this work is going to cost, and some estimate of its length, within a few miles, and the character of the country it is to traverse.

During this discussion a large number of petitions have been presented to the House coming from every section of Canada, coming from the farmers of this country, who ask that, following ordinary business principles, the government should lay upon the Table some estimate of the cost. Surely,

there must be some duty resting upon the government in respect to the expenditure of the people's money. It is all very well to say that we have prosperous times now, it is all very well for the Finance Minister to say that we have a flowing treasury—that is all very acceptable, and is appreciated by the people of Canada. But notwithstanding that, Mr. Speaker, the people of this country expect that their money should be expended in a business-like manner, and with that in view they have spoken out in very loud tones, I think, judging from the large number of petitions that have been presented from day to day, signed by hundreds and hundreds of electors belonging to both sides of politics. I think it is proper that a copy of these petitions should be placed upon the 'Hansard,' and I propose, with the kind indulgence of the House, to read it. It deals with the subject of the resolution which I have moved, because it asks for an estimate of the cost of this proposed railway.

To the Honourable
The Senate and House of Commons of Canada,
In Parliament assembled.

The petition of the undersigned electors of the Dominion of Canada humbly showeth :

1. That a wise and prudent solution of the great question of transportation is of the utmost importance as regards the future of this Dominion.

2. That your petitioners are of opinion that it would be unwise and imprudent to take definite action until the government and parliament are fully possessed of the information essential to a proper decision of that question.

3. That the country is not possessed of such information ; that the government has appointed a commission to investigate and report upon the whole subject of transportation.

4. That a project of such magnitude should not be undertaken without the most complete and accurate surveys, under the direction and control of engineers of standing and repute.

5. That such surveys should be in the hands of the government and of parliament before the credit of the Dominion is committed to an enterprise which involves enormous obligations.

6. That those obligations cannot properly be estimated before such surveys shall have been made.

7. That, however, the most competent men are of the opinion that the cost of the projected line between Winnipeg and Moncton will reach the enormous amount of upwards of $120,000,000.

8. That no evidence has been adduced so far during the long discussion that has taken place to establish that such a large expenditure of public money will cheapen the freight rates for the products of the west, or establish more satisfactory communication between the different parts of the Dominion.

9. That, on the contrary, it is greatly to be feared that by pledging the credit of the country to such a vast extent, the government will make it impossible to carry out works better calculated to meet the transportation needs of the country.

10. That the government, parliament and taxpayers should have an opportunity to learn the results of the investigation of the said commission ; and to examine the evidence upon which such results were arrived at.

Your petitioners, therefore, humbly pray that the said Bill now before parliament may not now become law ; but that its further consideration by the government and by parliament shall be deferred until such full and accurate information shall have been obtained and laid before parliament.

That is a copy of the petitions that are being presented to this House by the hundreds within the last few weeks. Some little effort has been made on the other side of the House to cast reflection upon the genuineness of the signatures to some of these petitions. I may remind our hon. friends opposite that from every section, almost from every county, have come petitions from the farmers who have put their names to these documents, making the reasonable request that before their money is expended the government should apply to this enterprise the same business principles that any private company would apply to its own business. I have no hesitation in saying that the electors who signed these petitions are responsible citizens—we have seen them coming from the great metropolis of Montreal this morning signed by 5,000 electors of that great city—surely these deserve some consideration by the government.

We are asked to construct this road without proper estimates. The right hon. first minister has laid upon the Table a Blue-book, that has been occasionally referred to in this discussion. I do not propose to make any extended reference to it, only to read one short paragraph in respect to the timber. It has been frequently alleged in this House by hon. gentlemen opposite that this road ought to be constructed through the northern part of the provinces of Quebec and Ontario for the purpose of developing timber limits and the timber resources of those regions. Here is a paragraph from the report of Mr. Ogilvie, D.L.S., 1891, addressed to the Minister of the Interior, in which he makes this statement :

If the timber on all the other rivers flowing into the bay is no more important than that I saw on the Abitibi, I would hesitate as to the timber resources of that district being valuable; for though it is all thickly wooded, only a small percentage of it (along the river at least) is large enough for merchantable lumber.

So you see that this gentleman says that the timber limits of that section of the provinces of Quebec and Ontario to which reference is made in this Blue-book, are not so valuable as the members of the government would lead us to believe. Now, in so far as the transportation of wheat is concerned, I wish to give one short quotation from a speech of the First Minister when discussing the transportation question last session. On page 958 of the 'Hansard' of 1902, I find he made this statement :

But, unfortunately, there is a rugged section along the shores of Lake Superior which hardly admits of wheat being commercially carried through.

When the First Minister was discussing the transportation question in the last session of parliament, with all this information in the hands of the government—because doubtless there is no information of more recent date than that they possessed last session—with all the information at his disposal with all the knowledge the right hon. gentleman has been able to obtain as First Minister for the purpose of solving the great transportation question during all the time he has been in public life, during the seven years he has been Prime Minister of this country, I say with all this information, the right hon. gentleman stood up in this House last session and said that the carriage of wheat from the west would be a failure as a commercial enterprise. I do not quite understand what change has come over the hon. gentleman's views. Surely the rocks that were there last year are there still; this rugged country that he referred to last session is still as rugged as ever. The hon. gentleman has not given us any information more recent than that. And yet the First Minister is prepared to say now that a road can be constructed through that country that would be of commercial value. It does look as if some unknown person had stepped in to the counsels of the government and demanded a speedy solution of this question in the interest of the Grand Trunk Railway. I do not quite understand what the right hon. gentleman means. We are expected as a Canadian parliament to conduct our business in a businesslike manner. The government of Canada, by reason of owning and operating the Intercolonial Railway has the advantage of knowing something about the cost of railway construction, inasmuch as it has expended an enormous sum ranging from seventy-five million upwards upon government roads in this country.

It has been expended, not by private enterprise, but by the government themselves. The government of this country, year after year, have been expending vast sums in the purchasing of cars, and of steel rails, and of locomotives, and of railway ties, indeed, in the purchase of everything that enters into railway construction, and the government, therefore, should have been able to lay before the people of this country a fair estimate of the cost before they would undertake such a gigantic work, notwithstanding the government has this advantage, they are now in the railway business themselves, notwithstanding that they have been equipping the Intercolonial Railway by taking down the old bridges and replacing them with newer and up-to-date bridges, notwithstanding that they have told the people of this country that they have practically equipped anew the Intercolonial Railway by the construction of better roadbed, by the purchase of better freight cars and better passenger cars—notwithstanding all this, the people of this country are asked to pay this enormous amount of money without the Railway Department coming forward and laying upon the Table of the House a statement of what, in their opinion, would be a proper estimate of the cost of this road. Further than this, it would not be an unreasonable request for the people of Canada to ask some leading railway man, either in this country, in the United States or in England, some man who has a reputation as a railway expert, who has constructed railways in this country, like Sir William Van Horne, to give an opinion upon the cost of the building of that road before we are asked to vote the money. As it is, we are asked to do so, without having the opinion of any great railway man in this country excepting that of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and I noticed the other day that the right hon. the First Minister rather shoved him aside and did not put quite so high an estimate on him as a railway expert as when he introduced the Bill.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Has the hon. gentleman read Sir Sandford Fleming's report?

Mr. BLAIN. I may say to the hon. gentleman of many years, that I have read Sir Sandford Fleming's report, and that it has been read in this House over and over again in the absence of my hon. friend during this discussion. Sir Sandford Fleming's report, in so far as it refers to the province of New Brunswick, and that gentleman states that the northern part of the province of New Brunswick, where this government propose to construct the road, is a very rough country, so rough that he would not recommend the government of earlier days to construct the Intercolonial Railway there. That is what he said in the report which is in the possession of this House at the present time.

Just one word in conclusion in respect to the country through which this railway is to pass in the province of Ontario and in the province of Quebec. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) made a statement in this House the other day that there was a very large area of good land in the northern part of the province of Ontario amounting to millions of acres. If that statement be correct, and perhaps it is correct, then I say that the people of this country would expect the government to tell them within twenty or thirty or fifty miles, through what part of that country this railroad will be constructed. Why do they not tell this to the people of Quebec and of Ontario and of New Brunswick, because the electors in these three great provinces are interested in this matter, as they will have to pay some portion of the taxes of this country like all other citizens—and they are not complaining on that point—but they do expect that the government will lay before the people of this country data sufficiently accurate to enable them to judge within 100 miles where this rail-

way will be constructed in these provinces. Is that an unreasonable request? I do not think it is, and I do not wonder that as the people come to understand this matter, information which the newspapers with their splendid facilities and enterprise, are circulating throughout the country, that we are beseiged day after day with petitions from the electors saying something must be done by this government to furnish information before they pledge the people of this country to an expenditure of at least one hundred millions of dollars.

I move the resolution which I read, seconded by Mr. McGowan, and I would earnestly hope—although perhaps it would be too much to say I expect—that the government will lay before parliament such information as will enable the electorate of this country to vote intelligently when they are asked to authorize the expenditure of so many millions of dollars.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). I desire to say one word in reference to this resolution, which appears to me to be one of the most reasonable that has been placed before the House in connection with this transcontinental railway project. The resolution asks that the information obtained by the government from time to time in regard to the surveys and estimates of cost shall be placed before this House. It is evident that this railway cannot be built before the House meets again; the surveys and the reports of the engineers cannot be completed before that time. Is it not, therefore, as reasonable a proposition as ever was made in this House that the information thus obtained should be placed before the House before we pass final judgment? The government, perhaps, might not then be disposed to adhere to what they had stated in regard to building a first-class railway, with one-half or four-tenth per cent grades through this country in order to carry the products of the west to the seaboard in a more economical way than by the existing routes. This country, under such circumstances, would not be under any obligation to the Grand Trunk Pacific, because parliament would have an opportunity to say whether the road shall be constructed or not. The only reports that have been placed before this House are reports of geologists, who were not instructed to investigate the regions through which they travelled for the purpose of building a modern railway, and I submit that their report is of no value when it comes to building a modern up-to-date railway. We have absolutely no information before the House from first-class competent engineers as to the suitability of that country for the building of a railway for the purpose for which this is being built. I would not have spoken on this resolution, but I wished to ask the Prime Minister a question. I read to him the other day a report from one of the Toronto newspapers that the Grand Trunk Railway themselves were making surveys between Winnipeg and the Quebec boundary. The right hon. gentleman will remember the contents of the article to which I am now referrng. I asked, why did not the government make the surveys for this government road, instead of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and also asked why it was that the information obtained by these surveyors was given to the press before it was submitted to this House. I think the Prime Minister would have replied to me the other day were it not that the chairman called 'carried,' and the resolution was hurried through. Surely the Prime Minister can give the information to the House now.

The PRIME MINISTER. What is the question?

Mr. KEMP. The question was in reference to the surveys. I will again read what was said by the Toronto 'News':

> The Grand Trunk has been exploring the country. Its officials to-day are in possession of their own surveyors' reports. These reports cover the country from Winnipeg to Lake Abitibi. These reports state that from Winnipeg to the eastern border of New Ontario a grade of four-tenths of one per cent—about twenty-one feet to the mile—is perfectly practicable. The standard of the best wheat-carrying railways of the United States can be attained.
>
> More than that, the fall of almost every grade is to the east. This is an immense advantage, for it means that the road will practically run down hill from Winnipeg for the thousand mile stretch in eastern Manitoba and New Ontario.
>
> This is a splendid start. For the first thousand miles at least the trains will roll down a continuous gentle slope. Extraordinary economy of operation should be practicable. The limit to the size of the trains will be the number of cars which a single crew can handle, rather than the hauling power of the engine. We must insist on equally good grades all the way through Quebec. It may prove the case that the height of land in Quebec will make an up hill grade necessary. The ideal road would be down hill every foot of the way from prairie to ocean. The ideal seems to be assured for one thousand of the fourteen hundred miles.

I wish to know why the Grand Trunk are making these surveys, and if they are going to be accepted by the government?

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman asks me, if it is true that the Grand Trunk Pacific are making surveys?

Mr. KEMP. On the government line?

The PRIME MINISTER. Between Lake Abitibi and Winnipeg. The hon. gentleman also asks, if the government will avail of these surveys. I understand that the Grand Trunk have been making surveys since last fall; that they started when they first thought of this Grand Trunk Pacific scheme. I do not know for a fact whe-

ther they have done so or not. It is impossible to say what the government will do with regard to these surveys. The only thing I can say is, that we shall have surveys of our own when the commission is appointed, and these surveys in proper time will be laid before the House.

Mr. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmoreland). I would be very sorry indeed to take up the time of the House in prolonging this discussion, but there has been some reference made to the petitions presented, asking that there should be delay, because there is little knowledge of the section of the province of New Brunswick, through which this road is to run. I do not think that there is very much significance to be attached to these petitions, but there is this significance: That while they have been very carefully prepared, I have no doubt, by hon. members opposite and printed and sent throughout the country and signed in their respective constituencies it is quite apparent—at all events judging of the signatures with which I am familiar—that they are signed by friends of hon. gentlemen opposite almost exclusively. There is one very strange thing in connection with the contents of these petitions, and that is, that though they have been prepared with so much care by hon. gentlemen opposite and circulated by their political agents, there is no reference in these petitions to the alternative proposition of the leader of the opposition.

Mr. SPROULE. The alternative proposition is not about to become law, and there is no reason to petition for or against it.

Mr. EMMERSON. This fact proves, that the great body of the Conservatives, in my province at any rate, are no more in sympathy with the alternative proposition of the leader of the opposition, than are some of the hon. gentlemen's own friends in this House, who have devoted the whole time during this debate to speaking of the government proposition, and have hardly raised a murmur in favour of the proposal of my hon. friend (Mr. Borden). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) who moved this amendment, has stated that there is little known of that part of New Brunswick through which this road will run. The fact that he stated that it was going to run in the northern part of the province, shows that he is ignorant of the geography of New Brunswick. I have in my hand a pamphlet issued by the board of trade of the town of Woodstock, which is situated in the county of Carleton, represented by my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Hale), and this road will run almost entirely through that rich and flourishing county. Just what portion of the county it will run through, I have no doubt will be determined by the engineers, but in order to show the resources of that county, I will read an extract from the circular to which I refer. Here is a statement of the yield of crops in Carleton county, in 1902:

Variety.	Acreage.	Bushels.	Yield Per Acre.
Wheat	2,951	62,945	21·3
Oats	42,982	1,428,325	33·2
Barley	372	10,718	28·9
Buckwheat	10,751	267,597	24·8
Potatoes	3,329	336,802	101·1

Hay—25,000 tons were shipped over the Canadian Pacific Railway, valued at $250,000.

Cheese.

	Pounds.	Value.
Manufactured in county	294,307	$29,430 70
Exported	210,450	21,450 00

Butter.

	Pounds.	Value.
Manufactured in county	124,229	$24,845 80
Exported	115,052	23,010 40

A county that can present such a record is not to be treated in the way in which the hon. gentleman who last spoke referred to it. This does not by any means represent to the fullest extent the resources of that very flourishing county. There are many other crops which have not been mentioned. It is a splendid fruit country, as my hon. friend will testify. This statement has reference only to the settled portions within sight of the valley of the St. John There are undeveloped sections of that country, to the development of which this railway will contribute, which I am sure will be equally productive. This is only a slight evidence of the richness of other sections of that portion of New Brunswick through which this railway will run, and I could not allow to pass unchallenged the remarks of the hon. member for Peel. There appears to be on the part of some hon. gentlemen opposite an antipathy to that section of the proposed railway between Moncton and Quebec which is unwarranted by the circumstances and by the past political history of this country. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition was quite willing that such a line should be constructed. He was not quite certain as to the time when it should be constructed; but he recognized its value to this Dominion, and he recognized the fact that it brought his own city of Halifax nearer to the other cities of the Dominion and clasped the different sections of the Dominion altogether. He was willing to aid in accomplishing this desirable object—desirable by his own admission; but his colleague sitting beside him, the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart), declared the proposition to build a shorter line between Lévis and Moncton to be an absolutely senseless proposition. He declared that such a line was not required, and that even though it was proposed in this Bill, it would be generations before it would be an accomplished fact. How many generations we would have to wait for it if hon. gentlemen opposite had the control of the matter, I am not in a position to say; but I do say that until we have this shorter line, until the several parts of the Dominion are brought together in the way pro-

posed by the terms of this Bill, there cannot be that interchange of trade, commercially, politically, and socially, that there should be. I am sure that the cities of Halifax and St. John are suffering, and have been suffering since this country became a Dominion, for the want of that interchange. Certainly the province of Nova Scotia has been suffering in a way that cannot be adequately described here. The province of New Brunswick has had advantages which the province of Nova Scotia has not enjoyed. The city of St. John has been connected through the state of Maine with the city of Montreal by a short line; but the other sections of the province of New Brunswick and a great section of the province of Nova Scotia have not enjoyed that advantage. Now, there is no doubt that the antipathy and antagonism shown by hon. gentlemen opposite is injurious to the interests of the maritime provinces. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), yesterday afternoon, in a spirit which was most sectional and narrow, and in a way indicating a small-bore idea of the needs of this Dominion, complained of the disadvantages of the province of Ontario. That province has had advantages and has enjoyed them, and she certainly should not now complain if other sections of the Dominion are to have some advantages. Under these circumstances, the amendment of the hon. member for Peel, based as it is upon his antagonism to the line through New Brunswick, is unwarranted, and I have a right to assume that his objections to the other sections of the line are equally faulty.

Mr. F. H. HALE (Carleton, N.B.). Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take up the time of this committee, and I did not intend to say anything on this subject; but in view of what my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) has quoted from the pamphlet he had in his hand, I desire to say a few words in regard to the county of Carleton, which I have the honour to represent. It is well known that Carleton county is one of the most fertile districts in the Dominion of Canada, and all that the hon. gentleman has read from the pamphlet is no doubt correct. It is a very productive county, but I am sorry to say that not one pound of the produce of that county will ever be carried over the proposed road. It will pass so far to the east and through so poor a section of the county that it will be impossible for us to reach it. I am sorry that the government propose to locate this road where they do. In that location it will never be of any use to the county of Carleton or to the province of New Brunswick. It is a great pity that the road, if it is to be built, is not to be taken down the valley of the River St. John, where it would be of some benefit to the people of New Brunswick, and where it would find a good outlet in the harbour of St. John. I am sorry that this road is to be forced along without any survey or any knowledge of the country through which it is to go. I can speak from personal knowledge of the section of the country through which this road is to go. So far as the county of Carleton and the county of York are concerned, it is going where it will never be of any use to that section of the country.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The hon. member for Westmoreland has just stated that these petitions do not make any reference to the alternative policy of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. One would surely expect that a prospective cabinet minister would be intelligent enough to see that in a case like this, the alternative policy submitted by the leader of the opposition is not usually referred to in petitions against the legislation introduced by the government. However, the hon. gentleman has evidently not read all the petitions. He has probably taken up one of them and concluded that all the others were counterparts. But if he had looked at some of the petitions he would have found that not only is the government scheme condemned in unmeasured terms, but that practically the scheme of the leader of the opposition is endorsed, and parliament is asked to take it up instead of the other. I happen to have a petition which is the same as that which is being circulated throughout Manitoba.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is not the same as that circulated in the eastern provinces.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I am speaking of the petition circulated in that portion of the country which this projected railway is particularly supposed to benefit. It is that portion of the country to relieve the congestion of traffic and lower the freight rates this government measure was introduced, and it is the people there who are protesting against the government scheme and asking, in effect, that the scheme propounded by the leader of the opposition be adopted in its place. Let me read the petition:

The petition of the undersigned electors of the Dominion of Canada humbly showeth:—

1. That western Canada is vitally interested in questions of transportation and that its progress will be checked by inadequate facilities on the one hand, or, on the other, by excessive transportation charges.

2. That it is of the utmost importance to the prosperity and development of western Canada that transportation facilities be afforded at the lowest possible rates, upon both products exported and merchandise imported.

3. That in this connection it is absolutely essential that the combined rail and water routes to the east should receive proper development.

The people of the west realize that it is by the combined rail and water routes they will get the required relief.

4. That ample and extensive railway construction in the west should be, and can be,

secured upon such terms as will safeguard the public interest in low rates and abundant car supply, and will thus avoid the recurrence in the territories of the grave public injury and discontent formerly caused in Manitoba by excessive charges.

5. That the over capitalization of transportation companies is one of the most important conditions leading to unduly high rates, and should be prevented.

They see the significance of the $45,000,000 of capitalization in connection with this road, which I referred to yesterday, and which, in connection with the bond issue, will make the fixed charges so very high that it will be impossible for the company to give low freight rates.

6. That a railway system designed to move the products of the west should not be burdened by the addition of costly and needless sections; that the proposed eastern section of the Grand Trunk Pacific would be of value chiefly for the purpose of colonizing the territory it traverses; and that the western lines should not be obliged to impose rates fixed with a view to providing for the annual fixed charges upon such a section, between one and two thousand miles long, built many years in advance of settlement in the James bay basin.

This is the very scheme propounded by the leader of the opposition.

7. That the country should not be committed to the construction of the eastern section over the proposed route until full information is obtained as to distance, grades, cost and the possibilities of local traffic.

Exactly as propounded by the leader of the opposition.

8. That the effective exercise of government control of rates upon the lowest practicable basis must be the object of government policy.

Notwithstanding this, the government voted down a resolution which would place the control of the rates absolutely in the hands of the government and make the maximum rates not greater than those charged by the Canadian Northern Railway, whose rates are controlled by the Manitoba government.

9. That because of the effect it would have upon the rates and general facilities the Intercolonial should be extended to Georgian bay, with party politics excluded from its administration and its management made non-partisan and business-like, and that under these conditions its field of operation should be extended to Manitoba and ultimately across the continent.

Almost the identical words of the leader of the opposition in his speech formulating his policy.

10. That the arrangement in the Bill now before parliament by which the government is to build the section between Winnipeg and Moncton at a large cost, and then lease it for 50 years, is unsatisfactory, because so large a pledging of the public credit as would be required may prevent the undertaking of more effective transportation measures; and also because, there being no option of purchase on the western division, the government at the end of 50 years would not have the alternative of obtaining a complete transportation system under government operation.

11. That the proposed western section of the Grand Trunk Pacific from Winnipeg to Edmonton should be constructed as an additional line opening up new territory; and that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company should not be allowed to purchase the Canadian Northern Railway line instead of constructing an additional line.

The government has refused to incorporate a clause to that effect. I had the honour of introducing one myself to prevent amalgamation with the Canadian Northern Railway, but the government absolutely refused to accept it. As regards the opening up of new territory, the government do not know where the road will be located west of Winnipeg. They cannot say whether it will be north of the Canadian Northern Railway or south. Unless it be north, it will not open up the new territory referred to in this petition.

12. That provision should be made in the Grand Trunk Pacific agreement for an outlet from the Grand Trunk Pacific's western lines to Lake Superior.

The people of the west realize that no matter how many railways they may have, the grain will travel by lake and rail.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that the transportation Bill now before parliament be not passed in its present form, but that it be altered to provide for the above-mentioned conditions, and that the commission on transportation should consider the whole question of the proposed eastern section and report, and that complete surveys and estimates should be made.

It seems to me that this petition is a complete endorsation of our leader's policy, just as much as it is a severe condemnation of the government's policy. And I merely rose for the purpose of drawing the attention of the House, and particularly of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), to the fact that the people of the west generally are opposed to the scheme propounded by the government.

Mr. TALBOT. With the hon. gentleman's permission, I would ask him if he is aware that in the province of Quebec agents are going from house to house getting signatures to these petitions, and that notwithstanding the very strong representations they have made, they have not so far got ten per cent of the people of these parishes to sign these petitions?

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I am not personally aware of that fact, but would require a little stronger testimony than that of the hon. gentleman to make me believe it.

Mr. S. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. member for Westmoreland endeavoured as usual to bring in the locality question. He said he was surprised to see the antipathy displayed by the opposition to that section

of country between Moncton and Quebec. I want to point out to him that the policy of the opposition is not to belittle one part of the country as compared with another. But when hon. gentlemen on that side claim they are going to get a line 140 miles shorter from Quebec to Moncton via the Etchemin valley and the Maine border, they do not know what they are talking about, or are endeavouring to deceive the electors. Take the figures given in the report of the engineer of the Quebec government. They show that with grades almost as low as 53 feet to the mile, and some of them rising as high as 71 to 79 feet, that road surveyed between Quebec and Edmundston is 209 miles in length.

Mr. TALBOT. If my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) will permit me, I would say he is mistaken in his figures. He will find several reports, which give it at 186 miles following the railway showing that it can be done within thirty days.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If my hon. friend (Mr. Talbot) will read the report, he will see that that line is across the state of Maine.

Mr. TALBOT. No, Sir.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. He cannot find an air-line of 186 miles around the point of the state of Maine.

Mr. TALBOT. I will get it and read it to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I shall be glad if the hon. gentleman will do so. What we want is to have the facts of these lines referred to by the hon. member for Bellechasse, one goes by the Etchemin and Daagnam rivers and down the valley of the St. John across Maine, while the other is still further to the south. Now, it is for me to go into these elevations and grades, which are given in my former remarks at page 11951 and succeeding pages of 'Hansard.' I have pointed out the report of the engineer of the Quebec government which says :

> I again took up my work which I had left off at the west of Lake Long, behind St. Paul de Montmagny, distant sixty-three miles from the original point of departure at St. Anselme in the county of Dorchester.

And he goes on to say :

> I should here observe that Long Lake is really only thirty-eight miles from St. Anselme in a direct line.

That is, the line has to cover a distance of 63 miles in order to reach a point distant 38 miles in a direct line. And he points out that the grades are about 53 feet to the mile, being about the old standard one per cent grade.

And he points out further on, with regard to the grades on this line :

> I started from the Etchemin valley line, eight miles south of St. Anselme, and half a mile from the north bank of the Abenakis river.
>
> The grades on this line can be made 52 feet per mile and under for a distance of 6½ miles, after which there is a continuous grade of 79 feet per mile for 4½ miles, rising to Lac Vert, but by lengthening the line and increasing curvature by actual location, that grade could be reduced to 53 feet per mile.

But our hon. friend the expert, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) tells us that no road need hope to secure a share of through-traffic unless its grades are reduced to twenty-five feet to the mile. This would stretch the line out still longer. So, for every one of these grades, where it is from seventy-five to seventy-nine feet to the mile, you must multiply the distance by three in order to give you the one-half per cent grades. Here is a distance of sixty-three miles and you must multiply it by two in order to get your mileage. Taking these elevations and gradients with an admitted length of line of 205 or 209 miles these are the extremes and hon. gentlemen will remember that I took the middle distance of 207 as my figures, in order to get grades of one-half per cent, I venture to say it will be nearer 300 miles than 250 miles between Quebec and Edmundston. A little further on, this engineer points out that near the foot of Lake Pohenegomook the grade rises at the rate of 71·28 feet per mile for a distance of nine miles. Multiply that by three as will be necessary in order to secure the one-half per cent grade, and you get a distance of twenty-seven miles, instead of nine miles. Then he goes on :

> In that next four miles the summit between the Smoky and Noire rivers was reached with a grade of 65 feet per mile, at an elevation of 1048 feet above the initial point in the Temiscouata Railway.

Multiply that by three again, and instead of four and a half miles you get thirteen and a half miles.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is not the route.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What does the hon. gentleman propose, then ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The frontier route.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That is what I am quoting.

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I can tell the hon. gentleman that lake Pohenegomook comes within one inch of the Maine border. The road will have to cross at the lower part of the lake in order to get round. Now. I come to the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Emmerson's) own province. Between the Salmon and Tobique rivers the line proposed by the hon member for Annapolis (Mr Wade)—though I believe the hon member (Mr. Emmerson) takes the same route—rises in five miles from an elevation of a little more than 366 feet to 1,000 feet, to the

summit pass of Tobique mountains, a rise of 634 feet in five miles. If, instead of climbing straight up the mountain you allow for one-half per cent grade you must cover a distance of 25·66 miles in order to make the same elevation. How will the hon. gentleman get the one-half per cent grade in any other way ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not wish my hon. friend to misrepresent me. I said that in the choice of routes there, if the grades did not permit me to cross the divide, the road will necessarily take the valley of the St. John which is the route I personally prefer.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am delighted with that explanation. Then there is no quarrel between us. The hon. gentleman must admit that the road will be, as I am convinced it will be, longer. It will certainly be longer from Quebec to Moncton by the St. John valley if he secures one-half per cent grades. That five miles is drawn out to 25·66 miles. Then, on the other side between the summit and the Tobique river with a fall of 684 feet, that stretched out so as to give the one-half per cent grade instead of nine and a half miles it makes 27·36. miles. The hon. gentleman cannot avoid it. He does not propose to go through the mountains, so he must go around them or over them. I am following point by point the line proposed by the hon. member for Annapolis. I believe that the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) and the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) have lines of their own.

Mr. EMMERSON. The line will be located by engineers.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. member for Annapolis was the only gentleman who undertook to give definite points, and I understood that he voiced the opinions of the hon. member for Westmoreland. From the Tobique valley to the next summit easterly to a distance of only ten miles it passes to a height of 1,206 feet. In order to secure the half per cent grade you would have to extend that to 33·64 miles. And yet, in the estimates furnished by these hon. gentlemen, they counted only ten miles. Going down on the other side of course involves a corresponding extension. We do not object to the road going through. Hon. gentlemen who sat on this side, years ago voted for bonuses for the road from Lévis out through the Etchemin valley through the Pohenegomook district to Edmundston and on through New Brunswick. We are quite prepared to support that policy but we are not prepared to have these hon. gentlemen deceive the House and the country, willfully or otherwise, by saying that there will be a saving of 140 miles, or even ten miles, as compared with the Intercolonial. I trust the hon. member for Westmoreland will live to see the survey made. But I am sure that he will never see this proposed line from Lévis to Moncton with a much less mileage than the Intercolonial. Such a line does not exist and cannot be made unless you tunnel the mountains.

Mr. TALBOT. I will read from a report made to the Commissioner of Public Works of the province of Quebec, 1891, to prove that the figures given by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) are all wrong, and that I was right when I made the correction. These figures are given by Mr. E. A. Hoare, the engineer who went over that part of the country several times :

From Chaudière via Intercolonial Railway and Quebec Central Railway, via St. Anselme, 207½ miles ; from Chaudière direct via St. Anselme, 205½ miles ; from Chaudière via Intercolonial Railway by St Charles, 202½ miles ; from Lévis via Intercolonial Railway and Quebec Central Railway via St. Anselme, 209½ miles ; from Chaudière via the Intercolonial Railway and Quebec Central Railway via Etchemin valley, through the state of Maine, connecting the St. Francis branch of the Temiscouata Railway, 190 miles ; from Chaudière via direct line——

This is the line which is now proposed.

—186 miles.

That is not 209 miles.

From Chaudière to Edmundston by the Intercolonial Railway and Rivière du Loup and Temiscouata Railway, the distance is 199 miles.

Further on Mr. Hoare quotes Mr. Henry O'Sullivan's report, in which the latter describes a favourable route for the railway between Quebec and Edmundston. Mr. O'Sullivan says :

That line would give access to a vast area of cultivable and well-timbered lands in the counties of Bellechasse, Montmagny, L'Islet and Kamouraska, and by touching the River St. John at its confluence with the St. Francis would bring the forest wealth of 3,000 square miles of United States territory, drained by the River St. John and Allaguash, a tributary, to Canadian markets, and to the port of Quebec. The distance between Quebec and Edmundston by this route is estimated at 156 miles, or 30 miles shorter than by the Etchemin valley.

Mr. HACKETT. I wish to make a few observations——

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. HACKETT. Mr. Speaker, before you left the Chair at one o'clock I was endeavouring to explain some features of the great undertaking proposed by the government and was endeavouring to show that this large expenditure of public money would be forced upon the country without any knowledge of what would be obtained in return for it or whether this country through which it is intended to build will be a country available for settlement. We have received no information from the government in that regard ; they simply say : We will go on and build this railway—and the people of

the whole of Canada are asked to pay $125,000,000 for its construction. I desire to say a word in reply to the statement of the hon. gentleman from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) that this railway will open up a large area for settlement in the province of New Brunswick. That was replied to pretty well by the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Hale). There is no gentleman in this House for whom I have a higher respect than for the hon. member for Westmoreland, but we have before us the fact that an hon. gentleman who represented the province of New Brunswick in the cabinet the late Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) was forced to resign an important seat in the cabinet, carrying with it much influence, because he could not accept the proposition of the government, and yet we now have a gentleman who has been a protege of the hon. the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals coming forward and saying that he approves of everything. Can it be true that the hon. member for Westmoreland, who is living in expectancy and is hoping to be a member of the government, at some future day, will endorse everything, while the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals resigned his position because he could not accept what was proposed by the government. I desire to say a word or two in connection with the petitions that are being presented to this House. I have presented many of these myself and I accept the responsibility, of saying, as a member of this House, that every petition presented by me, having my name endorsed on it is a right and a proper petition. In addition to that, while I take the responsibility of endorsing these petitions, I say that it is an insult to the people of Canada to say that they would send a petition to this parliament which is not properly and correctly signed. The hon. gentleman for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) made a remark this morning in connection with a petition presented by my hon. friend from East Prince (Mr. Lefurgey). I can assure the hon. gentleman that his statement is not correct.

Mr. TALBOT. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I referred to the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn), not to the hon. member for East Prince.

Mr. HACKETT. I accept the hon. gentleman's apology. I would not for one moment have stated that the people of East Prince or of West Prince who attach their names to any petition of this kind are doing it by fraud. They are honest and straightforward, and I would say in addition to that that there is not one man whose name appears on the petitions either from East Prince or West Prince or from Queen's or from King's who is not the equal of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot).

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to delay the proceedings of this House. We have been here for many months threshing out as far as possible the rights of the people and endeavouring to ascertain the views of the government. We have been charged by our friends on the other side of the House with obstructing public business. Sir, what are the facts? During a period of four months and a half, from the 12th of March until the last day of July, although the House was in session this important measure was not placed before parliament. Can you blame the representatives of the people, who are charged with doing their duty to the country, because they opposed by every means possible a measure which is brought down four and a half months after the opening of the session when it would be supposed that we were to prorogue and go to our homes? The hon. gentlemen, for some reasons of their own, withheld this proposition until the last day of July when the House had been in session four and a half months, and then they charge hon. members on this side of the House with obstruction. I heard the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) make a charge a few days ago that the opposition were obstructing.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman has no right to refer to a previous debate.

Mr. HACKETT. It was in connection with this debate; it was part of this debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid that this discussion of delay is not germane to the question before the House. The subject now before us is the third reading of this Bill, with the amendment thereto proposed by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain).

Mr. HACKETT. Mr. Speaker, I accept your ruling, I submit to it, and I trust that the amendment offered by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) will be accepted by this parliament, because it is an amendment in the right direction. It is an amendment that will not allow the passing of this Bill until full information has been obtained by the people of this country; until after the people have had an opportunity of raising their voice and speaking through their representatives in parliament, and have had submitted to them at the polls this question of building a railway, costing over $100,000,000, from Quebec to Moncton. My first intention was to say one word in connection with the remarks made by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) who has gone back on his benefactor and who has not acted fairly by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair). I want to say in connection with the late Minister of Railways and Canals and to say it honestly and fairly that so far as the province from which I come is concerned, I found the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals progressive and up to date and

I believe that when he found it his duty to resign as a minister of the cabinet he was conscientious and that he felt he was doing his duty to the people of this country.

Some eight months ago, before the meeting of parliament, a meeting of the electors of West Prince was held in the town of Tignish, and they unanimously passed a resolution congratulating the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) on what he had done for the opening up of that part of the country, and especially for running two trains a day between Summerside and Tignish. I desire to convey to the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) the thanks of that meeting, and at the same time I trust that the acting Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Fielding) will continue the good work initiated by the ex-Minister (Hon. Mr. Blair). Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that, before the government undertakes such a large and expensive project as is included in this Bill, proper surveys should be made, and estimates of cost should be obtained and we should not have to rely on explorations made 25 or 50 years ago for another purpose altogether. I am in favour of opening up our country, but I do believe that while we have in the North-west 150,000,000 acres of the most fertile lands in the world awaiting settlement, it is a mistake to throw away the money of the people of Canada on such an undertaking as this.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). Had it not been for the member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) and the member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) prolonging this debate this Bill would have passed the House before one o'clock. I have a question to put to the Prime Minister, which has not yet been answered so far as I know. It is reported that the reason why the Winnipeg-Moncton section is tacked on to this project by the government, is, because the member for Victoria, N.B., (Hon. Mr. Costigan) is interested in a railway from Quebec to Edmundston, part of which has been built, and that pressure has been put upon the Prime Minister to absorb that line of railway. It is also reported that the Quebec Bridge is to be absorbed, and that the government intend bringing down a subsidy of some $4,000,000 for that Bridge Company, of which Mr. Parent, Prime Minister of Quebec, is the president. In addition to that, there is the Trans-Canada Railway from Quebec to Winnipeg, of which Mr. Parent is also president, and that also is to be absorbed by the government, and these parties are to receive a large amount for their charters. Perhaps the Prime Minister could give us some information as to these rumours.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have no objection at all to answering my hon. friend. Although we do not share all ideas in common perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Reid) will take a piece of advice from me, and that is, that he will do well not to be too credulous, and especially not to credit reports which are without even a semblance of foundation or common sense. The member for Victoria (Hon. Mr. Costigan) is, I believe, interested with other parties, in a charter for a railway over the territory which will be traversed by the government line from Moncton to Quebec. His charter which I think had some value some few months ago, will in consequence have no value whatever to-day. As to the rumour that the Prime Minister of Quebec is president of a transcontinental railway company to which some subsidies are to be given ; this is the first information I have had on that. I am not aware that the Premier of Quebec is interested in any such road, and at all events the government has no such intention, nor has it received any application with regard to it. There is a company known as the Trans-Canada, which had a charter, and wanted to build a railway practically over the same ground which is to be covered by the railway contemplated by this Bill. As to the Quebec Bridge Company, there is an application for further aid to that company. It was assisted by the government some two or three years ago, and there is an application for further aid.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That bridge would be absorbed by the new road ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, legislation will be necessary on that subject.

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (King's, N.B.). I would not have spoken further in connection with this Bill, were it not that the member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) has I am told attempted to cast a reflection upon the members for New Brunswick—especially those who sit on this side of the House—by saying that they were not doing their duty to their province in opposing this railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. If the hon. gentleman understood that, he certainly was misinformed. Those who heard me will acquit me of having made any reflection whatever upon any hon. member from New Brunswick or any other province.

Mr. FOWLER. I am very glad to hear from the hon. gentleman's own lips that he did not make any such statement, but I am informed that what he said was that he was surprised at their antipathy against that section of the country between Moncton and Quebec. If the hon. gentleman uttered these words he cast a reflection upon the gentlemen who are opposing this Bill, because he insinuated that they had an antipathy, not against the railway itself, but against that section of the country between Moncton and Quebec. I do not know how else his language can be construed. Speaking for myself—and in this respect I can speak for

every member on this side of the House—we have no antipathy against any part of this Canada of our. We are Canadians before we are provincialists. The fault I find with the member for Westmoreland and others of his friends is, that they are provincialists and not Canadians. The hon. gentleman from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) said that the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Hale) should support this railway because it goes through his county. Are we to be told that a member of this House should support a national transcontinental railway as it is called, simply because it runs through a portion of his county ? Are we to take such a narrow view of national questions ? Are we to consider only the interests of the little district in which we live, and not the interest of our country as a whole ? As a member of this parliament of Canada, I protest against being asked to take any such narrow view as that. We are here as Canadians, expected to legislate for the best interests of Canada, and not to narrow our minds by local considerations when the good of the whole country is at stake.

No man in this House will stand up for the particular district he represents more strongly than I will if it is being interfered with or is being injuriously affected in any way. But what we are to look to is the good of all Canada, the good of the greatest number. Is this proposed railway going to do the greatest possible good for Canada ? That is the first question for us to consider. Afterwards we may consider how it is going to affect the particular district in which we live or the particular province from which we come. I say I object to this railway on broad grounds, because I do not believe that it will do what its promoters claim it will do. I do not believe it will prevent Canadian freight going through Canadian channels to American ports. That could have been prevented ; but the very men who are promoting this railway, the very government which is pinning its faith and pledging its existence to this scheme, have by their contract failed to prevent that being done, notwithstanding the objections which have been urged from this side of the House. I am opposed to this scheme because it will to my mind destroy as a trunk line the Intercolonial Railway, on which $70,000,000 of the public money of this country has been expended. I am not alone in that view. The leading man on the government side of the House from the province of New Brunswick, the hon. ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair)—a powerful member of the government he was too—felt so strongly on this point that he abandoned his office and resigned his seat in the cabinet rather than agree to this scheme.

Let us for a moment contrast the conduct of that hon. gentleman with the conduct of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), and see which shines the brighter by the contrast. The hon. member for Westmoreland was just as strongly opposed to interference with the Intercolonial Railway as was the hon. ex-Minister of Railways, if we can judge of the strength of a man's position by the strength of the language he uses ; and that is the only way we can test it until we find that his acts do not harmonize with his language. The hon. gentleman urged strongly in the Railway Committee the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Depot Harbour. But now we find that the hon. gentleman has abandoned that position entirely. He has swallowed this Bill holus-bolus, although it was too severe a dose for the ex-Minister of Railways. Why has the hon. gentleman gone back on his professions ? Why has he changed his view ? Does he put his party before his country ? Surely he was honest and sincere when he was advocating so strongly the extension of the Intercolonial. He waxed most eloquent. I was pleased to hear him, because the language he used was entirely in accord with my own view, and I contributed to the generous meed of applause which his remarks received in the Railway Committee ; and a man has to be pretty eloquent to get any applause there. So you can judge of the strength of the language the hon. gentleman used on that occasion. Since then, as I say, a change has taken place in his views. Has he seen more light ? What is that light ? Is it the bright reflection of office ? Is it that he sees an office in the distance ? Does he hope to rise by the fall of his former benefactor and chief ? Is he willing to give up his principles ? Is he willing to go back on that which he so strongly urged, and which he claimed was required in the best interests of Canada, because he sees, forsooth, an opportunity of becoming a member of this cabinet, and this is the only way he can reach that desired goal ? I do not like to impute motives. I am not imputing motives ; I am merely asking the question. I do not say for a moment that that is the case. It may be that some miraculous intervention of Providence has taken place. It may be that there has been a miracle as in the time of old, when a great light broke in upon a benighted man and he saw clearly what he had not seen before. It may be that that is the case with the hon. gentleman. If so, I am afraid that the light that has broken in upon him is not a light from heaven, but that he is being deluded by a false light.

What is the great reason given for the building of this transcontinental railway ? The reason is the freight congestion in the west. One of the reasons why I oppose this road is because it will not relieve the present congestion in the west. This proposed road cannot be built for many years ; but the freight congestion is acute to-day, if we can believe the statements of western people. And so, if you are only going to apply your remedy to a deep-seated disease ten years hence, I am afraid your patient

will be dead before the remedy can be applied. I believe in applying the remedy at once, when the patient can be relieved. I am opposed to this road, and I believe the people of New Brunswick are also opposed to it. The hon. member for Westmoreland will find that the people of New Brunswick are opposed to this railway irrespective of politics, apart from the heelers and the hot party men. I am not using the word heeler in an offensive sense. I am only using it to indicate those men who are always prepared to swallow anything their party puts forth. Then, there are a certain class of men supporting the government, who have no party fealty, but whose sole idea is to get what they can, by whatever means they can, out of the public treasury. That class of men will support this Bill, as they will support anything that the government brings forward.

Mr. EMMERSON. Will my hon. friend pardon me if I ask him a question ?

Mr. FOWLER. With pleasure.

Mr. EMMERSON. I want to ask him if it is true that when the Grand Trunk Pacific Company proposed to have their line stop at Quebec, he, in conjunction with the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Hale), sent a telegram to the St. John Board of Trade to this effect :

> Important that civic bodies take immediate, united and strong action re Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. Apparent intention is to make Portland winter terminus ; and if maritime provinces are to reap reward for past services, a fight to the finish must be made.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, I sent that telegram, and I endorse it to-day. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that I do not pursue so sinuous a course in politics that I have to take back to-day what I said yesterday. I sent that telegram, and I stand by it to-day. What does that telegram say ? It says it is evidently the intention to make Portland the winter terminus. Has that intention been changed ? Why, that is the very fault I have to find with this whole scheme—that under this contract between the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government, the Grand Trunk Pacific are enabled to send their freight originating along this line, by way of the American routes to American ports.

That is the very ground that I take now and that I took then. The alternative proposition of the leader of the opposition is the very thing that will prevent that. It is the very thing that my hon. friend proposed in the Railway Committee when he spoke so strongly and eloquently in favour of the extension of the Intercolonial. That extension I was in favour of then as I am to-day. He was in favour of it then, but is opposed to it to-day. And why ? By the extension of the Intercolonial you would prevent most effectively the making of Portland the winter terminus of the Grand Trunk Pacific. That is one feature which will appeal particularly to the electors of the east when called upon to pronounce their verdict. By extending the government system until it taps the wheat fields of the west, we would ensure to the people of the east the certainty that the sacrifices they have made for the development of Canada were not in vain. We will ensure to them their share in the trade of carrying the grain and other products from that great western country to the markets of Europe. I stand by every word of that telegram, and I defy any one to construe it in any other way than I am construing it now. But the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) cannot square what he said in the Railway Committee with what he has been saying here. There is just this difference between us. The one is guided in his career by patriotic motives, by endeavouring to do what is best for the country, whereas the hon. gentleman is evidently guided solely by what he thinks will be most to his own advantage.

Another objection to the transcontinental railway scheme is this, that by expending so much money you will restrict your capacity to spend in other directions. You are about to incur an enormous expenditure of over $120,000,000, which is the lowest estimate of cost, and you are to build a road with gradients of four-tenths per cent, according to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) over which you will be capable of hauling trains of 2,000 tons. I am confident that there will be no such grades on that road, nor will you be able to haul trains of more than 250 tons, and you will prevent us from obtaining the proper transportation facilities which are so necessary in the east in order to handle the immense trade we expect to develop between the west and the east. When you tax the country to the extent of $120,000,000 and over, you will find it more difficult to get the necessary millions to construct the great work required at Montreal, St. John and Halifax, and the other ports which it is necessary to develop on the maritime coast. You should do these things first, and then when you have obtained the requisite information, build your transcontinental. But do not take a leap in the dark. First develop our ports, make them free ports so that we will be in a much better position to compete against American ports, and after we have obtained full information about the character of the country through which it is proposed to build this line, will be time enough to build it. We object to this scheme on the ground that we have no definite information on which to base it. What have we ? Nothing but guesses. We have no information such as business men would require before they took one step forward. It is all very well for the hon.

member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to make glib statements about the condition of that country, which he knows no more about than the man in the moon. I have never yet seen an hon. gentleman who possesses such a vivid imagination. He can imagine almost anything, and then he will speak with such an air of candid sincerity that people almost believe him. But we want something more definite than the mere statement that a man has tramped on foot over a certain portion of this territory, when the snow was three feet deep, and then gave his opinion on the fertility of the soil. We want something more definite before we spend $150,000,000. That country may be the most fertile part of Canada. I am not saying anything against it. But I am opposed to your proceeding before you have definite information regarding the character of the country, and before you know whether there will be any local trade developed there or not. As to the gradients that may be obtained, of course, you can go through a mountain if you have money enough. But then comes the question whether or not the cost would be so great that the freight rates would be too heavy to enable freight to go that way. All these things have to be considered. There should be full information on all these points before we undertake this responsibility. That is what the people of New Brunswick are saying. What the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) suggests is that the people of New Brunswick are so venal as to be bribed to vote against their conscience and what they believe to be best simply because there is going to be a railway down there through some portion of the province. A suggestion of that sort would come fittingly from the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), who described the maritime provinces as the shreds and patches of confederation, but I cannot understand an hon. gentleman who is a son of New Brunswick, who has had the honour of being premier of that province, making such an insinuation against it, more particularly when that province has done much better by him than he deserved. He has tried to lead the House to believe that we in New Brunswick are to be bought, simply because a railway is going to be brought down to our country. Let me tell hon. gentlemen opposite that we are not that kind of people in New Brunswick. There is no part of Canada where the Canadian spirit burns more strongly. We look first to the interests of Canada, and then to those of our province.

Some hon. MEMBER. Good.

Mr. FOWLER. I can quite understand how the hon. gentleman can say 'good' in his sarcastic tones. That sort of thing does not appeal to little minds. I have heard that particular hon. gentleman before in this House, and can quite understand how anything of that kind would appear absurd to him. But there are men to whom that sentiment would appeal. They are the sort of people we have in New Brunswick, and are not to be dragooned into the supporting of Bills simply because you are going to throw a sop by building a line down there. I would not have taken up the time of the House had it not been for the hon. member for Westmoreland. I do not know why he spoke. Surely he must have received the same instruction as the rest of the rank and file on the back benches. Surely he was told as well as they to retire into the cave of silence and remain there. Did the ministers not speak to him? Is it because he is just standing on the threshold of a cabinet portfolio that he was not spoken to? Perhaps he did not get his notice and was dragged into the debate. But I understand it was whispered around the corridors that one minister was deputed to spank the hon. gentleman for having interfered in this debate. I hoped the hon. gentleman had enough manliness to resent that and prevent the Minister of Customs from giving him that spanking.

Amendment (Mr. Blain) negatived, on the same division.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (South Leeds). I notice, in reading the 42nd section of the agreement between the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government, that it is very ingeniously worded. I am not a lawyer, but I will submit my point, and will challenge any legal gentleman in this House to controvert the statement I make. That 42nd section reads as follows:

It is hereby declared and agreed between the parties to this agreement that the aid herein provided for is granted by the government of Canada for the express purpose of encouraging the development of Canadian trade and the transportation of goods through Canadian channels. The company accepts the aid on these conditions, and agrees that all freight originating on the line of the railway, or its branches, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall, when destined for points in Canada, be carried entirely on Canadian territory——

From that point it goes on as follows:

—or between Canadian inland ports, and that the through-rate on export traffic from the point of origin to the point of destination shall at no time be greater via Canadian ports than via United States ports, and that all such traffic, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall be carried to Canadian ocean ports.

That makes provision only for traffic for export. But what provision is made in the agreement for the Canadian manufacturer in eastern Canada, or the Canadian shipper from Manitoba or the North-west over this line? Suppose a manufacturer in the eastern provinces wants to ship to Winnipeg over this line, there is no provision that his goods shall be carried as cheaply as by lines running over American territory.

I propose to amend this section by putting in the following words :

That all freight originating on the line of the said railway or its branches, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, if destined for points in Canada, shall be carried entirely on Canadian territory or between Canadian inland ports, and that the rate for such carriage shall not be greater than the rate charged between the same points by any route not wholly Canadian ; and if such freight be for export, it shall, unless otherwise specifically routed by the shipper, be carried to Canadian ports, and that the through-rate on such export traffic from the point of origin to the point of destination shall at no time be greater by way of Canadian ports than by way of any other ports.

I want this to apply for the benefit of the Canadian manufacturer or the Canadian shipper. Suppose a Canadian shipper has a carload of cattle, or a carload of hogs or a carload of butter or cheese, that he wishes to send to Montreal, this clause makes no provision for his case. Suppose a miller in Manitoba has sold a carload of flour in Prince Edward Island. That is not export trade, and there is no provision that this road shall serve him as cheaply as the road that runs partly over American territory. There is nothing to prevent the Manitoba miller from shipping over the Canadian Northern and Northern Pacific to Boston, and so to Prince Edward Island, and he may get a much cheaper rate than on this proposed route under this agreement. I wish to make provision so that the Canadian shipper, whether in the east or in the west, shall be able to ship over this line at as cheap a rate as over a partly American route. There is not a member of the government, there is not an hon. member supporting the government, particularly among those who come from the west or from the manufacturing towns in eastern Canada, but will see the necessity of the condition I here propose.

Before I formally place this resolution in your hands, Mr. Speaker, I desire to refer to a matter that was up for discussion yesterday. The right hon. Prime Minister, just before the House rose, took occasion to refer to a debate which took place in the afternoon in which I criticised some remarks of his with reference to the route proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition. Here is the statement the right hon. gentleman made :

I come now to the main proposition of my hon. friend. He proposes to acquire the Canada Atlantic Railway as it exists to-day. But though the government may acquire the Canada Atlantic Railway, it certainly could not operate it.

And he goes on to explain why :

How could you expect that a Canadian government could possibly, with any advantage to the country, operate the Canada Atlantic Railway. It is within the knowledge of everybody that at this moment three-fourths at least of the business of the Canadian Pacific Railway and three-fourths the business of the Canada Atlantic Railway is American business. It is business connected with the western states and carried to its destination in the eastern states. The Canadian government could not compete for that business if we were to acquire that railway.

He does not explain why. Why would not the government be in a position, if the scheme of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition was carried out, and this road operated by a commission entirely apart from politics, to operate that railway the same as any company would operate a railway ? But the right hon. gentleman goes on :

At present the manager of the Canada Atlantic Railway has connections and agents in Duluth, Milwaukee, Chicago and other points in the west, and in New York, Boston and other cities in the east, collecting freight in the east for the western states and in the west for the eastern states. Now, would it be possible for the Canadian government to maintain those agents in American cities and keep connections there in order to collect that trade now passing over our territory ?

Why not ? Has not this government a horde of immigration agents in the United States trying to collect immigrants in that country, and does it not pay these agents large sums of money ? Wherein would it be inconsistent in this government, operating this railway through a commission, to have its freight agents in every city of the United States bidding and competing for the trade of that country ? But the right hon. gentleman went further, and I presume he has had a number of telegrams from the marine interest of this Dominion this morning telling him that the statements he made yesterday in the House were not in accordance with the facts. Remember this, that I am about to quote the statement of the right hon. Prime Minister to the people of this country :

There is something more. The fleet maintained on the lakes for the purpose of supplying traffic to the Canada Atlantic Railway is composed in part of American bottoms. It would be impossible to have the trade we have to-day unless it was carried in American bottoms. We can carry Canadian freight in Canadian bottoms, but you cannot take freight at Duluth, Chicago or Milwaukee or any of the western ports and bring it to Depot Harbour except in American bottoms.

There is the statement of the Prime Minister that we cannot take freight in Chicago, Duluth or Milwaukee and bring it to Depot Harbour except in American bottoms.

The PRIME MINISTER. If destined to American harbours, certainly.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is where the right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is wrong again. It is being done every day. Since this discussion took place I have had a conversation with a prominent officer of the Canada Atlantic Railway, and

he explained to me that they have part of their fleet American bottoms and part Canadian bottoms. The Canadian vessels go to Chicago, Duluth or Milwaukee, take a cargo and bring it to Depot Harbour. The reason for having part American bottoms is so that if they have no business for Depot Harbour they can load at Chicago, Duluth or Milwaukee for Buffalo or any other point on the American side, which a Canadian bottom cannot do. But the Canadian bottom can load at an American point and carry to Depot Harbour exactly the same as an American bottom. Then, to contradict my statement, the right hon. gentleman read the law. I challenged the Minister of Customs to deny my statement last night, and he said that the Canadian boats could do just what the law allowed them to do. The law is the same on the Canadian side as on the American side. Will the Minister of Customs tell me that I cannot do what I am doing every day, shipping goods to Winnipeg routed by the Grand Trunk Railway to Collingwood or to Sarnia, loading them there on American boats, taking them to Duluth and shipping them over the Northern Pacific and the Canadian Northern into Winnipeg? Is there anything in the laws or bonding privileges of the United States to prevent that being done? Nothing. We are doing it every day, so is every manufacturer in eastern Ontario shipping by the Grand Trunk and by the water route, going partly through American territory in bond; and the Americans are doing the same in our country. The law passed in the United States is for this special purpose. it was passed in February, 1898, and the Prime Minister read it last night:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Repesentatives of the United States of America in congress assembled, that no merchandise shall be transported by water——

'By water' this Act applies to—by water all the way.

—under a penalty of forfeiture thereof, from one port in the United States to another port in the United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any other part of the voyage, in any other than a vessel of the United States.

Now, that applies this way: I cannot go to Chicago and order a load of grain shipped from Chicago via Port Colborne to Ogdensburg by a Canadian boat; that is, I cannot go into Chicago and load grain on a Canadian boat and carry it to Port Colborne, unload it in an elevator there, get it reloaded into another Canadian boat and carry it to a Canadian port. But they say: Grain going from Chicago, for instance, to Ogdensburg must be carried all the way in an American bottom, it cannot be transshipped at Port Colborne by a Canadian vessel or by an American vessel and then put into an American vessel and carried back, the same bulk, to an American port. But there is nothing in that law, and I defy any lawyer in this House to contradict the statement, there is nothing in the bonding privileges of the United States, which are the same as they are in Canada, to prevent us shipping every day in bond through the United States and back into Canadian territory, from Collingwood or Sarnia to Duluth. There is nothing to prevent it being carried in an American bottom, neither is there anything in their law to prevent me from shipping a load of grain in bond at Chicago to Depot Harbour, because that is the water route, shipping it partly through Canada and partly through the United States, for export to the old country. Every bushel of grain in bond for export goes through Depot Harbour and goes through our Canadian elevators and over our Canadian railways. The Prime Minister tried to belittle the proposition made by the leader of the opposition, saying that he could not acquire the Canada Atlantic Railway and operate it; and could not operate the boats, because they are sailing under the American flag. That is in accordance with the statement made by the Postmaster General when he tried to make the people believe that by the proposition of the leader of the opposition you could not acquire 57 miles of the Canada Atlantic Railway, all of which were in the United States, whereas there are only three miles in the United States to make a connection. Although the Postmaster General made that statement and I showed he was wrong, he has not risen in this House and apologized for it Neither has the Prime Minister apologized for the statement he made in introducing this Bill, saying that it was wanted altogether for the purpose of making Canada independent of bonding privileges that might be withdrawn. He has never withdrawn that statement. He made the same statement yesterday, which I am sure he will withdraw when he looks into the matter, otherwise he will raise the marine interests of Canada against him; he said that we cannot carry grain from an American port and land it in an American port when it is carried through in bond for export. Therefore, in order to settle this question, I am going to move an amendment, which I hope the government will accept, because it is in the interest of the manufacturers of eastern Canada and of the purchasers in the west, who may want to ship goods through Canada. I want to assure them that they will be sure of the same rates on this road on goods transported from the west as they can get when they are carried partly over Canadian and partly over American territory. I therefore move:

That all the words after the word 'that' to the end of the question be left out and the following substituted therefor:—'the Bill be referred back to a Committee of the Whole House with power to amend the same as follows:—

That all freight originating on the line of the said railway or its branches, not specifically

routed otherwise by the shipper, if destined for points in Canada, shall be carried entirely on Canadian territory or between Canadian inland ports, and that the rate for such carriage shall not be greater than the rate charged between the same points by any route not wholly Canadian; and if such freight be for export, it shall, unless otherwise specifically routed by the shipper, be carried to Canadian ports, and that the through-rate on such export traffic from the point of origin to the point of destination shall at no time be greater by way of Canadian ports than by way of any other ports.

I may say this whole clause provides, in case of freight carried from the west or elsewhere, if it is for export, that they must comply with the requirements and not charge a greater rate; but if the grain, or cattle, or cheese, or butter is shipped from any point in the west to any point in eastern Canada, they can charge whatever they please for it. We want to say this to them: You have received aid from the government of Canada, and you shall carry these goods as cheaply as they can be carried over any competing line, whether partly in Canada and partly in the United States or not.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. One word about a subject not directly concerned in the amendment, and that is with reference to the misunderstanding that seems to exist between the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and the Prime Minister with reference to the law of the United States. He asked me last night what I had to say, and being busily engaged at the moment in conversation, I did not hear what he said, and gave the answer that they could do whatever was permitted by their law. Now, the law of the United States that was passed in 1898 is this:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in congress assembled, that no merchandise shall be transported by water, under penalty of forfeiture thereof, from one port of the United States to another port of the United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the voyage, in any other vessel than a vessel of the United States.

Then the hon. gentleman argues that if merchandise is shipped from Duluth destined, we will say, to Boston——

Mr. TAYLOR. For export.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It has to take that voyage from Duluth to Boston, we will say. This section reads that if on any part of the voyage it is carried in any other vessel than a vessel of the United States it is subject to forfeiture.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does he say that the United States have construed the word 'voyage' as including transmission by railway trains?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There is reciprocity in the bonding arrangements as far as railways are concerned but not with reference to coasting.

Mr. TAYLOR. No one denies that.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. But I have read the law which says these consequences may arise out of this and if they did not arise I do not think it would be our desire or duty to call attention to it. I understood the hon. gentleman to say it is done now, that it is perfectly legal to do it and that he has the authority of the Canada Atlantic Railway for stating that it is possible for a merchant to ship goods say from Boston by way of the Canada Atlantic Railway destined for Chicago, that they may be put on a Canadian vessel at Parry Sound and landed from a Canadian vessel in Chicago. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) say that the Canada Atlantic Railway can do that?

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. minister is quoting me, I said nothing of the kind.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What did the hon. gentleman say?

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman said: that what we are doing in Canada to-day is shipping goods via the Grand Trunk Railway by rail to Collingwood or Owen Sound; that they are there placed in a Canadian or American vessel and are landed in Duluth; that they are there taken by the Northern Pacific, carried through the United States, handed over to the Canadian Northern Railway, and taken again through Canadian territory. Will my hon. friend admit that this can be done under the United States law?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The question was one of United States law and we do not here interpret United States law. If the United States law is more liberal than we thought we are delighted to know that, because we would like to have all the advantage we may have, and therefore I would be pleased if I correctly understood the hon. gentleman to say that he has the authority of the Canada Atlantic Railway for saying that merchandise may be shipped from Boston over a Canadian line of railway, say to Parry Sound, and there be placed on a Canadian vessel and be delivered from that vessel at its destination in Chicago. I again ask the hon. gentleman if he has the authority of the Canada Atlantic Railway for saying that?

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not say that the Canada Atlantic Railway made any such statement. The statement I made about the Canada Atlantic Railway was that they are to-day carrying grain from Chicago and Duluth by both Canadian and American vessels to Depot Harbour, then putting it in cars and shipping it out from there; that there is no difference between Canadian and American bottoms.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Grain is merchandise and I understood my hon. friend to say that grain may be shipped at Duluth, consigned to Boston, in a Canadian vessel, may be taken in a Canadian vessel to Depot Harbour and then be carried from Depot Harbour on to the port of Boston.

Mr. TAYLOR. For export.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. You are qualifying it now.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, I said it from the first; the hon. gentleman wants to misrepresent to the House every statement I made.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Not at all, I am only trying to understand.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have interpreted the law and I challenge any legal gentleman in the House to disprove my interpretation of it. The hon. minister cannot do it himself.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am not going to define the meaning of American law.

Mr. TAYLOR. The law against coasting applies to carriage altogether by water; it does not refer to carriage by part water and part rail.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I would be very pleased if it did so; I wanted to ascertain from the hon. gentleman if he had the authority of the Canada Atlantic Railway for the statement that they carry grain from Duluth in Canadian vessels and that it is being shipped out by Boston; that they can carry American grain in Canadian vessels to Depot Harbour destined to Montreal for shipment is of course very evident, but the question is whether they can carry it from one port in the United States to another port in the United States. As I said I will be very glad if that will be found to be the case but I will say to my my hon. friend that perhaps the Prime Minister can interpret a law fully as well as my hon. friend and he interprets it that this can not be done. The commissioner of customs also does not think it can be done.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. Minister of Customs take the ground that if a cargo of wheat billed from Chicago to the port of Boston is taken in a Canadian vessel to Depot Harbour, there transhipped to the Canada Atlantic Railway cars and taken from Depot Harbour to Boston, it will come within the law of the United States prohibiting the participation of other than United States vessels in the American coasting trade?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The officers of my department think that is the interpretation which the American government place upon that law; if they do not do that we will be very pleased to know it.

The PRIME MINISTER. I made a statement yesterday with regard to American traffic originating in the United States and ending in the United States, for instance a bill of lading from Chicago to Boston or to any inland town of the United States, and said that that cargo, in order to get the benefit of the bonding privilege on the Canada Atlantic Railway, would have to be carried to Depot Harbour on American bottoms.

Mr. TAYLOR. Not at all.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is the statement I made and I hope I am wrong and that the Canada Atlantic Railway can do that, but, I am not going to admit that I am wrong at this moment. I was not guided by my own interpretation of the law, I do not undertake to interpret American law, but I was acting on the impression I have had for some time. I made the statement yesterday; I make it to-day; I may be wrong, I think I am right, but I shall look into it and give the result of my investigations to the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Whatever question there may be about the matter which has been raised by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) there is no question at all that the Prime Minister was wrong yesterday as I shall show him in a moment. If the officers of the Department of Customs say that the United States courts have interpreted the word 'voyage' in the United States statute as including transmission by rail, I say no more because I have had no occasion to investigate or to interpret this statute; but I would be surprised to learn that the United States courts had interpreted that section in that way. The clause is dealing with vessels, and it uses the word 'voyage' and there does not seem to be anything in it which would include or appear to take into consideration transportation by railway. It is a matter for the United States courts to determine. Have they determined that the law in the United States is as the Minister of Customs says?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I did not say that. I asked the commissioner of customs if there had been a decision on this question and he said he thought there had been but he had not it handy and he is looking it up.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is a perfectly fair statement. The point we were dealing with yesterday was, whether or not grain taken at Duluth and brought to Depot Harbour for the purpose of transmission through a Canadian port, could be carried in a Canadian bottom. There is not a scintilla of a doubt about that. Does my right hon. friend say there is a doubt about it?

The PRIME MINISTER. What I said yesterday, was, that the business of the

Canada Atlantic was chiefly American business from American port to American port, and I stated yesterday, that that business could not be carried, so far as water transportation is concerned, except in American bottoms.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the Prime Minister or the Minister of Customs say that there is anything to prevent a Canadian bottom carrying grain from Duluth or Chicago to Depot Harbour, for transmission through a Canadian port to Great Britain ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly not. I referred to American business.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then why did the right hon. gentleman raise the question, that we were extending the Intercolonial Railway for the purpose of sending grain to American ports ? What we want to do is to send the trade by Canadian ports. The right hon. gentleman has American ports too much in his mind ; it is Canadian ports that we are thinking of. Our object is to bring that grain from Duluth or Chicago to Depot Harbour, and to transmit it, not by American but by Canadian ports. The right hon. gentleman now admits that there is nothing in the United States law that could by any possibility interfere with a project of that kind. Let me point out to my right hon. friend, that if we acquire the Canada Atlantic Railway system there is no reason why the 20,000,000 bushels of Canadian grain that now go via Buffalo through an American port, should not be brought by the Canada Atlantic Railway system, and sent to Europe through Canadian ports. The Canada Atlantic Railway carries a very considerable portion of Canadian grain now. My recollection is that it carried some 8,000,000 bushels of Canadian grain last year, and if 8,000,000 bushels of grain can be carried by the Canada Atlantic Railway, I do not see any reason why, with proper development, it could not carry 28,000,000 bushels to the ports of Quebec and Montreal in summer, and to the maritime province ports in winter, as set forth in the letter of Mr. Meighen, thus giving to the ports of Canada a greater share of the western business than they have at present. If you are going to acquire the Canada Atlantic Railway to take grain from Chicago or Duluth to Depot Harbour, and then send it to Boston or Portland, there may be a doubt ; but my proposal was that you should acquire the Canada Atlantic Railway for the purpose of sending traffic to Canadian ports, and in that respect the point raised by the hon. gentleman has no bearing at all.

The PRIME MINISTER. I presume that the Canada Atlantic Railway could develop Canadian business, but the point which I made against the project of the hon. gentleman was, that if the government were to acquire the Canada Atlantic Railway they would destroy the American business which the Canada Atlantic Railway has at this moment. You might improve the Canada Atlantic Railway business, but that business could be done by any other company just as well as the Canada Atlantic Railway. If the government undertook that, it would destroy the American business of the Canada Atlantic Railway, and as I stated, three-fourths of the business done by the Canada Atlantic Railway is American business ; that is to say business originating in the United States and ending in the United States.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does the right hon. gentleman say that three-fourths of the business of the Canada Atlantic Railway commences and ends in the United States ?

The PRIME MINISTER. That is my information.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is that grain sold in Boston or is it taken there for export ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The Canada Atlantic Railway is doing not only a grain business but a large package trade in return freight. I stated that this freight could not be carried except in American bottoms upon the lakes, and I maintain it. That is what I stated yesterday, and if I am wrong I will admit it. I will investigate it, and give the House the benefit of my investigation. I say that the business commencing in the United States and ending in the United States, has to be carried in American and not in Canadian bottoms. I had occasion to look the matter up some years ago, and that is my impression about it, although it may be that my recollection is wrong.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). So far as the origination of grain traffic in the United States is concerned, my right hon. friend may perhaps not be very far from the mark. My recollection is, and I speak only from recollection, that about 20,000,000 bushels of grain were carried last year by the Canada Atlantic Railway, 12,000,000 bushels of which were American grain, and 8,000,000 were Canadian grain. The hon. gentleman is right so far as that goes, but I was not aware until the right hon. gentleman stated it, that when that 20,000,000 bushels got to Montreal, it went, not from the port of Montreal but from United States ports. Upon that I have no direct information, except the impression I have gathered from reading the reports of a recent commission in the United States, which seemed to indicate that grain brought by the Canada Atlantic Railway not only from Canadian points, but from American points, went by the St. Lawrence route. Has the right hon. gentleman any information which would indicate that any considerable portion of the grain brought to Montreal by the Canada Atlantic Railway, does eventually go by American steamship routes ?

The PRIME MINISTER. What I had in my mind was not only the freight eastward

but the freight westward, and a good deal of the trade of the Canada Atlantic Railway is package freight from American cities to other American cities in the west, and which would have to be carried in American bottoms.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My right hon. friend is, I think, right in saying that a portion of this westward freight is package freight from the United States; and as to that we will have to investigate the question as to the intrepretation which the United States authorities put upon this statute.

Mr. BENNETT. I have lived for many years in the town of Midland, where there is a large quantity of grain handled, and I know that Canadian vessels bring corn to Midland from Chicago, transfer it to the cars, and these cars are sealed by a United States officer, who is kept there for that purpose during the summer months. This grain goes to the United States and is shipped from Portland. I notice from the 'Marine News,' in this newspaper that a boat called the 'Ottawa' has passed Mackinaw. That boat comes from Chicago loaded with grain. She belongs to the Booth line, and is going to Parry Sound. When that boat arrives at Parry Sound her grain is shipped eastward, and it is possible that it may be shipped at a Canadian port. There is no doubt that numbers of Canadian vessels arrive at Midland with grain in the summer months when the Canadian North-west grain is not moving, and then these vessels go into the corn trade between Chicago and Midland, and that corn is ultimately shipped from United States Atlantic ports.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Is it for export or does it go into storage?

Mr. BENNETT. I am quite positive that it is shipped from Portland to points in Great Britain. There is no doubt that the United States government keep an officer at Midland, whose duty it is to have these cars all sealed, so that they will not pass to any ports of Canada.

The PRIME MINISTER. Under the bonding privilege.

Mr. BENNETT. Under the bonding privilege they go to the United States and on to Portland. The grain cannot be used for local consumption. It must be exported.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Hon. gentlemen have been speaking entirely of American laws. I suppose that these bonding privileges are mutual, and that our Canadian laws regarding them are the same as those of the Americans. If such is the case—and this arrangement was agreed to between the two governments when this bonding treaty was made—there should be no misunderstanding about it. The Minister of Customs must have been a party to the making of this bonding treaty with the American government in 1898; and the interpretation which the government place on the American law must be the same as that which the Americans place on the Canadian law. If such is the case, our Canadian vessels have been running great risks; and they are doing so now if they carry cargoes from an American port in the way the hon. Minister of Customs speaks of. I suppose that if this new railway is built, or if the government acquire the Canada Atlantic Railway, and if goods are shipped over the government railway, they will have to be loaded into Canadian vessels at Depot Harbour, if consigned to a Canadian point in the west. If American vessels carried those goods they would be violating the law of this country, as the Minister of Customs construes it. I rose to refer to this matter because I think the press should let marine men know the position they are in, so that if there is any misunderstanding of the matter it can be remedied at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Mr. Speaker, the remarks which I have to offer on this motion will partly cover the remarks which I addressed to the House this morning. I was pointing out the length of the road from Lévis to Edmundston. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot), who was in the House a few moments ago, and to whom I gave notice that I was going to correct his statement, has gone out. When that hon. member this morning stated that the distance was only 186 miles by a direct line, I stated that that was through United States territory; and the hon. member for Bellechasse contradicted me point-blank. I will read from the same report that he read from. The first heading is: 'To Edmundston by lines surveyed via Cabano river and Temiscouata Railway.' The next heading is: 'To Edmundston via Etchemin valley through state of Maine, connecting with St. Francis branch of Temiscouata Railway.' Then it goes on: 'From Chaudière via Intercolonial Railway and Quebec Central Railway, 190 miles.' The hon. gentleman quoted this and the next line to make it appear that it was not through the state of Maine, though it is under the sub-heading which says that it is through the state of Maine. It is from Chaudière via direct line, through the state of Maine, 186 miles.

The PRIME MINISTER. What report is that?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). This is a report to the Quebec government by Mr. Henry O'Sullivan. Then, here is something that he did not read:

It can be seen by the table that for a through line to Edmundston within Canadian territory, as regards length, the Intercolonial and Temiscouata route ranks first. Any line passing in the

interior is lengthened by loss of distance following river valleys whose course is often out of direction.

This report the hon. gentleman had before him this morning; and yet he sought, I will not say intentionally, to mislead the House by saying that the route he was speaking of did not run through the state of Maine, when it is here stated in plain black and white that it does run through the state of Maine. This was also before him:

The summit on the Temiscouata Railway is 235 feet lower than the lowest summit of the line surveyed. There is a possibility of reducing this by 100 feet by changing the position of Mr. Têtu's line, and that part of it between St. Paul and the township of Painchaud might be shortened by a closer survey.

This was also before him this morning, and he failed to read it when he tried to make out that there was a direct route 186 miles in length without going through the state of Maine:

Although the surveyed line may not have the advantage as a through route, by its position it is admirably adapted to colonization purposes, and it would get a share of foreign business without a doubt.

This was also before him this morning, and he failed to present it to the House:

The maximum grades on the new survey for this line need not exceed 53 feet per mile, excepting at Lake Pohenegomook, where the only long continuous grade of 71·28 feet per mile occurs. I am not able to give the maximum grade on that part of the old survey made use of for this route, not being connected with that work.

Then follows the statement which the hon. gentleman read from Mr. Henry O'Sullivan's report. Yet, with that report before him, the hon. gentleman attempted to mislead this House by saying that that route did not go through the state of Maine.

Now, Sir, a word to the west. As I have already said, I at first regarded the notion of a transcontinental railway with a great deal of favour; and if the right hon. First Minister had brought down a scheme which, to my mind, was in the best interests of Canada, or nearly the best interests of Canada, it would have had my hearty endorsation. He knows that I supported his project for a railway to the Yukon, with certain amendments, a few years ago. But this measure I regard as nothing more nor less than one to give the Grand Trunk Railway Company, not the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, a through-line to the Pacific via Chicago, Minneapolis, Winnipeg and the Canadian Northwest from Portland. If some one will waken up the expert from Norfolk, I would like to have his attention.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am listening to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). As has been previously pointed out, the part from Winnipeg eastward is to be built and owned by the Dominion government, but is to be operated by the only railroad in Canada that should not operate it.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is to be operated by any railway company.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. gentleman will pardon me. The Bill does not say so. Perhaps he has something from behind the scenes which other people are not in possession of. The Bill says it is to be operated by the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. CHARLTON. With running powers to other railways.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That is not operating, as the hon. gentleman knows, if he knows anything.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Am I out of order?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman should not accuse a member of not knowing anything.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I used the hypothesis: I said if he knew anything. I would not like to accuse the hon. member of not knowing anything, no matter what I think. Knowing that he knows something on some matters, Christian Endeavour and that sort of thing, I know that he knows that this railway is not to be operated by any other company, but is to be operated solely by the Grand Trunk Pacific Company. Therefore we have that eastern section of the road from Winnipeg built and owned by the government, but operated by the Grand Trunk Pacific, and we have the section from Winnipeg west assisted by the government, but owned and operated by the Grand Trunk Pacific. Speaking generally, the mileage is 1,600 from Winnipeg to the Pacific coast, and 2,000 and a little over from Winnipeg to the Atlantic ocean. The Grand Trunk Railway is to receive $25,000,000 of the common stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific. The total stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific is to be $45,000,000, so that the Grand Trunk Railway will have the controlling interest, it will elect the president and the directors, and be master of the situation. It will absolutely control the Grand Trunk Pacific from Winnipeg to the Pacific ocean, and will control the management from Winnipeg east. Let us review the transport of freight over that road. A carload of freight leaves the Pacific coast over the Grand Trunk Pacific, 1,600 miles to Winnipeg and 2,000 to the Atlantic ocean. Let us say that the freight is $360. The share that will belong to the Grand Trunk Pacific will be $160, and the share that will go to the government section east of Winnipeg will be $200. The Grand Trunk Pacific proper will only get $160 out of it. There is grave doubt as to whether the earnings of the

eastern section will be sufficient to pay 3 per cent interest on the cost of the construction during the forty years, and we may easily set apart all the freight on the eastern section to meet the interest and maintenance of way, so that there will be nothing available for dividends or general maintenance. Then let us take a car starting from the Pacific coast over the Pacific Railway to Winnipeg, and thence by the Grand Trunk Pacific from Winnipeg down to Minneapolis, Chicago and on through Sarnia or Detroit eastward to Portland. The distance covered will be a few miles over the 3,600, but in round numbers exactly the same. The freight we will say is $360, which will net $160 for the Grand Trunk Pacific and $200 for the Grand Trunk Railway. In other words, the whole of the $360 will pass into the treasury of the Grand Trunk Railway for the benefit of its own system. And inasmuch as there is not a line in this contract, and there cannot be a line in the contract, that will force that management of the Grand Trunk Pacific to send its freight by the North Shore instead of via Chicago, is it at all likely that the Grand Trunk Railway will not give the preference to its own route ? Undoubtedly every car will go over its own lines from the Pacific coast to Winnipeg, and thence to Chicago and Portland, and in such case the Grand Trunk Railway will get every dollar of freight, whereas by the other route it would only get $160. Take another illustration. Suppose you start a car from Toronto. The distance to North Bay over the Grand Trunk Railway is 200 miles ; over the Ontario government road it is 200 miles to Lake Abitibi, from that point to Winnipeg it is 1,000 miles, and to the Pacific coast 16,600 miles. Then send another via Chicago and the Grand Trunk Railway. Let us say that the freight is $300 to the Pacific ocean. The Grand Trunk Railway will get its share on 1,400 miles haulage, or $140 to Winnipeg, and the Grand Trunk Pacific will get $160. The entire amount will go into the pockets of the Grand Trunk Railway. But by the other way the Grand Trunk Railway will get $20 as far as North Bay, the Ontario government road will earn its $20, the government road from Winnipeg east will earn $100—all of which $100 is supposed to go for the maintenance of way and equipment and government interest—and $160 will be the share of the Grand Trunk Pacific from Winnipeg west, so that this $160 and the $20 from Toronto to North Bay are all that really the Grand Trunk Railway will get. Under these conditions, I have never been able to see why the government does not operate as well as own the line from Winnipeg east. If that road is to be built, either let the government operate it themselves or let some other company than the Grand Trunk Railway operate it. The Prime Minister may be determined that some regulation shall be made to bring the traffic over this northern road, but if he were accustomed to the handling of freight on railways he would know that in 99 cases out of 100, the shipper will send his freight by the way he thinks will best suit the railway over which he is primarily shipping. I would suggest to the Prime Minister that it is not yet too late to amend this Bill. No doubt the Grand Trunk Railway will be more than delighted to carry their traffic through the United States, but there is one great objection to that. It is generally understood in railway circles that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway purpose using Duluth for their lake port in the west. I would again seriously impress on the First Minister the necessity of insisting on a guarantee that the Grand Trunk Pacific will run to a Canadian port on Lake Superior, so that there will be a lake route from a Canadian port to Midland instead of from Duluth to Midland. If the Grand Trunk Railway choose to go to Duluth, I do not see how he can prevent them. Unless he gives liberal assistance for a line to a Canadian port, it will be in their interest to go to Duluth. If the right hon. gentleman will not accept the proposition of the leader of the opposition, then let him not only build the road and own it, but also operate it from Winnipeg to Quebec. There can be no earthly intention of ever building the line from Lévis east. A colonization road through that country, as the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Morin) pointed out, from Lévis east, should receive the endorsation and assistance of this country, and would undoubtedly open up a track of country which is very badly off for railways.

But if he will not do that, let him abandon the northern scheme ; let him hand it over to some company—any one of a dozen companies that will take it—on a guarantee of bonds giving them the same as is given the Grand Trunk Pacific Company through the mountains, and he will find that a road will be built through that region that will not cost much over the interest on the bonds during the period of construction. In other words let him give the same privileges that are given to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company through the mountains and there will be any number of opportunities to relieve the government of the construction of the road to the north. Then we will have enough money left over to develop the transportation needs of the country. Ports on the Atlantic and Pacific can well be developed. The Ottawa and Georgian bay canal can be built, and I would much like to see that work completed. It is not necessary to make it a canal of a depth of 21 feet. There is plenty of water in the French and the Ottawa rivers to provide for long locks. Let the locks be built so that the capacity of the barges can be in length rather than in depth, and I

am satisfied that the canal would be a great factor in the problem of transporting the grain from the west. The city of Buffalo finds that its grain trade is not satisfactory, and the people of New York proposed last year to tax themselves some $30,000,000 to improve the Erie canal, and I see that it is now proposed that the American government shall spend $100,000,000 on the Erie, Oswego and Lake Champlain canals, so as to enable them to hold the traffic of the great west, which they find the Canadian routes are taking from them. There would also be sufficient money to provide better grades on the existing roads in Ontario, so as to allow of reduction of rates for the benefit of the people in this province. I have already stated in this House that the rate from Lindsay to Montreal was higher than the rate from Winnipeg to Liverpool, and infinitely higher than the rate from Chicago or central Iowa to Liverpool. By some such arrangement the government could control the freights from inland centres, and thus benefit the whole community. I trust it is not too late for the Prime Minister to take this matter up. If he thinks it cannot be decently done in the House of Commons, I trust he will give a hint to the Senate that it may see to it that the scheme is remodled in the manner I have suggested.

Amendment (Mr. Taylor) negatived on the same division.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I beg to move :

That the said Bill be amended by adding thereto the following clause, and that for such purpose the same be referred back to the committee :—

'That no contractor or sub-contractor on the said railway shall employ any Asiatic labour or workman in the construction of the said railway. Any contravention of this section shall render the person so contravening liable to a penalty of dollars in respect of every such person so employed for each day during which he shall be so employed.'

Before the motion is put I have only a word to say in addition to what I said the other night in support of a similar amendment. I wish to accentuate the statement of the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Macpherson), that there are to-day in British Columbia some 35,000 of the Chinese and Japanese people. I remonstrate on behalf of the labouring men and others in the province of Ontario that on this road, which is practically a government road from Winnipeg to the sea-board, this foreign element should be allowed to participate in the work of construction.

Amendment (Mr. Bennett) negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER. On the same division ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I would not have this on the same division as last reported yesterday, because I do not know the views of some members and how they would vote, so it would not be fair to them to have them on record as voting the same as on another amendment.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Very well.

Mr. SPEAKER. Lost on division.

Mr. S. BARKER (Hamilton). I beg to move the following amendment :

That all the words after the word 'That' to the end of the question be left out and the following substituted therefor :—'the Bill be referred back to a Committee of the Whole House with power to amend the same as follows :—

'Should the government be of opinion that at any time during the continuance of any obligation of the government in respect of the western division, or during the said lease of the eastern division, that the earnings upon the traffic interchanged between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company's system of railways and the system of railways of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, have not been properly apportioned between the said two companies, the question of such apportionment shall be determined by arbitrators to be appointed by the government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada in like manner as is provided with regard to arbitrators by paragraph 47 of the said agreement, or be determined by the board of railway commissioners as mentioned in section 19 of the said agreement. And the government shall have the right to inspect all books of account, statements, contracts, correspondence, vouchers, waybills and all other papers and documents of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, the inspection of which may be considered necessary for the purpose of investigating or determining any question, matter or thing arising out of the said agreement, or the said lease or the provisions of this Act, or connected with the obligations or undertakings of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company entered into pursuant to the said agreement, or lease, or to this Act.

The object of this amendment is to enlarge the scope of section 19 of the agreement. The government in that section endeavours to protect itself against a possible unfair division of the earnings on the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. The Grand Trunk Pacific Company will own the western division of the line and it will be lessee of the eastern division. Its liability in certain years to pay rent upon the eastern division depends, under the contract, upon whether there shall be net earnings in those years. It might, therefore, be to the interests of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to so divide the earnings as between the western division and the eastern division of the railway that all its profits would go to its own property, the western division, and that there should be no net earnings upon the eastern division, and thereby the company would escape, in certain years, any liability to pay rent. The government very properly saw that this might arise, and, under section 19, they protected themselves fairly enough against it. The provision of that section is :

The company shall keep separate accounts of the earnings and expenditure of the eastern and western divisions, and, for the purposes of this agreement, the earnings from through traffic shall be apportioned between the eastern and western divisions, according to the usual practice of connecting lines of railway operated by two separate companies ;——

Then it goes on to provide that, in case of a dispute between the government and the railway company in that regard the matter shall be left to arbitration, or, in the event of a board of railway commissioners being appointed, the board of commissioners shall deal with the dispute as between the company and the government. All that is fair and reasonable and would be expected in such a case as this. But the government seem entirely to overlook the very important consideration that the very thing they are protecting themselves against as to the western and eastern divisions of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, may occur as between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. A very important portion of the through-traffic will pass over both the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Grand Trunk Railway, and there will be through-earnings on that traffic to be divided and apportioned between the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Grand Trunk. Now the Grand Trunk, it is quite clear, will control both systems, and it will be quite possible for that company, by taking too large a proportion of the through-earnings to itself in respect of its own railway, so to lessen the earnings upon the Grand Trunk Pacific that they will accomplish the very object that the government in this section 19 have endeavoured to prevent. Therefore I propose by this amendment to provide that wherever there may be a question as to whether the Grand Trunk is taking to itself, for its own railway, a larger proportion of the through-earnings than it ought to take, the government can intervene, and if the parties cannot agree, can ask that the matter shall be referred to arbitration, so that the Grand Trunk Pacific shall get its due share of the earnings, and that in consequence the government will be certain to get its rent. The Minister of Finance the other day seemed to think that the government was sufficiently protected because the Board of Railway Commissioners might intervene. But that is really a mistake ; there can be no question about that. The Board of Railway Commissioners can only intervene to settle questions where two railway companies differ about a division of their through-rates. But there will be no such difference here, there is no possibility of a difference between the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. No one will ever hear of a dispute between these two companies as to the apportionment of the earnings, and unless there is some dispute, the Board of Commissioners cannot intervene. They can, however intervene if it is made part of the bargain between the government and the companies ; while if we are left to the statutory provision that the Board of Railway Commissioners can settle disputes between two railway companies as to the apportionment of through-traffic, such a dispute will never arise. Therefore it is that I move this resolution, which I will not take up further time in discussing, because the proposition seems to be perfectly plain. The government have shown by their own agreement that they contemplate the possibility of an unfair division between the eastern and the western sections; that unfair division could only take place for the purpose of avoiding the payment of rent, and having provided against such an emergency, the government is bound to go further and prevent the same trouble arising from an unfair division between the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

Amendment (Mr. Barker) negatived on the same division as yesterday.

Mr. CHARLTON. I question the propriety of declaring this lost on the same division as yesterday. Some members are here to-day who were not here yesterday and others were here yesterday that are not here to-day, and I think it would be better merely to declare it lost on division.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understood yesterday that our arrangement was to have the same division recorded on the other amendments.

The PRIME MINISTER. I did not understand that we should have absolutely the same division recorded. At all events, there can be no difficulty, for if five gentlemen wish for a division they can have it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know that it makes any difference.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was not in the House yesterday, and he was recorded as paired.

Mr. CHARLTON. I was not speaking exclusively in my own interest but merely as a question of policy.

Mr. BARKER. I would prefer that a vote should be taken than that it should be declared lost on division, because I would like to know how hon. gentlemen are going to vote on this amendment.

Mr. CHARLTON. Let it go on yesterday's division, I have no objection.

Mr. SPEAKER. Call in the members.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Lost.

Mr. SPEAKER. Lost on the same division as last recorded yesterday.

Mr. HENDERSON. Even at this late hour of the debate, I do not consider that an ex-

cuse is necessary for offering another amendment to this Bill. When we consider the very large sum of money that is involved in this Bill I do not think it is necessary to offer any apology for the amendment which I propose to place in your hands. Never during the history of Canada has any question of so far reaching importance been brought before the attention of this parliament, not even the Canadian Pacific Railway, as the question now under consideration in this Bill. Consequently the greatest care should be exercised by the government in dealing with the moneys to be expended on this undertaking, and every safeguard should be adopted to secure the proper and legal expenditure of every dollar of the money.

Let us look for one moment at the authority on which the money is to be expended. When work is done or a service performed it has to receive the approval of the commissioners appointed under this Act. Then, on the approval of the commissioners, certified by the chairman of the board, the Minister of Railways and Canals recommends to the hon. Minister of Finance that payments be made and payments are consequently made from time to time on the recommendation of that minister. First parliament appropriates the money by a vote, then the commissioners approve of the work and of the services performed, the Minister of Railways and Canals recommends to the hon. Minister of Finance payment and payment is made accordingly, but it is made without any audit of these accounts by any officer of this parliament until after these moneys have all been expended. The commissioners, we understand, will be appointees of the government. The Minister of Railways and Canals is a member of the government and so also is the hon. Minister of Finance. But who is to guard the rights of the people of this country? Who will represent the people in this vast expenditure of the $100,000,000 or $150,000,000? Even if the cost of the railway does not exceed $125,000,000, if the work is continued over five years it will result in the expenditure of $25,000,000 per annum. And yet this work under the Bill is to go on from day to day without any audit of it, such as is necessary for the protection of the people, being made. I am aware that under section 31 of the Act it is proposed that an examination and audit shall take place, but, I desire to remind the House that this examination and audit does not take place until after the money has been paid and consequently will prove to be of very little value or importance indeed. It would be better that the ordinary course be pursued and that all the safeguards that are exercised over our ordinary expenditure should be exercised in this case, where such a vast amount of money is to be paid out. Therefore with a view to making it imperative on the government that such an audit should take place I propose to move an amendment to section 22 of the Act and I trust that the House will accept it. I may say for the information of the House that section 22 as I have already stated provides:

> The Minister of Finance and Receiver General may, on the recommendation of the Minister of Railways and Canals, from time to time pay such claims and accounts for work done or services performed in the construction of the said eastern division as have been approved and certified by the chairman of the commissioners: Provided, however, that no money shall be so paid until a sufficient appropriation has been made by parliament for the purpose.

I now beg to move, seconded by Mr. Wilson:

> That section 22 of the Bill be amended by adding thereto the words 'and that the making of such payments shall be subject to the provisions, regulations and requirements of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act.'

Amendment (Mr. Henderson) lost on the same division as recorded yesterday.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). I suppose it is scarcely necessary at this stage of the question to repeat all the arguments that might be advanced against the Grand Trunk Pacific project and I shall not even attempt to repeat the majority of them. There is, however, one feature in the Bill which is of great importance to the people and parliament of Canada and particularly to the people of eastern Canada, that is, that it should be so carried out as to realize for that part of Canada all the benefits which I understand, the right hon. the leader of the government and his colleagues anticipate from its completion and operation. In order that that may be accomplished it is necessary, in the opinion of some persons who are not quite so sanguine in their hopes in respect to this matter as some others are, that the parties who are entering into the contract with the government to build and operate this road should be so bound and held that they would faithfully operate it and thereby realize all the advantages that in the course of time may be expected to result from its operation. It has been shown very clearly in the course of the discussion that the real party of the second part is the Grand Trunk Railway and it has been just as clearly brought out that the Grand Trunk Railway is not a contracting party in the ordinary sense of the word. Nor is it our opinion that they are held and bound to the fulfillment of all the agreements in the contract, or under any penalty whatever if they fail to execute these contracts. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company has undertaken to secure certain action on the part of the Grand Trunk Railway Company but it would apparently be better if the Grand Trunk Railway Company itself were held and bound by the contract. In the opinion of hon. members upon this side of the House the contract is secured by a very slender provision

so far as the Grand Trunk Railway Company is concerned. It is admitted that the financing of the new corporation is to be largely the work of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, still it is held that there is not sufficient strength in the contract so far as the Grand Trunk Railway Company is concerned to ensure that that company may not at some time refuse to carry out its part of the contract and that the penalty which may be exacted under the terms of the contract would not be of sufficient strength or weight to prevent that company from forfeiting, from violating its agreement and refusing to carry out what they had undertaken. Therefore, with a view to improving the condition of affairs in that regard I am about to offer an amendment to the House and to ask the government to adopt it, or at least to endeavour to secure the assent of the House to the proposition that there should be some further security than that which is contemplated in the agreement as we understand it. The only security which the government have is a claim upon $5,000,000 worth of rolling stock, a property which in the course of time must depreciate very rapidly so that its value will diminish to a point far below $5,000,000. It is quite easy to realize and to understand that the moment may come, and may come perhaps in the not very far distant future, when the Grand Trunk Railway Company, which is really the contracting party, would consider it a good business operation to forfeit and abandon that property which is held as security for the fulfilment of this agreement. We believe that the government of the country should have some further hold upon the contracting company in order to secure that the operation of this road be continued, and that it be not thrown back to us, as it may be, in a depreciated condition. Therefore, with the view of trying to improve the security held by the country, and to furnish a much stronger guarantee that this road should be operated, and that whatever good results from its operation by the Grand Trunk Pacific as represented therein by the Grand Trunk Company, shall be more fully and more thoroughly ensured to the people of this country; I move, seconded by Mr. Kemp, the following, as an additional clause to the Bill.

The railway and the property and equipment of the said western division, and the equipment of the eastern division shall be charged, subject only to the mortgage obligations in the said agreement mentioned, with the payment of all rents that may become payable to the government under the said lease of the eastern division to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and with the payment of all claims of the government against the said company under any and every covenant or obligation or condition of the said lease and agreement, and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company shall enter into and make all proper and sufficient mortgages, agreements and covenants with the government for that purpose.

400½

I do not think it is necessary to occupy the time of the House at greater length just now. I think I have made it perfectly clear that the purpose of this amendment is to endeavour to improve the security held by the government and by the country.

Amendment (Mr. Bell) negatived on the same division.

Mr. MORIN moved:

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be recommitted to the Committee of the Whole House, with power to amend section 8 by adding the following thereto:—

Provided that the said railway in its course through the province of Quebec, shall run from the Quebec bridge on the St. Lawrence river, in a south-easterly direction, through the counties of Lévis and Dorchester, following the course of the Etchemin river up towards Etchemin lake, and thence easterly through the province of Quebec towards the city of Moncton.

Amendment negatived on the same division.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Before fore you put the motion, Mr. Speaker, I desire to draw attention to the fact that on the second reading of this Bill, I raised a point of order as to the irregularity of the course pursued by the government in introducing the Bill. I drew attention to the fact that the Bill had reached its second reading, and although it was a Bill which involved a charge on the revenue of the country, it was not introduced by resolution, as it should be, nor had the announcement been made in the House that the consent of the Crown had been given to the Bill before its introduction. You then intimated, Mr. Speaker, that you would give your decision later on. In the meantime I presume that you have had an opportunity to consider the question, and I would like to have your ruling on it now.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have prepared my opinion on the question whch was raised by the hon. gentleman, not on the second reading, but on the first reading. That, however, does not make a great deal of difference. This is my opinion:

A point of order has been raised as to the propriety of proceeding with Bill (No. 235) 'An Act to provide for the construction of a National Transcontinental Railway,' because that measure has not been previously considered in a Committee of the Whole, and has not been recommended by the Crown. That question is a very important one, as I had occasion to state when it was raised on motion for leave.

The rules which govern the case are Rules 86 and 88. Rule No. 86 reads as follows:

By the 54th section of the Imperial Act, 30 Vic., c. 3, 'The British North America Act, 1867,' it is provided that the House shall not adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address or Bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any tax or impost, to any purpose that has not been first recommended by

a message of the Governor General in the session in which such vote, resolution, address or Bill is proposed.

Rule No. 88 is couched in about the same wording. It requires that no motion can be made in the House for any public aid or charge upon the people unless it be considered in the Committee of the Whole House. I need not refer to the importance of the principle embodied in Rule 86. It gives, as we see, the initiation of money votes to the Crown, and was adopted in Canada as a necessary remedy against the numerous and glaring proposals made by private members to make grants of public money, as Mr. Gladstone once said in parliament (vol. 182 'Hansard,' p. 598).

The principle of Rule 88 is perhaps of not as great importance. In fact, in England to-day they are in the habit of introducing Bills where appropriations of public money are provided for, with the reserve, however, that the clauses which give the public aid or charge upon the people are inserted in italics, and considered as blanks until the House has considered those clauses in committee on a separate resolution. They have a standing order to that effect. Those clauses, however, are so well considered as being part of the Bill, that if they are adopted in committee the Bill is not reported with amendments.

It was decided in England by the Rt. Hon. Mr. Peel, in 1894 :

Provisions imposing charges in a Bill involving charges on the revenue are printed in italics and technically form no part of the Bill, but the discussion thereon is not irregular. The chairman in committee would not put any question on those clauses unless the charges to be imposed by them were previously sanctioned in a money committee, and the motion setting up that committee could not be put unless a minister of the Crown signified the Queen's recommendation to such charges being incurred. As the government were not prepared to sign this recommendation, the debate therefore is of the nature of an academical discussion, as no effect can be given to it, but the debate is not irregular.

In this country we have been following the same procedure. Bourinot says, at page 597 :

It often happens that Bills are introduced with certain clauses providing for salaries or other charges on the public revenue, and in that case the Bill may be introduced directly on motion, while the clauses in question (which should be distinguished by italics or brackets) are considered in the shape of resolutions in committee, and when agreed to, referred to the committee on the Bill.

When the motion for leave was made the other day, I suggested that the debate be adjourned. The House, however, went on to consider the motion for leave, and it was adopted, and the Bill stood over for the second reading on the next day. Since that time a resolution has been put on the Order Paper, having for its object the approval of the contract mentioned in the said Bill, and, for the purpose of authorizing the government to do whatever is necessary to give full effect to the said Bill. Moreover, the House has been informed of the fact, that the Crown has recommended the said resolution to the House. It has since been adopted and referred to the Committee on the Bill. If at one time the question could have been raised, whether this Bill was properly introduced I do not think that at the present stage of the proceedings it would be a proper question to discuss. We are now aware that the recommendations of the Crown have been given to the money clauses of the Bill, and that they have been considered in Committee. It is perhaps an opportune time to call the attention of the House to a very serious difference which exists between our rules, and those governing the English House of Commons with respect to grants of public money Bills.

Before 1866, the rules 396, 397 and 398 of the parliament of Great Britain and Ireland provided : That the House could not proceed upon any motion for granting money, or, for any public aid or charge upon the people, unless upon the recommendation of the Crown, and in Committee of the Whole.

It was found, however, that those rules had not the effect desired, and that members were in the habit of having Bills passed contemplating demands upon the public purse, and containing a clause which provided that the necessary expenses should be defrayed out of money hereafter to be voted by parliament. In 1866 it was decided to amend those rules, and to declare that the restriction would apply not only to actual aids and grants, but also to grants and charges payable out of moneys to be provided by parliament.

The debate on that question is very interesting, and will be found in vol. 182, pp. 591, and following. These English rules are now to be found in Standing Orders 57, 58 and 62, as printed in 1901.

In the Bill under consideration, it is provided in clause 22, that no money will be paid until a sufficient appropriation has been made by parliament for the purpose.

Applying to this case the English precedent, as it was before the amendment of 1866, I have come to the conclusion that there was in that respect no violation of our rules 86 and 88.

As to the western section of the road, the government pledges public credit by guaranteeing the bonds of the company. Could that part of the Bill have been introduced without a previous recommendation of the Crown, and without the consideration of the matters in Committee ?

I find in Blackmore (p. 26), a decision on that point which is to this effect :

A Bill which pledges the public credit for any loan to be raised may be introduced without the preliminary committee, for the introduction of money Bills under the standing orders provided,

that the clauses referring to the raising of the money area guarded by being passed through preliminary committee of the whole House.

The Committee, having adopted a resolution, as required by that decision, and the recommendation of the Crown having been announced, I am of opinion, that the House may proceed to debate, and to adjust the motion for the third reading of the Bill.

We have a precedent in this House in the procedure adopted with regard to the contract with Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. On the 8th of February, 1898, that contract was laid before the House. At the same time a motion for leave to introduce the Bill confirming the said contract was granted, and before the second reading of the Bill, the House passed a resolution, on the recommendation of His Excellency, providing for the construction of the railway mentioned in the contract. The resolution was reported and referred to the Committee of the Whole, on the Bill.

Journals House of Commons, pp. 25, 37 and 88.

Motion agreed to; and Bill read the third time, and passed, on the previous division reversed.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 237) to further amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898, read the second time, and House went into Committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What change in the law is effected by this?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The explanation of this Bill is very simple. A Bill passed the House and the Senate this session amending the Steamboat Inspection Act. By an inadvertance an omission was made from it. A petition had been presented on behalf of people owning or running boats on the Yukon river, and some other rivers in the west, asking permission to use coal oil as fuel. I was under the impression that it could be allowed; but after looking through the law and studying the precedents, I came to the conclusion that such permission could not be granted legally. Coal oil as fuel has come into very general use, and the officers of my department report that when it is properly stored and guarded it is perfectly safe.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the hon. gentleman be kind enough to say what subsection 1 of section 27 really does enact?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The portion of subsection 1 of section 27, to which this refers, reads as follows:

No coal oil lamp shall be used between decks on any passenger steamboat in which any inflammable material is carried; nor shall any coal oil which will not bear a test of 300 degrees Fahrenheit without taking fire be used on any passenger steamboat.

It is proposed to add at the end of this section:

Provided, however, that in any case where oil is used as fuel for the production of motive power on steamboats, oil which will bear a test of two hundred degrees Fahrenheit without taking fire may be accepted if properly stored with safe and suitable provisions as to safety and to guard against fire and explosion from such oil to the satisfaction of the steamboat inspector.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). You are changing the test from 300 degrees to 200 degrees?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES: Only when it is used as fuel for motive power.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does not the danger which was previously guarded against still exist?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Section 27, as regards the oil to be used for lighting purposes, is left the same. This deals with cases where the oil is used as fuel for the production of motive power. It provides that oil which will bear a test of 200 degrees Fahrenheit may be accepted if properly stored to the satisfaction of the steamboat inspector. Besides, I know as a fact that the insurance companies will not permit the use of the oil for motive power except under special rules and regulations.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Unless the conditions to which the hon. gentleman refers are statutory, we cannot rely on their being enforced or made effective. I understand that the hon. gentleman depends to a great extent on the conditions imposed by insurance companies, but I would not consider that a good principle in legislation. Some of these steamers may not be insured, and if you were to have an accident and loss of life resulting from the absence of safeguards, that would be a very unfortunate condition of affairs.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have referred to the insurance companies' conditions only as an additional safeguard. My hon. friend will see that there is provision at the end of this Bill for the taking of proper precautions. The oil must be properly stored, with safe and suitable provisions as to safety and to guard against fire and explosion, to the satisfaction of the steamboat inspector. The test is the same as in the United States, and it is considered perfectly safe, under certain conditions, to use that oil for fuel for motive purpose. The boats on the transportation companies between San Fran-

cisco and Dawson are using that oil at present, under the laws and regulations of the United States, and considered perfectly safe. The officers of my department report that under the conditions imposed by this Bill, there will be no danger.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SWING BRIDGES AND FERRIES.

House went into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient, in the interests of navigation, that the Act respecting certain works constructed in or over navigable waters be amended so as to better control the working of swing bridges and ferries worked by cable, rod, chain or other device.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine). This resolution has been brought before the House on the recommendation of several members of the North-west. Since a few years there has been increased communication between points on the shores of lakes and rivers in the west, and a great many ferries are operated, which are run by cable. Under the existing laws, we cannot make any regulation for the protection of life and property, and frequent accidents have happened and lives have been lost owing to these ferries not being properly managed. It was suggested that the Marine and Fisheries Department should make the necessary regulations. The same remarks apply to draw bridges which are not regulated.

Mr. SPROULE. If the Bill which is to follow does not give more information than we have in the resolution, we will not have much to go by.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The point made by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is that the resolution seems to be of a very vague and indefinite character. It simply informs the House that 'the Act respecting certain works constructed in or over navigable waters should be amended so as to better control the working of swing bridges and ferries worked by cable, rod, chain or other device.' I do not see any great object in proceeding by resolution, when the resolution is of so vague a character. Of course, Bills of this character should be proceeded by resolution, but I should hardly think that a resolution of this kind would fulfil the condition made necessary by the rules of the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) will allow me I can give him a general idea of the Bill. I did not frame the resolution myself, and I know that it does not cover all that the Bill is intended to cover. For instance the Bill explains that :

No person shall lay, stretch or maintain any ferry cable, or any rod, chain or other device for working a ferry across, over or under any navigable water in Canada, without a license from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries ; and the said minister may make rules for regulating the applications for such licenses, and may fix the fees (not exceeding the sum of five dollars each to be paid therefor) and any ferry cable, rod, chain or other device for working the ferry laid, stretched or maintained without a license may be removed and destroyed under authority from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries ; and any person laying, stretching, or maintaining a ferry cable, rod, chain or other device for working a ferry without a license shall be liable on summary conviction to a penalty not exceeding one hundred dollars or to imprisonment not exceeding thirty days, and, in addition thereto shall pay the cost of removing or destroying such cable, rod, chain or other device.

2. The Governor in Council may, for the purpose of this Act, make regulations to govern the use of ferry cables and to regulate the maintenance, use, opening and closing of swing or draw bridges, other than railway bridges, upon any navigable water in Canada, and for the maintenance of lights and other precautions of safety in connection with ferry cable and bridges, and may impose a penalty, to be recoverable on summary conviction, not exceeding in any case fifty dollars and costs, or imprisonment not exceeding ten days, for the breach of such regulation, and, in case of continuing the breach, a further penalty not exceeding ten dollars and costs for every twenty-four hours during which such breach continues, or imprisonment not exceeding twenty days ; and in the case of ferry cable license the Minister of Marine and Fisheries may cancel the license upon any conviction for breach of the regulations. Every such regulation shall be published in the 'Canada Gazette.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I must compliment the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Prefontaine) on the speed with which he got through that. The result of it all does not seem to be very much information, but I suppose we shall be able to read it in 'Hansard' to-morrow, and so we shall be able to get an idea of what the hon. gentleman was imparting to us. I think the hon. gentleman made a record in his reading.

Mr. COCHRANE. We generally have a resolution to explain a Bill, but the hon. minister read a Bill to explain a resolution.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is this law going to be retroactive ? Will it apply to ferries already established ? Because, in my section, from Howe island to the township of Pittsburgh, we have two cable ferries that the farmers have established there for their own convenience and that have been running for years. If the Bill is to be made retroactive it will apply to these.

Mr. SPROULE. It will apply to all.

Mr. TAYLOR. It may be intended to apply only to new ferries. Then, on the Rideau river we have a number of swing bridges that are not railway bridges. Why should

the Department of Marine and Fisheries take charge of the bridges across the Rideau ? And why should the Department of Marine and Fisheries interfere with these ferries? As I understand it the Department of Public Works gave permission to have them placed there, and now the Department of Marine and Fisheries interferes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There might be some good reason in support of the suggestion by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) with regard to bridges on the Rideau canal. My attention was not drawn to that point. It may be that when we come to consider the Bill in committee it will be found advisable to except these as well as the railway bridges.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time, and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 260) to amend the Act respecting certain works constructed in or over navigable waters.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PILOTAGE ACT AMENDMENT.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that in the interests of the navigation of the River St. Lawrence, between Montreal and Quebec, and the River Saguenay below Quebec, to amend the Pilotage Act, and the Acts relating to the Montreal Harbour Commissioners, and the Quebec Harbour Commissioners, so as to place the pilotage of these districts under the control of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.—The Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. R. Préfontaine). I suppose that the hon. gentlemen on the other side will not complain of the form of this resolution, because it comprises nearly every word of the proposed Bill. I do not wish to detain the House very long in discussing the question, as the subject is pretty well understood by hon. members of this House. There have been very serious complaints about the pilotage on the St. Lawrence, but, up to the present moment it has been impossible to get the consent of the harbour commissioners of Quebec and the corporation of pilots of Quebec to put the Quebec pilots under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. But the pilots on the St. Lawrence between Quebec and Montreal have asked that the Act concerning pilotage should be amended and that they should be put under the control of the department. The harbour commissioners of Montreal have had control up to the present time, and they also have recommended that this matter be transferred to the department. The conference of the transportation companies and the shipping interests have asked that this Pilotage Act should be amended, not only as regards the St. Lawrence, but generally. But, on account of the fact that I could not come to an agreement with the shipping interests in Quebec proper, the Bill is made to cover only the pilotage system between Montreal and Quebec and on the River Saguenay.

Mr. SPROULE. Why apply to one part of the country only ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We have not been able to get the shipping interests in Quebec proper to consent to it. And the harbour commissioners of Quebec and the corporations of pilots themselves do not want it at present. After many consultations with them, I came to the conclusion that we would try the plan of bringing under the control of the department the pilots of the port of Montreal as well as those of the Saguenay river. We will see if it works any better. If it is found to be an improvement, probably these gentlemen in Quebec will consent to an extension of the system. The Bill covers the upper Saguenay. The reasons are these : There have been serious accidents in the Saguenay river, due to the incompetence and ignorance of some of the pilots. The pilots could not agree with the harbour commissioners of Quebec as regards the pilotage of the Saguenay. The harbour commissioners allowed all pilots to pilot vessels in the Saguenay river, instead of appointing only those who were well acquainted with the river. This resolution is introduced on the recommendation of the shipping interests and the boards of trade of Montreal, who think it would be in the public interest to have the Saguenay river put under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, which, while keeping control of the pilots in the district of Quebec, will require from them such examination as will afford the necessary guarantee of efficiency to the shipping interests.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What body has control at Quebec and Montreal, and between the two cities, at the present time ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The harbour commissioners of Montreal control the pilotage between that city and Quebec, and the harbour commissioners of Quebec control the pilotage of that city and down the gulf to Bic.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does this Bill remove the pilots between Quebec and Montreal from the jurisdiction of the Montreal harbour commissioners ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is proposed to remove the pilotage authority from the harbour commissioners of Montreal to the Department of Marine and Fisheries as concerns the river between Montreal and Quebec.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does that comprise the pilots at Montreal as well ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The resolution does not make that very clear. What you mean by the resolution is this, that the pilots above Quebec and up to Montreal are placed under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And the pilots at Quebec and below as far as Bic are to remain under the control of the Quebec harbour commissioners ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will there not be something of an anomaly in the government exercising control over the pilots on part of the river and not over these on another part of the river ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The principle is the same. At the present time pilots from Montreal to Quebec are under the control of the Montreal harbour commissioners, and the pilots from Quebec to the gulf are under the control of the Quebec harbour commissioners. It is now proposed to change that system, and to take the control over those in the Montreal district from the Montreal harbour commissioners and vest it in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. This is done with the unanimous consent of the pilots themselves, who are not incorporated between Montreal and Quebec. But between Quebec and the gulf they are incorporated, and that is why they persist in making their own regulations. From Montreal to Quebec they are not incorporated, and are administered by the harbour commissioners of Montreal, and it is desirable to make some further regulations governing those pilots. The harbour commissioners of Montreal are quite willing that this control should pass to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, the pilots themselves are unanimously willing, and the boards of trade and the shipping interests have been asking for this amendment for years. The Act will go into effect on the 1st of January next, after regulations have been prepared and submitted to the different bodies interested, so that the interests of every one will be fully protected.

Mr. GALLERY. What is the reason that the pilots between Montreal and Quebec are not incorporated ? What is the difference between those below Quebec and those above ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Those between Montreal and Quebec asked two years ago to be incorporated, and presented a Bill for that purpose. It was opposed by the boards of trade and those interested in navigation, and the Bill was killed in the Senate. That is the reason why they are not a corporation.

Mr. SPROULE. But if there is any need of putting the control of the pilots under the Department of Marine and Fisheries for one portion of the river, the same argument will apply to all.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman may be right in theory, but we do not want to put any compulsion upon the pilots at and below Quebec, who are now making a strong opposition to coming under the control of the department, and the shipping interest in Quebec are supporting them. So we have concluded to take only those of the Montreal district under our own control, and to make such regulations as will be satisfactory to the public and to the pilots themselves. If these work satisfactorily, as we expect they will, we will then be justified in saying to the pilots of the Quebec district, whether you are willing or not, you must come under the control of another authority. But for the present we are not ready to do that.

At six o'clock, Committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. GALLERY. I would like to get some information from the hon. minister in reference to this Bill. It appears to me that it is just as important that the pilots between Montreal and Quebec should be incorporated as it is that those from Quebec to the coast should be incorporated. I would like to know why it was that the pilots between Quebec and Montreal were not incorporated. They made an application for incorporation some time ago.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Two or three years ago when a demand for incorporation was made on the part of the pilots between Montreal and Quebec it was opposed by all the shipping interests, by the Board of Trade of Montreal, by the Corn Exchange and by everybody connected with shipping. The reasons given for that opposition were discussed by the Senate, before whom the matter was brought up, and they came to the conclusion that these pilots should not be granted incorporation, that they should remain as they were, under the control of the harbour commissioners of Montreal.

Mr. GALLERY. Do I understand from the hon. minister that the pilots between Quebec and Montreal are a different body altogether from the other pilots ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, yes.

Mr. GALLERY. What is the difference ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The difference is that the pilots from Quebec to the gulf formed an incorporation many years ago and that incorporation has continued in existence. The harbour commissioners of Quebec and the Quebec Board of Trade, seem to be inclined to keep the corporation alive and not to allow it to be under the control of the government, through the Marine and Fisheries Department. The sentiment in Montreal is quite the contrary. Everybody admits that the pilots between Montreal and Quebec should be under the control of the Marine and Fisheries Department, and they have asked that this should be the case, and the pilots themselves have unanimously concurred in that demand.

Mr. GALLERY. So far as I can gather from what the hon. minister says, the pilots between Quebec and Montreal are not as good as those between Quebec and the gulf.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Nobody says that.

Mr. GALLERY. Is it not as important to have the pilots between Montreal and Quebec incorporated as to have the other pilots incorporated ; that is the point I wish to get at. It seems to me that this is a very important matter, and that the members of this House should consider it well and should not deal with it in a hurry. The success of the whole transportation system of Canada rests on this question of pilotage, and if we are now going to change any part of the system we should change the whole system and not deal with only a part of it. Since six o'clock I have been speaking to a couple of the harbour commissioners of Montreal, and as far as I can see they would very much like to have the matter deferred for a day or two.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The harbour commissioners of Montreal have unanimously passed a resolution in favour of government control of these pilots. The board of trade and the shipping interests have also expressed themselves in favour of it, so I do not see where the difficulty comes in. The harbour commissioners of Montreal desire to get rid of the control of the pilotage between Quebec and Montreal, and under the circumstances I do not see where any objection can be raised.

Mr. TALBOT. The difference between the pilots on the river between Quebec and Montreal and those from Quebec down to Bic Station is easily explained. It was only a couple of years ago that the pilots of Montreal moved for incorporation ; their system is entirely different from that of the other pilots and is almost voluntary, giving the shipping companies the privilege of choosing whom they liked out of the number of pilots. There are about seventy-five pilots between Montreal and Quebec and the best authorities say that about twenty-five or thirty could do the work. As to the pilots between Quebec and Bic, I may say that they form a body which has existed over one hundred years, and as a corporation for forty-three years. I think it is generally agreed that we should move slowly in this matter, that we should experiment first and find out if the new plan works well between Quebec and Montreal before we go any further with it. I want to read you a few extracts which I hold in my hand as to the history of the pilots of Quebec :

The branch pilots for the lower St. Lawrence, the sea pilots, were incorporated in 1860. At that time, the pilotage authority was the Trinity House. Later in 1875 this was replaced by the harbour commission. (Vide chapter 82.) Our corporation has been in existence for over 43 years, so that it has had a long experience in pilotage matters as well as in all that concerns the management of the pilots under its control and direction. It is perfectly well posted as to the services of the different pilotage stations such as Bic and Father Point, as well as what is necessary in handling the ocean steamships, and the vessels called colliers. Besides this, our corporation has a considerable advantage, by its constant communications with the captains of the pilot-boats who are themselves branch pilots always cruising day and night to Bic and other stations. In brief, its duty is to see that the service is as effective as possible. This year the number of pilots on official list is 114, but the effective number is, in reality, 106.

I may say, Mr. Chairman, that at the time of incorporation the number of pilots was between 240 and 250, and in order to explain this diminution, I may say that it is now admitted that probably seventy-five or eighty pilots could do all the work between Quebec and Bic, owing to the change which has taken place in the system of navigation, owing to the introduction of steamships. At one time all of the vessels were sailing ships which moved very slowly, but with the more rapidly moving steamships the same pilot can do five times as much work as he then could.

The pilot office is open the year round. During the season of navigation, that is to say, from April 10th to December 10th, our office is open day and night. The night watchman is himself a licensed pilot, always ready to give all the information asked for at any time. He has always on hand some pilots ready to board a vessel the moment she arrives in port, be it a sailing ship or a steamer, whether she comes from Montreal, or Three Rivers, or whether she is ready to leave our port for sea.

The ship-owners, their agents, the captains or masters have the right of selecting their pilots in the port of Quebec or at the pilotage stations at Bic or Father Point. Every spring the large companies choose the pilots they wish to have and our board readily accede to their request, reserving the right, however, to command their withdrawal if the general interest

requires it. All this is done in such a way as to help the trade, although the law does not bind us to do so. We have some pilots who have been 40 years in the employ of the same company, and some others during over 30 years. This proves that they have given full and complete satisfaction to the trade.

Most of ocean vessels, colliers or others coming from Montreal arriving at Quebec during the latter part of the day, steam ahead to sea during the night. They hardly slow down the vessel to allow the boat carrying the pilot to come alongside, and you can thus easily see that our pilots are sailing at night most of the time. They must have, during foggy weather, knowledge of the river to pilot their vessels and steer them off the reefs when necessary.

Several of our pilots hold first-class certificates from the captains of the vessels they have often piloted. Several too who hold certificates are sea captains, and others are river captains.

Complaints have been made against pilots, a good deal of noise has been made about the complaints against pilots, either for incompetency, drunkenness, or some other cause. Allow me to call specially your attention to the fact that most of these complaints are made most of the time from unauthorized sources. It is not the companies conversant with the organization of the pilotage service which complain of its efficiency, but some writers badly informed, and I would add who have a predisposition against the pilots. When an accident happens—an accident may happen to the most experienced pilot—it is said it is the pilot's fault, even before they have the necessary information, and before the investigation has decided who is to be responsible for it. Nay, more: even after the investigation, these writers persist in accusing the pilot when the fault has been attributed to the captain or the officers of the vessel.

Even in those cases in which it was said that the accident had happened through a lack of knowledge of the pilots, it has been a common thing to accuse the pilots of imaginary complaints. These irresponsible writings have done more harm to the St. Lawrence route than the so-called incompetency of the navigators.

There has been error of judgment in some cases; but where is the mortal who has never committed an error? One moment of absent-mindness is sufficient to strand a vessel, and during foggy and bad weather, God knows what our troubles are, and to what dangers we are exposed. Those who give us the blame so freely do not know the anxieties we have to experience. I do not fear to state that, with regard to maritime disasters, the St. Lawrence can show a very favourable comparison with any other river.

I ask the House to give attention to this statement:

During the last forty years, our pilots have piloted 86,702 vessels, of which 50,305 were sailing vessels and 33,398 steamers.

We are accused of forming a family compact, and of being an out-of-date institution, whose existence is no longer necessary.

In several instances the pilots have gone through investigations which have been turned against them by those who were trying to ruin them. Every time the pilots have come out safe from those investigations. What better testimony can we give them than that of the companies who employ us? We have from these the most flattering letters addressed to the pilots. Without boasting, we may say that we compare favourably with the pilots in all parts of the world.

In the pilotage waters from Quebec to Bic and vice-versa, you can see by the official reports of the harbour commissioners that accidents have been comparatively few. Some years even, there was no accident for which the pilots had to be blamed. To show you how cautious and severe we are, we do not allow a pilot under the influence of liquor to take charge of a vessel. If this pilot is engaged or retained by a company, its agent or captain, he is fined, and loses the privilege of being employed by a line. I am proud to be able to affirm that the pilots who make use of liquors are very few. Our board, for a certain number of years have been very severe in this respect. Before long we hope to completely kill this vice which is of great danger to the safety of navigation. To destroy this deplorable passion, our corporation has an efficient means which is given by law; it is the loss of the license upon a sworn official declaration by two trustworthy witnesses given before the harbour commission.

When an accident happens to a pilot, he must have a hundred good reasons to win his case, as he may be sure to have all the crew against him to save their officers.

3. Apprentice Pilots—To-day, the apprentice pilots have not the advantage of obtaining reliable information as to certain features of pilotage, notably the soundings. It may be understood that, on board steamers which run at full speed, the soundings are impossible, except in foggy weather. Formerly, when we had the sailing vessels it was easier. Several times the corporation of pilots has asked the government, that the part of section 22 of 12 Vic. chapter 114 which was abrogated by the 36 Vic. chapter 54, be put into force. By the Act 12 Vic. chapter 114, it was said: 'There will be two superintendents of pilotage, who will be licensed pilots of at least ten years practice. And be it enacted that the Trinity House, in order to give to the apprentice pilots the means of studying the north channel, will send at least twice every year its vessel to explore this channel, on which may be admitted, under the supervision of one of the superintendents, all the apprentice pilots.'

The harbour commission which replaced the Trinity House since 1875, has no vessel at its disposal. That is the reason why the pilots insist that a vessel be put to their service. These apprentices, having made all the necessary soundings under the supervision of a licensed pilot, and having kept official notes verified on the charts, will obtain more knowledge than by any other means. Every apprentice who, in future, will have to pass an examination to become a pilot, when his apprenticeship will be finished, will have a perfect knowledge, not only of the compass by points and degrees, but also of variation, deviation and sheering, to be made to give the true or astronomical course and vice versa. To get a thorough knowledge of the River St. Lawrence either of the south channel which is mostly in constant use, or the north channel, and the going in or going out of the Saguenay, we must necessarily give to these apprentices the opportunities to become competent pilots. It is no use thinking now to make soundings when a steamer runs 10 or 12 miles an hour. On board, they even count the minutes a vessel may lose. That is why we ask that a vessel be put at the disposal of the apprentices in order that they may learn what cannot be

taught to them otherwise. This would cost very little to the government and would make the navigation of our river safer. These apprentices could then make the necessary soundings, under the direction of a licensed pilot. The pliot board should be authorized to examine at least once a year, during the summer all the apprentices. This would give us the opportunity of seeing the progress made by them in the study of their future profession. Special notes would be kept in a particular book to that effect. I cannot repeat too often that the profession is open to every one. It is, therefore, unfair to say, as is said in some quarters, that the profession is limited to certain persons only. We have actually on our board, a pilot who has been several years president of our corporation, and whose father was never a pilot. Some say: it is only the pilot's sons who can enter the profession. Does it not happen often that a young man becomes a lawyer, or a doctor because his father belonged to the profession. He undergoes the influence where he lives. It is the same thing with the pilot's sons ; from their tender youth they hear navigation talked of ; they have small boats, which they command with their comrades and, little by little, the taste developes for navigation, and they become pilots. Where is the evil in that ?

According to the new law the apprentices are admitted to be indentured with the corporation of pilots only after permission is obtained from the pilotage authority as to the number. These apprentices are presented to the pilot board, according to their seniority, by licensed pilots, after the manner which has now been made law. They are afterwards presented by the board of directors to the pilotage authority who has a right to accept or refuse them. These apprentices are then seemingly under the government control, because all the by-laws, even those of the pilots before coming into force, have to be published in both languages in the newspapers, and receive the sanction of the pilotage authority established by the government.

The tariff.—The pilotage tariff goes as far back as 1803. It has 100 years of existence. It is only in 1882 that we succeeded in getting its lightly modified. We were then granted an increase of 7½ per cent ; the harbour commission have unanimously and according to law, recommended 5 per cent. Besides we had from the Hon. Mr. McLelan, the then Minister of Marine, the promise that in the following year our tariff would be based on the tonnage, in all the Dominion. This manner is undoubtedly the most rational. Several of the ministers who have preceded you at the head of the ministry, have admitted the principle, but that is all that has been done ; it has been a dead letter.

You will admit that the conditions of life have singularly changed. Every thing costs dearer, and we are still with an old tariff 100 years old, slightly changed in 1882. But the lawyer's and the notary's, and the salaries of the judges, have been changed on the ground that the cost of life has much increased. We are mortals like all these men, and we suffer from the increase in the cost of living as they do. Would it not be just to remodel our tariff ?

It is a fundamental principle that an employee has a right to such remuneration, in proportion to the responsibility he assumes. Does a lawyer entrusted with a $100,000 case charge the same fee as for a 100 case ? Evidently not. Well, why not apply this rule to us. If it is just for some, it ought to be just for others.

Allow me to call your attention to the fact that we have lost, partially at least, what was granted to us in 1882, by the exemption of colliers from pilotage (vide R.S.C., chapter 80, section 59, (C) and by 2 Ed. VII., chapter 27). Some of these colliers take pilots, but some take pilots only when the captains fear that they could not easily pilot the vessels themselves or believe that they would save time by taking a licensed pilot. We have already verified the incompetency of these unqualified mariners, especially when crossing another ship in the river in different places. Our pilots know what to do being constantly exposed to these crossings, they know how to give the necessary space, because they are certain of the depth of the water they have on either side of the river. There is loss of time for both parties and those inexperienced pilots put our pilots in difficult positions.

The pilot, to have a right to take charge of any vessel, must be a branch pilot. That is to say, he must have served an apprenticeship of seven consecutive years, made eight trips over the Atlantic, have passed an examination as to the river, and as to his sight, hearing, &c. When an accident happens to him, his branch is taken from him for a longer or shorter period, if not for life. As to those colliers, said to be exempted from pilotage, any one can take charge of them without having passed an examination, or having proved that he had a sufficient knowledge of the river, and yet he has no responsibility, as there is no law governing such a case. We keep licensed pilots at the pilotage stations on the pilot boats ready to take charge of these vehsels. We believe it would be better to repeal that law. After all, the pilots have never refused service, so conscious are they of the responsibility of their position.

The whole is respectfully submitted.

(Sgd.) L. E. MORIN,

President of the corporation of pilots for and below the harbour of Quebec.

I may add that some 35 or 40 years ago, when we had only wooden sailing vessels, the pilots were paid so much per foot draught. In those days the largest sailing vessels carried a cargo of from 1,200 to 1,500 tons. To-day vessels on the St. Lawrence carry from 8,000 to 10,000 tons. Then, wooden vessels sailing down the St. Lawrence might go aground five or six times without any injury, while the vessels of to-day, being constructed of iron or steel, will be smashed by the least shock. Then, the wooden vessels usually had only the wind for their propelling power, while the vessels of to-day are steamers. Therefore, the responsibility of the pilots is to-day much greater than it was formerly.

This paper, in a few words, describes the action of the pilots on the Lower St. Lawrence. No one who has had any knowledge of the navigation of that river from Quebec down will deny that the corporation of pilots is composed of excellent men. They are all men of experience who have had a thorough training as sailors, who know all about the compass and the business of navigation, and who have been over the seas in many parts of the world. There is no doubt

that in the last few years great improvements have been made on the St. Lawrence river, but some things yet remain to be done. It is admitted that there are more pilots now belonging to the corporation of pilots from Quebec down than are able to find employment. As the steamship companies have their choice of pilots, it would be a very good thing if the Department of Marine and Fisheries employed the balance to take constant soundings across and up and down the channel. They would be able to make complete reports from year to year, which would certainly be valuable aids in the navigation of the St. Lawrence, and would tend to diminish the chances of accidents.

Mr. TAYLOR. I fail to see what the argument of my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) has to do with the resolution now before the House. I agree fully with what he says with respect to the great body of the pilots; and some legislation may be necessary at the proper time on their behalf. But the resolution now before the House is to amend the Pilotage Act and the Acts relating to the Montreal Harbour Commissioners and the Quebec Harbour Commissioners. I fully agree with my hon. friend from St. Anne's division, Montreal (Mr. Gallery). The government should move slowly in disturbing existing arrangements on the St. Lawrence. It is very singular that after the House has been in session for nearly seven months, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should have the Order paper covered with four resolutions which he is introducing at this late date, and on which Bills will afterwards be founded. What time is there for the harbour commissioners of Montreal and Quebec and the general shipping interests to protest against this resolution if they do not approve of it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They have all demanded it.

Mr. TAYLOR. We have not seen any evidence of that demand, and we have the hon. member for St. Anns (Mr. Gallery), who represents one of the districts most largely interested, protesting against it. But there is a sting in the closing words of the resolution, 'so as to place the pilotage of these districts under the control of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.' Are we to take this as carrying out in part the pledge which the hon. minister made to his constituents before his election, when he said to them: If you will elect me, I am going to take control of a great portion of the public Works Department? If he made that speech with the sanction of the government, why does not the government come down with a Bill to divide up the Department of Public Works, instead of bringing in resolutions by piece-meal to transfer portions of that department from the Minister of Public Works to the hon. gentleman? We have here a resolution to take this pilotage system and put it under the control of the Marine Department. The hon. minister violated a cabinet secret in making the announcement he did, and afterwards denied that he had made any such declaration, but we find the announcement verified by this resolution. I should think that the words of the hon. member for St. Anns would have some weight with the government, and that the government would hesitate before disturbing the existing regulations. The present system has been in force for years, and I fail to see what necessity there is for changing it. f this is in part accomplishment of the bargain made by the government with the hon. minister before he accepted office, namely, that they would transfer a certain portion of the public works to his department, they should come down with a Bill and do it in the light of day, and not slip in half a dozen little resolutions taking this part and the other away by piece-meal from the Public Works Department and transferring them to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I would advise the government to let this Bill lay over until we hear from the pilots, and the shipping interests, and the harbour commissioners. They are under the Public Works Department now, do they want to come under the control of the Marine Department? These interests connected with navigation should either be in one department or the other, and not be split up piece-meal—a part in Public Works, a part in Marine and Fisheries and a part in Railways and Canals. The government should settle on some well defined plan and place them under the charge of one department, so that the people would know with whom they were dealing.

Mr. GALLERY. The reason I raised an objection was because I think the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal are just as well able to manage their own affairs as are the Harbour Commissioners of the port of Quebec. I fail to see why the pilotage system and the pilots below Quebec should be treated differently from the pilotage system and pilots between Montreal and Quebec. I have been speaking to a couple of Harbour Commissioners since the House took recess at six o'clock, and I find that they are of the same opinion as myself, and would like to have the matter held over for a day or two. I am not at all implying that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine has any object to serve in doing this. I believe that he is simply acting according to the wish of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, but I am not inclined to see the matter in the same light as these gentlemen. In my opinion we would be taking a retrograde course, if we were to take this matter out of their hands and give it to the control of the Marine Department. It would be better that the resolution should be held over a day or two in any case, so as to give us time to think over it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not quite approve of the way in which my hon. friend the Minister of Marine approaches this question. He says that because a certain public body has no objection to transferring to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, the control of the pilotage from Montreal to Quebec, this should be done, and because a certain other public body does not want the pilotage from Quebec down to be interferred with, no change should be made. It seems to me that the real question is what is the most effective way of dealing with the pilotage question. If the most effective way is to put it under the control of the hon. gentleman's department, then let that be done for the entire pilotage from Montreal down to Bic. If it is best to let matters remain under the present control, then make no change. I do not see why this matter should be dealt with upon any consideration other than the consideration of what is best in the public interest. But the only reason which my hon. friend gives for the change is that certain men, who are exercising certain functions in Montreal, are willing that the pilots under their jurisdiction should fall under the control of his department. Is there any sound principle in that for the administration of public affairs ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The principle involved is the same in the two cases. I entirely agree with my hon. friend that the whole of the pilotage should be under the control of the department.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not say that it should be under the control of the department, but that we should come to a conclusion as to what would be the best plan, and when we came to a conclusion apply that to the whole river.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Who is going to judge ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why the government.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. On the advice of whom ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). On whose advice does the government act with regard to public affairs generally ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Public opinion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there one public opinion for the river above Quebec and another below ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is not my conception of public opinion. If my hon. friend means that there are local opinions in each case, each of which differs from the other, I can understand him. But that is not public opinion. Further in matters of administration. I do not agree with the hon. minister or my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) that you are to be guided entirely by public opinion. The government ought to have some opinion of its own. Surely my hon. friend does not propose that, if public opinion this year is favourable to dealing with this question in a certain way, he will deal with it in that way this year, and, if public opinion in that particular district veers around, he will veer with it and deal with the matter in another way next year. I know that public opinion controls the policy of the government in very many cases; it controls it much more than principles do. But I do think, so far as an administrative matter of this kind is concerned, no safe guide is to be found in the mere question of local public opinion in one locality.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But, when we find among those interested a unanimous opinion in favour of a change in the way suggested by this resolution, I think the government is perfectly justified in accepting the suggestion of those who know something about the matter. For instance, the shipping conference of Montreal is composed of men representing the different steamship companies. That conference have represented time and again that the pilotage system between Montreal and Quebec should be under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and that there should be an improvement in the management of this important part of the St. Lawrence transportation system. That has been their opinion, to my knowledge for the last ten or fifteen years. An investigation took place some years ago, the result of which was that the recommendation that the pilotage should be put under the control of the government. It was not done because the government wanted to have the consent, as much as possible, of those who are directly interested. There were the board of harbour commissioners of Montreal and the pilots. The pilots are an important body of men. Most of them have made sacrifices in studying navigation and becoming proficient for the work they are called upon to do. After becoming Minister of Marine and Fisheries I took hold of this question, because I knew something of it before I was in office, having been a member of the board of harbour commissioners of Montreal for four years. I knew the difficulties in connection with this part of the navigation of the St. Lawrence. The board of harbour commissioners came to the conclusion that they would be relieved of part of their duties by handing over the control of pilotage to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and they unanimously passed a resolution in that sense. The pilots themselves discussed the question for quite a long time before coming to a decision, and, finally, they came unanimously to the decision that they should be under the control of the department. The

Board of Trade of Montreal also favours the change. These are all public bodies and must know something of what is in the public interest and in the interest of the navigation of the St. Lawrence, that part of it at least. But we have not succeeded in convincing the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec or those specially interested in navigation in Quebec that they should concur in this Bill. They have a corporation of pilots, and that corporation hold to their privileges and advantages, believing that the severe laws and regulations under which they work are sufficient. They have not consented to come under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Why should we coerce them? Why should we take them by the throat and force them to come under the control of the department when, after all it is a debatable question and a question which, even when it is decided in the sense in which the government have decided it up to this point, will involve some difficulty in working out so as to make sure that it shall be to the general advantage? The Harbour Commissioners of Montreal are convinced, the pilots themselves are convinced, the board of trade and all the shipping interests are convinced that the pilots should be under the control of the department, because then they would know whom to blame in case of an accident or in case incompetent pilots are employed. Under these circumstances, the government have prepared this Bill. Delay is suggested. I do not know how anybody can complain about haste when everybody agrees to this measure and demands it. It is very well for the hon. member for Ste. Anne, Montreal (Mr. Gallery) to voice the after thought of some members of the harbour commissioners in asking for a day or two more. But surely this hon. gentleman is not serious any more than the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) is serious in his remarks. Because, when everybody wants something to be done, and all have agreed that it should be done, I would like to know if the objection is well founded when it comes from outside. Who knows better what is proper for the pilotage between Montreal and Quebec than the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal? Who knows better than the pilots? Who knows better than the representatives of the shipping interest?

Mr. TAYLOR. If they are left to themselves. But the hon. minister stated that he had not been able to convince the harbour interests of Quebec that it would be in the interests of navigation. So, it is evident that the department has been trying to influence public opinion. The framing of public opinion originated with the Department of Marine and Fisheries by the hon. minister's own story.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That would indicate powerful influence on the part of the department. I stated a fact that was well known, and with regard to which I defy contradiction, when I said that for over ten years the shipping interests of Montreal had been asking for what I propose in this Bill. Who are more interested in the safe navigation between Quebec and Montreal than the shipping interest? They are unanimous on the subject. Why should the hon. gentleman say that we had framed public opinion in that sense? We have not framed it. Their opinion of the shipping interest on this question was formed ten years ago and it has never changed. But the pilots themselves were not at first disposed to favour the change. Lately they have convinced themselves that it would be better in their own interests that they should be under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The board of trade have passed a resolution in that sense and so has the harbour commissioners. So, opinion among those interested is unanimous. Outsiders certainly cannot be supposed to know more than those who are especially interested in a satisfactory settlement of this question.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Prefontaine) has not assigned a very high function to my hon. friend from Ste. Anne's division (Mr. Gallery) when he says that everyone is asking for this Bill and demanding it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Every one interested.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is not my hon. friend from Ste. Anne's division a ratepayer of Montreal?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He is not interested in shipping.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is not the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gallery) representative of one of the most important divisions of Montreal? The Minister of Marine and Fisheries practically tells us that the hon. gentleman is not to be considered, because though he stands up and objects to this proposal, the hon. minister says that everybody demands it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Every one interested.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I should have thought that my hon. friend from St. Anne's division, being representative of a very important division of the city of Montreal, might be regarded as being interested, to some slight extent at least. I do not know how many constituents my hon. friend has, I suppose, 35,000 or 40,000, for whom he speaks in this House, and yet he is not interested in this measure, which affects the interest of the city of Montreal to a vital extent. Well, no one is talking about forcing the pilots, or doing them any injustice, either at Montreal or Quebec. The pilots at Montreal and Quebec must be

subject to the law. The passing of an Act regulating the control of these pilots would not necessarily result in any injustice to them. Is it to be supposed that the pilots coming under the control of a department of this government would thereby be subjected to some injustice? Would it disturb their corporate rights in any way? Would they, by being subjected to an Act of that kind, be treated any more harshly than any railway or telephone company, any bank, any company having public officers in its employ, is treated by being made subject to the law, and to regulations devised by the government under the law? This is not to be spoken of as coercion, this is to be spoken of as a regulation in the public interest, such a regulation as will protect the public interest on the one hand, and will also do justice to the officers engaged in the performance of public duties on the other hand.

Mr. TALBOT. I think the point under discussion as to the different position occupied by the Quebec pilots and the Montreal pilots, should be made clear. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) doubted whether the memorandum I read from the pilots' corporation of Quebec was germane to the question. I began my remarks by saying that they were unanimously of the opinion in Quebec, the pilots the harbour commissioners and the shipping interests, that things should remain as they are now, whilst in Montreal they are just as unanimously asking for a change. The pilots of Quebec are differently organized altogether from those at Montreal. In the latter district they have a system of go-as-you-please, each one is independent of the others; whilst in Quebec they are under stringent rules, being bound by their Act of incorporation. Besides that, the Quebec pilots are making strong efforts every year to improve the St. Lawrence river in order to make the navigation more efficient. The change they ask for is contained in that memorandum. All the pilots are interested in preventing accidents as far as possible, because their lives are at stake in the performance of their duties, and the welfare of their wives and children is at stake. When a man takes a steamer and is on duty 12 or 15 hours, he may run into a fog and meet with an accident. Well, you may say, he had no business to run into a fog. But he must suffer the consequences, and in any case he is set aside by the steamship company, whether he was blameable or not. That man is certainly interested in seeing that everything possible is done for the improvement of navigation, he is interested in seeing that every facility is given to the safe navigation of vessels.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Do steamship companies have the selection of their pilots in going out and coming in?

Mr. TALBOT. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are they not obliged to take the first pilot that hails them on coming in?

Mr. TALBOT. No. Each steamship company in Quebec has an agent or a representative, who goes to the pilot corporation and says: We require so many pilots this year, and we want you to give us the names of those whom you think are the best pilots, and we will take our choice. The company keeps these pilots on trial a number of months, perhaps a year. Indeed some of these pilots have been forty years with the same company, who are satisfied with their services and who employ them all the time. When an agent gets a telegram notifying him that a steamer is coming in, he asks the pilot to go down to Father Point and take charge of the vessel. The agent has the choice of the pilot.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I should think that is a very serious state of affairs, because, according to my hon. friend's statement, it appears that the steamship companies have the choice of their own pilots, and if these pilots are not willing to violate the law by running into a fog, or running at an excessive speed, they are put to one side and others are put in their places. That indicates that some better regulations are needed in the district of Quebec.

Mr. TALBOT. It is not the fault of the pilots, because if the pilots were left to themselves they would prefer throwing out the anchor than to move on under dangerous circumstances. But they have got to move in their own interest.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I agree that, under these conditions, it is not the fault of the pilots, but it is the fault of the system, and indicates that some different regulations are required. I do not say that the system which prevails in Halifax is a perfect one, but it is a different one. I have a little familiarity with the system prevailing there. Vessels coming into the harbour of Halifax are obliged to take the first pilot that hails them. But the pilots are under strict regulations. No pilot receives a license unless he is perfectly competent, and they are employed only so long as proper discipline is maintained among them, and every case of wrong-doing is properly punished. We have a pilot commission in Halifax that attends to these matters. Then when a vessel leaves the city the same pilot that brought the vessel in is to be on hand to take her out, and if he is on hand the vessel is obliged to engage the service of that same pilot for the voyage out.

Mr. EMMERSON. Under the system in Halifax, the pilot who does no work, is he not entitled to as much compensation as the pilot who does work?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The pilots are obliged to be on duty; they are obliged to be on hand when vessels are likely to come into port. A vessel is bound to take the pilot that first offers, as I understand the regulations, and that pilot has the option of taking that vessel to sea himself. He is bound to be on hand when she goes out, and if he is not, he is subject to censure and punishment. I think there is some system by which the pilots, although they do not happen to meet a vessel in the first instance, nevertheless receive some consideration for the time they have spent, and for the risk which they have run in going out to the mouth of the harbour in all kinds of weather to pick up vessels that are coming in. I think they also have a provision by which some portion of the common fund is set aside as a superannuation allowance for those pilots who are no longer able to perform their duty. But I think the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) will agree that it is not in the interest of the pilots themselves that any such system as that which he describes should prevail, and it seems to me one of the strongest arguments why some better regulations should be made respecting pilotage affairs in the district of Quebec. Whatever else we may differ about we are all agreed that there should be no such system as will place temptation in the way of pilots to violate the rules which are laid down for the proper guidance of vessels. If a captain of a vessel desires to run the risk of violating the regulations in order to get to sea a little earlier, I say that the pilot should be in a perfectly independent position, and be at liberty to disobey the captain and to say that he will not violate the regulations; he should be able to do that without the slightest fear of penalty. I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will agree with that. If the system to-day be as described by my hon. friend from Bellechasse, it is certainly the best argument in favour of better regulations.

Mr. TALBOT. In answer to the hon. the leader of the opposition I may say that after a pilot starts with a vessel he may anchor the vessel if he wishes whether the captain is willing or not. While the pilot is in charge of the vessel he is the master, but there is this consideration that the captain looks after his own interests; he has so much expense for delays, &c. for which he has to account. The company want him to make time and he is urged to make time and to save expenses so that the pilot is indirectly under that influence. The one body that should see that a vessel comes to anchor in cases of that kind is the insurance company. It is they who suffer the risk and the loss and they should see to this matter. They know all about the situation and know that this occurs for the very reason that the pilots at Quebec always take their steamers at night. The navigation between Montreal and Quebec is carried on during the day time and the steamer arrives at Quebec about dark so that the Quebec pilot has to do his work in the night.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend will see that it is the public who suffer in the end, because as the result of this, accidents occur, insurance rates are put up and the St. Lawrence route is discredited.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time, and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine). Moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 261). respecting the Pilotage District of Montreal and respecting the Pilotage District of Quebec.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

NORTH SYDNEY HARBOUR COMMISSION.

House went into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient, in the interests of the harbour of North Sydney, Nova Scotia, to amend chapter 30 of the statutes of 1879, intituled: 'An Act respecting the Harbour of North Sydney in Nova Scotia,' by striking out the word 'four' in the last line of section 8 of the said Act, and substituting therefor the word 'five'; and by inserting the words 'after deducting five per cent for his remuneration' after the word 'shall' in the fourth line of section 10 of the said Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to explain.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am perfectly willing to give all the information but I really cannot give more than is contained in the resolution. It appears that the harbour commission of North Sydney, Nova Scotia, have more work to do than they used to have and their secretary will not remain in office with a salary of $400. The department has been requested to amend the law so as to give a salary of $500. The second section provides that the collector of customs, who has been collecting harbour dues, will have a commission of five per cent of these dues as remuneration for his services.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any remuneration provided for the commissioners themselves either at Sydney or North Sydney?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think they have any remuneration.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is my hon. friend quite sure of that?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The commissioners have no

remuneration whatever. With that commission of five per cent the collector of customs will probably receive $150 a year.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries considered the question of giving some moderate remuneration to pilotage authorities in cases where the duties which they discharge make very large demands upon their time? I know the question has come up a good many times within the last ten or twelve years in connection with the pilotage authority at Halifax and I believe it was under the consideration of one of the predecessors of my hon. friend, Sir Louis Davies. I do not know whether my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has himself taken the question into consideration.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No requests have been made of me in regard to that, but, I will inquire into it.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time, and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 262) to amend the Act respecting the harbour of North Sydney, Nova Scotia.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SHIPPING CASUALTIES ACT.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that with a view to facilitate investigation into shipping casualties, it is expedient to amend the Shipping Casualties Act, 1901, by inserting the word 'stranded' after the word 'abandoned' in the first line of paragraph (a), and by inserting the word 'stranding' after the word 'abandonment' in the first line of paragraph (d) of section 3 of the said Act; by repealing section 8 of the said Act, and substituting therefor the following section:—

'8. The minister may appoint any officer of the government of Canada, or any judge of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec, or any judge of a county court, or any local judge in Admiralty of the Exchequer Court of Canada, or any stipendiary magistrate, to be a commissioner to hold formal investigations, and a commissioner shall for such purpose be a court.'

By adding the words 'or default' after the word 'misconduct' in the second line of paragraph (b), in the first line of paragraph (c) and in the second line of paragraph (d) of subsection 2 of section 8 of the said Act; and by adding the words 'provided, however, that no formal investigation of any case shall be held until it has been ordered by the minister,' after the word 'bound' in the last line of paragraph (e) of the said subsection; by repealing section 12 of the said Act, and substituting therefor the following section:—

'12. When the minister, at the request of any person, orders a formal investigation, it shall be the duty of such person to render such assistance to the court as is in his power.'

By striking out the words 'before the commencement of the investigation' in the fourth line of section 15 of the said Act; by adding the words 'or engineer' after the word 'mate,' in the third line of section 17 of the said Act; by repealing section 21 and subsection 2 of section 21, of the said Act, and substituting therefor the following sections:—

'21. The certificate of a master, mate or engineer may be cancelled or suspended by a court holding a formal investigation, if the court finds that any loss or damage, or the abandonment or stranding of any ship, or any loss of life has been caused by the wrongful act or default of such master, mate or engineer; or if it finds that any master, mate or engineer is incompetent, or has been guilty of any gross act of misconduct, drunkenness or tyranny, or that in a case of collision he has failed to render the assistance, or to give information required by law. Provided that in a case of a shipping casualty the court shall not cancel or suspend a certificate unless one at least of the assessors concurs in the finding of the court.

'2. A certificate shall not be cancelled or suspended by a court under this section unless a copy of the report or a statement of the case upon which the formal investigation has been ordered has been furnished to the holder of the certificate, and he has had an opportunity of making a defence.'—The Minister of Marine.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to say what is the exact effect of the amendment on the first paragraph of the resolution?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The word 'stranding' is added to the existing law and it gives us power to hold an investigation in the case where a vessel is stranded, and if the evidence is against the officers, they may be censured. This Bill is introduced on account of representations made by the British Board of Trade, and it is almost word for word with the English law. The idea is to make our investigations into shipping casualties uniform with the English procedure on the subject. Mr. Salmon, chairman of the board of examiners of masters and mates has made these suggestions, and he believes that in the future we will be in a position to give complete satisfaction to the insurance companies. In every case where an accident has happened we will be able to hold an investigation, and to discover who is responsible. Perhaps it may be well for me to read Mr. Salmon's report to the deputy minister. He says:

While holding an investigation into the casualty to the ss. 'Manchester Trader,' several omissions and deficiencies in the present 'Act relating to Shipping Casualties' became apparent. Some of them are of so much importance, that, with deference to your opinion, I venture to suggest that they should be amended as soon as possible.

A recent letter from the Imperial Board of Trade, urgently requests the department to hold investigations into every shipping casualty occurring in the Dominion of Canada, and I think

you will agree with me, that unless these investigations are held promptly—especially where ships and cargo are underwritten at 'Lloyds'—the possibility of reducing the present high rates of insurance is remote. For this purpose I think it advisable to appoint a permanent commissioner of wrecks, who would organize some system and be responsible that every casualty of importance is reported, with comments thereon, to the minister.

While I was in the maritime provinces last month, no less than six casualties occurred that should have been investigated, but owing to the fact that they were not reported to me, and the local papers gave me no information, I was unable from lack of knowledge, to make any representations as to the advisability of holding investigations, and on my return to Ottawa, five out of these six vessels had sailed.

As the Act stands at present, the minister is not empowered to appoint a commissioner permanently, but in the inclosed draft you will see that by a slight alteration in the wording of section 8 relating to this, I have made it possible.

At the time the Act was drafted, it was not considered necessary to hold investigations into mere strandings, the word 'stranded' was omitted from the section of the Imperial Act from which section 1 was taken, so that, although investigations have been held and certificates dealt with in cases of stranding where no damage was sustained, the proceedings were illegal. As it is of the last importance that strandings should be investigated, and masters punished where negligence is proved, I have thought it advisable to amend section 1 to read as the Imperial Act does; also subsection 2 of section 8, and section 21 relating to the same thing.

Section 12 has been slightly altered in wording though not much in sense, by the advice of the Department of Justice. It refers to a superintendence of a marine inquiry.

In the investigation into the loss of the tug 'Mersey,' I was unable to deal with the certificates of two officers, owing to the fact that the Act requires that a 'report' or 'statement of the case' shall be delivered to the master, mate or engineer before the commencement of the proceedings. It will frequently occur—as in the case referred to—that witnesses absent themselves purposly with an idea of escaping justice, and I have therefore amended section 15 by omitting the words 'before the commencement of the investigation.' Subsection 2 of section 21 in the inclosed draft refers to this also.

In section 17 the word 'engineer' in the third line was omitted owing to an oversight, so that an engineer who fails to comply with an order of the court to deliver up his certificate cannot be subjected to any penalty. I have amended the section in this respect.

The alterations to the Act suggested have been approved by the Department of Justice, and I now submit them to you, trusting they may meet with your approval, and that you will impress upon the minister the importance of revising the Act, if possible, this session.

R. SALMON,

Chairman of the Board of Examiners, Masters and Mates.

I may say that this is signed by a special officer who was appointed to replace the late Captain Smith, who died three or four years ago.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There does not seem to be any objection to the first paragraph, except that I do not think it adds anything to the Act to insert the word 'stranded'; because a vessel can hardly be stranded without being damaged. With regard to the second resolution, there seems to have been a mistake in drafting it, because it first repeals section 8, and in the next paragraph amends the section that has been already repealed. The draughtsman has evidently overlooked the fact that section 8 contains two subsections. This should be amended so as to read as follows: 'by repealing subsection 1 of section 8.'

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I move to add after the word 'repealing,' in the sixth line, the words, 'first subsection of.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The language of the first subsection of section 8, as now proposed to be enacted, is very different from the language of the first subsection at present on the statute-book. Is there a recommendation of the British Board of Trade that it should be enacted in this form?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not submitted this draft amendment, but it is introduced in consequence of the British amendment. But this is largely a domestic measure. Its object is to render more effective these investigations by authorizing them to be held at any place or at any time the minister decides.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Section 8 at present provides that if it appears to the minister that a formal investigation is necessary, a formal investigation may be held. The section as proposed to be enacted simply provides that the minister may appoint certain officers to hold formal investigations which have not previously been mentioned in the statute. It would seem possible that this subsection might require a little further consideration; but as the hon. gentleman is to introduce a Bill, and that Bill can be amended in the committee if necessary, I merely make the suggestion for the consideration of the officers of his department. I wish to make another suggestion. We have discussed more than once in this House the form in which amendment to statutes should be made. I agree with the hon. Minister of Justice that when you are amending a section of a statute, it is far better to repeal the statute and to re-enact it in full with the amendments than simply to specify that a word is to be inserted in place of another here and there.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think the Bill is to be introduced in that form.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose section 21 is designed to carry out the recommendation of the British Board of Trade?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the recommendation of that board available ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. When the House goes into committee on the Bill, I will furnish all the information required.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the hon. gentleman could place it on the Table of the House or place it on 'Hansard,' so that we could see it in the meantime, it would be of great advantage.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will try to lay it on the Table of the House to-morrow.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time, and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 263) to amend the Shipping Casualties Act, 1901.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). When may we expect the railway subsidies ? We were promised them during the past week, and afterwards we were told that they would be laid on the Table the early part of this week. We have been now six and a half months in session, and it is high time we should have them. The same observations would apply to supplementary estimates.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Although we have been a long time in session, the hon. gentleman will bear witness to that fact that there has been no lack of business occupation for us all. The supplementaries I hope to lay on the Table to-morrow morning, and the railway subsidies at a very early day. They may be down Friday or Monday.

THE NORTH POLE—CAPTAIN BERNIER.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer a few remarks to the House with reference to a matter which is one, in my estimation, of considerable importance, the consideration of which has been delayed until this stage of the session. Naturally the House will not be disposed to devote much time to it at present, and I shall certainly not trespass to any extent on its forbearance. We discussed last session the propriety of making a grant for a polar expedition, and I think that the general feeling of the House was in favour of a sufficient grant being made for that purpose. At an early date in the session, a very large and influential deputation waited upon the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, accompanied by Captain Bernier, whose explanation of the plan he intended to adopt was evidently quite satisfactory to the minister, and it was expected that some action would be taken on his application. I do not know what the intention of the government may be, but it certainly has not moved in that direction up to the present. The importance of this expedition, I think, is very great indeed. A successful expedition to the pole would give to Canada a very prominent place among the maritime states, and the discovery of the Pole would give us a standing with regard to territorial acquisition in the north between the Pole and the northern coast of the continent, which we would not otherwise have. A successful expedition would be worth much more than it would cost, and an unsuccessful one would entail no disgrace, because the discovery of the North Pole has been the dream of nations for many years, and each failure to reach the goal has only been an incitement to a renewed attempt. Captain Bernier reminds me, in his persistence of Columbus going from court to court in Europe in the 15th century, seeking for a patron to put him in possession of the means of making his coveted voyage of discovery to the west. For several years Captain Bernier has been in pursuit of this project. His persistence is worthy of all praise, and the traits of character he has evinced in the prosecution of his mission would lead us to suppose that he has the dogged pertinacity and courage which would stand him in good stead, if he ever be placed in command of a Canadian Polar expedition. He has peculiarly good qualifications for this position. He is now fifty-one years of age. He commanded a vessel at the age of seventeen, and has been a commander of 46 vessels. He has crossed the ocean 174 times, and he is a navigator possessing a record. This question of Arctic exploration has engaged his attention the last twenty-four years. He has been a diligent student of all the facts that have been elicited with regard to Arctic matters. He has studied the question of the Arctic currents and the proper methods to be followed in order to make progress towards the North Pole, and his speculation and knowledge have been availed of by Arctic explorers, among them Nansen and Baldwin. The route which Captain Bernier proposes to take is to enter the Arctic ocean from the Behring straits. The Japan current strikes the west coast of America, and one portion is deflected to the south and another passes through the Behring straits to the Arctic sea. It has been discovered that the ice pack in the Arctic ocean moves to the eastward from the western side of the ocean reached from the Pacific ocean, through Behring straits. In 1879 the 'Jeannette' entered the Arctic ocean at Behring straits, and entered the ice pack,

and while the expedition was disastrous, a portion of the crew reaching the coast of Siberia, the relics of the vessel were afterwards found between Greenland and Spitzenburg, showing that the ice carried it across the Arctic sea. Captain Bernier proposes to place his vessel in the ice pack, between longitude 170 and 175, entering the Arctic ocean through Behring straits, and trusting to nature for the driving of his vessel as near as possible to the Pole. The old theory about an open sea around the Pole is an exploded one. It is certain now that if there is not land there, the North Pole is water covered with ice.

Captain Bernier belongs to a race eminent as explorers in the early history of this country—a race of adventurers, a race of men filled with the spirit of adventure. While the English were quietly settling along the sea-board of the Atlantic in the thirteen colonies, and penetrating no farther than the Alleghany Mountains, the French inhabitants of Canada penetrated the far west, established trading stations on the upper lakes and on the Upper Mississippi, extended their explorations far beyond Manitoba even, and entertained dreams of the creation of a French empire in that country of the possibilities of which they alone were aware. The captain is thoroughly imbued with that spirit; and, if he is entrusted with the charge of this expedition, I have not the slightest doubt that he will be able to give a good account of himself.

One feature of this matter which possesses some degree of significance is the fact that Lord Strathcona endorses the captain's theory with regard to the proper course to pursue in polar explorations. Lord Strathcona has promised to give the Captain a subscription of $5,000, and, by this course and by his statements made to the Captain, has endorsed the plan that Captain Bernier has adopted. This is significant because of the fact that Lord Strathcona is intimately acquainted with Arctic matters. He was early in the service of the Hudson Bay Company, has been in the far north, and has a knowledge of that country of a character which makes him peculiarly a judge of the proper methods to be employed in such an expedition as this.

The prize of the discovery of the North Pole is one that any of the great marine powers would gladly win. Several expeditions are even now afoot, as expeditions have been set afoot from time to time, none of which have been successful. It is not an unworthy object of ambition for us to seek to snatch these laurels from other competitors. The Captain's plan is to have the vessel built and owned by the government. This vessel, if she returns from her voyage of exploration, will be of service to the government. She would be the kind of vessel that would be exactly wanted in patrolling Hudson bay, in making voyages among the islands north of Hudson bay, and taking possession of newly discovered lands in that region. The government could easily find useful and profitable employment for such a vessel. The cost of such a vessel as the Captain proposes would be about $80,000. In addition there would be certain instruments required, which, it is supposed, the government has in its possession and could loan along with the vessel, for the purpose of this expedition. In addition to the cost of the vessel and the instruments, about $70,000 additional would be required for the expedition. This the Captain would furnish himself; that is, he would secure it by contribution from the public. About $60,000 has already been secured, and there would be no difficulty in collecting the balance if the government would make the appropriation necessary for the construction of the vessel and would embark upon the scheme as the Captain proposes.

Of course, this vessel would be one of peculiar construction. In the first place she would be built of wood, for a wooden vessel is infinitely better in contact with ice than steel or iron. She would be a vessel of great strength, braced with heavy timbers, and would have six water tight compartments. She would be a vessel of 300 tons register, 120 feet in length, with 35 feet beam, a depth of 18 feet, and would draw 14 feet of water. She would have an engine of 200 horse power. She would have a ten foot wheel, and would carry 300 tons of anthracite coal of which she would burn 3½ tons in twenty-four hours. In every way the vessel would be thoroughly adapted to the navigation of the ice-bound sea. She would carry a spare wheel and a spare rudder. She would carry a diving apparatus, which, I believe, no previous Arctic expedition has carried. She would have 100 tons of provisions—six years' supply. These provisions would be of a character to provide against that dreadful disease of Arctic exploration—scurvy. The provisions would include vegetables of various kinds done up in fifty pound cans; and generally the provisions would be of such a character as to ensure the crew against the ravages of scurvy. She would be—which is a new feature—lighted and heated by electricity. For this purpose she would be furnished with two windmills and two dynamos which would be run by the windmills. The electricity would be used for lighting and heating and also for medical treatment of certain maladies among the crew as, for instance, rheumatism. The vessel would carry a doctor and apparatus for the medical treatment of disease where it might be necessary. This provision with regard to heating and lighting is a matter of very great importance. Of course, the burning of oil, or the combustion of fuel, consumes air, while electric lighting and heating would consume no air. So that keeping the air pure would be much easier by this method of lighting and

heating than by the burning of oil or coal. The vessel also would be kept cheerful and dry, overcoming a great difficulty of former Arctic expeditions, that of dampness in the vessel. The vessel would carry an apparatus for the distilling of water. In most cases, Arctic explorers have depended upon melted snow, which is often found to give a supply of water that is impure and deleterious to the health of the crew. The vessel would carry a wirelesss telegraph apparatus and could maintain communication with some point upon the shore of America, and, when well advanced on the exploration, with some point in Norway. But the great advantage of the wireless system would be that the communication could be maintained with the sledge parties sent out from the vessel. It is the intention of the Captain, as he drifts towards his destination, to send sledge parties fifty miles from the vessel on each side and take soundings at intervals and make other investigations. These sledge parties would be in communication, by wireless telegraphy with the vessel, so that they would know the location of the vessel and the vessel would know the location of the sledge parties, and the sledge parties could keep up communication which would be of the greatest importance in case of emergency of any kind. When the vessel approaches the pole—it might be one hundred miles or two hundred miles away; Nansen, I believe reached within 280 miles of the pole and the nearest has been 250 miles—when the vessel is at its nearest point to the pole a sledge party would be sent out with the most ample and up-to-date provision for making a successful journey over the ice. Among other things, the Captain proposes to have an automobile motor with either a reservoir of electricity or an engine run by gasoline. They would take frames and canvas for boats that could be set up readily for transportation across the open stretches of water. The expedition would set up bamboo rods with small flags every mile, and every ten miles they would place a hollow cylinder with records. Every ten miles also they would leave a supply of provisions, so that the return could be made with greatest speed and safety. And all the time communication with the vessel would be maintained by telegraph.

The Captain proposes to carry a crew of 15 men, and the arrangement with regard to this crew is one to secure efficiency and economy. I will give, from the statement made last year, as to the composition of this crew :

> The crew will consist of fifteen men. There will be the commander himself, without pay. There will be two officers, captains of experience, who can take the wheel, go to the masthead and look-out, or perform any duty regarding the navigation or care of the ship in case of the captain being incapacitated. There will be a first mate who will be what is termed an ice master, a man who is thoroughly conversant with everything pertaining to the dangers of ice and of being caught between the ice floes. There will be two engineers ; one will be a machinist who can do any work in connection with the machinery or apparatus, the telegraph apparatus or fixtures ; while the other will be an electrician and wireless telegraph operator. Two men will be surveyors and astronomers who will also serve on sledge journeys or in almost any other capacity on the vessel. There will be one doctor who will be a botanist and seaman. There will be one naturalist, who will be a botanist, photographer and artist and assistant to the surveyors and electrician, and who also will go on sledge journeys. There will be one cook, who, in addition to being a cook and steward will be an able seaman. There will be one seaman who will be a whaler and sealer and stoker, and who will combine the qualifications of all three and be able to serve in almost any capacity. There will be a carpenter who will also be an able seaman, and one stoker who will also be an able seaman. These will be his crew of 15, men combining the qualifications and different kinds of capacities that, if confined in each case to one man, would require a crew of 50 or 60 men, an efficient crew, and yet a compact crew of small number.

This is the arrangement that Captain Bernier proposes to make with regard to his crew. His scheme for provisioning his vessel, fitting it out, and the conduct of his expedition, all has been carefully thought out. He has brought to bear upon the arrangement of his plans the experience of a navigator of over thirty years, and his experience as a navigator with regard to Arctic matters extending over more than twenty years. Undoubtedly Captain Bernier possesses qualifications for the task he desires to undertake at least equal to those possessed by any living nautical man. He does not know but deems it advisable to buy the celebrated vessel the 'Fram,' which is for sale, and can be bought at a less price probably than he could construct a vessel. It might be possible to buy the German vessel, the 'Gosse,' which is just returning from an Antarctic expedition. But whatever course may be taken with regard to a vessel, the government is called upon, if it embarks in this scheme, to supply not more than $80,000. It will be an investment in a vessel which will belong to itself, and which will be available in subsequent years for other purposes. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the feeling of the House last session was unmistakably in favour of giving Captain Bernier the means that are necessary to prosecute his cherished purpose of making an expedition to the North Pole. I feel confident, from my investgations into this matter, that if Captain Bernier secures the outfit he requires, he may enter the ice pack east of Behring Straits, and that he will drift past the Pole, and will locate the Pole, and that we will in all probability have the credit of making that discovery. I think his plan is one that is calculated to secure success, and Canada certainly could have no prouder distinction than to step in and

discover the North Pole after all the attemps that have been made by Americans, by English, by Norwegian, by Swedish navigators and others. I trust that the government will look favourably upon the application which Captain Bernier makes, and that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will urge upon his colleagues the appropriation of the necessary sum of money to carry the Captain's purpose into effect.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). I presume this is not a matter which has at all any party significance. I feel very much disposed to lend my support to the argument made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). From the statement made by him it would appear that Captain Bernier is contributing resources that he has accumulated by a very long and patient effort in this direction, to the extent of something like $70,000. This the Captain has collected, or has secured the promise of, by very patient, persistent devotion to a subject which is of course of very great interest. Now, it would appear that the government of Canada is asked to contribute about an equal amount; and surely if one enthusiastic citizen of Canada is prepared to contribute half the capital required, and his own services for a great many years, not only in preparation for this adventure but in carrying it out to a successful completion, which I hope he may succeed in doing, it is comparatively a small matter that all the other citizens of Canada collectively should contribute merely one-half of the total sum required. There can be little doubt as to the great value of the search that Captain Bernier intends to make. The discovery of the North Pole, while it may seem to a great many people to be a visionary project to which no material advantage can attach, is unquestionably one which has engaged the attention and aroused the enthusiasm of all the maritime nations of northern Europe in succession. Our cousins in the United States have made repeated efforts to discover the Pole, and I think if any people in the world should look upon it as their peculiar business, and finally succeed in making that discovery, it is the people of Canada, because the North Pole when discovered will unquestionably form part of this country. It would be an exceedingly inconvenient and unfortunate thing for us if some representative of another power should, with less advantages, beginning from a more distant point, succeed in finding the North Pole, and planting the flag possibly of some other country upon that point of the earth's surface. I think we have more reason to look upon this as particularly a Canadian object than have the people of any other nationality in the world.

There can be no doubt at all that there is a certain amount of scientific interest attached to this effort. There can be equally no doubt that it may be of great material advantage to Canada to establish finally and indisputably her claim and title to all the lands lying on the north part of this continent. Now it is possible for us at this moment to look upon this enterprise as being of no importance. It is not a long time since the whole of the north-west portion of the continent now owned by the United States, Alaska, was regarded as a country of no importance whatever. Any one looking at its position on the map would not suspect its character or importance. To-day that country is proving to be possessed of great wealth. Our own territory lying adjacent to Alaska is at this moment perhaps attracting more attention to Canada than any other part of our territory, and in this far northern region is just as likely as anywhere else to find great and valuable stores of mineral wealth. There can be no question that there are great and valuable stores of coal in those northern regions, and while they are at present inaccessible, and we have other supplies more near at hand which satisfy our requirements for the moment, we cannot tell what scientific discoveries may do in the course of a year or two. The access to that northern region, which is now almost impossible, may become, through some scientific discovery, comparatively easy, we may be able to derive from these northern portions of our possessions great wealth, great stores of mineral value. There can be of course no prospect of anything outside of minerals, but there is no reason to doubt that in those extreme northern regions, as well as in any other portion of this northern half of the continent, may we expect to find richly mineralized lands. I know very well that Canada, while making great progress in many other directions, has depended quite as much, if not more, upon her largely increased exports of minerals for her enormously extended foreign trade, as upon any other portion of her resources. Therefore these extreme northern regions, while possessed of no agricultural value, may prove to be capable of largely expanding our exports and of adding to our national wealth. So while we may admit that national pride and scientific interest should impel us to enter at once upon an undertaking that can be carried out at such a small cost as $80,000 or $100,000 we must recognize in addition that if we succeed through this expedition in increasing our knowledge of these regions, unpromising as they may seem at this moment we may in the end derive benefits that will repay us tenfold or one hundred fold for any outlay we may make. I think that the enthusiasm and energy that the Captain has shown in his long continued effort to foster this child of his fancy and to carry to completion the course which he has marked out for himself and has pursued despite every kind of difficulty and doubt and disappointment, should incite us to turn with warm sympathy towards a Canadian who is willing to undergo every

discomfort and hardship that the frozen north may present, in order to accomplish the object he has set before him and should induce us to assist him in his enterprise.

Mr. D. HENDERSON (Halton). I do not wish this occasion to pass without availing myself of the opportunity of expressing my hope and confidence that the government will not permit the appeal made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to be lost sight of. Several years ago, when I first had the pleasure of hearing Captain Bernier deliver a lecture on this polar expedition and explain his views in regard to the northern hemisphere and the surroundings of the pole, I became interested in the work which he has so much at heart, and I believe that if the north pole is ever to be discovered, it will be discovered either by Captain Bernier or by some one following a course similar to that which he has marked out. He told us that he is following nature, getting nature to assist him. Instead of following the course pursued by navigators who have gone from Europe and America, he proposes to enter the ice in a different way and to follow the direction of the current which is flowing towards the pole and southward instead of going over ice which is flowing away from the pole. In this way he has great hopes that he will discover the pole. It seems to me to be common sense reasoning that if another man has come within 200 miles of the pole and has passed it by, there should be no great difficulty in Captain Bernier coming within fifty or one hundred miles, of it, or even passing over that coveted point of the earth. It may seem something like a wild cat scheme to many in this country to talk about an expedition to the north pole ; they see no financial advantage to be gained by spending money in that way, but to my mind the contrary is the case. Even in the matter of immigration, of making Canada known in every home in Europe, I do not believe that $100,000 could be better spent than in assisting Captain Bernier to fit out an expedition to discover the pole. Even if he fails so much would be written in the newspapers about the expedition that Canada would become a household word in every home throughout Europe, and if he succeeded in discovering the pole Canada would be known in the heart of China as well as in the heart of every European country. My suggestion is that we should provide the $100,000 which Captain Bernier requires out of the money which we have been appropriating for purposes of immigration. I believe that in that way it will accomplish a great deal more than if it was spent on newspaper advertising or even in sending agents to the continent of Europe and Great Britain to solicit immigrants to come to this country. My object is to make Canada known, and by fitting out an expedition to the pole, whether it proves successful or not, we will secure the aid of every newspaper in the old land in advertising Canada. That is just what we want to do ; it is by advertising Canada and making this country known throughout Europe that we are going to get immigrants. To my mind nothing will do that more cheaply or successfully than the fitting out of such an expedition, and that is one reason why I think we should assist Captain Bernier in his very laudable purpose. The hon. member for North Norfolk has referred to another point which I think is worthy of consideration by the government. Not long ago I saw in the newspapers that the Americans are talking very loudly of some possessions to which they propose to lay claim, away to the north of this Dominion which properly belong to the Dominion of Canada. Now, if Captain Bernier succeeds in locating the pole and planting thereon the British flag, taking possession of whatever there is in land or sea, we will certainly have a right to claim possession in the name of the King of England of everything that lies between the north pole and the now known Dominion of Canada. We will then not be troubled in the future with any Alaska boundary disputes in that direction, but will have the first claim to everything lying between what we now know as the Dominion of Canada and the North Pole. I hope the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Prefontaine), who will no doubt take an interest in this enterprise, will deeply concern himself about it, give attention to it and encourage Captain Bernier in his expedition. I hope that he will persuade the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) that the Dominion of Canada is patriotic enough and rich enough to supply the funds necessary to meet the needs of Captain Bernier's expedition. I am not at all afraid to advocate this scheme ; I think it would be a great thing for the Dominion of Canada to have it said that one of her citizens was the first to plant the flag of his country upon the pole. And if the pole is ever to be discovered—and I believe it will be discovered some day—every citizen of this country would feel proud in the thought that a citizen of Canada was the first to plant the British flag upon the pole. I trust the hon. Minister of Finance will not be backward in providing a sum of money even if it is taken out of the vote which is ordinarily given for immigration purposes. I would say again : Let us devote $100,000, less to immigration and give $100,000 to Captain Bernier to fit out his expedition. If we do that I am quite sure that at the end of two or three years we will have accomplished a great deal more in the way of attracting immigrants to this country than if we had spent the sum in the ordinary way.

Mr. R. HOLMES (West Huron). At the risk of perhaps being the only member who will speak in opposition to this project, I

desire to say a few words. I have no hesitation in saying that I am entirely opposed to the project of the Dominion of Canada granting any considerable amount for this purpose. If I am not mistaken, this is the second or third time the matter has been before the House, and has to certain extent received the approval of the members of this House. The attempt to discover the North Pole is a very fascinating subject, which has engaged the attention of mariners for many years. Expeditions have been fitted out in past years, and almost unlimited wealth has been expended in the attempt to discover the north pole. Nevertheless, we can safely say that the result of these expeditions has not furnished us with even sufficient information to warrant us in spending money for such a purpose. We have heard a great deal in this House recently about lack of information, but there is nothing in the world about which there is less definite information than there is about the North Pole. Those who have read the history of polar expeditions know that many lives have been sacrificed, and that wealth has been poured out lavishly without any definite result having been accomplished. It is simply a matter of sentiment, and if you should be disposed to look upon it from a commercial point of view, there is certainly no commercial advantage to be reaped. If the North Pole is ever discovered, I would be very glad indeed that it should be discovered by a Canadian, but in view of the fact that so many expeditions have failed, I have grave doubts that the North Pole will ever be found. The statement of the member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) that this expedition would be a good advertisement for Canada is to my mind rather far-fetched. When the Coldstream Guards band played here the other night, I met in the audience the gentleman who signs himself 'the wandering Yankee,' and he told me that when he first came to Canada he brought his furs along in the summer time, thinking he would require them, as he had formed his ideas of this country from the pictures sent abroad of ice palaces and winter scenes. I do not think it particularly advantageous that we should spend $100,000 to let the world know that the North Pole is in Canada. I believe we could spend $100,000 to much better advantage in advertising Canada in another direction. The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has told us that for 24 years Capt. Bernier has made this matter a subject of very deep concern. I would not for a moment think of detracting from the merits of Capt. Bernier. I esteem him as much as any one, and I believe that as a navigator he is entitled to much credit. But if for 24 years he has been following this visionary idea without any greater success than he has achieved, it is pretty nearly time for him to think of something else. I believe that the House will be endorsed by the public at large if it once and for all sets its face against this proposition. One of the functions of government is to spend money to the best advantage for the good of the country, but we must not think that because we have an overflowing treasury, we can take $100,000 from it and spend it for some impractical purpose which will bring to us no beneficial results. The hard-headed farmers of Ontario and the business people of Canada generally, would not have much sympathy for a government that has no better use for $100,000, than to spend it in chasing a chimera. For some years past they have been fitting out polar expeditions in the United States and in European countries, and I believe that the navigators of these countries are just as likely to find an easy way to the North Pole, if easy way there be, as Capt. Bernier. The simple fact that Capt. Bernier belongs to Canada, and will start out on a new tack, does not to my mind give an assurance whatever that he will be successful. My opinion, based upon the reports of polar expeditions in the past, convinces me that this expedition, if it be undertaken, is doomed to failure, and that the money expended for it will be absolutely thrown away.

Mr. S. E. GOURLEY (Colchester). I am very happy to support the views of the member for North Norfolk in this matter. It is very proper that the objection to this expedition should come from a gentleman representing a constituency in Ontario, which is the home of all the narrow ideas in Canada.

Mr. HOLMES. And Truro is the home of the narrow men.

Mr. GOURLEY. For 24 years Capt. Bernier has pursued this ambition, but we know that Columbus besought the court of Ferdinand and Isabella much longer than 24 years before he got a vessel to discover the American continent. I am not embarrassed by the statement that Capt. Bernier has besought this country for 24 years without success, but I trust that as the name of Ferdinand and Isabella are immortalized because of the aid they gave Columbus, so this country will be immortalized on account of the aid which it will give to the discoverer of the North Pole. The hon. member (Mr. Holmes) fancied that there was something derogatory to Canada in the possession of a cold but delighted climate. I am here to say that the climate of Canada is her glory. I desire to propagate the idea that we possess a cold climate, and I shall not attempt to minimize it in the slightest degree. Any gentleman who is acquainted with the history of the great forces that have made, and are making this world, recognizes the benefits of a cold climate. I desire this country to be known as a northern country. All of the countries

of the world that have matured high civilizations have been northern countries, Germany and Russia are north of the fiftieth parallel, and they are great, dominating, world powers, while southern countries, like France, and Italy, and India, and China, are the dying nations of the world. Therefore, to be a northern country is to be a dominant and a growing country, and in that view I boast that Canada possesses the North Pole. A northern country has but one frontier to defend, and hence a northern country is most dominant in the military sense, being almost impregnable. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Holmes) peculiarly illustrates the genius of Ontario, when he says that this is a commercial question. I wonder that the people of Ontario can never rise above some little tu'penny-ha'penny consideration in the discussion of great questions. Ontario, instead of being the dominant and leading province of Canada, has almost lost her influence, because she has permitted herself to be influenced largely by petty commercial considerations. Gladstone and John Bright undertook to rule the British empire on those lines in Exeter Hall, and one of them had a little bit of paper, on which was figured out the cost of an insult that had been offered to England by France or the United States. Some little fellow got up and said: It will cost us five million nine hundred and twenty-six dollars and twenty-six and a half cents to avenge that insult, but, if we let the insult go and take the kicking, it will cost 36 cents less; therefore let us take the kicking and the insult. That was the commercial argument; that is the Ontario argument. That kind of argument reduced England from a first-class power to a third or fourth-class power. Thank God, the day for that kind of argument is past, the men who made it have gone into oblivion, and we have in England to-day a dominant people who would face the world and spend every dollar they possess rather than take an insult. We have got past the commercial idea in England, and I hope we have in Canada. There are much more important ideas than the commercial idea when we are dealing with imperial questions. Sentiment rules this world, and mere figures are a secondary consideration with the great, dominant powers of the earth. Let me say one word more. Some hon. gentlemen seem to think that there is going to be a great sacrifice of life and blood in the proposed expedition. Well, what of that? You cannot build up a nation of high civilization without the sacrifie of life and blood. That is the price any nation pays for building up a great civilization. Little Switzerland, the most civilized country in Europe, has defied the whole of Europe because it has been willing at times to sacrifice its best men and to defend its independence with its life-blood. That is the price you have to pay for high civilization and dominant political feeling. The life that would be sacrificed in this enterprise would be a noble example to the people of Canada. We want self-sacrifice. What is the good of a lazy loafer who is not prepared to make any sacrifice? Of what value are such people to any nation? We want men and women who are capable of self-sacrifice. The mother who tells her son to go forth and fight for his country is the only kind of woman who is worth her salt. You want men and women who are willing to sacrifice themselves and their children, if need be, on the altar of their country. That is the only basis of high national life, and we want that sentiment in this country. I am surprised, when the duty of self-sacrifice is mentioned, that any hon. gentleman should be averse to self-sacrifice in the direction of noble duty. The railways of the United States kill 70,000 or 80,000 people a year, and whoever hears a word of that. In the South African war when 200 or 300 people were sacrificed in a battle everybody held up their hands in horror, and said, What a terrible thing war was. But, when the trains of the United States kill that many every week, nobody says a word about it. Why, Sir, the sacrifice of life in war is the noblest way in which life can be sacrificed; and yet you find weak writers, weak ministers, and sometimes weak members of parliament deprecating the shedding of blood. I will deprecate the shedding of blood if it is shed for no purpose; but if blood is shed in the best interest of the national life, there is nothing to regret. What are flesh and blood given to this world for? At eighty years of age when life is spent, man is thrown into the earth and covered up; is it not better at thirty or forty years of age, when life is keen and the blood is strong, to throw it away in the defence of some noble principle? So far as I am concerned, I will support this proposal, because I do not think there is the slightest doubt about Canada owning every foot of territory from here to the North Pole. It is contiguous to Canada, and we own every foot of it by right of discovery and exploration. But if there is any doubt about it, and if we have to take physical possession of it, I am ready to support Bernier in taking physical possession of it. What we ought to do in this parliament is to husband our resources. I hear that Greenland is in the market, and if so, we ought to buy it to-morrow. Alaska was in the market a few years ago, but England did not take advantage of the opportunity to buy that country. Since then we have had enormous difficulties in consequence, and we shall continue to have difficulty in regard to Alaska until we get strong enough to ask the United States to hand over that country for a fair price to

us, as we certainly shall. If Canada succeeds in this boundary arbitration, as I hope and believe it will, the United States will still own a narrow coast line of almost 400 miles that should belong to this country. No maritime people will ever put up with a deprivation of that kind. No maritime people will ever permit a neighbouring country to own a thin strip of 400 miles of its coast; and if the United States will not sell us that territory for an equivalent sum of money, the day will come when we will take it, in spite of all the resources of the United States. It is an insult to a maritime people to be deprived of 400 miles of their coast line, and England deserves the reprobation of the Canadian people for letting Alaska go. While I am an imperialist, and while I am in love with the traditions of England and the English people, I have nothing but reprobation for the stupid diplomatists who gave away 400 miles of our coast line on the Pacific. I make a distinction between the people of England and the few men who attempt to play the role of diplomats and statesmen of England. I support Bernier's proposition, because we are the vikings of this continent. Nansen, who attempted a few years ago to reach the North Pole, was the heir of the old vikings of Norway and Sweden, who illustrated the genius of the human race on the continent of Europe; and if the English people and the French people are great races to-day, they owe the fact to the brave old vikings, who, without compass or any of those mathematical instruments which make sea-faring safe to-day, went out on the turbid ocean to battle valiantly with wind and wave. No inland people can ever be a dominant people. You must have a race of men fond of the sea, battling every day with dangers to life and limb, to become a bold and dominant race. Therefore I favour this search for the North Pole. In that way we shall keep up in Canada that spirit of the vikings, the going out on unknown and sormy seas in pursuit of exploration. That makes a bold and intrepid race, which is the sort of race we want in Canada. Therefore, without figuring this matter up, according to the Toronto or Hamilton or Ontario notion of making five or ten cents profit, I support this project, because it tends to arouse and keep alive the old sentiment for life on the sea, and those feelings of high courage and enterprise that makes a noble race.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). I very much fear that the country will question the sanity of this House when it finds that after sitting here for seven months we have nothing better to talk about than discovering the North Pole. On behalf of Manitoba, let me say that there are a great many things which ought to be attended to by the government as soon as possible. The St. Andrews Rapids work has been at a standstill for upwards of a year. In Winnipeg business is almost paralyzed for the lack of room in the post office. And I am not ready to spend money on the North Pole until more immediate necessities such as this are attended to. I have been doing my best for some weeks past to get a sufficient amount of confidence in the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to accept his curves and gradients, which he says may be obtained in that country to the north, of which he alone seems to know anything. But I cannot follow him when he goes to the North Pole and shows us exactly by what currents and curves and grades you can get there. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman ought to be content to wait and see how some of his prophecies will come out regarding our own northern country before he asks us to accept his statement about the passage of the North Pole. As to $100,000 being spent out of the immigration grant for that purpose, that would be most absurd. We have been spending money trying to abolish the idea among Europeans that Canada is an annex of the North Pole, and our increased immigration is due to the fact that we have to a considerable extent dissipated that notion. I should therefore be opposed to our spending money in a direction which will tend to foster it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine). I do not propose to detain the House at any length, but as this matter came under my consideration early in the session, I would like to say a few words concerning it. It was brought under my notice by a large number of members of the House of Commons and Senators, and Captain Bernier gave at that meeting a complete exposition of his plan. Last year his proposition was that we should vote him purely and simply a certain amount for the purpose of his expedition. His proposition was that we should give him from $100,000 to $120,000 to organize an expedition and carry it out. But the plan he submitted at the meeting to which I have referred was quite different. It was one which should really commend itself to the attention of the House and the country. His proposition was that the Department of Marine and Fisheries should provide a boat, to be constructed in Canada and be loaned to him, and he would, by means of public subscriptions, get the crew and all the provisions necessary. That would entail an expenditure of about $60,000 or $70,000. Acting on that idea, Captain Bernier with commendable courage and energy succeeded in getting nearly $40,000 subscriptions, among which was a subscription of $5,000 from Lord Strathcona, and he would certainly have succeeded in getting the full amount had he been in a position to say that the Canadian government was ready to endorse his scheme. If he has succeeded in getting subscriptions to the amount of $40,-

000 without the aid of parliament, no doubt, he would with that aid, succeed in getting all the money necessary from public subscriptions. The boat to be constructed by the government would remain government property and be used for fishery protection and other purposes on the Pacific coast, provided Captain Bernier ever returned with the boat. Such a scheme should certainly commend itself to the serious attention of business men. There is not only sentiment in this matter. Of course we feel a good deal of pride in having one of our fellow-citizens, at Captain Bernier's age, plucky enough to undertake this perilous expedition. A great many would treat the question as just an idea without anything at the back of it. If Captain Bernier has sufficient courage to undertake this expedition at the risk of his life, that is certainly commendable even as a question of sentiment, but there is a practical side to this matter. We have organized many expeditions, most of which have been successful and given great returns. No doubt until ten years ago the territory of the Yukon was almost unknown except for two explorations made and organized by the government. Ten or fifteen years ago, if any one had stated on the floor of the House that the Yukon Territory would some day be producing from $10,000,000 to $25,000,000 of gold, people would have laughed at the idea. But now the fact has been established. The Yukon Territory to my personal knowledge—I was there a year ago—has not yet been scratched. It has not been opened really for mining in the proper sense of the word, and I have no doubt that there is an immense future for that country. Captain Bernier has held many conferences in which he has been considered a very serious man, who knew what he was talking about, and what he said about his project was taken seriously by all those who took the trouble to listen. If his proposition be simply and purely to loan a boat for the expedition, personally I do not know that there would be much objection. I understand perfectly well that this country, in developing itself so fast, requires large sums of money for things that are absolutely necessary, but that does not mean that we are going to fold our arms and let our neighbours take advantage of us. At the present time an expedition has left for the northern part of Hudson bay. And why? Simply to organize that territory, to protect our interests in it and keep it for Canada. We have an immense territory in the direction of the North Pole, and that territory has been but little explored. It is reported, however, to be rich in minerals of all kinds. If by risking the sum of $80,000 which would be the cost of the steamer to be built for the expedition, and which could be used for something else when it returns, the exploration of that territory could be helped on, I think, personally and as a member of this House, that the people of this country would approve of it. Of course, speaking as Minister of Marine and Fisheries, though personally quite favourable to the scheme, I must say that question has not yet been considered, because there have been so many important matters demanding the attention of the government that this question has not been specially taken up by the cabinet. But, surely if the government thinks that it should be encouraged in the way that has been suggested, I am sure that the people of the country would agree with it. And it certainly would be a credit to Canada if a Canadian should achieve the discovery of the North Pole, which nobody has been able to achieve up to the present time.

Mr. EDWARD HACKETT (West Prince). We have been debating a region of frost and ice. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is very anxious that assistance should be given to Captain Bernier. I desire to call his attention and that of the government to the province of Prince Edward Island, which is not near the pole at all. That province has been deprived of the communication with the main land which the Dominion, at the time of confederation, undertook to keep up. The minister speaks in very glowing terms of the possibility of discovering the North Pole and what Captain Bernier may do in that direction. But I wish to impress upon him the fact that the government undertook with the province of Prince Edward Island to maintain communication during the winter between the Island and the mainland. Before the hon. minister undertakes to spend $80,000 or $100,000 to discover the North Pole, he should provide us with another boat to keep up this communication. The hon. gentleman says that if this boat we loan to Captain Bernier returns from the North Pole, it will be of some service. But, so far as the province of Prince Edward Island is concerned, we do not want to depend upon a boat of this kind from the North Pole. I am not opposed to this expedition. I would like to see Captain Bernier bring back enough of the North Pole to make a snuff-box. But, while I say that, I say that the government should, in the first place, carry out the terms of confederation and give to Prince Edward Island the communications that they were guaranteed at the time of confederation. And when this parliament are ready to carry out the terms of confederation in that respect, they may think about the North Pole.

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

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I invite the attention of the committee again to the estimates of the Department of Railways and Canals. When we last had these estimates under consideration, two or three items were held over and

these items I now ask the committee to take up. I refer to the main estimates, page 42 :

Railways and Canals—chargeable to capital—Intercolonial Railway—increased accommodation at St. John, $84,800.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I think that the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) and the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) were making inquiries about this item. I see that these hon. gentlemen are not in the House. If we could take up the Prince Edward Island items in the meantime, these hon. gentlemen might be with us later on.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think that there is anything that the hon. gentlemen would object to in this item. I shall be glad to give any information asked for, and, if the items are adopted, that shall not shut off discussion. With regard to this item for St. John, I may explain that we had an appropriation for this service last year of $90,500. That amount was expended, and a little more, including the purchase of some land under a judgment given by the Exchequer Court. The actual expenditure was $3,000 odd in excess of the appropriation. We ask here for an appropriation of $106,000, of which a one-fifth has already been voted. We shalll ask in the supplementaries to be brought down a further sum of $5,000. So we shall have for expenditure on the works at St. John $111,000. I gave the details of this on a previous occasion, but I may summarize them now. The sum of $41,355.50 is to pay the balance of the contract for the engine house and machine shop ; $10,000 for coal shed ; $10,000 for boilers and engines, and $10,000 for grading and track laying, and various small items.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Are these manufacturing shops ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The engine house and machine shop are for repairs. The manufacturing is done at Moncton.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it anticipated that there will be a greatly increased trade by adopting St. John as a winter port ? And is that why we need to make this heavy expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The larger portion of the winter port business is done by the Canadian Pacific Railway on the other side of the harbour. But the general business of St. John has grown very much, and it is necessary to make these improvements for its accommodation. The work is now in progress, the contract having been let for the engine house and machine shop.

Mr. SPROULE. But, if the Canadian Pacific Railway is doing the major portion of the work and the Intercolonial is not, what justification can there be for this greatly increased expenditure ? Is the business of the Intercolonial Railway increasing rapidly in St. John of late ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In what I said regarding the Canadian Pacific Railway doing business, I did not imply that the Intercolonial is not doing any, but the Canadian Pacific Railway is doing a winter port business, which is handled on the western side of the harbour. But the general business and trade at St. John are decidedly increasing, and we desire to increase the facilities for handling that business. An engine-house is also rendered necessary by the fact that we are now using engines of much larger size, and we require larger engine-houses. The modern engines cannot get into the old engine-house.

Mr. SPROULE. A few years ago we were told that the roadbed was in first-class condition, and afterwards it turned out when the new engines were purchased that it was dangerous to take them over the bridges.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman knows that there has been quite a development in railroading. You have to build larger engines, heavier cars ; and the equipment of railways is different from what it was a few years ago.

Mr. SPROULE. It was contended on this side of the House that the road was not suitable for the heavier rolling stock, and unless it was made more substantial this rolling stock could not be used to advantage. Now, with regard to the engine-house, if you require to expend over $100,000 in one place for an engine-house, it seems you must either be expecting greatly increased trade there in future, or else your old engine-house must have been very inferior in the first place.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The old engine-house was part of the original construction of the road, and was built before confederation, and naturally was not adapted to the conditions which exist at present.

Mr. SPROULE. Could the minister tell us what quantity of winter freight is being carried, and whether much grain is carried to St. John in the winter ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A very small quantity of grain passed through the elevator, but the general business of the Intercolonial is increasing at St. John.

Increased accommodation at Halifax, $83,600.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We had a considerable appropriation for Halifax last year, but a large amount of it was not expended, and we have to revote it now, with some additional sums. The appropriation last year was $143,000, of which we expended $75,174. So there is a balance of last years's expenditure to de carried forward, in the form of a revote, of $67,826.

The revote here is stated to be $104,500. That estimate was made some months ago, and is now found not to be correct. We are taking in this item an additional sum of $36,674, making the sum of $104,500 which is accounted for in the main estimates. We have, however, other works on hand in Halifax which we shall have to provide for in the supplementary estimates, and which will make the total appropriation for the year, including these revotes of last year, $229,500. The details of this sum are: Land for engine-house and yard, $20,000; land at Cornwallis street, $20,000; grading and other work in connection with the proposed engine house, $20,000; to complete improvements at station, $7,500; construction of quay wall of crib-work, $37,000; wharfs and freight shed, $125,000. A part of the sum we are asking will be included in the supplementary estimates. With regard to the land for the engine house, we have not yet determined on the location, and we shall be obliged probably to go outside of the city limits, where we have some land in our mind's eye. It is not wise at present to state where it is. We have, of course, in view two or three different locations, and we think we shall be able to acquire the land at a moderate cost. We wish also to acquire a small amount of land south of the elevator at Halifax, partly because it is likely to be applied to other purposes if we do not purchase it, and also because we shall need it if we are to do any business at all with the elevator, to allow tracks to run through the elevator, so that the cars may pass through and go off on another track. At present there is not a great deal of that kind of business done at Halifax nor at St. John. But for any business that may be done at the elevator, the cars at present have to go in and then back out again, which makes considerable delay. It is desirable that we should purchase a small quantity of land on the other side of the elevator so that tracks may be laid down on which the cars may pass through the elevator, while others come up behind. These, together with wharf improvements, are the changes and operations which we propose to carry on.

Mr. SPROULE. After this new transcontinental road is built, do you expect to need all this heavy expenditure to accommodate the trade that you are likely to get over the Intercolonial at Halifax and St. John?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, I differ with my hon. friend on that point; but to my mind, after building this railway, there will be more business at St. John and Halifax than there is now. The Intercolonial buildings will all be required, and probably more. However, even without the transcontinental railway, we require this accommodation at Halifax; and we also require, apart from the elevator, which will only be used for the grain traffic—but leaving that out of the question, for the business of the Intercolonial we undoubtedly need the greater accommodation in land and buildings, both at St. John and Halifax.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not object to the expenditure if it is needed. But it does seem a little suspicious. We expended a large sum for an elevator at St. John some time ago for the purpose of handling grain on the Intercolonial, but we have never had any grain to handle. That was not a wise expenditure. To-day you propose to purchase more land to run cars through the elevator, but there is no grain to handle, and according to the outlook you are not likely to have any grain to handle in the future. It seems to me to be providing accommodation for a trade which we have not yet got, and that the money expended in it will not be earning any interest. I do not think that is wise; in fact, it is very unwise, but if there is clearly indication that the trade requires it, I for one do not feel like objecting to the expenditure.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that if we should take the position that we should first get the trade and then build the elevator, instead of building the elevator so as to be prepared to handle the trade, we would be reasonably and justly open to criticism and to be asked: How can you expect trade when you provide no facilities? As to additional land to be purchased near the elevator at Halifax, for which $20,000 is asked, I may say that this land is close by the deep water terminus in the centre of the north part of the city. We had some reason to believe that this property was about to be purchased and a costly building to be placed upon it. Then, if in a short time we should require that ground, we would have to buy it with the buildings added, and we thought that as the buildings now on it are of a very poor character, we should buy it now. It was thought wise by the railway authorities to purchase the land. We have not yet purchased it, because the parties who own it are not willing to accept the price we offer, and we may be obliged to go into the Exchequer Court. We have made an offer which they do not wish to accept. I may say that in these purchases of property we do not wish to go into the Exchequer Court, because it is an expensive proceeding.

Mr. SPROULE. What portion of these works are now under contract or under construction?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is some costly work to be done on one of the old wharfs, and it is proposed to build some new wharfs further north. It is proposed also to buy some land outside the city to put up an engine-house. I think that only a small amount of work has yet been under-

taken; in fact, it is a subject of criticism that they have not done more with it.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it intended to do these works and to put up these buildings by tender, or does the government propose to do the work by any other means ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Works of this character are usually done by tender.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the minister has an idea whether he will or will not do this work by tender, and his answer appears to me to be an evasive answer.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was not intended to be an evasive one ; I have no intention of doing it otherwise than by tender, but at the same time if any reason should arise why, in my judgment, or in the judgment of the government, it appears better that it should be done otherwise, I would wish to be free.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Have tenders been asked for any part of it yet ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. For the Halifax work tenders have been asked for creosoted piles for one of the wharfs ; that is the only work that has yet been started. Owing to the difficulty of obtaining the land the work has been delayed.

Increased accommodation at Pictou, $23,200.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We had an appropriation last year for this work of $70,000, and the work in that case also, owing to some difficulty in obtaining the land has been delayed, and we have not been able to make as much progress as we expected. The actual expenditure out of that vote has been $12,155.10, so that the unexpended balance at the close of the year which is to be revoted, is $57,884,490. This sum of $57,884, carried over from last year with $40,355, which we shall have to add, makes a total of $98,200, which is the amount that we expect to be authorized to expend in Pictou this year. Of this we are taking $36,500 in the main estimates, and we shall have to ask in the supplementary estimates for the balance of $61,700. This $98,200 is made up as follows : Land, $27,000 ; piles and trestles, $10,000; new station, $30,000. There are also various smaller items, making up the total of $98,200. Pictou is the point at which a large part of the business with Prince Edward Island is carried on ; the station buildings are somewhat old and we are desirous of making considerable improvements. We have selected some land, but it has not yet been purchased, because the price asked is higher than we feel disposed to give, but we are now negotiating and hope to obtain the property at a lower price.

Improvements at Little Metis station and diverting public road, $3,200.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. When this item was before the committee the other night, I was asked to explain what portion of it went for land and what for the road, and other improvements. I find now that the estimated cost of the land is $300 and the cost of building the road $1,200, making $1,500. Then, there are the expenses of moving the station and tank and enlarging the station, which is estimated at $2,500. These items together make the $4,000 for which the vote is asked. Little Metis is the principal summer resort on the Intercolonial Railway, and is visited by a large number of people from various parts of the Dominion, particularly from Montreal and vicinity, and this improvement seems to be very necessary.

Prince Edward Island—to widen wharf and to provide coal sheds at Summerside, $1,600.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is proposed by this expenditure to increase the size of the coal shed so as to afford more shed room on the wharf. We made some expenditure last year upon the other side of the wharf, but this further expenditure is deemed necessary, especially for the accommodation of the coal trade.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Summerside railway wharf is the only place where goods can be landed for transit throughout the Island, and there is only one side of the wharf at which a vessel can get accommodation. At a meeting of the maritime board of trade held recently this question was considered and the following resolution adopted :

That better facilities should be provided at the railway wharf at Summerside to accommodate the steamers landing freight for transportation over the Prince Edward Island Railway.

Most of the freight coming through Prince Edward Island from the west, is brought to Summerside, and it has to be stored in the warehouse before being shipped. There is also a very extensive shipment of goods from different points on the Island to the railway wharf. Increased accommodation is badly needed there. Only one steamer can lie at that wharf, and other steamers have to land their freight at private wharfs, so that the goods have to be trucked across the town at increased cost. I trust that both the wharf and warehouse accommodation will be improved there. I have seen the warehouse so overcrowded, that flour and other merchandise had to remain outside.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The improvements contemplated by this vote will I am sure be appreciated so far as they go. I shall give careful consideration to the representations made by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. LEFURGEY. This work contemplates an improvement to the coal shed, and that is all right so far as it goes, but the other improvements are of great necessity.

Murray Harbour branch and Hillsborough bridge, $600,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a large item, but as hon. gentlemen know, we have undertaken quite a costly work in the extension of the railway from Charlottetown to Murray harbour, inasmuch as a very expensive bridge has to be provided for. In the main estimates we ask for $750,000, a portion of which has already been voted, and we are asking the balance now. In the supplementary estimates we shall have to ask a further sum of $480,000, so that the expenditure which we expect to make on that work during the current year, including the bridge, will be $1,230,000. There was expended on this work up to the 30th June, $1,492,525.47, so that if we take the expenditure to the 30th of June, and the amount we shall have to ask for the current year, these sums make the cost of the work, as estimated up to the end of the current year, $2,795,113.19. The road is already constructed as far as Murray river, and it will take six miles more to carry it down to Murray harbour, which extension is included in the estimate which I have given for the year, and which will have to be provided for in the supplementary estimates. There is also a wharf to be built at Murray harbour, where navigation is open four weeks earlier in the spring and four weeks later in the fall than at Murray river. We propose to carry the road down, as the Act contemplated, from Charlottetown to Murray harbour. The total expenditure for the whole work completed will be about $3,000,000 in round numbers. The bridge is a very costly bridge.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What is the tender for the bridge ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The tender is on schedule prices, and the estimated cost of the bridge is $1,494,097.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Is the estimated cost likely to be increased or decreased ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think there will be any change which would increase the cost of the bridge. It was known from the beginning that it would be a very expensive undertaking. I may say in reply to a question put to me some time ago, that there is a contract between the Dominion and local governments, by which the local government is to contribute to the Dominion the sum of $9,750 per annum for this bridge, and the local government reserves the right to levy tolls on the highway portion of it, if they should see fit to do so.

Mr. SPROULE. For how long are they to pay that ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is a permanent charge which is to be deducted from their subsidy, or any payment that may be due them.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. LEFURGEY. On what basis is the schedule of prices for the building of the bridge arranged ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is the usual method of taking tenders for a work of that character.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I thought you said you could not give the exact cost of the bridge, because it was based on schedule prices ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a lump sum for the superstructure, and the schedule price applies to the masonry, &c.

Mr. LEFURGEY. How much has been expended on the bridge up to the present time ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The expenditure on the substructure and approaches up to the 30th June, 1903, is $733,101.99.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I understand that the work on the bridge has not been proceeded with as rapidly as the government promised and that the contractor has been very little on the ground, pushing the work, this year. When does the minister expect that the bridge will be finished and open for traffic ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The work, like most large undertakings of the kind, has not gone on as rapidly as we might desire. The probable date of the completion of the substructure of the bridge is fixed at the 31st of December of this year, and the probable date of the completion of the superstructure at the 30th of June, 1904.

Mr. LEFURGEY. You say the railway has been completed from Charlottetown to Murray river. How many miles would that be ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Forty-four miles to Murray river, and 6½ miles further to Murray harbour, making 50½ miles for the whole length.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Was this 44 miles tendered for ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, in the first instance ; it was awarded to a party who did not take it. It was then passed to the next tenderer. At a later stage the subsequent portion of the work was given to that contractor at the same rate as the tender price.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Who was the contractor ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Willard Kitchen.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Is he the contractor for the bridge ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No; the contractor for the bridge is Mr. M. J. Haney.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The 6½ miles of railway was not contemplated at the time the contract for the 44 miles was let ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. The contract was let only to Murray river, and we propose to build the railway to Murray harbour.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Has the contract for the 6½ miles been let ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Is it proposed to let it by tender ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have not given that any consideration. We have no intention to build it otherwise than by public tender; but if there are good reasons why we should not do that, I would like to hold myself free.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What is the estimate for the wharf at Murray harbour ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The estimate is much larger than I thought it should be, and I have been asking the engineers if it can be reduced. I have included in these figures an estimate for cribwork, which is to cost something over $60,000. It is a question whether we can reduce this figure. The place is very much exposed, and we may have to build a wharf there of a very substantial character, and the estimate for that is, I think, $69,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you charge the building of that wharf to the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any distinction between building that wharf and building wharfs all over the county and charging them to harbours and rivers ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Wharfs built as part of the terminal facilities of the Intercolonial Railway are all considered to be part of the railway, and are charged to capital.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What is the cost of this railway per mile ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is difficult to make an estimate of the cost of the railway per mile without the bridge. I do not think we have the figures in that form.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Is there any standard to which this road has to be built ? Is it to be built as well as the Grand Trunk Railway between Montreal and Toronto, apart from the double track ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. I think it will be as good as the railway from Charlottetown to Murray river. We like to have standards which the people can see. When the Canadian Pacific Railway was built, the standard fixed was some railway in the United States that the people of Canada knew nothing about. We want a standard which the people can see.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I have had several communications from people in the locality of the railroad, people who have some little idea of the construction of railroads, and they report that the culverts along the line from Charlottetown to Murray river are not fit to be under any railroad or tramroad, as they are not properly constructed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am bound to take notice of what my hon. friend says, but I can only say that no such representations have reached me. Of course, the island railway is a narrow gauge road, and does not require to be built according to the standard of a larger road. But we do want good and substantial work ; that is what we are paying for, and if we are not getting it, there is something wrong. But the work is constructed under competent engineers, and I cannot think that they would accept work of the character my hon. friend describes.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why would it not be easy to arrive at a calculation of the cost of the railway per mile apart from the bridge ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say it would be difficult to arrive at it. I said I did not happen to have the figures before me. The deputy minister informs me that it cost $21,500 per mile without the bridge.

Mr. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.) I was somewhat surprised at the statement made by my hon. friend from East Prince (Mr. Lefurgey), to the effect that the character of the road was so poor. My information is just the opposite.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I did not say the general character of the road. I said the culverts.

Mr. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.). That is a part of the road and a very important part. It is very strange that if that is the case I have not heard anything about it. I live pretty near that part of the country. If the railway does not run through the district I represent, it runs close to it. As a matter of fact, I have been speaking to some railway men, who belong to the Prince Edward Island Railway and who would have no interest in misrepresenting the matter in any way.

Mr. LEFURGEY. You do not suppose I would.

Mr. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.) No. But I do not know the men who gave my hon. friend the information. I do not mean to say for one moment that he would misrepresent ; but possibly the matter may have been misrepresented to him. The men I have been speaking to on the subject are practical railway men, and they have told me that it is an excellent road, a much better one than the older part of the Prince Edward Island Railway was when it was built.

Mr. COCHRANE. Were they contractors?

Mr. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.). No, and they have no interest whatever in the contractors. They are Prince Edward Islanders, who would be interested in having a good road.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Are they brakesmen ?

Mr. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.). No ; they are men who have been engaged in the construction of railways.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then they have been contractors ?

Mr. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.). No, they have been employed with contractors in railway work. They have no interest at all in Mr. Kitchen's contract, not the slightest, no more than my hon. friend.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The information came to me in several communications, and I have given it to you as I got it. I only call the attention of the minister to it in order that it may be looked into. I would like to know how this amount of $9,750 which the provincial government is to pay has been arrived at ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid I can hardly answer that question. It was originally fixed at a larger sum, in the earlier negotiations. The estimate for the bridge was less than was thought in the first negotiations, and this sum was fixed by Act of parliament in the year 1901 confirming the arrangement made with the government of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. COCHRANE. What are we to understand by a narrow gauge road ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The railway on the island is not the standard gauge, but three feet six.

Mr. COCHRANE. What is the lay of this country ? I always understood that it was level.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not level, but there are no very high mountains. It is a rolling country.

Mr. HACKETT. I am satisfied with the plan of the hon. minister with regard to the substructure of the bridge. But how will the superstructure be carried on ? Are we to have some of the old bridges on the Intercolonial taken across and placed as a superstructure on that work ? The people of the island, according to the statement of the hon. gentleman, are paying $9,750 per year for this accommodation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Haney's contract is for the substructure, $1,218,000. The superstructure represents $275,000. We are not to have any played-out bridges, but some good, strong bridges, suitable for the island, are to be taken from the Intercolonial.

Mr. HACKETT. From what part of the Intercolonial are those bridges coming ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. From the Miramichi river.

Mr. HACKETT. The south-west or north-west branches ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The chief engineer thinks south-west, but not very positive.

Mr. HACKETT. What is their age ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They were built in 1872.

Mr. HACKETT. Did not the hon. minister a few days ago give a bridge of the same age to be used as a traffic bridge between Quebec and the province of New Brunswick, without charging anything at all for it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are not charging this to the island.

Mr. HACKETT. Yes, you are compelling the province to pay $9,750 per year for this superstructure, where there shall be a carriage way alongside, and I think that it is strange that a present should be made to the rich province of Quebec and the province of New Brunswick, while you insist upon Prince Edward Island paying the last farthing.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think, in view of those large figures, that my hon. friend will hardly get a great deal of sympathy when he complains that the island is badly treated. Over the Restigouche there was a bridge for which we had no use. If we could have used it on any other part of the government system, we would have done so, but there was no place for which it was adapted, so that it was practically worthless. We offer it to the provinces of New Brunswick and Quebec as our contribution for an iron bridge between the two provinces, but the municipalities or the provinces will have to provide considerable expenditure in the making of that bridge. We occasionally grant sums for interprovincial bridges, and we deal with new Brunswick and Quebec as we deal with other provinces between which there are interprovincial bridges.

Mr. HACKETT. I am not objecting at all to what is being done at Restigouche, but I object that, while the provinces of New Brunswick and Quebec are dealt with in one way, Prince Edward Island is dealt with differently. What does the acting minister intend doing in connection with the building of a railway station at Charlottetown ? That has been in discussion for many years, and the present railway station is not at all fitted for its purpose. Does the hon. minister intend now to build a proper railway station in Charlottetown ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We expect to provide for some improvements in Charlottetown in the supplementaries.

Mr. COCHRANE. What is the cost per mile of that road ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. $21,500 per mile. It is a narrow gauge road through a hilly country, with a considerable amount of rock.

Mr. SPROULE. If the bridge cost a million and a half and the whole expenditure was $2,795,000, the railway, being 45 miles in length, must have cost $28,000 a mile.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That would include the bridge.

Mr. SPROULE. No.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is 50½ miles over the whole line—44 miles to Murray river and 6½ miles from Murray river to Murray harbour.

Mr. SPROULE. That would make it about $28,000 a mile.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would like to ask the acting Minister of Railways and Canals if he has had any communication from any source, inside or outside this House, with regard to a line to Elmira ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have had communication verbally and, I think, in writing—at any rate, I know that a desire has been expressed for one or two extensions. But I do not remember the name of Elmira. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lefurgey) has better information than I have.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Among the lines very much needed in Prince Edward Island is one to Elmira. I think my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Hughes) will explain that point somewhat fully. I have here a resolution passed by a public meeting held on the 27th of February, at which speeches were made by Messrs. John McLean, M. L. A., J. J. Hughes, M.P., and others. And the following resolution was passed :

Whereas a survey for a branch line of railway was made in the year 1882 by the then government of Canada ; and whereas

The government of 1895 promised to construct several branch railways on Prince Edward Island, among which was the Elmira branch ; and

Whereas a delegation from Elmira had a promise from Sir L. H. Davies when Minister of Marine and Fisheries that upon the completion of the Murray Harbour Railway he would use his influence with the Minister of Railways to cause a survey to be made and estimates prepared and submitted to parliament for the construction of a branch line to Elmira ; and whereas

Since that time largely increased expenditures for railways and other public works have been made in nearly every part of the Dominion ;

Therefore resolved that the residents of East Point and vicinity, in meeting assembled, strongly urge upon the government the necessity of commencing this important work at an early date, and also request our representatives in parliament to press this matter upon the Minister of Railways during the coming session.

It seems to me very strange that the acting Minister of Railways and Canals had not heard fully of this branch line to Elmira, seeing that the hon. member for King's was one of the prominent speakers on this occasion. But if the hon. gentleman has not spoken of it, I wish it to be borne in on the hon. minister on this occasion that there are other places in Prince Edward Island that need railway facilities; and, while I do not know so much about this railway to Elmira, I have on several occasions brought to the notice of the government the promise that was made to the people of Prince Edward Island that a branch line was to be constructed from North Wiltshire to Crapaud. On two occasions, I think, petitions were presented to this House largely signed, by persons irrespective of politics, for branch lines through that thriving settlement. It would run through a country from 15 to 20 miles away from railway communications, and would be of great service to the people there. There are also several much shorter lines in the western part of the province to which, I think, the attention of the government has been called on several occasions. I think we have the right to expect some promise or some indication of what the government's intentions are as to these branch lines.

Mr. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.) My hon. friend from East Prince (Mr. Lefurgey), speaking of the branch line to Elmira, said he did not know much about it. I am quite convinced of that fact. He does not know much about it, or he would not have mentioned it. I did not intend to make any remarks about this matter, and would not but for the ill-advised statements of the member for East Prince. I should be sorry to refer to any matters in the hon. gentleman's district while he is a member of the House and present. I take it that he is quite able to take care of his own district, and I think that I am able to take care of the part of Prince Edward Island which I represent. The facts are, that while the hon. gentleman's friends were in power a survey was made from Harmony, near Souris, to Elmira, just on the eve of an election. But when the election was over nothing further was done. And so the people were deceived. In fact, they were deceived twice by running a survey over that part of the country. After the first survey the stakes were allowed to rot, and when the next survey was made they were not to be found. As a supporter of the government, I would not ask the government to do anything of that kind. The hon. gentleman has referred to a meeting

at Elmira, or rather at Lakeville, near Elmira. If he has a true report of that meeting, he will find that I stated that, until the road to Murray harbour was completed, I would not take this matter up, as I thought the government was doing fairly well for Prince Edward Island in the matter of building railways. And I think so still. I have told the people that I would not bring this up as an election dodge, nor would I bring it up until the Murray harbour road was completed. But, when that road is built, I shall bring this to the attention of the government upon its merits as a fair and reasonable commercial proposition. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey) was ill-advised when he brought this matter up. I did not intend to refer to these old subjects, but I could not avoid it in view of the fact that his party, when in power, deliberately twice deceived the people of the eastern part of King's county, in the hope of affecting an election. I would not ask the government to do anything of that kind, and if I did ask them, I do not think they would consent.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I am sorry the hon. member for King's (Mr. Hughes) got so excited over this matter.

Mr. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.) I am not excited, but I have stated some facts that are not palatable to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lefurgey).

Mr. LEFURGEY. I have brought this matter up on several occasions, and intend to bring it up again until I get some satisfaction as to the intentions of the government with regard to these lines. The hon. member (Mr. Hughes, King's) may be very well satisfied with the work going on in the eastern part of the province, where they are getting fifty miles of railway built, while the people of the western section have none. He may well be quiet for a year or two. I have simply taken occasion to remind the government of a promise made by Sir Louis Davies that on the completion of the road now under construction, the road to Elmira would be looked after. But merely because one road is under construction, is that any reason why the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes, King's) should not press his claims on the government. Is he too bashful? Well, I can tell him that, while I am in this House I consider myself as a representative not only of my own district, but of his district as well, which is in an integral part of the Dominion, and I am a representative of the Dominion. I do not intend to keep quiet, even though the hon. gentleman does get excited; and if he does not see fit to ask for more railway communication for the eastern part of the island, I shall do so myself.

Mr. HACKETT. Can the minister say that a new station will be built in Charlottetown within a year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will ask my hon. friend to be patient, because the supplementary estimates will be down to-morrow. I cannot promise that they will satisfy him absolutely, but they will be encouraging.

Mr. HACKETT. There is another matter I desire to call to the attention of the minister, and that is the construction of a new station at Alberton, in the county of West Prince. The station there is really an old ramshackle, one of the first erected on the Island, over thirty years ago.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Leave something for Ontario.

Mr. HACKETT. You are asking us to vote away over $100,000,000 for building a railway from Moncton to Winnipeg.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Do you have to pay for it?

Mr. HACKETT. We have to pay our proportion of it, and we insist upon receiving our share of the public moneys of the Dominion of Canada. Now might I ask the minister again if he intends to build this station at Alberton, in the county of West Prince, within a short time?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think my hon. friend will have to have some faith and not cross examine us too closely. I will not say 'wait till you see us next year,' but wait till you see the supplementaries.

Mr. HACKETT. There is another matter I desire to bring to the attention of the minister, and that is the building of a branch line of railway from O'Leary Station to the west shore of Prince Edward Island. There have been petitions sent asking for it, and many meetings held advocating it. The people are desirous of having this branch line constructed. While my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Campbell) appears to be very indignant because we insist upon having our rights in the expenditure of public money, he is quite willing to vote away a hundred million dollars of the public money, while he would not give us a hundred thousand dollars in the province of Prince Edward Island to complete our railway system. I hope the minister will see his way clear to do something in connection with a branch from O'Leary to the west shore of Prince Edward Island.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am sorry to hear that my hon. friend from West York is not willing to give Prince Edward Island a hundred thousand dollars, because I am asking my hon. friend from West York to vote $1,230,000 for Prince Edward Island in this one item alone.

Mr. SPROULE. How many tenders did you receive for the substructure of this bridge, and who was the lowest tenderer?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This contract was let to Mr. Haney on the 25th of August, 1900. We expect the bridge will be finished at the end of the calendar year, and we hope the whole work will be finished by the 30th of June, 1904.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the minister bring down the information regarding this contract, the parties tendering and the amount of each tender ?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is this superstructure to cost $275,000 over and above the bridges that are taken off the Intercolonial Railway ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, a value will be put upon the bridges and credited to the Intercolonial account. The $275,000 will include the price which will be paid to the Intercolonial and also the cost of erection.

Mr. HACKETT. The minister brushed aside the remarks I made very easily. But he must remember this first, that while we are voting this large amount for the construction of this bridge, the government and people of Prince Edward Island are bound to pay $9,750 in interest upon that sum. Now if you are voting a million dollars or so, you are obliging the people to contribute that much. I shall make no apology for bringing up the matter in this House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. With regard to the people of Prince Edward Island paying this sum of money, I do not wish the hon. gentleman to offer an apology, but unintentionally he has omitted an important fact. This bridge is being constructed for two purposes, partly for a railway bridge and partly for a highway bridge. The Dominion of Canada is paying every copper of the cost so far as it relates to the railway, and the local government are contributing a share towards the bridge in consideration of the fact that it provides a highway for them, and it is their business to provide a highway.

Mr. SPROULE. What valuation do you put on these bridges that are taken from over the Miramichi river ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The value placed on the bridges for the purpose of being credited in the Intercolonial Railway accounts is $64,000. The remaining portion of the value placed on the bridges represents the cost of transportation and erection.

Mr. HACKETT. Will the bridges be sufficient to cover the distance between Southport and Charlottetown ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the bridges will be quite sufficient for the purpose.

Mr. HACKETT. In addition to that you have to provide the carriage way by the side of the bridge ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is included in the figures I gave.

Increased accommodation at Kensington, $800.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. One-fifth of this has already been voted.

Mr. LEFURGEY. This is for increased accommodation at Kensington. I have a letter from one of the chief business men in Kensington in regard to these improvements and for the benefit of the acting Minister of Railways and Canals I wish to read this in order to give him an idea of what is required there. He says :

A memorial asking for a new station building here was sent to Mr. Blair a few days ago from the committee appointed at a meeting of the patrons of the station here held on October last. And since then we see that $1,000 is in the estimates for repairs of the old one presumably by Mr. Sharpe's plan. Now, owing to increased business, both freight and passenger lately, and especially as it is here the summer tourists for Malpeque and New London take and leave the train, decent and if possible attractive accommodation should be had. At present it is the very reverse. The change proposed by Mr. Sharpe would be very little better, whilst it would stand in the way of getting a new building for some time. For instance, he proposed taking a portion of the old freight-shed (ceiling 8 feet 6 inches), under a flat roof and saturated with oil, petroleum and other things and converting it into a ladies' waiting room, and all his other changes according to that. We had some differences with Mr. Sharpe and now he is getting square with us. He could not say but the old building as you know, with only one waiting-room, where every class of persons have to wait for hours at night waiting for belated trains as is very common, yes, from wealthy, refined Americans and other tourists down to Indians and drunken toughs, is not fit for use. But he wants to patch it up in any shape and punish the public for the criticism offered to him about the present state of affairs.

Now, this section is one of the principal shipping points between Charlottetown and Summerside, possibly the largest town between these two points, and it is a place of considerable commercial importance, as the writer states here it is a point where a great many tourists coming to Prince Edward Island leave and take the trains to go to the watering places and they have had but the one station where Indians, ladies and all congregate to wait for trains which at this point are necessarily late leaving Summerside and arriving through from Charlottetown. When $1,000 is being spent to make repairs in this station it seems to me that at a point so central as this the government might very well spend a little more, a thousand or two, whatever is necessary and build a suitable station. I merely want to call the attention of the minister to

this before any expenditure is made upon it in order that he may have an opportunity to investigate. I wish also to say that their freight accommodation and the platform arrangements for passengers are very deficient and require some attention. Before sitting down I would also wish to put in a word for the improvements at Charlottetown and to say that I am entirely in accord with what Mr. Hackett said that the station is an old and dilapidated affair and the people there certainly need a new station. They also need increased accommodation along their water-front for the different private wharfs. There is no way of getting at the freight in these places unless you cart it straight across the town to Charlottetown station.

To improve the water service, $19,200.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At present they use wells on the Prince Edward Island Railway, and we propose to place upon the system a modern method of supplying the railway with water from tanks.

To provide additional accommodation at Kinkora, $640.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Is it intended to make this a booking station ? Unless it is made a booking station the residents of that section of the country extending from Emerald and Albany to Kinkora, will not be able to get their goods without sending their money to Emerald. Trains pass this station late at night and early in the morning, and the booking station is an absolute necessity.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We propose to erect a building forty feet by twenty feet, in which there will be a waiting room and baggage room. The business at the station is not very great, and I think probably it will have to be a flag station for the present.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The business of the station cannot be great when you do not afford accommodation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At all events this is a step in the right direction.

Mr. HACKETT. Kinkora is a very prominent point on the line from Emerald to Cape Traverse, and I would urge the minister to have a regular booking station and telegraph office there.

New stations at Northam and Richmond, $800.

Mr. HACKETT. Will these buildings be erected before the winter ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will try. I cannot promise.

Mr. HACKETT. Will these stations be similar to the stations at Elmsdale and Conway, and have a fire and caretaker, without being regular booking stations ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The station will be similar to that at Kinkora.

Mr. SPROULE. We have now passed the railway estimates, and as it is after twelve o'clock, we should adjourn.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the request is reasonable.

Some resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

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

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The orders are so reduced in number now, that it is very easy to make a selection. We might take up some Bills which have already been discussed, and we will perhaps go on with supply. That is as definite as I can state at present. If we go on with supply we will proceed from the point at which we left off.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.25 a.m. Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, October 1, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

QUESTION.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES VOTED.

Mr. WILSON asked :

1. What amount of bonuses or subsidies have been voted by parliament each year to railways during the years 1900, 1901 and 1902 ?
2. How much of the said bonuses or subsidies has been paid during the said years, and up to 1st September, 1903 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The first part of the question will hardly admit of a definite answer, inasmuch as the subsidies are not voted in any lump sum. If my hon. friend will take the mileage which is voted, and make an approximate estimate on the basis of $3,200 per mile, he might arrive at some idea of the amount ; but in some cases the subsidies are larger than $3,200 and are paid in proportion to the cost of the road. The second question admits of an answer, and I will be very glad to give the hon. gentleman the information at a later stage ; I have not it ready to-day.

Mr. WILSON. Would it not be convenient for the Minister of Finance to get one of the clerks to make up the calculation, and give it to me later ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is impossible to make it up accurately ; it is a matter of approximation.

Mr. WILSON. You can give the amount voted ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid my hon. friend has not caught the point of my remarks. The hon. gentleman wants to know the total amount of the subsidies that have been voted by parliament. Railway subsidies are not voted in an express amount, but are voted on the basis of so much per mile, and the statute provides that the subsidy may be $3,200 per mile in the case of an ordinary road, or, when the road proves more than ordinarily expensive, it may be an increased sum not exceeding $6,400 per mile. I therefore cannot give the hon. gentleman a statement of the amount voted, but I can give a statement of the amount paid, and will be glad to do so.

Mr. WILSON. We had a statement brought down to the House giving the amount voted.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If my hon. friend will call my attention to that, I will be glad to look into it.

Mr. WILSON. I shall.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Sometimes the subsidies are voted in this way : To a line between certain points, not exceeding so many miles in length. Perhaps that is what my hon. friend wants.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We vote the subsidies for not exceeding so many miles, but the amount per mile is necessarily somewhat indefinite, although within limits. That is why I cannot give the hon. gentleman the statement he asks for. If he will be good enough to call my attention to the return to which he has referred, I will see what further information can be given.

GOVERNMENT OF THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—FINANCIAL AID.

Bill (No. 256) to provide for advances to the government of the North-west Territories, read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). This Bill is in the precise terms of the resolution which has already been fully discussed in Committee.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this intended as an advance for any particular period of time, say for the fiscal year, or is it simply an indefinite advance to be paid to the government of the North-west Territories at any time in the future, as the government may see fit ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is an advance without limit. It stands to the credit of the government of the North-west Territories, to be used or not to be used, as in their discretion may seem to be necessary.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the correspondence brought down in connection with this matter been printed?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not aware whether the correspondence has been printed or not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My recollection of the correspondence brought down in connection with this matter is that the Prime Minister of the North-west Territories objected to the creation of a debt account between the North-west Territories and the government of Canada at the present time, and pointed out that what the North-west Territories really desire is that the annual subsidy to the North-west Territories should be increased to such an amount as would be adequate for the works which they have to undertake in the administration of that country. He also expressed the opinion that it was not in the interest of the North-west Territories that any debt should be incurred by them at the present time, before the territories have received that provincial status which has been demanded by its legislature for some considerable time past.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think that the government of the North-west Territories objected to this advance being made to them. The special point of their objection was to a proposition which was made at one stage of the negotiations that the cost of two large bridges, for the construction of which we were arranging with them, should be made a charge against an advance. However, I am sure the government of the North-west Territories would prefer to have any sums which are available for them given in the way of an annual grant and perhaps my hon. friend may be right in saying they objected to this. There is however, nothing compulsory about this; it is an option which we give to the government of the North-west Territories and if they do not see fit to exercise it no harm will be done. The allowance made in the meantime was fully discussed in the Committee. I then pointed out the rapid increase made by this government in the allowance to the North-west Territories and I think the Committee were generally satisfied that the allowances we now make, irrespective of this grant, are quite liberal and take due account of the rapid growth and greater needs of that section of our country.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What increase is made in the allowance for the present year ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I gave the figures in the previous debate. The appropriation for 1902 was $407,979. I am speaking now entirely of what I may call the general vote for the North-west Territories which would correspond to the provincial subsidy. There are other grants for other purposes, and my observations are

confined entirely to that general vote which appears in the estimates as a grant for school and other purposes. For 1903, including the supplementary estimates passed in the latter part of the year, the grant was $707,989 and for the current year we are proposing to pay them including a special grant for two large bridges which at one time it was suggested should be charged to capital account, but which we ultimately decided to provide for in the way of grant —$1,046,979, irrespective of this advance of which the government of the North-west Territories may or may not avail themselves.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Harbours and rivers, Quebec—Sorel deep water wharf, $37,600.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like my right hon. friend to make some explanation of this item. I would like to know how much money has been expended on the terminals, wharfs and harbour improvements at Sorel; how much is proposed to be expended in the future and whether or not the object of that expenditure is to create at Sorel an ocean port for export traffic.

The expenditure made there is not at all commensurate with the idea of improvements for merely local purposes, and we are entitled to a full explanation as to whether or not this port is designed to be one of the national ports of the St. Lawrence. We have the ports of Montreal and Quebec upon which considerable sums have been expended. It may be the policy of the government to create another national port at Sorel and to expend large sums on terminal facilities there for the export trade. But I do not suppose there will be any difficulty in handling all that trade in Montreal and Quebec, if these ports are properly equipped, and further we have the ports of Halifax and St. John, to which, in the winter months, the people of the maritime provinces at least think a very considerable portion of the western traffic will come. We ought to know what has already been expended at Sorel, what is the scope of the works there, what traffic is expected. Has the government any expectation that traffic, which could be handled at Montreal and Quebec, will be handled at Sorel? Why should we attempt to create an ocean port there instead of concentrating our efforts upon Montreal and Quebec?

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. colleague the Minister of Public Works will give the information required regarding the expenditure. The question of policy, I think, was stated pretty fully two years ago when this appropriation was first asked for. In the opinion of the government there certainly must be at Sorel a large ocean traffic. It is the outlet of the Richelieu valley, which is one of the most fertile and wealthy in Canada, and from which a great deal of agricultural produce is exported. At Montreal to-day there is scarcely adequate space for the traffic. The government are asked every day to provide more facilities at that port. The tendency there has ever been to concentrate the traffic within a very narrow limit. All the efforts of the traders have been to get as near as possible to the canal basin, so that practically the whole traffic is centred between the canal basin and Bonsecours market. But it is impossible that the trade should be confined within that narrow space. The government has put up large wharfs at St. Mary's Current, near Hochelaga, and the trade no doubt will extend more and more along the St. Lawrence. It is impossible that the western traffic will be confined at Montreal. By and by the harbour will not be confined merely to the city of Montreal, but will extend to Sorel and Three Rivers, and the Montreal Harbour Commissioners will claim jurisdiction over these places. In my opinion the harbour of Sorel is destined not only to take the trade of the Richelieu valley, but also to become an outlet for the trade of the North-west. At present the Canada Atlantic Railway has no terminus in any Canadian port. It is forced to unload at Coteau and send its freight down the St. Lawrence in barges. On the south shore it extends to the state of Vermont, and has a point of junction with the Southern Counties Railway, at Noyan, which comes from the state of Vermont and extends to Sorel. It is expected that the Canada Atlantic Railway will be able to make arrangements with that company in order to have its terminus at Sorel. Unfortunately however, the Southern Counties Railway is in difficulties. It is in the hands of a company which cannot carry on the work, but this is only a temporary obstacle, and I expect that the trade of the west will certainly find an outlet at the city of Sorel.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have not recently examined the explanation which my right hon. friend gave of this expenditure some two years ago. My recollection is that the policy of the government then was based altogether on an expected railway development which has not materialized. I believe that Dr. Seward Webb had some negotiations with regard to the acquisition of some of these railways. There was to be a great system connecting with certain railways in the United States. As I understand it, that project has entirely fallen through, and there is no prospect of it being resuscitated. If it is not resuscitated, I do not know exactly upon what ground we can anticipate that a considerable trade

in exports will go by Sorel. Properly equip the harbour of Montreal and why should trade go past Montreal to Sorel? Surely, we can hardly expect, at present, to have trade so great that it will occupy both sides of the river St. Lawrence for a space of forty miles or more. Surely the Prime Minister can hardly expect to equip the St. Lawrence to that extent when his Minister of Public Works, in making a comparison between the government's proposal with regard to the transcontinental line and mine, added $14,000,000 in connection with these harbours to the cost of my project, and not a single dollar in connection with the project of the government. Now, the harbour of Sorel is within forty-five miles of the harbour of Montreal. No one is inclined to minimize the Richelieu valley or its products. But, as my right hon. friend speaks of the necessity for an ocean port in that valley, has he any information to give the House as to how many tons of export for Europe the Richelieu Valley produces at this present time? Has it sent one steamerload to Europe in the course of the year?—or two, or half a dozen? How many does it send? There are fertile valleys in the province of Nova Scotia, valleys that may not be so large in extent as the Richelieu valley, but quite as fertile, I suppose, as any valleys in Quebec or Ontario; but I shall hardly expect to have a great ocean port created for one of these valleys, though its people send a great many hundred thousand barrels of fruit to Europe every year. Sorel, being about forty-five miles down the St. Lawrence from Montreal, must be within about 120 miles of the port of Quebec. My right hon. friend and his transportation expert, my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), have proven, very much to their own satisfaction, that transportation by rail is cheaper than transportation by water. So, if we wish to be economical, we should send the freight of the Richelieu valley as far as we can by rail. This would mean, under present circumstances, that we would send it at least as far as Quebec. That is a logical result of the argument of my right hon. friend and the hon. member for North Norfolk. But now the right hon. gentleman is going on an absolutely different principle from that which guided him in relation to the National Transcontinental Railway. He has embarked upon the project of constructing a railway nearly 2,000 miles in extent from Quebec to the maritime provinces, on the theory that rail transportation is cheaper than water transportation—if that is not the reason there can be no reason for his policy. Acting upon that principle what should the right hon. gentleman do? He should improve the railway grades from Sorel to Quebec to the four-tenths per cent of which the expert has told us, and thus minimize the cost of transportation via existing ocean ports. I am sure the right hon. gentleman did not think of that when he embarked upon this project. It is two years since he entered upon this policy of making an ocean port of Sorel, and the great advantages of rail transportation had not then become crystallized in his mind. But, in the light of his new theory he will see that this project is unwise; and I should think he would not be inclined to persevere in his proposal to spend these very large sums at Sorel. For, of course, on the hon. gentleman's theory, that expenditure can only result in disadvantage to Sorel and to the Richelieu valley, as it will result in sending their products by water, when, with other improvements, they might be more advantageously sent by rail. As I understand it, the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) is going to give us the cost of these improvements up to the present time and the estimate of further expenditure. But I am sure, that he, like my right hon. friend, in view of the light that has come to them with regard to all-rail transportation, will see that there cannot be any justification for the expenditure of any further large sums of money on these works at Sorel.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote of $40,000 is to complete the work. The total cost of the work when completed is estimated by the department at $273,500. Of course, the work is under contract, and I believe it is nearly completed. This vote is to pay the amount which will be earned under the contract.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is the wharf a wooden one?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, all wood. I suppose I need not go into details, for on a previous occasion this matter was discussed at length, and I gave the committee all the facts of which I was in possession.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could tell us the wharfage that has been collected? What quantity of freight has been shipped, especially foreign exports?

The PRIME MINISTER. There is none, because there has been no wharf to take it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This money is being expended to serve the export trade of Europe. This is to be a wharf for ocean-going steamers. Surely, the Minister of Marine, in whose department this is, will be able to give us information as to the amount of dues collected.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The wharf has not been handed over to the department yet, because it has not been finished.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But the government must have made a calculation of the work to be done before entering into this expenditure. Can he tell us the whole export trade of the valley of the Richelieu that is expected to be sent by Sorel?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think we have any statistics. But to show the amount of export trade, I can tell my hon. friend—or rather remind him, for he knows it already—of the extent of the valley from which this wharf would draw its trade. The counties of Richelieu, Yamaska, Verchères, Rouville, St. Hyacinthe, St. John and Iberville, all centre upon the Richelieu river, and the hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that these are amongst the most fruitful and wealthy parts of the province of Quebec or of the Dominion. There are large exports yearly of hay, butter, cheese, and all agricultural products. These are what we expect to carry from this wharf when it is completed. But my hon. friend is 'too previous' in asking how much has been collected. There is no connection yet between the wharf and the railway, the work being still in progress.

Mr. BROCK. Considering the very meagre information that the government has been able to give us in connection with the establishing of a great ocean port, I think I might draw the attention of the House as I am sure the attention of the country will be drawn, to the fact that the government has appointed a transportation commission for the very purpose of taking into consideration such matters as these. I believe that the government have contended that that commission will have no right to interfere with the transcontinental railway, but that harbours, wharfs and general transportation questions will be considered by them. I do not think it would be too much to ask that this matter of Sorel should be taken into consideration by the transportation commission along with the other matters which will claim their attention. I believe a report from that commission would have great effect upon this House and upon the country. It would greatly simplify our plans. The government are starting out on what I believe they have called a patchwork system of transportation—a part of a scheme here, part of a scheme there, and without definite information with regard to any of them.

We all know that the valley of the Richelieu is a very rich valley, and we all know that if they are going to bring freight from Iberville, the question of which will be the cheapest route, whether by rail or by water, would be an important one. That district is now served by the river navigation, and I suppose by the harbour of Montreal. But the point I would like to make just now is: What part is the transportation commission going to play in dealing with matters of this kind, when the government let contracts for supplies? I do not see that these gentlemen are really going to be of any use, and I think that if they have any respect for themselves and for the position they will occupy, they will say: Well, we have got the appointment, for which we are going to be paid a salary, but if we are not going to have any work to do we will throw up the appointment. Now the hon. gentleman must remember that we are building a railroad on which we are going to spend hundreds of millions of dollars, and we are making appropriations for harbours here and there. The harbour of Three Rivers has a large appropriation, and I think these things should be taken into consideration by the Transportation Commission. If they decide that Montreal is the best harbour, let them concentrate their means upon it and make a grand harbour of it. These little patchwork harbours do not seem to be in accordance with the grand views expressed by the Prime minister and other hon. gentlemen when they spoke of the idea of a transcontinental railroad. Now, I contend that spending $37,000 in addition to what we have already spent, is doing the work in a patchwork fashion, because the government are not able to lay before this House a single item of information as to the amount of freight that is likely to be moved there. I say, therefore, that this whole question should be taken up by the Transportation Commission, and reported upon to the House, so that next session we will have sufficient information upon which to go; and you will find that members on this side of the House will be only too anxious to assist in the improvement of our transportation facilities in every possible way. Perhaps the right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) may be considered a doubting Thomas in respect to any desire we may have of assisting the government. I know he is able to carry this vote through the House, although I do not consider it is in the interests of the country at large, but I believe it is brought forward merely in view of an early election. There has been too much of that kind of thing done already, and the country is getting hold of it. I do not want to give the hon. gentlemen advice for their own interest, because I know they are able to take care of themselves, and they can turn a corner more sharply than they will be able to do under any advice I can give them. Again I say that this transportation commission must consider all these matters and make their recommendations before we spend these enormous sums of money. I, therefore, ask the government to submit this question to the Transportation Commission.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend's objections come rather late. He should have made these remarks two years ago when this vote was first brought to the attention of parliament. Let him remember that this work is already far advanced, there is only $40,000 more to expend upon it, and surely the hon. gentleman does not expect that we are going to give it up now and not pay the contractors who are at work. This work has been progressing, and it is now nearly completed. True, we stated at the opening of this session our plans with regard to the navigation and transportation

questions. I am afraid we have been proceeding rather loosely, but it was better to adopt an extensive transportation system, and that is the reason we have appointed this commission. I think the commission will do good work in this respect, and will give us a general plan as to where these national works had better be undertaken. But in the meantime we must complete the work that we have undertaken.

Mr. BROCK. The right hon. gentleman says my remarks come too late. If he will look in 'Hansard' of 1900 he will find that I urged the appointment of a transportation commission in reference to this very point, when these items were up before. I am merely reiterating what I said then. I gave the government good advice. but they did not see fit to follow it. They have recently appointed a commission, and now they are taking the whole question of transportation out of the hands of the commission.

Mr. KEMP. The counties to which the Prime Minister refers as being fertile counties are doubtless the most fertile in the province of Quebec. The surplus exports of these counties, however, are not very large, because there is a large consuming population lying near-by. The city of Montreal takes a very large part of the products of those counties. I suppose that one large modern steamship, such as navigates the St. Lawrence, would be able to take all the surplus products of those counties which will be produced in the course of a season. I do not suppose there will be more than could be put on one large steamship and taken to Eurpoe. Now, to make ocean harbour for the purpose of taking away the products of these few counties I do not think is a very practical way of viewing the question. I have been under the impression that the best way to deal with the Sorel harbour matter was to let it drop, and I justify that opinion by the fact that the railway for which this work was proposed to be promoted, has failed to make its connection, and has failed to make Sorel its terminus. The excuse for these tremendous works at Sorel was that the United Counties Railway was to be taken over by the Rutland Railway, which was practically a part of the New York Central. I believe the Prime Minister assumes full responsibility for the initiation of this work. The first vote was a small sum of $25,000 for improvements in Sorel harbour. That was an innocent looking estimate, and no one in this House, I presume, took strong ground against it. But as time went on the reports of an engineer were secured by the department and it became known to this House what is would cost in order to carry out the works which the petitioners asked for, representing the Bank of St. Hyacinthe and the United Counties Railway, who wanted to make this an ocean port. The engineer estimated, according to papers laid on the Table of the House this session, that it would require a sum of not less than $935,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think my hon. friend is mistaken as to the report of the engineer.

Mr. KEMP. I will read it. The report of the engineer is dated, Department of Public Works, office of chief engineer, Ottawa, January 10th, 1900:

Sir,—With reference to file No. 208,734, being an application from Mr. J. N. Greenshields, on behalf of the United Counties Railway, for the construction of deep water terminal facilities at Sorel, I have the honour to state that a certain portion of the ground to be occupied by the improvements in question has already been surveyed by Mr. Assistant Engineer F. W. Cowie, and that judging from the estimate of the cost of the works then proposed, which only consisted of 1,000 feet of wharfing instead of the 2,000 feet applied for, the estimated cost of the works now required cannot be placed at a less figure than $935,000, as follows:—

Dredging an area 800 feet wide by 25,000 feet in length, an average depth of 18 feet to 27½ feet at extreme low water..	$255,000
Cribwork and sheds..	430,000
Elevator of 1,000,000 bushels capacity..	250,000

If the department decides to undertake this work it will of course be necessary to have a complete survey made, in order that the above estimate may be revised, especially as far as the dredging is concerned.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) EUGENE D. LAFLEUR,
Acting Chief Engineer.

The Secretary,
Department of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In what way does the hon. gentleman make the connection between that report and the item under discussion?

Mr. KEMP. That is an interesting question. I will have to think that out and see how I can connect it with the item under discussion. The item under discussion is a small estimate for the purpose of doing further work on the Sorel harbour.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend, as well as the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock), has apparently not looked at the estimates to see what the item is for, because both seem to have made the same mistake.

Mr. KEMP. Is the item not for the purpose of carrying on work to give Sorel a deep-water harbour and make it an ocean port?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The item is to pay the balance due on a contract for work already undertaken.

Mr. BROCK. It is all part of the same scheme.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, facts are facts. This is a balance

as I say, of the payment due on a contract for work that has already been undertaken. My hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) is reading the report of an engineer in regard to another proposition that was not undertaken. What we are discussing now is an item providing for the payment for work that was undertaken, that was let by contract and which is almost completed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think they are pretty closely connected by the fact that this report is included in the file of papers that was brought down to the House, papers that we demanded in respect to the very matter we are now discussing. If they are not connected it is a remarkable thing that this report was brought down with the papers in connection with this scheme.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) that it is connected with it in the sense in which he speaks of it, and that is the reason why I asked my hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) the question. He is apparently using the report as a report in connection with the work under contract.

Mr. COCHRANE. No, I do not understand him in that way.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I simply asked my hon. friend the question, because, if he was using the report in connection with the work under contract, he is making a mistake. If he was using it in connection with a certain proposition that has not been undertaken, I think my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) is quite correct.

Mr. KEMP. I think the question which the hon. Minister of Public Works puts forth is a reasonable one. It seems to me that it resolves itself chiefly into a question of order. I am discussing the whole work of improvement at Sorel harbour. I realize that the amount now under consideration is to complete certain contracts already entered into. I realize that for the full amount of $935,000, which is estimated as being necessary to make Sorel an ocean port, you would only have a depth of water of 18 feet. That would not take very large vessels in, and if it is intended to make Sorel a port to compete with Quebec and Montreal, you would need to have a greater depth of water and the cost would be that much more. As the prospect of the New York Central Railway having a terminus at Sorel has not materialized, is it not a reasonable thing to criticise this item very strongly? The right hon. Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) last year stated in this House in regard to the New York Central having a terminal at Sorel:

> But railways are taking the place of waterways, and two railways are now converging at Sorel, the South Shore which has been constructed from Montreal to Sorel and beyond Sorel to Nicolet, and will be completed this year probably to Lotbinière. There is the United Counties Railway also, which became the Rutland Railway and which I believe now belongs to the New York Central, and it comes from the New York Central Railway system at Lake Champlain to the town of Sorel.

I submit that we ought to have a full explanation from the government as to whether it is their intention to go on with this work and follow out the report laid down by Mr. Lafleur, in which it is stated that, in order to make Sorel a deep-water harbour, for the purpose of transferring merchandise, and to provide an elevator of one million bushels capacity, it will take $935,000, and that Sorel will then only have a depth of 18 feet of water.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Before the item is adopted, I wish to make some remarks in answer to the hon. Minister of Public Works. He asks what the report estimating the cost at $935,000 has to do with the item at present under discussion. He forgets that the right hon. leader of the government stated that the intention of the government was to make Sorel an ocean port, and use it as a terminal, perhaps, for the Canada Atlantic Railway, which had not terminals in Montreal, and which might establish its terminal in the United States. According to this report, it is necessary to expend $935,000 for the purpose of getting only a depth of 18 feet of water. What good would an ocean terminal for the Canada Atlantic Railway or any other railway, or for the export of trade of that particular section of the country be with only a depth of 18 feet of water? No modern vessel could go into the port. Not $935,000, but $2,000,000 or $3,000,000 would be required to make an ocean port of that place. Then the hon. gentleman says that this is not for the purpose of carrying out that scheme, that it has no connection with the $935,000. What is the hon. minister going to accomplish then with the $270,000 that he is getting from this House? If it takes $935,000 to give an 18-foot navigation, $270,000 will accomplish not a tithe of it. If it is for that purpose, then the expenditure of this amount of money will be totally useless.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I quite agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) in the sense that he explained the manner in which he was using the report. I think it was quite in order and quite interesting. I only asked him the question for the purpose of showing that the report was not acted on in connection with the item under consideration. I quite agree with him as to the propriety of using the report in discussing the general question as to what further improvements may be made there with the view of making Sorel a national port. But the item was adopted on the report of the engineer, at the time estimating the cost of this work at $306,000. The work has been described fully, and this

item is a balance of $47,000 to pay the contractor for work done. This does not mean that we are undertaking anything new at all. It is carrying out a plan that some years ago was submitted to the House.

Mr. COCHRANE. It appears to me, as a farmer from a section of the country which I think is quite as fertile as this valley, that this expenditure is most enormous. It almost staggers me when I think of the people of the district from which I come, Northumberland, Durham, Hastings, and down through that section of the country, asking me why it is that these enormous sums of money are being spent down at Sorel for the accommodation of the people there. We have five or six wharfs on Lake Ontario. There has not one dollar been spent at Presqu'Ile, for instance, one of the finest natural harbours on Lake Ontario, for the improvement of that harbour. Now we are told that this enormous expenditure is necessary to facilitate the export of the products of the rich valley adjacent to Sorel to the markets of the world. If it is necessary to build a wharf there, not connected with this great scheme which is going to make it an ocean port and the terminal of several railways, as we have been led to believe, why all this enormous expenditure? I venture the assertion that a wharf can be built for a fraction of this $270,000 that would provide for all the export trade that will take place at Sorel from that section of the country. If this is not going to be an ocean port this enormous expenditure is worse than money being frittered away. The whole scheme is wrong. I am willing to vote any amount of money to facilitate the transportation of the products of this great country to the markets of the world; but I want to know that every dollar I vote for shall be expended on some well thought out scheme for the benefit of all the rich valleys in this Canada of ours, and not for the special purpose of the Richelieu Valley, or any other single valley, I care not in what province it may be. There is no provincialism about me. I want to have the money wisely expended, so that it will do the most good to all Canada. For years this government has misapplied money, because they have gone on with schemes which were not well thought out and considered. The Minister of Public Works is not treating the House with proper courtesy when he says that this money is to pay for a contract already let. This was originally voted for the purpose of making Sorel an ocean port —the minister shakes his head but if it was not voted for that purpose, there is more money expended than ought to have been expended for local purposes. It is no argument for the Prime Minister to say that the time to protest against this was when the appropriation was first asked. We know how these things are done. I recollect that in one case down there, there was an innocent looking vote of $5,000, which no person paid attention to, but it developed into an expenditure of $60,000 to build a wharf where there were only 350 people, and no post office even. These votes look very innocent at first, and we are left in ignorance about their meaning. I know, Mr. Chairman, (Mr. Macdonald), how you grieve at these things; I know how you criticised these expenditures when we were in power, and I know how the hearts of your party went out to the farmers of Canada who were robbed and bled white. But now Sir, I know you grieve at what is called a buoyant revenue, and a Liberal expenditure.

Mr. GEOFFRION. I am well acquainted with the locality where this wharf is being built, and it is only right that I should say to the House, that at Sorel we probably have the best harbour in Canada; a harbour which it would not be in the interests of the country to allow to remain unimproved. This wharf at Sorel will give facilities for shipping their produce to the counties of Yamaska, Verchères, Chambley, St. Hyacinthe, Bagot, and several other counties in the valley of the Richelieu, which have an extent almost as large as the provinces of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick. For years and years the people of these counties have been anxiously waiting for this accommodation. Sorel is their natural harbour, and I appeal to every member of this House who knows anything about the locality, if this is not a desirable and useful work. The ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) rightly thought that Sorel was destined to be one of the great harbours on the River St. Lawrence, and he was enthusiastically in favour of the scheme.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it an ocean port or merely intended for local trade ?

Mr. GEOFFRION. We have first to equip it for the trade of the surrounding counties, and when that is done there is nothing to prevent us building wharfs and elevators, and shipping from Sorel for export. There are already four or five railroads centering there. It is true that so far they have not been a success, but every day we expect to make arrangements with other companies, and to get these railways into such shape that they will be paying concerns. What is an expenditure of two or three hundred thousand dollars, compared with the advantages that will be gained by making Sorel a first-class port ? We have spent larger sums on other ports which serve only the interests of small localities, but this port will serve a district almost a province in extent. Sorel is our natural port. It is more costly to take our produce to Montreal, and it is not natural we should have to convey our freights up against the current. At Sorel we have a deepwater harbour which only awaits proper facilities to make it a splendid port, and as we hope, an ocean

port. When our railway difficulties are settled, I have not the slightest doubt, that a very considerable trade will be developed at Sorel.

Mr. SPROULE. If Sorel is going to be as important a port as the hon. minister intimates; then a great deal more money will be required than is provided here; but if it is to be an ocean port it must have over eighteen feet of water. The hon. gentleman states that the railways there are not paying at the present time, although he hopes that other companies will take them over. But is this not reversing the natural order of things ? Is it not usual to have trade at a certain port before we provide facilities for trade ? Are we to build these wharfs here, and then look for the trade afterwards ? Let me point out, that if elevators are to be built there, and if ocean going vessels are to trade at that port, you must have more than eighteen feet of water. If you have it planned out that it will be an ocean port with only eighteen feet of water, it simply shows that all ordinary business precautions are discarded in reference to this scheme.

Mr. GEOFFRION. The money is almost all spent, and only a small sum is required to complete the work.

Mr. SPROULE. If the object of this expenditure is to make Sorel an ocean port, all the circumstances show how unwisely the work was undertaken.

Mr. BRUNEAU (Richelieu).—(Translation) : Mr. Speaker, as a member for the county of Richelieu, in which the town of Sorel is situated, I consider it part of my duty to offer a few suggestions regarding the item of the estimates now under discussion. I really fail to undertand what reason there can be for objecting, after the work has been going on for two years, to the grant which the government ask for the completion of the wharfs at Sorel. This is the more incomprehensible to me, that when the late Conservative government were in power they had surveys and soundings made, plans and specifications drawn, for the dredging of the harbour of Sorel. Their friends at the time urged again and again on the government the importance of carrying through the work in the harbour of Sorel with a view to rendering it a suitable shipping port.

When the present government came into power, we took up the scheme and we are at the present time carrying it through to successful completion. Consequently, I am satisfied that when the people are called to decide upon the action of both governments, they will be astonished to learn that the hon. members on the other side have stood up against the development and progress of the whole region of the Richelieu.

My hon. colleague for Chambly-Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) has given a very full presentation of the case; but I think it proper to draw the attention of the House to the geographical situation of Sorel. That town is situated at the confluence of the River Richelieu, which is, in the east, the only waterway leading into the United States. Our whole export trade passes through the port of Sorel, ascending the Richelieu and Lake Champlain up to the Whitehall canal. There are at present over 700 vessels on the River Richelieu, calling at Sorel, and carrying our traffic to the United States.

The port is almost wholly taken up by the boats of the Richelieu Company, of the Sincennes-McNaughton Company and of the government. As everyone knows, Sorel is the winter port for about 300 boats. The whole river fleet of the province of Quebec takes up its winter quarters there; and for the time being, there is no accommodation in the port for United States vessels trading with us. The new wharf referred to, while providing accommodation for those vessels, will at the same time be of immense benefit for the trade which will develop rapidly there.

The ex-Minister of Public Works spoke of the export trade which is being carried on at the port of Sorel. I may say that this year and last, one company has exported ore in considerable quantities. That company had in the first place begun operations in Three Rivers, but finding subsequently that Sorel offered greater opportunities, they transferred their business to our side. They are exporting their ore through Sorel just now.

I may add that, a few miles away from the town, are to be found the Tourville mills, which turn out yearly over two million feet of lumber. We have reason to hope that the Rutland, Canada Atlantic and Quebec Southern railways, under certain agreements, will contribute to develop trade at this point and will, before long, draw to it considerable traffic from the west. Reference has been made to some difficulties in connection with these railways. I may say that the roads in question are to-day in full operation and will increase the amount of business done in the port of Sorel, provided the improvements destined to develop the export trade are effected, and Sorel is made a seaport.

Mr. WRIGHT. It may not be clear to some hon. gentlemen in this House why a member living so far away from Sorel as I do, in the town of Renfrew, should have any special interest in the equiping of that port. As a matter of fact it is of great interest to us. Not over three months ago a trader in that section of my riding came to me and said : 'Look here Wright, if there is anything you can do to assist us to obtain the full advantage of the Canada Atlantic Railway, we wish you would do it ; we do not have the same advantages shipping by that road to Montreal as we would have if that road were extended to Sorel.' I said : 'I have myself resided in

Berthier en haut, near Sorel; I know something of Sorel, and anything I can do to assist in improving that port and in allowing the railway which goes through our town to be extended to it, I shall be glad to do, as it will afford very much better means of shipping from this district.' The small amount that will be expended in the improvement of Sorel harbour will benefit the people not only of the Richelieu valley, but of the valley of the Bonchère as well. The avenues of trade are far-reaching and those who take this narrow, small provincial view are not the men whom we want. I am glad to raise my voice and to do all I can in favour of this work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I want to say once more that it seems to me a most remarkable thing that the government proposes to enter upon this expenditure, which if the right hon. gentleman's views are carried into effect will involve over $1,000,000 without the slightest estimate being made of the trade which will develop there in the future. No one wants to minimize the importance of the country adjacent to Sorel or of Sorel as a harbour. My hon. friend from Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) took the position that because this was a good, natural harbour it must be equipped. I can tell my hon. friend that there are at least twenty-five harbours in Nova Scotia which are as good as this harbour of Sorel, upon which not one dollar of public money has ever been expended, and on which it would be absolutely absurd to spend money because the public interest does not demand such an expenditure. There are dozens of these harbours all around the maritime coasts, but because you have a good harbour it does not necessarily follow that you should spend $1,000,000 in equipping it. I would like to know before I go any further, whether or not the view suggested by my hon. friend two years ago, as to the railway situation, has been in any way realized? The hon. gentleman, as reported on page 4799 of 'Hansard,' first explained that Sorel was a growing and thriving town of 8,000 people that at one time it had considerable importance, and he continued as follows:

> That was previous to the era of railway transportation. Since the railways have been established, the trade of Sorel has gone down, and has been transferred to Montreal, which is allied with that section of country by railways. After the railways were built, the counties which I have named had no means of export except by railway to Montreal.

Has there been any complaint that that has resulted in any disadvantage to these counties? My right hon. friend has explained that railway transportation is much better than water transportation, and therefore one would suppose that those countries could not be put under any such disadvantage for that reason. Then my hon. friend goes on:

> Some of the lines of railway have been consolidated. The South-eastern Railway, the United Counties, and the Rutland system are all concentrated under one management.

Is that the case to-day? Are they consolidated under one management, and has the statement been carried out? I ask this for the sake of information, because I do not know whether that has been accomplished or not, but I have heard that it has not been accomplished and is not likely to be:

> It is manifest that a great trade must be carried on by that system of railways to Sorel if, instead of finding entrance to Montreal over the Victoria bridge, it can find a harbour at Sorel.

The object of my right hon. friend seems to be to prevent the trade from going to Montreal, and to send that trade, for some reason, to Sorel. No one would object to that if he could show that it was to the public interest that trade should be diverted from Montreal and sent to Sorel, but unless you can show that it is largely in the public interest, I do not see why we should undertake to spend a million dollars for that purpose. My right hon. friend continued:

> This will be the case not only with the trade in agricultural products, which is large, but with the trade of several thriving towns on those lines of railway, such as St. Johns, St. Hyacinthe and Iberville. But above all things it is an agricultural country, productive of all cereals except wheat, as well as butter, cheese and hay. I do not believe there is a more thriving population anywhere in Canada than in the valley of the Richelieu river.

We must remember also that this splendid agricultural region has excellent communication by railway with the city of Montreal, that Montreal is being equipped as a port and his facilities for shipping, then consider whether you can find in all that any legitimate reason for spending a million or even a quarter of a million dollars at Sorel. Would it not be better in the interests of the people in that locality to spend it in some other way? Can you not do more good to the people of that locality. Can you not spend a quarter of a million or even a million dollars to better advantage than by sending to Sorel the traffic which could just as well be handled at Montreal? The hon. gentleman continued:

> It is also connected with the Canada Atlantic, the Intercolonial and the South Shore Railways. Then, besides the counties I have mentioned, all the border counties of the St. Lawrence—Yamaska, Nicolet, Lotbinière—will be connected by railway with this harbour. When it has the facilities which it will have when this work is completed, it must have as a natural consequence a very large trade.

Then my right hon. friend refers to the fact that the province of Quebec up to this time has had only two harbours and that it is desirable that it should have more; he refers to the fact that the maritime provinces have several. I do not think we can

deal with matters of that kind according to the number of harbours one province or another may have. The maritime provinces have natural harbours, not by the dozen, but by the hundred, yet no one in the maritime provinces pretends that it would be in the public interest to equip every one of these harbours so as to make them ports for export. I would like to know from my right hon. friend whether or not his expectation with respect to railway consolidation—and it was upon that that his scheme of two years ago was largely based—has been realized, or whether there is any reasonable prospect that that scheme will be carried into effect? Some reference has been made to these matters by some other hon. gentlemen who have spoken, but we would like to know the exact situation.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend it seems to me takes a very erroneous view of this question. First of all he said that this involved an expenditure of over one million dollars. I repudiate that statement altogether. There is no question here of spending one million dollars. The hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) a moment ago read a report of the chief engineer, to the effect that to complete the works at Sorel as he indicated it would require an expenditure of $1,900,000, but if I correctly understood the report, as I think I did, this was simply a preliminary report, and he said that before committing himself the figures would have to be revised and reduced, and further examinations would have to be made. I do not know whether that has been done by the Public Works Department, but he said that would be necessary before a final report could be made. But all this is very remote from the subject, and it is not germane to it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it is germane for this reason, that I distinctly heard my right hon. friend say only a few moments ago, what he had already said in 1901, that the object of this expenditure, in part at least, was to bring by means of the Canada Atlantic Railway, a considerable portion of the western trade in grain to the harbour of Sorel. Then looking at the estimate brought down to the House, I saw that an elevator was contemplated at an expenditure of $250,000, that crib-work and sheds necessary for the same purpose were to cost $430,000, and that in addition to that there was the expenditure which has already been entered upon. I do not see how you could accomplish what the right hon. gentleman has in view unless you would bring that expenditure up to about $1,000,000. If I am in error in making that deduction I shall, of course, be very glad to be corrected.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend from Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) gave an answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Borden); he said a moment ago that this harbour of Sorel would get local and ocean traffic, and so far I agree with him, but it is also reasonable that local traffic will have to be accommodated first, and perhaps it will be necessary to go on with this further expenditure later on. But the purpose of this vote is to complete a work which will cost $300,000. I cannot understand the object of this criticism in anticipation. Hon. gentlemen criticise these figures as if we were rushing into this expenditure before the trade was contemplated. Even if we were to rush into this expenditure, as has been hinted on the other side, I am not sure whether such action would not be justified and proper, although we do not propose to do so. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) stated that it would be very unwise to take such action, because this would be creating facilities before the traffic was created. My hon. friend should not forget that in order to create traffic it is sometimes sufficient to create facilities. Let me call his attention to a fact which has been mentioned on the floor of this House more than once, and which was brought out in the discussion on another matter. That is that the Canada Atlantic Railway was created for the purpose of anticipating traffic, and creating it; it was taken to the shore of Georgian bay where there was not even a hut of an Indian, in the anticipation that traffic would develop. If we should go into this expenditure now with the view of developing the traffic of the Canada Atlantic at Sorel, I do not know that we would be far wrong. However, we do not propose to do so at the present time, although we may think it advisable to do this very thing in the future, and if we do so, we will be prepared to meet criticism of our course. In the speech which I delivered upon this subject some two years ago, to which attention was called by the hon. leader of the opposition, I recalled the fact that in the early history of the colony, the valley of the Richelieu was the centre of communication for the province of Quebec between the east and the west, as the east and the west then existed, and enjoyed a trade greater than in recent times. But when railways were introduced, a good deal of the trade left that valley and went to Montreal. My hon. friend asked whether the communications with Montreal are not sufficient and whether there has been any complaint. There has been none, but while it is true that some forty years ago, when the era of railway construction was inaugurated in Canada, the Richelieu valley was left and the trade went in a direct line from Montreal southwards, since then there has been considerable railway development in the valley itself, and roads have been constructed all along the river from its source almost to its outlet in the St. Lawrence. Shall we be told that these railways are not to be furnished with the necessary ter-

minal ? If my hon. friend takes this position, we differ with him and on that ground we will have to be judged by the masters of us all. It is true that the expectations we had of a consolidation of the different railways from Vermont through the Richelieu valley have not been realized, owing to the failure of the project of the Webb Syndicate, but no doubt that consolidation will take place at an early day. At all events, whether it takes place or not does not alter the importance of the position we take. These railways will go on doing their work, though not so successfully as though consolidated under one management. My hon. friend says that there are twenty-five harbours in the maritime provinces just as important as Sorel which are not developed and which have not received any railway facilities. That is very true, but railways are being built everywhere in the maritime provinces, and no doubt at an early day we will have to do there what we are now doing in the town of Sorel.

Mr. KEMP. The first objection of this expenditure was said to be the obtaining of facilities for local traffic at Sorel and later on to provide facilities for ocean steamers. Well, I am under the impression that ample facilities were already in existence at Sorel for the local traffic. I do not know what is the depth of water at the harbour there, but I have gone into that harbour on steamers and it appeared to me that its facilities were ample for the local traffic. We must therefore look at this question from the standpoint of creating an ocean port at Sorel. We are told that the Canada Atlantic Railway is to have a terminal there. We have not heard very much of this matter until this morning. If the government intend to provide an ocean port for the convenience of the Canada Atlantic Railway, we should have been informed of their intention at an earlier day. As the Canada Atlantic Railway has no terminal in Montreal, it may be the ambition of that railway to have an ocean port at Sorel. But we have a report of the engineer of the department in whch he says that to get eighteen feet of water at Sorel, will cost $935,000, including $250,000 for an elevator. Deduct the $250,000 for the elevator, and you have what it will cost to get eighteen feet of water. If it requires that amount in order to get eighteen feet of water, what are you going to get for an expenditure of only $300,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My chief engineer informs me that the depth of water is thirty feet now. I do not know where my hon. friend gets his eighteen feet depth.

Mr. KEMP. Does the Minister of Public Works say that we have thirty feet of water at the wharf and that the approaches to the wharf from the channel of the St. Lawrence are also thirty feet deep ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is what I understand.

Mr. KEMP. There is no such informaton in the report.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The report to which my hon. friend refers is a provisional report, and not directly connected with the work as carried out, and I think it was to be subject to surveys to be made. This wharf has been built on a different plan and according to a different report. The engineer informs me that the contract provides for thirty feet of water, that the work is nearly completed, and that there is thirty feet of water now at the wharf.

Mr. KEMP. There were three reports. The one I read to the committee is the one I understand the engineer recommended as giving the most feasible way of doing the work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are dealing with the one that has been carried out.

Mr. KEMP. Which one is that ? Does it include the cribwork and the sheds and the dredging ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will read again what the chief engineer says about it :

> This is a wharf which is being built parallel to the south shore of the St. Lawrence, opposite the town of Sorel, immediately below the mouth of the Richelieu. The structure consists of ballasting and crib-work 700 feet long, 20 feet wide at top, 40 feet at base, 46 feet deep, and stands in 30 feet depth at low water.

Mr. COCHRANE. The crib might be 30 feet and the water not.

Mr. KEMP. The papers in regard to this matter were asked for and were brought down. I understood that everything in connection with this work up to date was included in the papers laid on the Table. There was no report to the effect that this work, which was to have cost $935,000, would cost only $300,000. I looked over the papers carefully and could see nothing of that kind.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Do I understand that a part of this project is to have a 30-foot navigation up to the wharf ? If so, that is in direct contradiction of the statement of the hon. Minister of Public Works, when he brought this estimate in the first instance. He said :

> I had an investigation made, and the chief engineer reported that the expenditure would be a great deal higher than the amount voted. Then I contented myself with asking for tenders without awarding a contract before asking parliament for the money necessary. . . I may say that the lowest tender that I received is $225,000, which, with incidental expenses such as engineering, superintending, &c., will bring the cost up to about $265,000 in round numbers.

And then he goes on to say :

It is also necessary to dredge a pretty large area in order to give 30 feet of water so as to allow big ships drawing 30 feet of water to reach the wharf.

—Altogether independent of the contract.

Mr. KEMP. With regard to the observations made by my hon. friend from Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion), I do not see the force of his argument as to these counties being tributary to Sorel rather than to Montreal. There are two of these counties that lie adjacent to Sorel and border on the St. Lawrence, but the others are farther to the south, and their southern portions are nearer to Montreal.

Mr. GEOFFRION. But they are separated from Montreal by the Richelieu and the St. Lawrence. It is more natural for them to come to Sorel down the river with the current, or even by the railways that come to Sorel.

Mr. KEMP. I quite understand that that argument would apply very strongly in the early days, when there were no railways. But all the produce is transported in these days by the railways. There are no boats of any account on the Richelieu carrying grain and——

Mr. GEOFFRION. My hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) is mistaken, there is a great deal of grain trade on the Richelieu river. All the produce comes by steamers on the Richelieu river through the canal—they are obliged to—and there is an immense amount of trade in butter, cheese, hay, grain and other things, coming to Sorel by the Richelieu river. If they go to Montreal, they have to come to Sorel and around the point to Montreal.

Mr. KEMP. I understand that those villages that lie on the river find it more convenient to send by boat. But that trade is limited. When you go back from the river a few miles, it is more convenient for the people to put their produce on the trains and let it go by the usual way of transport. That is the way the traffic goes in these counties. The natural thing is for it to go to Montreal, the port we have already made. I am sure that the railways will find it more to their advantage to carry it to Montreal and ship to Sorel. I have no desire to criticise this matter from a narrow standpoint. I have thought that too much money was being spent for the results which could be expected. We are told now for the first time that there is an idea of making the Canada Atlantic terminal at Sorel. But when this expenditure was at first proposed we were told that the New York Central would make its terminal there. Are we more certain that the Canada Atlantic will go to Sorel than we were that the New York Central would do so ? In any case, is it necessary that this money should be expended for this purpose ? The hon. leader of the opposition has spoken of twenty-five harbours in Nova Scotia which could be compared with Sorel. The hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) has referred to a harbour in his constituency, a very important one, and one that could be used with advantage for the trade of a considerable area of country, if it were improved so that steamers plying on the lakes could reach it conveniently. There is another harbour lying alongside a city in Ontario, with a population of 250,000 people, on which the government of this country has never spent a single cent. We have asked for improvements, and have protested time and again. The centre of population to which I refer is known by the name of Toronto, and to it an enormous amount of produce finds its way. It would be a benefit to a great area of country if we could get our harbour properly equipped. But we have never been able to impress this government with the idea that it should be equipped. Since the St. Lawrence canals have been deepened to 14 feet, it can be easily seen what an advantage it would be if the harbour of Toronto were improved——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. But you will not give me time to attend to it. I am anxious to look into that matter and see what ought to be done.

Mr. KEMP. As the hon. minister wishes time, I will not extend my remarks if he will promise to provide proper facilities for Toronto. But, at the same time, I cannot withdraw anything I have said with regard to Sorel. I cannot see that the government's theory is correct in regard to this matter.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to refer to some remarks of the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in answer to what I said. I suggested that it was not the best way to build harbours first and then hunt for trade for them. The Prime Minister cited Parry harbour as an illustration of the truth of his colleague's contention—because it was the contention of an hon. gentleman behind him—that trade might be expected, and so it was wise to build this harbour. He said : There was no trade at Parry harbour, but the business foresight of Mr. Booth led him to build the railway, and afterwards the trade came. But there is no analogy between that case and this. Mr. Booth built for a trade already in existence. And, before building, he either had made, or knew he could make, commercial arrangement with men in the western states and the eastern states to supply his route with trade ; and it was to handle that trade that the railway was built. Then, in order to enable him to handle the trade, the harbour had to be built. Mr. Booth merely arranged to handle a trade that was already waiting. He established himself, as it were, upon a great artery of trade. But it is entirely different in this case. I speak from personal knowledge when I say

that when we in our part of the country have asked the government for money to improve our harbours, the first question asked was as to the trade to be handled—what was the population of the town; what trade was waiting to be handled; what district was to be served? And if we suggested that we should have the harbour first and would look for trade afterwards, we were told that it was time enough to spend money on harbours when the trade was there waiting to be handled. This is true of all the ports on the Georgian bay, Collingwood, Parry Sound, Goderich, Kincardine and the others.

But here it seems to be for an entirely different purpose. First, you expend the money and make a harbour, and then you hunt up trade. I regard that principle as radically wrong. There is another feature wrong as well. This harbour must either be, as the item in the estimate says, a deep water harbour, that is an ocean port, or it must be for local purposes. Now, if it be for local purposes only it would not require to be arranged on the large lines that would be necessary if it were for ocean purposes, and the expenditure would not require to be as large as if it were meant for ocean purposes. But we are told that this was first intended for local purposes, and afterwards it can be developed for ocean purposes. While I admit that it would be necessary to provide for the needs of local traffic, I do not agree to the opinion that it would be wise to map out a scheme upon that principle if it were ever expected in the future to be an ocean port. It might be proper to construct it on an extensive plan if it were intended to accommodate ocean freight. Most of our local boats require only eighteen feet of water as their greatest depth, but that would not accommodate ocean going vessels. They want not less than twenty-five or thirty feet. But if you make your harbour eighteen feet for local needs, then you will have to change it almost entirely if you propose to provide for a depth of twenty-five or thirty feet. We found that to be the case in the Georgian bay. At first we only required fourteen or fifteen feet, but afterwards we required a greater depth. But when you come to dredge down to a greater depth it was found that the crib work had not been put down deep enough, the piling had to be torn out, you had not your docks, crib work and your other structures put down deep enough in the first place, and the consequence was that when you dredge down to a greater depth you undermined your own work. From a business standpoint it is important to decide at first whether you want your wharf for ocean purposes or for local purposes.

There is another thing that we cannot overlook. It is said that this trade goes to Montreal when the railway is built. But why should it go to Montreal? The trade belonging to that portion of the country ought to go eastward instead of going to Montreal. The trade of that country must ultimately find its outlet towards Europe, and we are shipping it back towards Montreal. Is it not a fact that a large percentage of the produce that is shipped, even from Nova Scotia and a part of New Brunswick, is first brought to Montreal, thence to be shipped to Liverpool? I am told by men who have been in business for years that trade practically travels first to Montreal and then goes to Liverpool; that people who sell their produce in those provinces find it advantageous to take that route, because there are greater conveniences for shipping at Montreal and a greater number of commercial men who are competing for the trade. When these roads were built they were useful to transport freight to the great emporium of Montreal. It may be that trade did not take the direction which we desired it to go, but that is because people did not find it to their advantage to send that trade by way of Montreal. Trade is taken to the larger centres with a greater population, where there is a larger number of shipping people to compete for trade, and therefore they pay larger prices. I complain that in the first place that was not intended to be a terminal of the Canada Atlantic Railway for the purposes of an ocean port to handle the trade going to Europe; I complain that the design was not mapped out for that purpose in the first instance. I say it was not wise to begin an expenditure of that amount, an expenditure which was going to reach to one or two million dollars, without having that information from the first, in order to lay out your design for that purpose. But to commence an expenditure upon the assumption that it would only involve an outlay of two or three hundred thousand dollars, and that it was necessary for local purposes, and then to say that it was only a beginning of an undertaking which was to be developed into an ocean port—I say that does not show the highest type of business intelligence. I think the government should always be ready to submit their plans and specifications to the House, with a report of an engineer, before they commence an expenditure.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As I have another matter which I would like to submit to the House after recess, I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again this day.

Some resolutions reported.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL—FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) presented a message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER read the message as follows :

MINTO.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, further supplementary estimates of sums required for the services of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1904, and in accordance with the provisions of 'The British North America Act, 1867' the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, October 1, 1903.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the message of His Excellency together with the estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Sorel—deep water wharf, $37,600.

Mr. SPROULE. I would ask the hon. Minister of Public Works when the last report was made upon this harbour and by whom ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). The report I have is a quite recent one from the chief engineer of the department who informs me that the work is practically completed.

Mr. SPROULE. As I understand the situation, in the event of it being decided to provide an ocean port there, the plan would have to be mapped out upon some different scale for that purpose and the work commenced anew ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No new work will be undertaken without submitting to the House all particulars in connection with it and asking for the authority of parliament for such vote as may be necessary.

Mr. BROCK. The course of action which was marked out this morning by the right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was one suggesting most elaborate changes at Sorel. Sorel was to be made an ocean port. The Canada Atlantic Railway and other railways were to be taken down there and were to have their terminals at that place. I notice that the hon. Minister of Public Works is not as enthusiastic as his leader upon this matter and I was wondering if probably he could not bring his influence to bear upon his leader to have a little of the gush taken out of this particular scheme. We are waiting for the commission which has been appointed lately by the government to take into consideration the whole transportation scheme. We have the announcement that it is necessary to make Sorel an ocean port in order to develop the trade of the magnificent country tributary to that point. It is a magnificent country west and south of that place but you must remember that the total exports from this country are not more than ten per cent of the whole consumption and that the home consumption of places like Sherbrooke, Richmond, and the great city of Montreal actually takes the whole produce of the country with the exception of ten per cent, so that all but ten per cent of what the people of this district raise is consumed largely by the manufacturers of Sherbrooke, Richmond and Montreal. We cannot prevent the spending of money after it is already spent and money due for work done must be voted. The right hon. Prime Minister in justifying the expenditure said that a larger expenditure was likely to be gone into there because he spoke of this being an ocean port, mentioning that the Canada Atlantic Railway would likely be taken there. On that account he might say next year, as he has said this year : You are speaking too late. You should have spoken of this at its inception. Therefore, having received from the right hon. Prime Minister an idea of what it is proposed to do at Sorel we on this side of the House enter our protest against a great scheme of this kind being gone into as another great scheme has been gone into, off his own bat. We contend that if he will not take the members of his cabinet into his confidence he should at least take into his confidence the commission which has been appointed to look into this question.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No work will be undertaken for the extension of the improvements at Sorel without the matter being first submitted to parliament. We all hope that the development of the country may make it necessary to further improve that harbour, that the trade will demand it and I am sure that my hon. friend (Mr. Brock) would support any improvement necessitated by such an expansion of trade as readily as I would. In view of the discussions that take place in this House in regard to the various harbours on the lakes, and rivers of this country and upon the coasts it is desirable that a commission composed of practical men should inquire into these questions. While a commission might pay attention more particularly to the larger ports of the Dominion where trade would concentrate from the producers throughout the various sections of the Dominion, we must all remember that a great amount of trade is gathered from the smaller places and that we cannot afford to ignore any of these various places in any proper expenditure of money made with a view of encouraging trade. Because in the expenditure of money in former times at various places we have probably taken too optimistic a view as to the results which we believed would follow, we are not justified in coming to the conclusion that an

improper expenditure has been made. This is not a political question at all, and it should not be regarded as such because mistakes may have been made in the past although the work was undertaken probably in good faith by all parties. I have thought in regard to a general scheme of transportation, that, if the matter were looked into and the best routes and ports picked out and if the report of the commission met with our approval, we would get greater value for the money and greater benefit for the people of the Dominion if we expended the money along the lines which had been determined upon. If we can get a commission which will go into the question and which will direct us in the way in which the expenditure will bring us the greatest benefits a great deal of good will be accomplished. As far as this particular item is concerned I think it is thoroughly understood that the work is practically completed and that this is the balance of the contract. This will complete the work as far as I know from the information which has been brought to my attention. However, that may be, no new work will be undertaken without all the necessary explanations being given and without it first being submitted to parliament.

Mr. BROCK. Would you make the same promise as to submitting it to the Transportation Commission ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. While nobody perhaps ever expected that the large question of railway development would be subject to or depend upon the report of the commission, I can easily see why, after having come to certain conclusions as to certain ports, either lake or river, which might be brought to the consideration of parliament and if the commission can show that the rate of transportation can be cheapened by the improvement of these ports, parliament would be perhaps justified in taking action. This certainly is one of the questions which the commission would be expected to look into.

Mr. BROCK. We are beginning to get a little light as to the reason it was so difficult to get competent gentlemen to serve on this Transportation Commission. Indeed, in view of what the Minister of Public Works has said, that they are merely to look into suggestions made by the government, I am surprised that the government got as good men as they did to take positions on that commission. I had thought that this commission would be a very good thing, and that the better the men on it, the better for the country, but it is difficult to get good men to act in a subservient capacity. I had hoped that they would be enabled to get the best expert evidence, and that they would be allowed to judge whether railways should be built, or whether harbours should be built, in the best interests of Canada ; but it now seems, according to the Minister of Public Works, that the commission is going to be of very little account. I had hoped that the government would be glad to get rid of such responsibility, which so often leads to a great deal of log-rolling. We had an example of that this morning, when we were told that if we voted against the item under discussion the public would understand why we voted against it. That is where this unfortunate petty politics comes in. I had hoped that the Transportation Commission would be able to submit recommendations to us as independent men, free from political bias and governmental influence ; but now it would appear that such is not to be the case. We have had this Transportation Commission launched, first by Order in Council, and then by the announcement in the speech from the Throne, but, after all, it is to be of little account. I am surprised, under the circumstances, that the government were able to get men of such high standing to tolerate, for one moment, occupying such a position.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) has either misunderstood my statement or he has put an unwarranted interpretation upon my words. I did not say that this commission would only deal with what the government suggested, nor did I say that it would be in any way subservient. On the contrary, if the hon. gentleman will read the commission, he will find that they have the whole Dominion as a field, and that they can report without any regard to the wishes of the government or any member thereof. What I said was that no scheme recommended by the commission could be carried out until parliament voted the money for it. Surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) would not take from parliament the power to conduct the affairs of the country ? The Transportation Commissioners will have the greatest possible freedom and latitude in dealing with all matters within their jurisdiction throughout the Dominion. They are no more subservient to the government than they are to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock). If he has any recommendations to make to them, I am sure they would be just as much pleased to hear him as they would be to hear the views of the cabinet ministers. The only limitation on the commission to make inquiry and to take as long as they consider necessary in doing so, is the amount that parliament will place at their disposal for that purpose. The commissioners are independent politically and in every other way, and it is unfair for the hon. gentleman to make any statement to the contrary. I have always believed that nothing but good can result from this Transportation Commission, and I am sure that a great many members of the House concur in that view.

Intercolonial Railway—collection of revenue, $5,200,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is the general vote for the working of the Intercolonial Railway. In former years we have asked for an appropriation, which time proved to be considerably less than the service required, and we have had to ask for more in the supplementary estimates. We think that this present vote will, in all probability, cover the working expenses for the whole year; but of course that cannot be accurately determined until the accounts are made up. So far as we can judge, the present vote will cover all the expenses for the year. While there has been a very considerable increase from year to year in the working expenses of the Intercolonial, there has been also a very considerable increase in the business of the road. The gross earnings of the Intercolonial from 1895 until the present year were as follows:

1895	$2,940,000 00
1896	2,957,640 10
1897	2,866,000 00
1898	3,117,000 00
1899	3,738,000 00
1900	4,552,000 00
1901	4,972,000 00
1902	5,671,000 00
1903	6,324,000 00

The working expenses have correspondingly increased and last year the working expenses were $6,196,653.19 against gross earnings of $6,324,323.72. It will be seen, therefore, that in asking for an appropriation of six and one-half million dollars for the present year we are allowing for a very moderate increase in the business as compared with those of the year recently closed. If we may judge from the increase of business of recent years this sum will be required for the expenses and will be fully met by increased earnings.

Mr. SPROULE. You did not give the net earnings.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Last year, 1902-3, the net earnings were $127,670.53.

Mr. BARKER. I see no objection to this item being charged against revenue; my objection has been rather the other way, that the government have year after year, asked for too small an amount to be charged to revenue and have managed to get on by charging to capital what ought to have been included in this item. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman will require the money for which he is asking provided he charges to revenue everything that ought to be charged to revenue. I observe that he is charging to capital in the estimates at page 42, $320,000 for rolling stock. Looking at the stock account in the last report, June, 1902, I think it is highly probable that every dollar of that $700,000 should be included in the item now under consideration. However, that may be, I think the hon. gentleman is doing right in increasing the amount of this vote for working expenses for the reason I have mentioned, that in the past the government have asked for too little, charging too little to this particular item in order that they may show a fictitious net earning.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would ask the hon. minister if in this increased item for working expenses for next year he has included anything for the trackmen in case he decides to give them an increase. I understand that the trackmen on the Intercolonial have made an application for an increase, and in case he decides to grant their request is there sufficient in this vote to provide for that increase?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, these estimates were prepared rather on the basis of the present rates of pay, as respects the officials generally. But it is in a general estimate that if it is determined to increase the pay of any class of servants we would have ample authority under this vote to pay the men but it might necessitate our coming to parliament for a supplementary estimate at a later stage.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is an increase of $1,000,000 over last year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not over the working expenses of last year. The actual working expenses last year were $6,196,653; we had to take a supplementary estimate.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The object then is to include in this estimate the total amount, including what was in the supplementary estimates last year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, if possible.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has business on the road developed to such an extent as to justify this?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the earnings have increased very considerably. For the year 1902 they were $5,671,000 and for 1903, $6,324,000. The increase for that year was very considerable.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). May I be allowed to divert the discussion from this point to an item which was passed last night in my absence in reference to the vote of $83,600 for increased accommodation at Halifax? I have already pointed out, both in previous sessions and during this session, the desirability of acquiring certain property at Halifax, immediately south of the present passenger station. I do not wish to repeat what I have already said two or three times in the House, but I believe that if the Intercolonial is going to have the increased business which we expect, it will be necessary to acquire the properties from North

street to Cornwallis street, fronting on Water street and extending westward to the rear of the lots on Lockman street. The property has deteriorated to some extent owing to the fact that a portion of Water street has already been taken up by the Intercolonial Railway. Claims for compensation on that account have been made by the property owners. These claims they attempted to enforce in the Exchequer Court, but unsuccessfully. I have always thought that although there was a legal defence to their claim under the statute of limitations, nevertheless they were claims that might very properly be taken into consideration by the Crown, notwithstanding that they are barred by the statute of limitations. Although I myself, acting as solicitor, had to raise that point I have felt that it was a point whch the Crown might very well waive. I do not know that there would be any legal claim ; the solicitors of these parties think there would be, and it is certainly an arguable question, outside the statute of limitations. These claims, which are regarded as a grievance by the people interested, could no doubt be adjusted on very easy terms if these properties were acquired by the Crown at a fair valuation ; in fact that would result in a settlement of that kind being made with these parties. It seems to me that unless the advice of the experienced officials of the department is absolutely against the view I entertain, it will be in the interest of this country to acquire these properties. If that is likely to be the case I think that measure should be taken to acquire them as early as possible. It will not be very expensive to acquire them, and their acquisition may lead to decreased expenditure elsewhere. I am not familiar with the details of the work at Halifax, but now and then we have items for blasting and filling in, and it seems to me that that work could be decreased if we acquired this property.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The estimates now before the House do not contemplate the acquisition of that property. The damage said to have been done to it by the extension of the railway down to deep water was done a long while ago, and the government of that day were not able to recognize any of the claims set up. I do not think that we can view the matter from the standpoint of any claim these people may have, but it might possibly be wise to acquire the land for railway purposes. We need some land at present, but for immediate necessity that property would not be suitable; and, even in its present depreciated condition, it would cost a very considerable sum. For these reasons we have not undertaken to acquire it. Still there is much force in the contention that as the property is close to the railway, it might be well to acquire it if we can do so at a fair and reasonable cost. But the difficulty is the moment the government try to buy a piece of ground, its value becomes very much enhanced. This property is not likely to be valuable for other purposes, and probably at no distant day it might be advisable for the railway authorities to purchase it, but it would only be purchased at a fair value, and not at the extravagant prices which property owners attach to their land as soon as they hear the government may require it. It is not wise therefore that we should bring down an appropriation, but if, as the result of negotiation, we find that the property can be obtained at anything like a fair and reasonable price, we might another session consider the advisability of buying it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would not ask anything more at this stage. I quite understand that high values are sometimes put on property under certain conditions, but of course the Crown always has a certain control by exercising the power of expropriation. I know what that leads to sometimes. We often find great differences in opinion among experts regarding values. In the case of one property, which was expropriated in Halifax some years ago, the value put upon it varied from $15,000 to $90,000, and there were about fifteen or twenty witnesses on each side. With regard to the claims for damages by the owners of this property, I have not very much to say. The Exchequer Court held that under the statute of limitations, the parties had no claim, and apart from that, there was a question whether the Crown had not a defence under certain legislation passed by the province of Nova Scotia. But while these people may not have a legal claim, their property was very much damaged in value by the fact of a railway running along the opposite side of the street. And in matters of that kind, where damages have resulted to the individuals, the Crown does not usually stand on its legal rights. Take, for instance, the sum paid Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. They had certainly no legal right to compensation. They made a claim against the Crown on account of the failure of parliament to ratify a certain agreement. They had incurred certain expenses and took the risk of that agreement not being ratified, but nevertheless parliament thought it right that they should be recouped their expenses. Therefore, while these parties may or may not have a legal claim, still they have a moral claim, and I would be inclined to think that the Crown should take into consideration the question of giving them some reasonable compensation.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why is there such an increase in this item ? I understand that this vote is not for the purpose of giving to the department the expenditure of anything for expropriations, where land may be needed, or for rolling stock, but only to make available for book-keeping purposes

the amount of revenue likely to be received from the Intercolonial.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The two items of revenue and expenditure very nearly balance, and in that sense perhaps the hon. gentleman is correct, but as a matter of fact the one does not necessarily relate to the other. This is an expropriation for the expense of working the Intercolonial, and whether the revenue equals that or not, we still need it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is limited entirely to that ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Entirely to working expenses.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Anything out of ordinary expenses, such as harbour improvements, cannot be paid out of this fund ? But the amount seems an abnormal one. Do you expect an increased business ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I see that there are resolutions brought down for the stores account, I should judge that that is merely a book-keeping vote also.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Quite correct.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Which is not intended to give to the stores management on the Intercolonial the right of purchasing locomotives or anything else but the intention is simply to balance the stores account.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Inasmuch as the stores on hand and the amount of the vote in the Bill are substantially the same, it may be treated as a mere book-keeping account ; but it fixes a limit within which the department may hold stores. On the other question, the hon. gentleman is right.

Mr. SPROULE. With regard to many items there is a difference of opinion as to whether they should be charged to capital account or to income. Has the minister directed his attention to the revision of the book-keeping in order to decide which items should be charged to one or to the other ? For, so long as there is no definite understanding, it is impossible to tell whether the road is growing better or worse. It seems to me it should be understood what items are to be charged to capital and what to running expenses. And, if that cannot be done under the present system, we should have a new system of book-keeping altogether.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have tried to look into the matter a little, not with a view to these estimates, which were prepared by my predecessor, but because of my own interest in the matter. I am inclined to think that in many of these charges there is room for differences of opinion as to the account in which it should appear. A good many years ago, I had occasion to seek the advice of an eminent railway man as to what a certain railway would earn, and he asked me how much I wanted it to earn. I admit that, in the accounts of any large undertaking there is always room for differences of opinion as to what should be charged to capital. There have been such differences of opinion between the late Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) and hon. gentlemen opposite. But I think that, after all, the amounts involved are not so great as to materially affect the result. I can only say that, so far as I am concerned, I desire to see sound methods of book-keeping. But I may say frankly, that I am not so anxious as some parties to make a profit or showing a surplus. I do not see why we should insist on having a surplus out of the Intercolonial any more than out of any other public work. We should see that the money is wisely and fairly expended, and if we can make ends meet, and show a balance, that is satisfactory. But if there is not a balance on the right side, I do not admit that that necessarily shows that there is anything wrong. In the case of another class of great works we do not even raise the question whether there is to be a profit or a loss. I speak of the canals. We do not attempt to make the canals pay even working expenses—and never did. We are content to lose, if it can be called a loss, the interest on the investment. Of course, it is not a loss, because it helps on the business of the country. But, so far as immediate return is concerned, the canals not only do not pay a profit, but do not even pay working expenses ; and, this year, without a moment's hesitation, we have thrown off the canal tolls altogether, and so have cut off our revenue from canals. So, I would ask the hon. gentlemen on both sides not to be too anxious about making a profit out of the Intercolonial, or even showing a surplus over working expenses. If we can make it, we will do it ; but, if we expend the money wisely and faithfully and give the public the accommodation they require, the public gets the benefit just as in the case of a canal. I would not say this was a reason why we should be indifferent as to the balance. We should have a balance if we can. But, if, as a result of the operation of the road there is a balance on the wrong side, it is not reasonable to assume that the country is the loser.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is only one way by which we can be enabled to judge fairly of the work of the Intercolonial, and that is by following the course recommended by the late Alexander Mackenzie when Minister of Public Works, and often discussed since. Here is a road finished a number of years ago. Unless there is an addition to the road in the shape of a building or purchase of some other railway, or something of that kind the capital ac-

count should be closed entirely. An expenditure at Halifax or St. John for terminal facilities or any similar expenditure should not be charged to capital, but to ordinary expenditure. The reason why it is desirable to have the same system of bookkeeping by one Minister of Railways as by another is that only in this way can we make comparisons. The making of a comparison does not necessarily mean that fault is to be found with the expenditure. We are not finding fault with the expenditure. But there may be on that road a number of employees that are not necessary, there may be lavish expenditure upon the road itself which is not justifiable. The only way by which we can judge of that is to compare one management with the other; and, if this is to be done the capital account should be closed entirely, so that all expenditures will be charged to current account. If one Minister of Railways, anxious to balance his accounts or make a favourable showing, charges to capital items which his predecessor charged to current expenses, comparison of the two administrations is quite impossible. This adds to the temptation to make unjustifiable expenditure, for the minister who makes it knows that his account can be so doctored that he cannot be compared with his predecessor. A minister may run the road in an economical way, while affording the public every accommodation, and his predecessor may be lavish in his expenditure, yet, by having recourse to charging his expenditure to capital, he can make as favourable a showing on revenue account as the other. This temptation to lavish expenditure would be removed if the capital account were closed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. So far as concerns my hon. friend's (Hon. Mr. (Haggart) remark that the purpose of a uniform system is that comparisons may be made, I think that is quite reasonable. But I think he goes too far when he advocates the closing of the capital account. He himself qualifies that by saying that in case of the building or acquiring of new railway there could be a charge to capital account. There have been considerable additions made to the Intercolonial since the construction of what may be called the original road. For instance, there was the St. Charles branch—that, the hon. gentleman will admit might properly be charged to capital. Then there was the short line—the so-called short line, for it did not prove to be very short. There was the Cape Breton extension. That is an addition to capital account. There was the Drummond County road, built to extend the Intercolonial to Montreal; and there are various other small branches and lines, additional sidings——

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No, additional sidings should not be charged to capital.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, the items I have given, together with others that do not occur to me at the moment, are fairly chargeable to capital account of the Intercolonial, and fairly increase that capital account, though the road is sometimes referred to in the course of discussion as being the same property as was brought into existence by the original construction. Let me show my hon. friend that we could not possibly justify the closing of the capital account even without constructing a new road. It is known to all men of experience in railway matters that during the last ten years there has been a revolution in regard to railway construction. Railways which were equipped in a very light manner are now putting on heavy equipments. A road with 56-pound rails fifteen years ago is to-day putting on 90-pound rails, some are putting on even heavier rails. A locomotive a few years ago cost only a small sum, but to-day you are paying practically double the price for it, and you are getting double value. Without the addition of a single mile to the length of that road, you might find it necessary in the case of a road like the Intercolonial Railway to expend several millions in the way of betterments, something which any railway manager would consider as betterments, in the shape of heavier rails, in the shape of improved grades, in the shape of better rolling stock. In all these things railroad construction and operation have been revolutionized in the last ten years, and you would find it necessary to have a capital account from which to purchase these things, because no railroad could purchase them out of its revenue. If the capital account were to be closed, it would mean that there could be no advance with the times at all. My hon. friend presses the matter too far when he says that the capital account should be closed.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is for the very purposes that the hon. gentleman has mentioned that I wish the capital account to be closed. This is not my own idea alone, but it is the idea of the friends of the government when they were in opposition. I have heard Mr. Mackenzie state again and again in this House that the only remedy for the unsatisfactory state of affairs on the Intercolonial Railway, and the charges to capital account, was to close that account altogether. I differ with the Minister of Finance in that respect. On an ordinary road, if you take up a 56-pound rail and put on a 90-pound rail, the difference is charged to capital account. My opinion is that if it is necessary for a road to put on a 90-pound rail, it should be charged to the ordinary revenue of the road—it will earn more afterwards; but do not charge it to capital account. I know that railroads ordinarily proceed as the hon. Minister of Finance has stated, and I tried to adopt that

system, which I thought was the correct one. I think now that when you change a locomotive from a lighter type to a heavier type, the difference should not be charged to capital account, and the same with rails. The only true remedy, and the Finance Minister ought to insist upon it, is to give no latitude of that kind to the department. If they want to improve the road let the bald statement be made to the public that there is a certain expenditure in excess of revenue, and let the company judge whether that is justifiable or not; but keep them strictly to this principle, that everything that is expended on the road, either for terminals, or for improvements in the way of better locomotives, better track and so forth, shall be charged to the ordinary revenue of the road. Then you will have a management better than any devices that you can imagine in arranging the accounts.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend is asking us to go a great deal further than, I am sure, his friends generally would ask us to go. The most that anybody could claim is that we should keep the capital account confined strictly to betterments of the road. Now, I think that the principle the hon. gentleman has laid down is one that practical railway men do not agree with. There are differences of opinion as to whether a given expenditure is a mere renewal or a betterment. I think it can be safely laid down as a principle that if you add something which increases the value of your road, and if you make two blades of grass to grow where only one grew before, if I may use that illustration, you have a betterment for your road, and you have value for it, and that is a proper addition to your capital account. My hon. friend says: Charge these larger locomotives and everything of that kind to the revenue account. But there is no revenue account to bear it, and there will be no such revenue account. Any railroad that has to provide all these things out of revenue would not get them at all. It would simply mean coming here and asking, on revenue account, for large sums of money which would not be fairly chargeable to revenue.

Mr. COCHRANE. What is the difference, so far as the country is concerned, since the country has to pay it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, I can answer that. That is a rough-and-ready way of looking at it, and if that is the correct way, then you might as well say, What difference does it make anyhow whether you charge an item to capital or revenue since the country has to pay for it ?

Mr. COCHRANE. The country would know how to compare the management of the road under one minister with its management under another. Now we do not know what one minister charges to capital account and what another minister charges to revenue. I would like to ask the Finance Minister how an ordinary railway corporation would furnish the money, if they kept the account as he proposes. I may be wrong, but I am asking for information. For instance, if the hon. gentleman was managing the Grand Trunk Railway and he required betterments in the cars, in the weight of rails, &c., how would the Grand Trunk raise the money if they did not pay it out of revenue ? Would you have to issue new stock all the time ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Most certainly, that is exactly what any railway company would do. If it requires anything in the way of betterment, it must issue new stock. If the road is very prosperous and has the revenue to pay all its dividends and leave a handsome balance, it might use some portion of that for improvements. There is many a corporation which is making a good deal of money, but is only paying moderate dividends, because it applies its profits to improvements all the time. But no ordinary railway company can do that. Railway companies generally provide for betterments by the issue of capital stock. I think I can show my hon. friend that what would be done in the case of a great railway company is what we are willing to do in the case of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. SPROULE. I was not complaining that we could not understand whether the road was paying or not, nor was I complaining because the road is not paying. But it seems to me we ought to have some barometer to tell us whether the road is running behind, or whether it is managed in such a way as to make it a paying road. We ought to know whether there is business enough in that part of the country to make the road pay expenses. The minister says : Suppose you wanted betterments on that road, out of what account are you going to pay them, if you do not charge them to capital account How do we pay them now ? We vote the money here, and could we not do that with regard to betterments in the same way as we do with deficits ? It makes no difference. I agree with the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. I have always thought, though not knowing much about the methods of keeping railway accounts, that that was the only solution of the situation, namely, to close your capital account. Then the country will know whether it is wise to run such a railway. I never imagined that the railway ought to be run so as to bring in a big revenue, I always understood it was constructed for the benefit of the country. The earnings of the railway, however, ought to be somewhere near enough to pay the running expenses, otherwise there is evidently no need for that railway. Now, if it does not pay running expenses, certain things are lacking, either the freight rates and the passenger rates are too low, or else the railway

must be running through a portion of country where there is not sufficient trade, or it must be managed in such a way that other railways are taking trade away from it. On the other hand, the government ought to be able to make a comparison as between its management by different administrations. When you have the road badly managed it does not pay, when you have it well managed it does pay. The country requires to be able to make some comparison, and the object of keeping the books should be that a fair comparison may be made, that there may be some barometer to show how the road is running. I suggest that, but if any other means can be devised that would be better, it is most desirable that they should be adopted.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It certainly would not be a fair means of comparison if we were to undertake to charge all these things to revenue account, because they have not been charged to revenue account in the past. The points of difference between the classes of items charged to capital now and in former days are not very wide. The same classes of items were charged to capital account in former days as are charged now. It may be that in late years, owing to the increased business, the items have been larger, but that items of the same class have been charged to capital account in past years is beyond all question. Keeping accounts in the way suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) would not be fair for the purposes of comparison, not fair as a means of keeping railway accounts. He perhaps knows that last session the Grand Trunk Railway Company received authority from us to issue a large amount of new stock, and that the Canadian Pacific Railway increased its stock by $20,000,000, although I do not think they added a mile of road to their system. They used that money in providing betterments and improvements upon the road. Certainly the greater part of it went into rolling stock. So that my hon. friend will see that he is asking us to adopt a system of keeping the accounts which would not be accepted by any great railway in the country.

Mr. SPROULE. That might be the case, and yet it might not be a proper course to adopt here. There has been a great deal of difference between the two sides of the House as to what should and what should not be charged to capital account. We have that contention up every year, and it is for the purpose of doing away with it that we should adopt a system that would enable us to make a fair comparison. The hon. Minister of Finance says that the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway have been obliged to issue new stock, the proceeds of which have been expended on betterments to the roads. That is true, but the roads are worth more money, and they have thus added to the value of their properties. If our property were made more valuable by a million dollars than it is it would be quite different, because you would have an asset to offset the expenditure. But, in regard to ordinary running expenses, taking betterments into account, we should be able to have these accounts kept in some more simple and understandable way than that in which they are now kept.

Mr. BROCK. I notice that the hon. Minister of Finance, in defending the present plan, states that the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway have been adding to their capital account. These railways would have a very poor show to get money upon the money market if they could not show that they were being operated at a profit. They must show a profit, and that being so, they are run much more carefully than a road which is being operated without any expectation, not only of making a profit, but of paying running expenses. I contend that this is a very vicious system. It may be excused by going to some localities and telling the people that: We are carrying our freight at rates at which we would otherwise be unable to carry it for. This is a most unbusinesslike thing for the government to do. We have been floating our bonds in the old country, and we have been representing that we are going to pay interest upon them. Just fancy going to the old country with a railway deal involving a hundred million dollars and say, taking into consideration the way in which the Intercolonial Railway has been managed, that the concern is not going to be able to pay interest on the capital invested in it. Although we are rich, and although the country is progressing, we cannot hope to keep it up for all time. We cannot have too many Pacific cables thrown upon this country when we have to pay $150,000 as our share of the loss yearly on working expenses in connection with the concern. Now, we are considering a railway out of which the hon. Minister of Finance tells us we should not expect to get anything. We are not getting anything out of our canals. There are no competing canals, and therefore we cannot tell what they might do. But I contend that after building a railway which is competing in many cases with other railways, it should be maintained on business principles, and the first business principle for any man who goes into any kind of business is to make a profit upon his investments. Otherwise, why go into business at all? Why not let private enterprise take hold of it? Yet the government have gone into a railway upon which they have expended $80,000,000, and the hon. Minister of Finance tells us that the intention was not to make a return upon it. If they had to raise that money to-day in England, and if they went before the financiers of England with the statement which has been made by the hon. Minister of Finance, that they were going into an

expenditure of $80,000,000 out of which they did not expect to make the interest or the running expenses, what would the financiers of England say ? It is all very well, with an abounding revenue, to take that view of the question, but when a period of depression comes, as the hon. Minister of Finance told us three years ago that it would come, how are we going to stand in the money markets of England ? We have been paying off some of our four per cent debentures. Let us go to England to-morrow and try to raise $100,000,000, even if the loan had the endorsement of the government of Canada. The endorsement of the province of Ontario could not get money the other day at three and a-half per cent. If we could apply business principles to all the dealings of the government the better it would be, not only for the government, but for the country as a whole. The government are an example to the country, and if large corporations are going to go into business upon the same principle, that is to say, that they not only do not expect to get any return upon the money they have invested, but that they are not going to pay running expenses, it will prove to be a vicious principle in connection with the business of the country. I can understand that in exceptional circumstances, such as the building of a railway for military purposes, that you might not expect a return in money from that. That is, to a large extent, the position of the Intercolonial Railway, but we are going to parallel that railway by another railway, and we do not expect it to pay running expenses for years. Under these circumstances, I contend that the less we do of this kind of thing the better, and quite endorse the contention of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Haggart) that the time should come soon when we should stop all further expenditure on capital account, particularly when we are getting no return upon it. I contend that is the plainest and the best way. A man does not require to be a bookkeeper to understand that if there is a capital account of $100,000,000 which is stationary it should not be added to, but the balance over and above that should be paid out of revenue or by vote here.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid I cannot quite see the bearing of my hon. friend's argument, or what real connection it has with the question under discussion. I pointed out that the Canadian Pacific Railway had issued a large amount of stock for betterments on its road. The hon. gentleman's reply to that is that the Canadian Pacific Railway could not have issued that stock unless it could have shown that it was going to earn the profit upon it, and he says that no capital should be expended in a transaction of this kind unless you can show that it is going to make a profit. I beg to differ with my hon. friend there. This country would never have been built up on any such principle as he has enunciated. We have spent $83,000,000 upon our canals, and we never expect to get one dollar of return in the way of interest upon the money. Does my hon. friend say that it is wrong for us to carry on these canals unless we are going to have a book-keeping account and show every year that we are dragging money out of the canal traffic to pay for it ? I want to tell my hon. friend that this country was never built up that way.

Mr. BROCK. That is the way it was built up.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman insists that you must have profit in cash in the treasury, but the policy of the country has been to get the profit in the development of the business of the country. We do not expect that you should get the revenue into the treasury, because if the country prospers by the development of public works, the country reaps a rich reward ; and even though you get no profit on a particular railway or canal, if these are instruments for the development of the trade of the country, it is absurd to say they are unprofitable investments. All the same, I have not said that it is not desirable to get a fair return where you can, without oppressing the business of the country ; I have not said that we should not have any advantage out of the Intercolonial Railway ; I have not said that we should not have a balance on the right side ; but I do say, that I would apply to any public work the larger view, namely, let us see that it is honestly and faithfully and justly administered, and let us get a balance on the right side if we can, but if we fail, let us comfort ourselves with the thought that by means of that railway system or canal system, we are getting our profit in the development of the trade of the country.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that there is no fair comparison between a railway and a canal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Why ?

Mr. SPROULE. Because the canal is a water-way which every man who wishes to build a boat can take advantage of, whereas, a railway is given over to one individual or corporation and no others can take advantage of it. You do not give running rights to all other roads over the Intercolonial Railway and not charge them for the privilege, but our water-ways and our canals are open to all the world. The canals of Canada and the United States are as equally available to the people of one country as of the other. A railway is entirely different.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Customs recently denied a statement made by my hon. friend (Mr. Osler). I say that the capital expenditure on the Intercolonial

Railway is $68,645,852, or an increase of over four and a half millions on capital account last year. My hon. friend (Mr. Osler) made the statement that when the Intercolonial Railway was finished, according to Sir Sandford Fleming there was about $14,000,000 charged to capital account, and the Minister of Customs said he was wrong. Can the Minister of Railways, through his deputy minister, inform the House whether the amount expended on the old European and North American road, and the Halifax-Truro section is included in the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The deputy minister says that it is included.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Are you certain of that ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I was not present when the discussion arose, but I am so advised by the deputy minister, who speaks from recollection.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If that be the case, then I do not see how you can possibly balance your public accounts.

Rental to the Grand Trunk Railway, $112,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I thought this was a statutory payment.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Now, that the hon. gentleman mentions it, I think it is covered by the statute, but the practice has been to vote it.

Mr. SPROULE. We were informed on a previous occasion, that we would be given figures to enable us to ascertain whether the Drummond County Railway has enabled the Intercolonial Railway to pay better than it did before the extension to Montreal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no statement which will enable me to answer that question. Possibly that is a little like the man who advertises and who cannot just tell on what particular advertisement he has had his order ; although he knows that his business has increased generally. We know the business of the Intercolonial Railway has largely increased, and I am inclined to think that a very considerable portion of that increase is due to the extension to Montreal.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There should be divisional accounts kept, and we ought to be enabled to make a comparison.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They do not separate the different divisions, but I suppose a general idea could be had as to which section of the road has the largest traffic. I do not think it is possible to give exact information.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Any railway manager would be able to give that information. He is able to take the different stations along the road, make allowances for through-traffic, and tell to a dollar the earnings on each division.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) never had such a system in his day.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You can tell it from the present system of bookkeeping on the Intercolonial Railway.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The accounts are kept precisely the same now as in the time of my hon. friend.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I know that the accounts are kept in the same way, or nearly the same way, and I say that from those accounts you can tell the earnings of each division on the road.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It could be only an approximate statement.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No, you can give it almost exactly.

Mr. SPROULE. We were assured over and over again by the ex-Minister of Railways, when he proposed to extend the Intercolonial to Montreal, that the future earnings of the road would show that the investment had been profitable. We desire to have this information now, in order to ascertain whether that statement was justified or not. Judging from the Canadian Pacific Railway report, this information ought to be easily ascertained. From that report we can ascertain the earnings and expenses, the profit or the loss on any portion of the road. If it can be done in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway there should be no difficulty in doing it in the case of the Intercolonial.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I can see that it may be necessary to keep a separate account of the earnings and expenses of a leased line. All I can say with reference to the Intercolonial is that such statements have not been kept in the past and are not at present available.

Mr. WILSON. In view of the debate which took place at the time the Drummond County Railway was purchased by the government, and the predictions then made as to the great increase in traffic that would come to the Intercolonial, it was naturally expected on this side of the House that the government would keep a separate account for that railway and be able to verify the statements they made at that time by producing the accounts. That can be done and ought to be done and we are entitled to receive that information from the Minister of Railways and Canals at any time, but especially when he is getting his estimates through.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid I cannot give it.

Mr. WILSON. If that account is kept distinct that the minister promises to bring it down another year as a matter of course, we will close up parliament and go home.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Slow to promise, sure to perform.

Mr. WILSON. I think we should have the promise.

Mr. BROCK. I am sure the Minister of Finance would be willing to do this if he realized how easy it is. Every station has a statement of the freight and passengers handled at it, and that information is easily accessible. It is a simple thing when you come to look into it and the minister might fairly promise to do this. It would be of interest to know what part of the road is profitable and what part is unprofitable. You could tell what the working expenses of each station are and the amount of freight handled at it, then you know the amount of through-freight that is shipped over the line and you can get the number of passengers who have bought tickets at each station and who arrived at each station. I think if the hon. Minister of Finance will think it over——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will promise to think it over.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We got a promise of this kind from the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals when we were voting the money for the purchase of the Drummond County Railway. The whole question was threshed out then and it was shown how easy it would be to keep an account of this and we had a promise that we would know whether the purchase of the Drummond County Railway proved profitable or not.

Mr. SPROULE. This is important to our side of the House because we venture statements on certain questions which only time can prove to be correct or incorrect. Our reputation is at stake and for the purpose of ascertaining whether our statements or those of the government have proved to be correct we should have that information. It is only a matter of a little book-keeping, because whether it is through-freight or local freight you know how many miles it has been hauled over the road and we also know exactly the passenger traffic that has taken place on it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Supposing you had fifty passengers from Halifax to Montreal under the present system, how could you tell how many of these you would have had if you had not secured the connection through to Montreal ?

Mr. SPROULE. You know how many miles it is from Halifax to Quebec and how many from Quebec to Montreal and you deduct the one from the other ; you know the number of passengers passing over the Drummoned County Railway; then you credit a part of the price of each ticket to the Drummond County Railway in proportion to the length of that line so it is an easy matter to keep the account. Supposing you are sending a quantity of freight ; it passes over the whole road or over a few miles of it, but you know the train mileage and you know the earning per train mile on that road.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend missed my point. Given the fifty passengers whom I have taken for illustration then you can make a division of the probable portion of their fares which should be credited to the different sections of the road, but how can you tell how many of these would have left Halifax for Montreal by the Intercolonial if you did not have any road to Montreal and they were able to go only as far as Quebec.

Mr. SPROULE. Surely that would be all to your benefit because the more traffic there is the more credit it is to you.

Mr. BARKER. I have no doubt it would be of interest and value to the country if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) would order, that for the next few years at all events, separate accounts should be kept for that division of the road. I quite admit that as the minister has said, it does not follow that although you know a particular section of your road has been worked at a loss you would have got as much traffic on your main line if you had not had that section of road. A railway company may have a feeder and although the feeder may itself be worked at a loss it may bring in profit to the main line. Apart from that question, it may be of very considerable benefit to the country to know exactly what such a line as you now have running into Montreal costs you as a portion of your main system. It would be valuable especially if the government were disposed on some other occasion to enter into a similar contract. I did not understand the minister to dispute that it is possible to keep such an account with accuracy, there cannot be any doubt upon that point, both as to earnings and expenses. We want no better evidence on that point than the clause inserted by the government for the protection of the country in the Bill which we passed through the House last night in which it is provided that separate and distinct accounts shall be kept of the earnings and expenses of the eastern section and the western section of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. It is possible to keep a distinct account of the earnings and expenses of the section of railway entering Montreal that has been the subject of discussion for the last half hour. There is no trouble about keeping the accounts ; the extra expense would not involve more than the salary of one clerk during the year. The value of the accounts will be very great indeed, and I think it would be well if the minister would order that they be kept during the next year or two so that the country may know whether the acquisition of that line has been a benefit of not. After we get the

accounts it will open to the government to argue that although they may lose money on the particular section, that fact does not settle the whole question, because the road may be of value for other purposes than simply the revenue derived for traffic over that section.

Prince Edward Island Railway, $256,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are asking an increased appropriation for the working expenses. The vote last year was $275,000. The $320,000 asked this year, of which one-fifth has already been voted, has some reference to the working of the new branch, the Murray Harbour Branch, but as the construction of that branch has been somewhat delayed, we shall not need so much for operating expenses as we are asking. I propose to reduce the item by $20,000. The earnings last year were $217,714.24 and the working expenses $259,637.82. While the Intercolonial proper shows a considerable balance, the Prince Edward Island Railway is operated at a loss, and I am afraid that for the present we shall have to anticipate the same result.

Mr. HACKETT. Is it the intention of the government to have a second train a day between Summerside and Tignish during the coming winter, as was instituted by the Minister of Railways last year and which proved of such great advantage to the people.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not had before me any question of changing the general arrangements of the Prince Edward Island Railway. Whatever the present accommodation is will be continued; and if necessity be shown for anything more, we shall be glad to consider it. We do not in the estimates contemplate any change.

Mr. CARGILL. What is the length of the road ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. 210 miles besides 50 miles of the new branch.

Mr. CARGILL. Does the hon. minister think it prudent to construct a new railway to Moncton in the face of the results shown by the Intercolonial and the Prince Edward Island Railway ? What is the reason that it is not possible to derive a revenue from the Intercolonial, which traverses such a magnificent country as the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and from the Prince Edward Island Railway which runs through what an hon. gentleman described last night as the garden of the Dominion ? We find private corporations investing hundreds of millions of dollars in railways and paying large dividends every year, and in every case the capital is very much watered. I have here the report of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The aggregate capital of that road is said to be $341,000,000. I do not know how much of that is water, but we know that the capital stock of $25,000,000 was originally issued and subscribed for at twenty-five cents on the dollar, so that out of that amount of $25,000,000, $18,750,000 is water. I do not know how much more of the $340,000,000 is water, but according to its report of 1903 the net revenue of that company gave five and nine-tenths per cent on its capital. If that be the case, there must be some extraordinary leakages on the Intercolonial which prevent its yielding any profit, and that shows the necessity of adopting some method of book-keeping which will show where those leaks take place. We ought to know what portions of the road are earning dividends and what are losing money. When a business man opens up a new branch he keeps a separate account for it. If he finds that it yields a profit, he keeps on working it ; but if not he gives it up. There are certain works on which the public money is expended in the interest of the people, in order to develop the resources of the country, and without any expectation of realizing a profit in cash. In this category are our canals, which are great national outlets for our commerce, and which could not be constructed by private enterprise. But the railways are in a different position. They may be constructed out of private capital, and the railway magnates become millionaires in a few years. I am satisfied that the promoters of the Canadian Pacific Railway have all become multi-millionaires. But what I fail to understand is why the government should not be in a position to secure the services of men just as competent as those who built the Canadian Pacific Railway. We are in a position to borrow money at a lower rate of interest. My idea would be for the government to build a road from Quebec, north of lake Winnipeg, thence through the prairie and the Rocky Mountains to Port Simpson. Such a proposition would have received my support. But this lengthening of the tail was what I seriously objected to, because I believe the present Intercolonial road is good for all the requirements of the section of the country through which it runs. And, with an expenditure of twenty-five per cent of the money which the government will spend in making the road from Quebec to Moncton, they could maintain a splendid harbour at Quebec which would enable them to do the business and would save the haul from Quebec to Moncton in the transportation of grain—if they ever hope to carry grain by that road.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am afraid the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cargill) is wandering a little from the question——

Mr. CARGILL. I beg your pardon, Mr. Chairman. I had asked the permission of the committee, and I was just going on to——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not object.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Of course, if the committee does not object.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cargill) is in order. He is discussing the Prince Edward Island Railway, and by way of comparison, to show what might be done under good management, he is quoting the example of some other roads.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think it would be better to put it in this way—that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cargill) is not in order, but the committee will hear him.

Mr. CARGILL. I thank the committee and you, Mr. Chairman. In the calculations I have made I assume that the road will cost this country $100,000,000—that that amount will construct and equip the road. If the cost is more the figures will have to be revised accordingly. I have here a table which I have prepared, showing the cost to the country of this road at the end of 50 years. I assume that it will take five years to build the road, and that for ten years thereafter we shall receive no rent, as for seven years no rent is charged, and for three following years rent is charged at the rate of three per cent on the cost, but if not earned by the road it is added to the capital account, and on that total capital the Grand Trunk Pacific pays rent thereafter at 3 per cent. I have proceeded on the basis of the experience of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Though that road has not yet been in operation for 20 years it is paying interest or dividends on the capitalization of $320,000,000. I have estimated that, for the first five years, after the ten years the proposed road should pay 3 per cent interest, the next five years 4 per cent interest, and so on, adding 1 per cent every five years up to the end of the fifty year period. This does not mean that a larger amount would not be earned, but that, as the capital expendture would be reduced by the difference between the interest we would have to pay—3 per cent—and the returns of the road, the amount of the capital account would be progressively reduced. With this explanation, I submit the figures to which I have referred :

$100,000,000 at 3 per cent capitalized half yearly for fifteen years..	$156,308,000
Three per cent on $156,308,000—$4,689,240, for five years with interest..	25,093,811
	$131,214,189

$131,214,189 at 3 per cent for five years..	$152,279,316
Four per cent on 131,214,189—$5,248,568, for five years with interest..	28,086,977
	$124,192,339

$124,192,339 at 3 per cent, for five years	$144,130,178
Five per cent on $124,192,339—$6,209,617, for five years with interest..	33,229,896
	$110,900,282

$110,900,282 at 3 per cent, for five years..	$128,704,211
Six per cent on $110,900,282—$6,654,017, for five years with interest..	35,608,040
	$ 93,096,171

$93,096,171 at 3 per cent, for five years.	$108,041,830
Seven per cent on $93,096,171—$6,516,732, for five years with interest..	34,873,379
	$ 73,168,451

$73,168,451 at 3 per cent, for five years..	$ 84,914,914
Eight per cent on $73,168,451—$5,853,476, for five years with interest..	31,324,057
	$ 53,590,857

$53,590,857 at 3 per cent, for five years..	$ 62,194,333
Nine per cent on $53,590,857—$4,823,177—for five years with interest..	25,810,556
	$ 36,383,777

$36,383,777 at 3 per cent, for five years..	$ 42,224,829
Ten per cent on $36,383,777—$3,638,378, for five years with interest..	19,470,270
	$22,754,559

So, at the end of 50 years the country would own the road at a cost of $22,754,559, with an earning capacity of $19,470,270 per annum, figuring it out on the basis of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not put any water into this $100,000,000 of capital expenditure—it is all cash properly and legitimately expended. It will be observed that I have shown an increased rate of dividend. So I cannot see anything wrong with the proposition. If I were in the position of the government and going into the building of this railroad I would look around and find some such man as Van Horne and get him to direct the affair. Supposing that, at the end of the period, the government were to give a man like Van Horne 51 per cent of the stock, retaining 49 per cent, they would have a 7 or 8 per cent dividend on the balance of the money, so that the road would be a good source of revenue. I am very much obliged to the Finance Minister and to you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me permission to present these figures.

Now, I believe the acting Minister of Railways and Canals will see the propriety of adopting some system of book-keeping by which he will be enabled to know how the operations of the road are being carried on. As a business man in a small way, I could not get along if I did not know at the end of each month how my business is going. I have to know how much I owe

and how I am going to pay it, and then I can go to bed and sleep at night. But if I did not know that, I would worry all night. Which reminds me of a story. There was a man who had given a note which was about due, and he had no visible means of paying it. He was very much worried over it, so much that he could not stay at home and face the trouble, but went away to a neighbouring town. He stopped at an hotel, but at night he could not sleep—turned and tossed in bed and at times got up and walked about his room and up and down the hall outside. The gentleman sleeping in the room alongside was prevented from sleeping by the other's restlessness, so he rose and asked the disturbed one what was the cause of the trouble. 'I don't know that its any of your business,' was the reply. 'Well,' said the good-natured neighbour, 'I thought perhaps I might be able to help you or afford you relief, so that you might get to bed and sleep.' Feeling that he had a sympathizing listener, the debtor said, 'I have a note coming due to-morrow, and I do not know where I am going to get the money to pay it.' 'Is that all,' said the other; 'well, you had better go to bed, and let the other fellow do the walking.'

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, you will not be so indulgent with me as you have been with our respected friend, therefore, I shall not be able to follow him in these figures. I am glad, however, to have his endorsement of the policy of building a transcontinental road, at all events through the northern part of the provinces of Quebec and Ontario. The only fault he seems to find with us is that we go a little too far south; that is to say, that while this has been called a sub-Arctic scheme, he wants it to be an entirely Arctic scheme. But coming back to the Prince Edward Island Railway, my hon. friend asked for an explanation why we have a loss on that road. He gave us some information about the Canadian Pacific Railway, and he said there was a lot of water in that. Well, in the case of the Prince Edward Island Railway, there is a lot of water round it, and this is largely the explanation why the Prince Edward Island Railway can hardly be expected to be a profitable enterprise. A very large part of the traffic of Prince Edward Island is served by water communication. Still, a railway was necessary for the development of that portion of the country, and I do not think we can look forward at any time to finding it a very profitable undertaking. Many of the people live on the sea-shore, and their means of communication are by water.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Cornwall canal, enlargement, $64,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This item is to pay for the cost of necessary works now under contract, protection to the north bank, installation of an electric system for operating the lock gates, new works, and repairs and enlargement, and regulating weir at lock 17.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Will the minister please give the name of the contractors to whom this money is to be paid, and the total cost of the electric light plant?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The contractor for the mechanism of the lock gates is M. P. Davis. Mr. J. J. Fallon is the contractor for some work on the wharf. I do not find the cost of the installation of the electric system separately. That is not for an electric light plant but it is for operating the lock gates, valves and workshops of the canal by electricity. The contract price is $35,496. That work is finished. There is an additional work of the same character going on by the same contractor. I will get the cost of the electric plant later, if the hon. gentleman wishes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I understood the work on the Cornwall canal was completed some time ago. Will this finally complete the whole work on the canal?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the work that is contemplated this year. The shops are not yet done, but the canal work proper has been done.

Mr REID (Grenville). A few years ago when these works were undertaken, and after they had been in progress for some time, the government decided that it was necessary to have a steamer to run from one end of the works to the other, that is from Cornwall to Prescott, through the Cornwall, Farran's Point, Rapide des Plats and Galops canals. That was for the superintending engineer, Mr. Rubidge, and when I asked for an explanation, some years ago, the answer was given that it was necessary for him to travel over these works. It cost $8,000 or $10,000 a year to keep that boat in operation, and now, although the works are practically completed, the boat is still employed. The boat is really idle as there is nothing for it to do. In fact, as I understand it, the only works that it would be necessary for the engineer to visit occasionally would be those in the north channel, which are being carried on by Mr. W. A. Cleveland, and I do not think that the engineer in charge, Mr. Rubidge, visits them very often. Now, there is an expenditure, I suppose, of from $7,000 to $10,000 per annum for the maintenance of that boat. I may say also at the same time that the position that Mr. Rubidge has held for so many years has been really abandoned, because of others being appointed to take charge of certain parts of the work. I want to ask the hon. acting Minister of Railways and Canals now, if, when the works are practically completed, this expenditure should not be done away with? I do not think it is further necessary. The hon.

acting minister will quite understand that we have another steamer in lieu of the 'Scout' that runs up and down the river, and that can readily do this work whenever necessary. I am not saying anything now in the way of fault finding with anything that has been done in the past, but it does seem a little unfair that this steamer should be allowed to lie at Cornwall practically all summer with a staff employed, and nothing to do. I would like to ask the hon. acting minister if it is intended to continue that condition of affairs? I quite understand that he is not fully cognizant of the whole situation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think perhaps the explanation of the boat not being so busily occupied is due to the fact that Mr. Rubidge has not been in good health. The 'Scout' has been transferred to the Marine and Fisheries Department and is being devoted to the lighting service. It will probably be necessary that there shall be a boat for the canal proper and it is very likely that the boat will be required for the superintendent after the work of construction is over and Mr. Rubidge no longer needs it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Of course, as far as Mr. Rubidge is concerned, I can quite understand that he is not probably in good health. He is over eighty years of age, and I believe that he has arrived at an age when he is hardly fit for the position. I would suggest that he be retired even at his salary for the balance of his days. I am not saying anything against Mr. Rubidge but the hon. acting Minister of Railways and Canals states that the boat may be required by the superintendent. I can hardly see how that will work because I understand that there is a superintendent who has charge of the Cornwall canal only. Then there is a superintendent who has charge of the Williamsburg canal, so that it would be impossible to manage this boat in that way and there could not be any possible use in simply having this steamer running up and down the canal. If it were necessary to have a superintending engineer for works of construction it might be quite different, but, these works are all completed now and there is no actual necessity for the steamer. I would like to have the hon. acting Minister of Railways and Canals explain how the superintendent could use the steamer in that way. There are two superintendents now.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend has referred to the local officers. There is a general superintendent of the St. Lawrence canal system and if he is to continue his work and to examine the various canals he will probably need a boat for that purpose.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to know who the general superintendent is. I never heard before that there was a general superintendent of canals.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I never had the pleasure of seeing him, but I am informed that his name is Stewart.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. acting minister states that Mr. Stewart is the general superintendent. Mr. Stewart is in charge of the Williamsburg canal and there is another gentleman in charge of the Cornwall canal. I think his name is Lally. So that, there are two superintendents. Has Mr. Stewart charge of the Cornwall canal as well as charge of the Williamsburg canal?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am sorry, that, not having visited these canals myself, I am not as well informed as I would like to be in regard to them, but I am advised that Mr. Stewart's duties include the supervision of the Cornwall canal as well as of the Williamsburg canal.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That is news to me because there was a superintendent appointed for the Cornwall canal and he believes he is in the same position as Mr. Stewart. Is it the intention that Mr. Stewart is to have charge of this steamer for use on the Cornwall and other canals?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. For the present the steamer remains in charge of Mr. Rubidge. But, if anything should occur that Mr. Rubidge retires from the service and does not longer require the steamer we shall have to consider what shall be done. I would not like to make a definite statement to my hon. friend.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I can understand that the hon. acting minister is not thoroughly acquainted with the situation there. The people along the river have been making complaints for some little time about this steamer and I am satisfied it is not a necessity. I am, however, satisfied that if the matter were brought to the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals, whoever may be in charge of the department, it will be looked into and perhaps remedied.

Farran's point canal—enlargement, $9,600.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is for work which has been done by the Canadian Construction Company for lowering the old canal bottom, repairing sills and pier and providing one pair of larger gates for old lock No. 22. The appropriation is $12,000, from which we have taken one-fifth.

Mr. REID (Grenville). This is to complete the contract?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That is wound up?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Rapide Plat, $20,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Who is the contractor?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. One of the Gilberts.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is that at the upper entrance ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Upper entrance ; extension of south pier.

Galops canal, enlargement, $102,400.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This expenditure is for the Iroquois section, $17,268 ; the Cardinal section, $39,000 ; the upper entrance, $46,350 ; and $25,000 to meet possible claims ; making $127,618.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What was done with regard to the slide that took place on the Cardinal section ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The contractors, Wm. Davis and Sons, are making it good at their own cost.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Has the leakage on the bank between Iroquois and Cardinal been repaired ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That has been repaired by the government.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There has been quite an agitation at Cardinal to have the government install some kind of machinery to swing that bridge, which is now being done by hand. If you do not put in a plant you should have two men more there, so that the work can be done faster than at present. It would be a great convenience.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It certainly would be desirable if some better arrangement were made for the swinging. That matter is now under consideration.

North channel and dam, $64,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Since I spoke on this matter early in the session, I have been consulting prominent engineers, contractors and marine men with regard to the dam on the Galops rapids, I do not recede from the position I have always taken, that as the Galops channel was being built, it never would be of any use. However, I am informed that by building this dam it would bring the water west of the canal to its normal level, and that for this reason it will be a useful work. If this dam should succeed in stopping the currents in the rapids, then there is no question that the further work can be done much cheaper, and for that reason I am satisfied that the item should go through in this form. I trust that the minister will strike out the item which will necessarily follow this and defer it until it may be seen what the results of building the dam will be. This work has been going on since 1878, and the north channel, or what is known as Cleveland's work, is in first class condition, and is being used by the large steamers of the Wolvin fleet. The other work to which I have referred is not urgent, and I appeal to the minister to postpone it until next session, so that we may ascertain what the effect of the dam will be. If the government then should decide to go on with the work, it can be done much cheaper, and the people would not have the fault to find with it that they have now.

Surveys, lifting boulders, &c., $28,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Where is this work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Between Prescott and Coteau Landing. Except for some surveys made by our own officers, no part of the work has yet been done.

Mr. REID (Grenville). In former days the steamer 'Alert' was used for this work, and there is no better steamer on the river for that purpose. I think that the government might very well use the 'Alert' for the sweeping of the channel. No doubt she would come in very useful but she would be hardly adapted for the purpose mentioned by the acting minister. I quite understand that next year she can be employed very usefully in doing something of this kind and save the expense that would unquestionably be caused by employing another steamer. The hon. minister might use her for that purpose.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is one of the services in which the boat might usefully be employed.

Welland canal, to provide electric light plant, $44,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is this being done by contract and has the contract been let ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It will be done but the work is not yet commenced. We propose to take in this item $55,000 but we have asked in the supplementary estimates a further sum of $45,000, making the estimated cost of the whole undertaking $100,000 which we believe will furnish a complete electric light plant for the whole canal. This estimate is made on the report of an electrical engineer. We expect the work will be done by contract.

Mr. LANCASTER. Has the contract yet been let ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will it be completed in time for use this season ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid it is too much to expect it for this season.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is not a kind of work that will take a great deal of time to install.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It would not take a very long time but it is hardly probable that it would be done this season. It will be done probably during the winter

and will be ready in time for the opening of navigation next spring.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would ask the hon. minister if there is any possibility of placing an electric light plant on the Iroquois and Cardinal section of the St. Lawrence canals at the present time. The Lachine canal, the Soulanges canal and the Cornwall canal all have electric light plants and I see by the supplementary estimates that the Farran's point canal is to have an acetylene gas plant installed on it, although I understand the electric light is best. When this is done the only canal which will have no lighting system at all will be this Iroquois and Cardinal section and I think that it is absolutely necessary, especially that at the head of the canal where the boats are coming in and out, that there should be good light.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No doubt the hon. gentleman is correct in the suggestion that an electric light system would be the better and I have no doubt that we will gradually introduce electric light on all the canals. In some instances we will be able to make arrangements with neighbouring towns having electric light plants to supply the light and in others we will have to establish our own plants, but the aim of the department is to have the electric light system generally employed upon the canals.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is it not a fact that when this plant is placed on the Welland canal, every canal will have an electric light plant from the Lachine to the Welland except the two I have mentioned ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Welland canal is lighted by gas at present.

Mr. REID (Grenville). When this is done will not every canal have electric light except this one stretch to which I have referred ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am told that the Rapide Plat and Galops canal have no electric light. Of course the Iroquois and Galops are interchangeable terms. The Farran's point canal is being lighted by gas. The Rapide Plat has no electric light. However, there is no doubt that the electric light system is very useful and that it will be applied generally.

Mr. REID (Grenville). These two stretches which are on the Morrisburg section are the only two not lighted by electricity. There are electric light plants in each place, the electric light system could be installed at very little cost and there is no doubt that it would be of great benefit to the maritime men. It could be done quite easily and it would complete the whole system.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will have to consider it.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is it the intention of the government to purchase the electrical energy necessary for the lighting of the Welland canal from one of the several electric light producers in the neighbourhood ? Is it the intention of the government to produce its own electricity or to purchase or lease from one of the companies that are in the locality ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This estimate is for the plant, but it contemplates obtaining the power to supply that plant from one of the companies in the vicinity.

Mr. LANCASTER. The contract has not been let to anyone ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. LANCASTER. Nor have tenders been called for ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, nothing has been done.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is the lighting of all these canals done by contract, that is the installation of the plant ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it has been done by tender and contract generally.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What is the cost per annum of lighting the Coteau, Lachine and Cornwall canals ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will get that statement for the hon. gentleman; I have not it at hand. I will try at a later stage during the consideration of the supplementary estimates to furnish the information.

To remove obstruction and make other improvements, $173,600.

Mr. LANCASTER. What obstruction is this ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to deepen the rock cut at Ramy's point, the only shallow rock cutting left in the canal, which is the cause of considerable trouble in times of low water.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is it expected that that will cost $217,000 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is to cost only $5,000. In addition to that there are the votes.

To remove the centre pier of three bridges on the long level and to rebuild the bridges at Welland, Quaker and Port Robinson, estimated cost, $130,000.

To build new weir at Allanburg, estimated cost, $10,000.

Spillway old lock No. 2, $2,000.

This makes the total estimate of $217,000.

Improvements, Port Colborne entrance, $240,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What depth of water will there be when this is done ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Sixteen feet.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Does that include the building of an elevator at Port Colborne ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, we are asking an estimate in the supplementaries to build elevator foundations on the two piers with a view to making some arrangement at once with some of the transportation companies for the erection of elevators. We propose to put in the foundations immediately, that is to ask the appropriation at once.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will this complete the work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This will not finish it.

Mr. LANCASTER. How much is it going to cost ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The total cost of the improvements at the entrance of Port Colborne is fixed at $1,067,856. It would take another year to finish them.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Does the government intend deepening and enlarging the Welland canal ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is work for the deepening of the canal at several places where it was found the water was becoming low.

Mr. LANCASTER. There is no intention to make it permanently deeper, generally speaking ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not generally.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Has the hon. minister any statement showing whether there has been any increase of the tonnage through the Welland canal on account of taking off the canal tolls ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have not particular figures, but there has been a considerable increase in the canals generally.

To deepen portion of summit level between Port Colborne and Thorold, $40,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That deepening already done has proved of great benefit. It will have to be continued until the very shallow portions are deepened. This work is necessitated by the fluctuations in the level of Lake Erie, and is intended to provide 14 feet navigation at all stages of low water.

Lachine canal—enlargement and improvements, pontoon gates, $116,800; slope walls, $17,600.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Who has the contract ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It has not been let, but will be by public tender.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Does this dry-dock at Montreal come under the Railway Department ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What rental does the government get ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is under lease, and I will bring down a statement.

Lake St. Louis—Hydrographic survey, sweeping channel, removing boulders,)c., $6,280.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Has this work been transferred to the Marine Department ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The lighting has been. The Railway Department still has the hydrographic survey.

Sault Ste. Marie canal—construction, $75,200.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is for extending the lower entrance and deepening it, and also deepening and widening the upper entrance.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Does that complete the work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Rideau canal—to rebuild swing bridge across the upper lock at Hog's Back (steel span), $2,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was an old wooden bridge there, over twenty years old which requires to be rebuilt.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the total cost for rebuilding it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Two thousand five hundred dollars will complete the whole work.

Welland canal—stone protection to banks of old canal, $4,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would ask the hon. minister if he would give consideration to the principle on which the government are to lease the water-powers of the old Welland canal? The old canal is not used for navigation. But there is a lot of valuable water-power on that canal, some of which is leased to manufacturers, and more may be leased in future. I think it would be in the interest of the country if the government had some stated scale of prices, so that those intending to go into the business of manufacturing and in a position to use this water-power, might be able to calculate on a certain scale of expenditure for power. If this canal were in the hands of a private corporation, of course it would be managed in that way. As matters are managed by the government in regard to this canal, those who think of locating on the canal are not able to know exactly what they will be called upon to pay. I do not wish to take up time discussing the point, but I would urge upon the minister to look into this matter. Or if he has looked into it and can tell me now what the policy of the gov-

ernment is in regard to it, I would be glad to have him explain.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know whether it will be found expedient to have a fixed scale. Certainly, there is none now. Still, no doubt, the matter is worthy of consideration. We are receiving better rates for water-power now than we did some years ago, but fixed rates might not be advantageous under the varying conditions. For example, we are generally disposed to give power to municipalities for their own purposes on more generous terms than those on which we give it to private parties. The mattter will receive consideration.

Welland canal—to change valves and hanging gear of new lock gates, $12,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. What changes are these ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This expenditure is to change the Townsend valve, which never was satisfactory, as it is complicated and frequently out of repair and slow to operate. It is to be replaced with the Butterfly valve. The $15,000 asked for will complete the work.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is it proposed to make the change all through the canal ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Welland canal—to survey and delimit government lands along the canal, $1,600.

Mr. LANCASTER. This is a small item; still, I would like some explanation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The canal boundaries along the old and new canals are very indefinite in many cases and require re-marking. A complete plan of the canal is needed to show the government's property and leaseholds.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not understand in what way the boundaries are indefinite. I never heard that we had any difficulty in ascertaining which was private property or the boundaries between the lands of private owners. I thought the lines were pretty well ascertained. They are magnetic bearings, and that ought to be sufficient.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a considerable quantity of land under leasehold, and it is deemed desirable by the officials of the department that the boundaries may be marked with stone monuments, as in the case of the Lachine canal.

Welland canal—to improve drainage along feeder, $1,200.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the hon. minister know what part of the feeder this is ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This amount is required for cleaning and improving back ditches in order that land may be properly drained, and so avoid complaints of land owners with regard to drainage of their lands.

Lachine canal—to renew masonry wall basin No. 2, $5,600.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to renew and rebuild the old locks 1 and 2, Montreal. They are falling into decay.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I see a lot of work going on there. Will this expenditure complete it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. The work has been going on for some time.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Who are the contractors ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Coulson, Quinlan & Robertson.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Was this let by tender ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Chambly canal—electric station by-wash, Ste. Thérèse, $4,800.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is a by-wash ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This sum is to be used to provide for rebuilding by-wash at Ste. Thérèse and at electric power station for lighting the canal and furnishing power for the work shop. It is estimated for each by-wash, $3,000. The work will be done in concrete.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is a by-wash ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I heard the question asked before, but I was doing my best to dodge it by pretending that I did not hear. But my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) compels me to admit that I do not know what a by-wash is. The chief engineer tells me that it is something to let the water out.

Mr. LANCASTER. How does it work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am sorry that I must acknowledge ignorance.

Mr. LANCASTER. Well, I am in the same position.

Chambly canal—macadamizing tow path, $6,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Will the minister macadamize the tow-path on the Iroquois and Galops section of the canal ? This canal has been built, and it is all clay.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a highway, this is a regular traffic road.

Mr. CLANCY. In that case, it is being done for the municipality.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is claimed we have spoiled the road and we must make it good.

Mr. CLANCY. Spoiled the road by using this tow-path. There are no wheels going over it by reason of its being a tow-path.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is a general public highway.

Mr. CLANCY. The minister said the road was spoiled by reason of our using it as a tow-path. Is that by reason of hauling heavy loads over it in vehicles ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The chief engineer informs me that we used their highway, and we are practically replacing it in this way.

Mr. CLANCY. I understood the hon. gentleman to say a moment ago that we had spoiled the road and this was done to repair it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We spoiled it by taking possession of their road, and we are now giving them this one.

Mr. CLANCY. This is not the same road, then ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are allowing them to use our tow-path as their highway, inasmuch as we took possession of their road.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the municipality contribute anything towards this work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. The department thought that inasmuch as we had taken possession of their highway we should give them a substitute therefor. We give them the right to use the tow-path, and we macadamize it for them.

Mr. CLANCY. Was it used in common before ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was used as a highway until we damaged it or destroyed it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not quite understand how it was that we took possession of and destroyed their own road.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The damage to the road took place years ago, when the department used a portion of it. That was macadamized before, and we are now adding to the macadamized portion. That is the explanation of the department. It is not so clear as I would like it myself.

Mr. LANCASTER. How many miles of this road are macadamized ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Three miles, at $2,500 per mile.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course it may be all right, but I think we ought to have a little more information about it. We ought to know why so many years have elapsed without doing this. It is perfectly plain, I should think, that if you took a highway belonging to the municipality you should either put it back in the same condition, or give them another one. But I do not see that there is any obligation on the government to keep it macadamized. We have discharged our duty by giving the municipality another road in the same condition.

Mr. REID (Grenville). We had a case in Cardinal where the government took the whole road, by the route of the canal, and it was absolutely necessary to make a new road. In that case it was macadamized.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The information is not as complete as I would like to have it, and I will let the item stand.

Item allowed to stand.

At six o'clock, Committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Chambly canal—land damages, $400.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This item is not correctly expressed. It is not actually for land damages, but for a wall to prevent land damages. I therefore beg to move :

That the words 'land damages' be struck out and that the words 'wall to prevent land damages' be substituted in lieu thereof.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Who owns the land ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It is understood that the item just before that one shall be allowed to stand ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. MONK. Is this to begin a wall or to cover the whole work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. To cover the whole work.

St. Ours lock—stop logs, $800.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to renew the stop logs which are at present decayed.

Landing wharfs, $1,280.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What is the cost of the landing wharfs ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The item for landing wharfs amounts to $1,600. It is proposed to replace the present wooden wharfs with concrete piers and iron and wooden superstructures, which will make it a permanent work.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Are these wharfs owned by the government ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Is that the total cost ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. When these estimates were prepared, some time ago, only a small appropriation was asked for this work, but since then it has been represented that we will have to engage in a much larger amount of work. It is almost a pity that this item is taken at all, because we will have to ask for a further

amount. I see that there is an appropriation in the supplementary estimates for $4,400, which will have to be added to this. The figures I have in regard to the item are not satisfactory, and I will have to ask it to stand.

Mr. MONK. I am not aware that there is any wharf at St. Ours excepting the wharf of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company. There is no government wharf at that point. If it is contemplated to build a new wharf there, when the item comes up, will the hon. minister have a little more information as to where that wharf is to be ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. It is represented here to be a government wharf.

Mr. MONK. I do not think there is a government wharf there.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will let the item stand.

Item allowed to stand.

Carillon and Grenville canal, $18,400.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to construct a guide pier at the entrance of the canal and to renew the wharf at Grenville. The wharf or pier has been built twenty-one years, and the part above water is urgently in need of being renewed. It is proposed to substitute concrete for cribwork. The estimate is $23,200, and we are asking in this vote for $23,000.

Mr. BROCK. In spending this $23,000 I hope the minister is keeping in mind, that before very long we will have the Ottawa ship canal built, and that this lock should be made of a capacity to suit that canal. This wooden pier having lasted for twenty years; I suppose this new one will last for one hundred years, so the government ought to take into consideration that in five or six years perhaps, it may have to be utilized for the Georgian bay canal. Will the minister put that consideration before the transportation commission ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The commission will have a free hand.

Mr. BROCK. If you build these walls and spend money, the commission will not have a free hand except to tear them down again.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is this a new work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is an old work which is being reconstructed.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Will it be let by public tender ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is under contract now to Messrs. Martineau and Lemoine. It was let by tender and the lowest was accepted.

Mr. REID (Grenville). When was the work commenced ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It began last year.

Mr. REID (Grenville). This is the first vote.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, there was an appropriation of $10,000 last year.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That is not shown in the estimates, and there do not seem to be any details regarding it in the Auditor General's Report.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is evidently a printer's error in the estimates. The actual expenditure last year was $9,776.53.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is this contract given for a lump sum ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The contract is for the whole work on schedule prices. The total estimate for the work was $60,000. I should have said that the work commenced in 1901, and that it has been going on since that time.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then it should be referred to in the Auditor General's Report.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It ought. There was an expenditure in the year ending June 1902, of $16,998.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Why should a comparatively small work like this take five or six years to complete ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As a matter of fact it is only two years under construction, but a good part of the work can only be done when the water is out of the canal in the spring.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Could it not be done in winter ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. You cannot do concrete work in the winter very successfully. I admit that it is a good deal of time for a small work.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It certainly is.

Miscellaneous—miscellaneous works not provided for, $4,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These items are the usual votes.

Salaries of engineers, draftsmen, extra clerks and messengers, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $23,200.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This difference is accounted for by several increases given to various persons.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I understood that all of these engineers, draftsmen and clerks were paid out of the appropriation for any special work. For instance that the engineers and draftsmen on a canal or a particular piece of railway were paid out of the estimate for that particular work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These are officers on the headquarters staff, and that does not apply to them.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That is in Ottawa?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). And they do not come under any other vote, do they ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Cost of litigation in connection with railways and canals, $4,800.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These are costs which are incurred by the department in disputes which may arise in any part of the country which are taxed by the Justice Department, and then charged against the Department of Railways and Canals.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to make an appeal to the acting Minister of Railways and to the Minister of Justice on behalf of a gentleman, a clergyman, residing in the village of Cardinal, who had a claim against the government for damages to his property. The case was tried in the Exchequer Court, and judgment for, I think, $1,200 was given in his favour. I understand the government are disputing his case in the Supreme Court. The appeal to the Supreme Court is, in the opinion of a great many people, very very hard, as the gentleman is not a man of means. I would like to appeal to the hon. minister to try to see his way clear to accept the decision of the Exchequer Court and to pay this man the amount awarded to him. Could not the minister let this matter pass and give this gentleman the amount to which he is honourably entitled ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If this were an isolated case, I think the appeal of my hon. friend (Mr. Reid) should be entertained. Unfortunately the case in question was a test case, and on the judgment rendered in that case a great many other claims depend. The difficulty with respect to the particular case which my hon. friend has put to the Minister of Finance is that if we were to acquiesce in the judgment in this case the government would find itself condemned to pay a very large amount as the result of other claims which have not yet been disposed of. As the result of representations made by my hon. friend, I think it will be found that the case will not be tried at the present sitting of the Supreme Court, and some effort may be made in the direction of settling the other claims before this matter is allowed to go any further. That I think is the object which my hon. friend has in view.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I understood from this gentleman's solicitor that this case might be settled without prejudicing the other cases to which reference has been made.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That statement was made by the solicitor of the reverend gentleman, but after considering the matter thoroughly I concluded that the interests of the government would be to some extent jeopardized by settling this claim, however, as I said a moment ago in consequence of representations made by my hon. friend, the matter is being inquired into further, and an effort is being made to arrive at some settlement.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am frequently asked by the electorate to explain on what principle these law costs are paid, and I would like to know from either the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Justice if they can tell me in what way this money is expended. Of course, I can tell at a glance that the amount being only $6,000, this cannot be more than the amount paid for the services of outside lawyers, and I therefore ask in what way business is given by the department to outside lawyers. I suppose that most of this money goes in counsel and solicitors' fees, and as it is a small amount in comparison to the amount of litigation every year, it is evident that some work must be done in the Railway Department and in the Department of Justice, where we know they have able lawyers engaged. As the electors frequently ask me and as I am unable to state on what principle the government act in having this business done by solicitors who are not permanent employees of the department, I would be glad if one of the ministers would give me as much information as possible on the subject.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Of course there is a law branch in the Railway Department, but in all matters of great importance we consult the Department of Justice. A good deal of the money is paid outside of Ottawa where it is necessary to obtain legal services. For instance very recently we had to send a representative over to the state of New York to interest himself in a very important matter with regard to the Galops dam, a part of which rests upon American territory. Occasions of that kind sometimes arise.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I see that you employed as a medical man, Dr. T. C. Gaboury, to act as attorney in re Lafleur et al.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That was a case of land damages, and Dr. Gaboury, who lives in the locality, was employed specially to go about and settle claims so as to avoid lawsuits. He was not employed as attorney at law but as agent, with power of attorney to act for the government.

Mr. BENNETT. In a certain case of Stewart against the King, over $2,000 were paid Blake, Lash & Cassells for fees. Were they acting for the government ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, this was an unfortunate case which arose out of Stewarts quarry on the Soulanges canal. It went to the Exchequer and the Supreme Courts and we succeeded in getting the claim reduced by a very large amount.

Mr. BENNETT. Was the Deputy Minister of Justice associated with Mr. Blake ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, not in that case. A conflict had arisen between himself and Mr. Stewart, and it was alleged at one time that Mr. Newcombe had shown personal hostility to Mr. Stewart, and we thought it was well to allow the matter to remain in the hands of a third party.

Mr. BENNETT. Did the Solicitor General act ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, none of the officials of the department.

Mr. BENNETT. Was there a junior counsel ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, a man named Lawlor, who was connected with the case at the locality where the work was done.

Mr. BENNETT. He drew $1,500 in connection with this case. $3,500 were paid out in law fees by the department in this matter although we have the Minister of Justice, the Deputy Minister of Justice, and the Solicitor General, and one of the pledges made by the hon. gentlemen when in opposition was that the law costs would be very much reduced. Are they decreasing or increasing ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The business of the country in litigation, as in other respects, has increased very considerably, but with respect to law costs there has been a gratifying decrease. When I was Solicitor General, I appeared in almost every case for the Crown, which I could attend to personally, and my friend the deputy minister has appeared to such an extent that it is a grievance to the bar at large that he is employed too frequently. As far as I am personally concerned, it is looked upon as improper for me to go to court, although my desire is to appear as frequently as possible.

Mr. MONK. Is this six thousand dollars more than the amount paid last year for law costs ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not the figures paid last year. But the preceding year the expenditure was close upon the $6,000. This has been the annual vote for several years.

Mr. MONK. Before 1896, one of the great grievances in the province of Quebec was that there was the amount of money spent on law costs despite the fact that we had a perfectly organized Department of Justice. I recognize the propriety of what the Minister of Justice has said with regard to his not appearing in every case in which the Crown is concerned, but it seems to me that that reason existed before 1896 as well as to-day. Very far from decreasing, the amount we expend in law costs has increased considerably. Last year over $87,000 were paid to legal gentlemen, and I notice that friends of the government were employed exclusively. Whether it be that they are better versed in the law than Conservatives I cannot say, but out of that $87,000 only $5 were paid to a Conservative, a lawyer in Montreal. I shall not go as far as my hon. friends opposite did in 1896, when they utterly condemned the late government because it spent a much smaller amount under this head, but $87,000 paid out in law costs during the year appears to be a very large amount, and we are justified in asking if this $6,000 is over and above the $87,000.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is part of the $87,000.

Mr. MONK. I do not think so. I think that $6,000 is over and above the $87,000 paid last year, and I have no doubt the amount will be considerably increased this year. In that connection I would ask the minister to give us the names of the parties to whom this $6,000 was paid last year.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) must not be alarmed at the magnitude of the costs last year, for, after all, $87,000 is but a small sum compared with the $116,000 paid in 1896.

Mr. MONK. Not as much as that.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Just as much as that.

Mr. MONK. I contradict my hon. friend.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. And in 1897 the sum was still larger, because we had to clean up the old accounts. If my hon. friend will bring this up on the supplementary estimates, I will give him the facts and show the decrease in these costs, although the business has increased. When I speak of costs, I mean solicitors' fees. Seventy-five per cent of the solicitors' work that used to be done outside exclusively is now done in the department. The enormous fees, amounting to as much as $18,000 paid in one year to a firm in Ottawa—and running each year from $15,000 to $18,000—are not seen any more. My hon. friend says that we limit ourselves to our political friends in the distribution of this patronage. Of course, other things equal, he would not blame us for preferring our friends. But if he will look at the items of expenditure, he will see the names of a good many gentlemen who do not belong to the Liberal party.

Mr. MONK. Precious few.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. A good many, and some of the largest items. And

my hon. friends behind me are constantly reminding me that there are too many of these names. I have to stand the assaults of hon. gentlemen opposite and of those on this side, too. I think I will have to get my back to the wall——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Or take to the woods.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am not sure that the grievance is not on this side.

Mr. MONK. This subject was such a constant theme of discussion in the province of Quebec before 1896 that my memory of it is thoroughly good. We were told on the platform that we were actually keeping alive a number of these dangerous people called lawyers, and I recollect that the sum we were said to have spent was much smaller than $116,000 mentioned by my hon. friend. But, if it was wrong then—and that is the point I wish to make—to carry on these expenditures, if it was a scandal then to spend the money of the people in maintaining lawyers when it should be devoted to public improvement, why is it right now? We have a long list in the Auditor General's Report, making up a total of $87,341.53 paid to lawyers. Here is one lonely Conservative lawyer in Montreal, who, probably, had a claim against the government which they could not dispute, and he received $5. This list appears at B—27-28 of the Auditor General's Report. Messrs. Blake, Lash & Cassels, of Toronto, received $4,030. I notice that Mr. F. C. Wade, of Dawson City, was paid the trifling sum of $7,768. Evidently there are many disputable matters arising in Charlottetown, because there are lawyers there who have drawn considerable sums of money. Charlottetown seems to be prolific of government litigation.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In connection with the new branch railway.

Mr. MONK. That may be correct. Mr. Congdon, of Dawson, received $2,476; Messrs. McCarthy, Osler, &c., Toronto, $3,000. Mr. McKenzie, of Macleod, defended the government, and was rewarded with $1,089. Then a patriotic gentleman in Edmonton, by the name of C. de W. MacDonald, received $2,280; Messrs. Langley & Martin, Victoria, $1,842; Messrs. Lafleur, McDougal & McKay, Montreal, $1,822; T. C. Johnston, Regina, bore up against the enemy and received $1,456. Mr. W. B. Ross, of Halifax—I suppose, not a relative of my hon. friend from Victoria (Hon. Mr. Ross)—was paid $4,524. Hon. A. Peters, Victoria, received $1,750. My friend Mr. Gouin, the provincial minister, and other provincial politicians, received a share. Mr. Cloran, now a senator, got something also, but not so much as many others.

Mr. COCHRANE. Was that after he was appointed senator?

Hon. Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Mr. MONK. No. If the custom which the hon. gentlemen opposite so violently condemned is to be kept up, I would suggest to my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) that there are in Montreal, and no doubt elsewhere, competent lawyers of a Conservative faith, and that he ought to divide this patronage between the parties.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. How many of us got a chance previous to 1896, except when we came with our guns after the enemy?

Mr. MONK. But my hon. friend knows the golden rule.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The Minister of Justice says that the payment of amounts to legal gentlemen in Ottawa has been done away with.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Not done away with, but the amounts largely decreased.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Quite a large amount was paid to one firm—several thousand dollars.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Chrysler & Bethune, I suppose, the hon. gentleman refers to. But the amount was not $18,000 or anything like it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I see that Hon. A. S. White was paid $2,375 for drafting the Railway Act.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The hon. gentleman does not hold me responsible for that?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Surely that work could have been done in the department. And in comparing amounts spent by this government and the previous government for legal fees in Ottawa this amount should not be overlooked.

Mr. BENNETT. Do I understand the Minister of Justice to say that all the law costs paid by the different departments are summarized under the Justice Department?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The practice is that when an account is rendered for professional services for any department the account goes to the Department of Justice; we tax it, and then it goes to the particular department that is charged with the case and that department pays it. But it is all under the head of legal expenses, and legal expenses are all summarized on page 327.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is this account of Chrysler & Bethune on page W—54 of the Auditor General's Report, $615—is that included in the summary?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That would appear to be an item in connection with the arbitration in the case of Mackenzie & Mann vs. The King, the judge of the Exchequer Court acting in that matter.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is there any regular fees that we pay solicitors ? That some are paid at the rate of $25 per day.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The amount varies. Some receive $100 a day ; but the regular agents of the department, those who do solicitor's work for us in different parts of the country, are supposed to receive $25 a day. But when you come to employ counsel they charge much higher. Christopher Robinson, for instance, who acts for the department occasionally, Mr. Sam Blake, and Mr. Aylesworth, get $100 a day. There are others who get smaller fees, varying from $25 to $100 a day.

Mr. REID (Grenville). In this case of the Hon. A. S. White, we are entitled to some explanation why the department had to send so far to get a gentleman to draft this Railway Act. I should think that required some gentleman with exceptional ability. But when he is only paid $25 a day, it would seem to indicate that he was not considered a light in the legal profession.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The drafting of the Railway Bill required to be done by a specialist. In the Department of Justice our hands are very full, and none of us would assume the responsibility of drafting an important Bill of that sort. There might be gentlemen in Ottawa capable of doing it, but it is not unusual to take professional men elsewhere. For instance, the Manitoba School Bill was prepared by a gentleman who came to Ottawa from Winnipeg for that purpose.

Mr. REID (Grenville). In that case it was the province of Manitoba who was interested, and therefore it was proper to send for a gentleman from Winnipeg.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. He was paid by the government, though.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That may be, but inasmuch as it was the Manitoba people who were interested, it was perfectly right to employ a gentleman from Manitoba where the Act was to be enforced.

Mr. COCHRANE. I do not think the Minister of Justice is doing justice to himself in his explanations with regard to the legal expenses. It is a very flimsy excuse for him to make, when he is challenged in connection with the expenditure of public money, and in failing to employ local talent, to say that the old government did the same thing. He might do something and be perfectly conscientious in doing it, but when the Minister of Justice sees fit to condemn something that we did, and when he does the same thing, I think he is a double-dyed hyprocrite to pretend to say that he was justified because we did it. Where is your Solicitor General now ? Where was he all this time ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. During part of the time that these expenditures were being incurred the Solicitor General was busily engaged in the Supreme Court and in the Exchequer Court. I happened to be Solicitor General myself at that time. The present Solicitor General is now absent attending Exchequer Court cases that are being tried in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. He was away during the past summer attending the Privy Council in England on government business. I may add to that, and I make the statement in all seriousness, that in my opinion it is in the interest of the government, and it is desirable, to concentrate as much as possible the litigation of the government in the hands of the Department of Justice. It has been my desire to do that, and I venture to say that seventy-five per cent of all the litigation in matters that are now pending, is controlled in the Department of Justice here. The solicitor's work is done by the Deputy Minister of Justice and it is only when it is necessary to engage counsel outside that we engage them. I would like to go further and say that it is impossible, when you have cases from Halifax to Vancouver, and when local knowledge is necessary, when you want a local solicitor who knows local conditions, I say it is impossible for all that work to be done here, and it is in the interest of the government that local men should be employed. Still, it is made a grievance against the government that we keep too much of the work in our own hands.

Mr. COCHRANE. I sympathize with the Minister of Justice. I understand how his followers are very hungry to get their share of what is going. But that does not justify him in doing what he condemned when we were in power.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. You did not do any of the legal work.

Mr. COCHRANE. That is rather a sweeping assertion, as I think the Minister of Justice will find if he looks over the Auditor General's Report.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, I know what was done in the department.

Mr. COCHRANE. But I was not inquiring where the Solicitor General was now, I was not finding any fault that he was not doing his duty. I was only pointing out that when we are paying these enormous fees for legal counsel, it seems to me the Department of Justice might do some of that work themselves. If litigation is increasing so fast, that shows the government must be at fault ; they must be doing business very loosely, or they would not have so much litigation. They cannot be a business government as we have been led to believe they are or they would do the business in such a way that they would not have so much law.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I can see where the seriousness of this legal business comes in. It might be well to have two or three very able gentlemen connected with the Department of Justice to look after the government's interest at the courts which are held. It is a well known fact that when a case is tried in the court the hon. Minister of Justice employs a local solicitor to take charge of the case in the interest of the government. I think I can safely say that in many cases the solicitor employed is not generally the ablest solicitor in the locality and is not able to cope with the gentlemen who are employed in opposition to the government. If this were all centered in the department at Ottawa and gentlemen of ability were employed to plead the case on behalf of the government I think it would pay the government better even to pay the local solicitors the amounts that they receive now, because, I believe in a great many cases, the judgments rendered against them would not be rendered if the government employed men of ability to plead their cases. I know of cases in which men have been employed on behalf of the government that I would not have employed on my own behalf and I say that without saying anything disrespectful to these gentlemen. I knew the men who were employed on the other side and I knew that those employed on behalf of the government were not able to cope with the situation. I believe that two or three men should be employed to do nothing else but plead the cases of the government. Of course, it might be necessary to have the assistance of a local solicitor to get up the brief. At present the government do not send any person to do that. They allow the local solicitor to go ahead and carry on the case and in nine cases out of ten judgment is rendered against the government.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is it not a fact that in nine cases out of ten judgment is rendered against the government, whereas it would be rendered in favour of the government if they employed men of the ability of those whose names have been mentioned, such as Mr. Christopher Robinson, Mr. Aylesworth and men of that calibre ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not know about the local cases. Perhaps my hon. friend may be correct because I suppose he would not speak without knowledge, but I can tell him in reference to the cases that I have personal knowledge of that you can go to the Supreme Court and find that 75 per cent of the cases have been successfully contested by the government.

Mr. REID (Grenville). In the Supreme Court.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The government have generally turned the other side down pretty successfully.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The gentlemen who have looked after the interest of the government in the Supreme Court are gentlemen like Mr. Aylesworth and Mr. Robinson.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Not always ; there are others.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the hon. minister if Mr. Lawlor was employed in any other cases beside that of Stewart vs. the Crown.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think that was the only case he was in.

Mr. CLANCY. I see that the following sum was paid to Mr. Lawlor.

Advances on account of services and expenses, November 15, 1901, $500 ; March 26th, 1902, $1,000—$1,500.

Is that the whole sum paid to Mr. Lawlor ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not remember that he was engaged in any other case but the Stewart case. In that case his fees were fairly large and then there were considerable travelling expenses because he had to prepare the whole case which was a very complicated and difficult one. The amount involved was exceedingly large and on the other hand we had against us Mr. B. B. Osler, Q.C. assisted I think by Mr. Hogg and another legal gentleman in this city. On our side we had Mr. Blake and Mr. Lawlor. In the result the government did not fare very badly because we had the amount of the claim reduced from over $70,000 to something in the vicinity of $28,000.

Mr. CLANCY. What was the result of this case of Battle vs. the Crown ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not remember the details of that case, but I think the case never went to judgment. I think the case was compromised and as a result of the compromise a very large reduction was made in the claim.

Mr. CLANCY. I see here that a lawyer was employed, Mr. C. B. Smith and that an engineer was also employed at $25 a day and travelling expenses. I see also that a gentleman named Mr. P. A. Peterson was employed and that there was a large amount of cost in the case.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It was in connection with the arbitration that Mr. Peterson was employed, was it not ?

Canals — repairs and operating expenses, $585,540.

Mr. LANCASTER. There is an increase of $54,216. We would like to know what this is for ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The increases on the Cornwall canal amount to $5,270, and the decrease to $2,264. leaving

a net increase of $3,006. I have the details of the increased cost of the services on each of the canals here. While the total increase of $54,000 is in one sense considerable, yet it is a very small percentage of the aggregate.

Mr. LANCASTER. I understand that the minister is not providing for an increase in the salaries of the lock tenders on the Welland canal. If that be the case, I want to put in a word for them, because I believe they are the most underpaid men in the services of the government; too much underpaid in fact, to enable them to render proper and efficient service. We have heard a lot of the prosperity of the country and the increased cost of living, and while I do not object to increasing the salary of a civil servant who gets $2,000 a year, if the increased cost of living requires it; yet, I think we begin at the wrong end, when we leave the men who are only getting $400 a year out in the cold. These men who receive small pay, feel the cost of living much more than the gentlemen who get high salaries. I would remind the minister that several petitions have been sent here from the Welland canal employees, urging on the government that they are justly entitled to an increased wage. As these employees cannot come to the House themselves, and as they are my constituents, and whether they voted for me or not, are entitled to justice, and, as I am the only person who can represent them on the floor of the House, I want to impress upon the government some reasons why these men should get an increase of pay. To commence with, they are getting exactly the same pay as they got twenty-five years ago and we all know that $400 does not buy as much today in the Niagara district, at all events, as it could buy a quarter of a century ago. Other employees than the lockmen on the Welland canal have had their wages increased. I do not believe that the carpenters are paid as much as they ought to be. They get less wages than are paid by contractors, and they get less than the union scale in St. Catharines, Merritton and other places along the canal. I believe that this government can afford to pay its servants just as much as any private contractor pays them. It is a poor government if it can not. While saying that, I must add that the carpenters and labourers have had their position improved during the past fifteen years, by shortening their hours as well as increasing their pay. The labourers on the Welland canal get $1.50 for nine hour's work, which is 16 2-3 cents an hour, but the lock tenders, who require to be more skilful men, get $45 a month for a day of twelve hours, which is only 14½ cents per hour. The lock tender at $45 per month can only get about eight month's employment in the year, and the minister can see what that figures down to. I do not think it is in the interests of the country that these men should be kept at such low wages, while civil servants in Ottawa who get five times their pay, have had their salaries raised because of the increased cost of living. The lockmen must be sober and steady men; their eyesight and their hearing must be good, and they must be trustworthy. To pay men of that class $45 a month for eight months in the year is penurious, is mean and is stingy. My remarks will apply to the bridge tenders as well. Let me point out also that the government have now made the canals free, no doubt with the object of getting more vessels to pass through them, and that being the case, it must necessarily increase the work of the employees to whom I refer. These men, when they are at work, have to work extremely hard, and their calling is only made comparatively easy because of the fact that many vessels may not lock through in quick succession. I can assure the minister that if he lived on the Welland canal and saw those men at work he would come to the conclusion that they have no easy job of it. The fact remains then, that the pay of these men has not been increased for twenty-five years, and as you have lately adopted a policy which increases their work, they, therefore have a double claim to the consideration of the government; first, because of the increased cost of living; and second, because the canals having been made free, their duties will be largely augmented. The matter I suppose will receive the attention of the government; but I am bound to say that I do not think that the ordinary justice is being done these men which they have a right to expect. If we are to err at all on the side of liberality it should be in regard to the $300 or $400 men and not the $1,500 or $2,000 men. You talk about the increased cost of living and increase the salaries of the judges who are receiving $5,000 or $6,000. I am not objecting to that, I am in favour of increasing the salaries of county court judges particularly, but while I am in favour of increasing the salaries of county court judges, we must remember that they get from $2,400 to $3,000, and I am that much more in favour of increasing the salary of the man who gets $300 or $400 and has to support a wife and children. If we are to err on the side of liberality let us begin with the poor man to whom $25 is a great deal and not with those who receive much larger stipends. The lock tender on the Welland canal gets $45 a month. If you multiply that by eight you get his annual income, or less than $400 because a man who is working on the canal cannot expect to obtain employment in the winter months. If he is working for the government during the summer he is not the subject of much commiseration and people naturally give the preference to the men whom they want to work for them in summer so that practically the income of these men for the whole year is simply the $45 a month which they get for eight months

of the year. It is sometimes said that it does not take much of a man to be a civil servant. That ought not to be the case and I do not think it is. I think we should have the best men in the country as civil servants, and I say that you cannot retain good lock tenders unless you pay more than $45 a month. Many of these men have become accustomed to this work and I think in all fairness they should have an increase. I would not object to a higher standard of qualification, and if the government think that some of these men should not be employed because they are not fit for the work, I would say that the proper business method would be to get rid of them and to get others but while the government are employing these men to do the work and are increasing the salaries of gentlemen in the civil service running up into the thousands, I think they are making a mistake and doing an unfair thing to the workman in not increasing his salary. The government should begin with the $400 men and not with the $1,500 or $2,000 men. It is not alone these men who are interested in this; the whole shipping interest of the country is concerned in the proper tending of these locks and swing bridges. If a man is careless in looking after one of these swing bridges where a railway crosses the canal an awful loss of life and property may result and carelessness in working the locks might also result in flooding of the adjoining lands and in great destruction. It must be remembered too that these men are on duty in twelve hour shifts night and day and the salaries which they receive are not at all fair in proportion to their work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand that the workmen on the Welland canal had the good fortune to get their increase in advance of the others. I think my hon. friend must be mistaken when he said that they had received no increase for twenty-five years. I understand that complaint was made that the lock tenders on the other canals were not receiving the same pay as those on the Welland canal and that the increase had to be made to bring them up to the standard of those on the Welland.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Welland canal lock tenders did not receive an increase.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They were getting higher pay than those on the other canals and the increase had to be made to bring the others up to the Welland standard. However, I have not had this matter brought under my consideration since I have been at the head of the department and I quite sympathize with the view that those who are receiving very low salaries should be considered. We are making the labour of these men less arduous by the use of the electric system, but that makes no difference as their time has to be considered and they are entitled to fair remuneration for their work.

Mr. LANCASTER.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. minister says that the increase in the repairs to the canals is very slight. I would like to call his attention to the fact that last year the total paid for repairs on the Morrisburg canal, with which I am more familiar, was $13,700 and the total amount paid to the Morrisburg staff was $14,403, altogether in the neighbourhood of $28,000. At the time the Liberal party came into power the amount expended on repairs was about $8,000 and the amount paid the staff was about $7,000, or a total of $15,000, so that the expenditure has been actually doubled. Now, there is no excuse why the repairs should be doubled. During the last three or four years these canals have been in the hands of the contractors, and have all been put in good order. There was no necessity for placing a dozen more men on the repair gang. I know for a fact that pressure was brought on the government from the local committee in each village, and the result was that from each and every one so many men were taken and employed on the repairs, and in addition the government put more men on the locks than were actually required. Take the locks at the head of the Galops canal, they have got an overseer there and a lockmaster as well, or more than they actually require. That is one of the reasons why the repairs staff have increased, and I think that the acting minister will also find very material increases on the other canals because I hear the same remarks about them. He will find too that in distributing the patronage, the government are very good to their friends. I see no objection to that save in this respect that they go outside my constituency, in which this canal is situated, for supplies, and I think it is hardly fair to do so when they are not inviting public tenders. And they pay big prices when they go and give the orders to their friends. For instance white pine timber sixteen feet long at $25 per thousand feet, and pine plank $26 per thousand feet.

Mr. BENNETT. Knots included.

Mr. REID. Yes, knots included. These prices were paid to the Alexandria Wood Exporting Company of Alexandria, and if report be true, the Alexandria Wood and Export Company is the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Schell).

Mr. SCHELL. The report is not true.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I see that this company received a large amount in connection with the Cornwall canal, and in connection with the Williamsburg canal it received $813.18. Here is Mr. Cameron of Iroquois who received $602.47. He lives along the line of the canal, and I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that he could have supplied all that stuff. But Mr. Stewart, the superintendent, came from the county of Glengarry, and I have not the slightest

doubt that the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Schell) recommended him for the position, and he has returned good for——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. For evil.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Yes, probably good for evil. This expenditure has increased materially, and if the acting minister will not do something to check it, it will grow to a very large amount. I would like to know whether we have reached the outside figures or whether the expenditure is to still go on increasing from year to year ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I can give no other assurance than that whatever is necessary to maintain the canal in good condition, we will have to provide. The mere fact that somebody supplied lumber at certain prices does not show that the lumber was too high or not needed. But my hon. friend has helped me to meet the argument of the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) who says that the men on the canals are worked too hard. My hon. friend says that, on the contrary, there are too many men for the work.

Mr. LANCASTER. I spoke of the Welland canal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Reid) spoke of all the canals.

Mr. LANCASTER. He does not know how his neighbours work on the Welland canal.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I referred entirely to the Cornwall and Williamsburg canals, the only ones I know anything about. There are practically double the men on the Williamsburg canal to-day compared with six years ago, and there is no more to do. The canal is in first-class repair, and there is no reason why the number of men on it should be doubled. I might also draw the attention of the acting minister to the fact that there are several men who were employed on the construction staff—I do not refer to the engineers themselves because they have to be kept on to finish their final estimates—but there are several men kept on the staff drawing their salary when the works are practically completed and their services might be very well dispensed with. There are none really necessary except the engineers and their assistants. Are those men to be continued right along indefinitely ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If I find any men employed on the canal unnecessarily, of course they will not be kept on.

Mr. REID (Grenville). They will be kept on unless the department takes some action, because a great many of them are members of the Liberal committee in that locality. It is on the recommendation of that committee that they were appointed and will be dismissed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is where my hon. friend is wrong.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I know of one Liberal committee, composed of about six men, of whom five are employed by the government. They appoint themselves each and every time and they are still on duty drawing their salary and doing no work whatever. The work is practically completed. In the village of Curran where that work is going on, is it necessary to have any men employed around there now ? The work is practically done, there is nothing but a dredge there, and yet the staff is kept on. I do not refer to the engineer himself. I think that there are two or three engineers who have to be kept on to finish the final estimates.

Mr. SCHELL. The hon. member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Reid) has been kind enough to mention my name in an entirely unwarranted manner. He said that he supposed I had recommended the present superintendent for his position. I never did anything of the kind. That gentleman was appointed before I knew anything about it. Then he said that, according to his information, the Alexandria Wood Export Company was myself. Well, I hold $1,300 stock in that company out of $18,000 paid up capital. It cannot therefore be my company. If the hon. gentleman would confine his remarks to the business before the House, instead of trying to cast a slur upon me, he would better consult his own dignity and show greater regard for the responsibility of his position as a member of parliament. If he has any objection to the prices paid that company, he is at perfect liberty to state his objections and furnish the proof. But in endeavouring to cast a slur upon me on hearsay information, which is entirely unwarranted, and the utter lack of foundation of which he could easily have ascertained, he is certainly not injuring me or gaining any credit for himself.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I am glad that the hon. member for Glengarry repudiates the appointment of the gentleman who is superintendant of the Williamsburg canal.

Mr. SCHELL. I do not repudiate it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I understood from the marine men that this gentleman lived in some small village back in the county of Glengarry, and the marine men told me that they hardly believed he had ever seen a canal before. He certainly was not qualified for the position, and I am glad that the hon. member repudiates his appointment, and thus virtually acknowledges that he is not fit for the position.

Mr. SCHELL. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to explain. I did not repudiate the appointment, and did not insinuate that the gentleman was not fit for the position, or anything of that kind. I simply said

that I had not recommended him for the position.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Schell) says he had nothing to do with the appointment, he does not assume responsibility and virtually says that he acknowledges that he would not agree to such a recommendation——

Mr. SCHELL. I do not acknowledge anything of the kind.

Mr. REID (Grenville). So far as this is concerned, my attention was drawn to the fact that they were supplying articles along the canal, and I was told that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Schell) was largely interested in the company. The information came to me from friends of the government, who think it hardly fair that those living along the canal and trying to make an honest living, find themselves prevented from getting this business because a member of the House has used his influence to sell goods from a constituency not adjoining the canal, and at prices higher than those that people on the canal would have sold for. And the facts have been borne out to a certain extent by the statements of the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Schell). He states that the capital of his company is $18,000, and he has $1,300——

Mr. SCHELL. It is not my company.

Mr. REID (Grenville). But the hon. gentleman is interested in it. I think it would be much better if he would not use his influence to interfere with constituents of mine. I believe that in the constituency I have the honour to represent there are gentlemen supporting the government who will supply anything that is necessary and at prices no higher than those charged by the Alexandria Wood Export Company. My main object was to draw attention to the increase. It may be very slight this year, but if the hon. gentleman will compare the expenditure with what it was in 1895 or 1896, he will see that the increase is very large. Now that his attention is drawn to it he should be able to reduce the expenditure to what it should be.

Mr. BENNETT. When is it expected that the lift-lock at Peterborough will be in working order ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In about six weeks, I am informed.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Why is it necessary to have a superintendent and an overseer on the Williamsburg canal ? In former days there was only one man, and there is not more than enough work for one man. The minister will remember that Dr. Hickey, ex-M.P., was superintendent of the Williamsburg canal, and he was dismissed and Mr. Stewart appointed in his place. In addition, there is a superintendent drawing $1,200 a year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand that Mr. Rubidge does not merely the engineering work, but in a certain measure, the work of superintendence also. But, owing to his advancing years and ill-health, it was necessary to appoint some one to assist him. The overseer was appointed by my predecessor, and I assume that he had good reasons for the appointment. I know nothing to the contrary.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Before the present government came into office, Dr. Hickey was the superintendent, and there was a superintendent on the Cornwall canal; also Mr. Ross. The government decided to reduce expenses and dismissed these officers, and placed the whole canal under Mr. Rubidge as superintending engineer. But, after a few months they decided to have the superintendents again, and Mr. Stewart was appointed superintendent of the Williamsburg canal and Mr. Lally of the Cornwall canal. Mr. Stewart has an overseer under him at a salary of about $1,200. This kind of thing explains the increase in expenditure on the canal. Why is an overseer necessary ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have already given the reason. He performs a portion of the duties which were assigned to Mr. Rubidge, who still is engineer of the work. This gentleman has been appointed with general supervision of the canal.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Mr. Stewart performs the duties of superintendent of these canals. He has nothing to do with Mr. Rubidge's work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Stewart's work is that of general supervision over the work. He has two overseers, each of whom has a local district.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Does the hon. minister know what position Mr. Stewart occupied before he was appointed superintendent ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. SCHELL. He was in the employ of the Canadian Pacific Railway in Montreal.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What were his duties ?

Mr. SCHELL. I do not know.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I understood he had been a school teacher, and at the time of his appointment was a clerk in the employ of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Montreal. Marine men are anxious to have a man appointed who is qualified for the position. If the hon. minister could hear the opinions expressed by Liberals along the canal, as well as by all marine men, it would not take him very long to make up his mind to get some person qualified for the work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am suspicious of the Liberals who would complain to my hon. friend (Mr. Reid, Grenville).

Mr. REID (Grenville). They are members of the Liberal committees in towns between Cornwall and Kingston.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They should keep better company.

Additional to pay persons employed permanently in the public service and remuneration to any other persons for services rendered for and in connection with passing vessels through the canals of the government of Canada from midnight on Saturday to midnight on Sunday, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $14,400.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is the usual vote.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is this for lock labourers and lock-masters, to pay them extra ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. They are paid extra when employed on Sundays.

Mr. CLANCY. Is that the sum that is expended each year, or approximately so ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not the actual expenditure of last year. It is the regular sum taken year by year.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Now that the canal tolls are abandoned, is it necessary to keep a collector at the head of the Cardinal canal ? There is no duty for him to perform there.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The making of the canals free, as announced at the time, was more or less experimental, and it has been thought well to keep the collectors there to keep accounts as usual, so that we may ascertain what the revenue would have been. But I think the increase of trade has been so considerable that we may look forward to adopting that policy as a permanent one.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Do they sign the shipping reports and make reports exactly the same as they did previously to the tolls being abandoned ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The accounts are kept in precisely the same manner.

Mr. MONK. What is the object of keeping a collector if there is nothing to collect ? Could not a tally of the boats passing up and down be kept just as well by some other employee on the locks ? The function of a collector is to collect money, but if it is merely a question of counting boats, cannot that be done by the lockmaster ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well the functions of a collector are not entirely to collect, that is a part of his duty. A collector is also an accountant, and it may be that a man who is otherwise well qualified to be employed on the canal might not be an accountant. However, no definite policy has been adopted.

Mr. MONK. I understand that the government are going to carry out the policy of freeing the canals from any tolls whatever. A collector has only one duty to perform, and that is to collect tolls and to account for them to a government official who goes around from time to time and examines his books. That is what the collector does on the Lachine canal, on the St. Anne's lock, and every other canal. If you abolish the toll what is the object of keeping a collector ? There is no object except that you do not wish to dismiss him.

Mr. REID (Grenville). In this case at Cardinal, all the steamers go straight through to Montreal, and there is a collector at Cornwall and one at Lachine, and the latter gentleman could do all the work that is necessary. The collector at Cardinal would simply issue a pass and the collector at Montreal would pick it up. It seems to me it is really a useless expenditure to keep a collector. The lockmaster could keep an account of the one or two local boats that pass up and down. I would like to know if it is the intention of the government to keep that office going ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. For the present we think it is desirable to have collectors there for statistical purposes. The lockmasters may in some cases be able to keep these statistics, but not in all cases. I am not prepared to say what the policy may be in future. I shall give the matter consideration, or whoever may have charge of the department will do so.

Mr. MONK. This is not a large item, but it seems preposterous to keep collectors of tolls after you abolish the tolls. The reason is probably because the government does not like to abolish the office. If you give as a reason for keeping the collector that it is for the purpose of collecting statistics, that can be done perfectly well by the lockmaster. I can tell the minister that there is not a lockmaster who is not able to furnish these statistics to the government, not one of them, I believe, who does not do that duty at the present moment. If these collectors are kept on, it is because the men who were collectors in 1896 were dismissed without any reason, and partisans were put in their places, and the government do not want to dismiss them, although they have abolished the tolls. So the country is put to the expense of paying collectors who have nothing to do.

Mr. REID (Grenville). In this case at Cardinal, the collector lives a mile and a half from the locks ; the lockmaster is the one who collects the statistics for him now. You are simply paying the collector a salary for doing nothing, at this point in particu-

lar, where the vessels go right straight through.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is the toll abolished on the Murray canal ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On all the canals.

Mr. COCHRANE. Then I presume the collector is kept on there also ?

Mr. CLANCY. I hardly think the explanation the hon. gentleman has given is quite satisfactory. Now, the hon. gentleman has some policy on the subject, we have a right to suppose. I do not know whether he is to continue to hold his present dual position of Minister of Finance and Minister of Railways and Canals. It is difficult to say just when the government will have sufficient courage to appoint a Minister of Railways. It is currently reported that the Minister of Finance is about to give up the position that he has adorned for some years, to become Minister of Railways. If he thinks of retaining the position of acting Minister of Railways which he now holds, has he formed any policy as to what he is going to do with regard to these collectors ? Now I do not advocate the taking away of a man's position from him unnecessarily, if he is required in the public service. Even though he may not be employed all the time, I would not think it the proper thing to take his living away from him. But this is a case in which it seems, as far as the discussion has gone, that there is no necessity for it. The hon. gentleman, looking forward to possibilities, probably, will tell the committee what his policy is.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I must confess that I have not given any special personal attention to the matter. I am simply adhering to the policy which my predecessor established, assuming that he had good reason for it. If it be found that there are persons who do not perform any work and are still drawing salaries, I think that is a matter that should be looked into and if a case of that kind is brought to my notice I will make inquiry into it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I have given the hon. minister a case to inquire into now on the Williamsburg canal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will see.

Mr. MONK. Will the hon. minister say that we are going to keep on paying collectors of tolls during the whole of this year on the canals when my hon. friend is surely aware that these men will have nothing to do ? It seems to me, that, although, as indicated by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), my hon. friend the Minister of Finance is on the eve of assuming a different department, he would not be so indifferent to the policy of the department which he at present occupies and it seems to me that some kind of defence ought to be given to the committee for the fact that the salaries of the different collectors of tolls on the canals are being continued although the tolls themselves are abolished. My hon. friend says that these officials are retained for the purpose of keeping the statistics, when he knows perfectly well that these statistics are kept irrespective of the collectors. We know even without the collectors exactly what traffic passes through the canals because these statistics are kept by other officials.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have already stated, without undertaking to define a policy for the future that for the present it has not been thought well to dispense with the services of these officials and that we are utilizing them for statistical purposes. If these statistical purposes can be as well served without those officials that is a matter that I am willing to inquire into, but for the present we do not feel warranted in dispensing with the services of these men without inquiry.

Mr. MONK. What statistics ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They keep precisely the same accounts of all transactions which take place on the canals as if they collected tolls. They keep accounts of the vessels which pass through and of what the dues would be if they were charged, so that we will have at the end of the year an idea of what the dues would have been and of what the concession is that has been made.

Mr. COCHRANE. Do boats have to stop and report to these officials just the same as if they collected tolls ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no change whatever in the manner of operating and keeping the accounts. It is the very same as if the tolls were collected.

Mr. TAYLOR. How about the case of the collector at Cardinal who lives two miles away from the locks, and never goes near them ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I confess I cannot answer that. That is a proper subject for inquiry.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Cardinal says that he never goes there. His office is at the locks, he visits his office only once in a while and draws his pay.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That we will have to look into.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the hon. minister if there are any reports made by collectors since the tolls have been abolished.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, they are making the usual reports.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Would it be asking too much of the hon. minister, as he is going to bring down some information before the supplementary estimates are passed, to bring down a memorandum, showing the amount of the tolls that the collector at Cardinal would have collected from the 1st of May to the 1st of October of this season ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will inquire as to what reports are made by the collector and I will be very glad to bring them down if they are there.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If he makes out the reports as heretofore there should be no trouble about it. These reports are sent every day to the department, and the department could tell up to last night what he should have collected. One of the clerks could get it in ten minutes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not anticipate any trouble. I will try to have the reports.

Mr. MONK. Would the hon. the minister bring down the reports of the collector at St. Anne's and the collector at Lachine, so that we can see what has been done by these officials ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Salaries and contingencies, collectors offices, $28,546.40.

Mr. CLANCY. I notice that there is an increase for these collectors who are not performing any service.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is an increase of $464.

Mr. CLANCY. It is not very great, it is true, but it is not the sum that is involved.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This increase is divided as follows : Williamsburg canal, $238; Soulanges, $550 ; Lachine, $100; Chambly, $5; St. Anne's, $1; an increase of $494, less a decrease of $30, making the net increase $464.

Mr. MONK. Is this $35,683 paid for the salaries of the collectors ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Salaries and contingencies.

Mr. MONK. Connected with the collectors' offices ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. MONK. I heard the hon. minister mention that there was an increase in the salary of the collector at St. Anne's ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, the item of salaries and contingencies shows an increase of $1. The amount of the estimate happens to be $1 above last year.

Mr. MONK. Are the salaries of collectors in no cases increased this year ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In Montreal, I am told, some of the clerks may have been increased.

Mr. MONK. Surely we are not increasing the salaries of collectors when there is nothing to be collected ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are several clerks in the office at Montreal and it is quite possible that some of the salaries have been increased. They are keeping statistical accounts.

Mr. MONK. Is the salary of the collector at St. Anne's to be increased ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I should say not. The increase for salaries and contingencies is $1 and I am sure that the collector has not got the $1.

Mr. MONK. Has the salary of the collector at Lachine been increased ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is an increase for salaries and contingencies of $100, but I have not been advised as to whether the increase is in salaries or contingencies. I will have to ascertain.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There is an increase on the Williamsburg canal of $238. What is that for ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot say what part is for salaries and what is for contingencies.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then the item should stand until we get the information, because I think that the salaries should not be increased under the existing circumstances.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think there is any increase in salaries, but I will bring down the informaton.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Last year the collector got a salary of $700, Sundays, 345 hours at 20 cents an hour, making $69, rent, $53.87 ; postage and express, $9.84 ; and horse-hire, $169.75 ; I cannot understand how he could have worked 345 hours on Sundays. That lock is closed on Sundays from 7 a.m. until 9 p.m. It seems impossible that he could have put in that many hours.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the latter part of the season the canals are open on Sundays without limit as to hours.

Mr. REID (Grenville). This would pay him for every Sunday during the whole season. Was his horse-hire to take him up and down from the village to his office, which is about a mile and a half.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He is allowed a dollar a day for horse-hire.

Mr. REID (Grenville). And in addition to that he is apparently paid $5 a month rent for his own house down in the village.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In some cases houses are furnished to the canal employees and it may be that he is allowed rent.

Mr. CLANCY. This seems an extraordinary case. Why should he be allowed rent for his own house ?

Mr. REID (Grenville). It was never allowed before this gentleman was appointed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If rent is to be allowed at all, I do not think that $5 a month can be complained of.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is he allowed to attend to his medical duties as a doctor, and is this horse-hire for driving him to his patients or to the canal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The deputy tells me that the understanding with these officials is that they are to give their whole time to the public service.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is the rent not allowed on the theory that a man should be where his work is ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Probably that was the origin of the system.

Mr. REID (Grenville). For thirty years the former collector got a small salary, and of course the government could not give the new collector an increase and so they got over the difficulty by giving all these extras which makes the salary over $1,000. I do not refer to this case in particular. There are other cases of the same kind. There are employees on the work of construction that has been practically completed, and if the minister wishes to find out he can ascertain that the increase is accounted for by employing men who have been forced on the government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will make inquiry into all these things.

Mr. CLANCY. This is rather a fishy case. It appears that this gentleman is employed as collector, and that he is at liberty to practice his profession as a physician. The canal tolls have been done away since that gentleman was appointed and he has no longer any duties to perform as collector. He lives in a house of his own and receives rent for it, a thing hitherto unheard of and he is paid $1 a day for horse-hire. Is that to go to see his patients or is it to go up and collect tolls where there are no tolls to collect ? The acting Minister of Railways had better allow that to stand until he gives us that information.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will give the hon. gentleman the information, but there is no reason to let it stand.

Mr. CLANCY. I am afraid that after the item is passed it will be a little too late. It might be a proper thing to strike out this whole item and the acting Minister of Railways might come to that conclusion himself. I can hardly think that he is prepared to justify a case of that kind ; I am sure he would not and I think he had better let that item stand.

Mr. TAYLOR. According to the Auditor General's Report that gentleman has charged for 345 hours of Sunday work, at 20 cents per hour, $69. During the seven months which constitute the season of navigation, the canals are open on Sunday from 12 to 7 and 9 to 12 o'clock, making ten hours on Sunday. That for thirty Sundays would make the total number of hours of Sunday work 300, but this gentleman charges for 345 hours, and yet no boat could pass through that canal on a Sunday night or any other night in the dark. Therefore there was no necessity for night work at all. I think the minister should allow this item to stand until he finds out why this gentleman put in a charge for 345 hours when he did not put in an hour's work. Why should he go up there and sit from 7 until 12 o'clock in the morning for the sake of drawing his pay when this canal is so situated that a boat must approach and leave it by daylight.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If I should find that any officer on the canal had been guilty of misconduct that would not be a reason why the others should not receive their money. These are proper matters for inquiry, and I shall see that they are inquired into.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is there anything in the Order in Council appointing this gentleman providing that he should be paid for house rent ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Would he be entitled to house rent if it was not provided for in the Order in Council appointing him ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not unless the minister of the day allowed it to him. I am not sure if he was appointed by Order in Council, but it would not be a very great stretch of authority for a minister to allow house rent ; that is speaking on the principle, not on the merits of the case.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is the minister going to allow this item to stand ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think so. This is the last item in the estimates, and I would like to have it cleaned up.

Mr. TAYLOR. You will have a similar item in the supplementary estimates, and perhaps the hon. gentleman will then bring down the information asked for, and give to the House the number of hours of Sunday labour that this gentleman put in on the canal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will give the hon. gentleman whatever information we have in our possession.

Mr. REID (Grenville). We have been very fair to my hon. friend and he might drop the two items which have been allowed to stand and clear the thing up.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend is right, the criticisms have been fair, but if there are two or three cases where some one gets $10 or $100 more than he should that is no reason why the rest should not have their money.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. minister did not catch my point. I stated that as we have been fair in the criticism of his estimates, he might allow these two items to be dropped, and then he could clear up the whole thing now.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will have to come back with some information for the hon. gentleman in any case, so I think it is better not to drop them.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MONK. Before we adjourn, I would ask the minister what business will be taken up to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have made such good progress in the last day or two that the Order paper is pretty well cleared. There are several Bills on the Order paper which are not yet printed, and therefore we are not in a position to proceed with them, but so far as possible, we will take up the Bills which are in order before the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. Shall we take up the Audit Act amendment Bill ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not to-morrow, we will postpone that perhaps until the first of the week. If there is no objection we can proceed after disposing of these Bills to deal with the supplementary estimates, although they were only laid on the Table to-day.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, October 2, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Twelve o'clock.

DEATH OF HENRY CARGILL, ESQ., M.P.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I deem it my very sad duty to refer to the lamentable event which took place last night, and which has deprived us of the companionship of one of the most esteemed members of this House. The Conservative party were certainly fortunate in having in their ranks such a man as Mr. Henry Cargill, for he was in every possible sense of the word a good man—a good citizen, a good father, a good husband, a good and warm-hearted friend. During the long years that he was associated with us in this House he had endeared himself to the hearts not only of his own political associates, but of those who held different political views. Not only was Mr. Cargill a good citizen, but we know from long acquaintance with him that he was a man of exceptional ability in the profession which he followed, and followed with much success. His sudden demise, coming under such sad circumstances, is another lesson to us, which is as old as the world, but always new, of the uncertainty of our lives. Those who apparently are frail and seem to live under the shadow of death may live long, while those who appear to be in robust health may be suddenly called away. We on this side of the House join sincerely with our hon. friends opposite in conveying to the mourning family of Mr. Cargill the frank and true expression of our deep condolence with them in their sad bereavement.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the members on this side of the House, I thank the right hon. gentleman most sincerely for the very kindly words he has uttered. Coming as we do from paying the last tribute of respect to a very dear friend, we are reminded, I am sure, how frail and uncertain is our tenure of this earthly life. Yesterday Henry Cargill stood amongst us in all the vigour and strength of mature manhood ; he spoke in this House with unusual animation, and none of us would have supposed for a moment that within a few hours we would be following his remains to their last earthly resting place. He has been a member of this House since 1887, with the exception, I believe, of one session ; and during all that time I am sure that not one word nor one act of his failed to inspire the deepest respect and confidence of every member of this House. His great generous heart was perhaps not known except by those who were most intimate with him ; but those who had that privilege knew of many acts of whole souled kindliness on his part which were not known to the public at large. I am sure it can be said of him that against his warmest political opponent his soul harboured no bitterness. He was too great a man for that. He was listened to in this House with deep respect. His great abilities, as a business man, and the sound common sense and breadth of view which always characterized his remarks earned for

him the sincere respect of every member of this House. I join heartily in the kind and generous words of my right hon. friend the First Minister, and in the assurance which he has conveyed to the bereaved widow and family of Mr. Cargill that they have in this hour of their affliction the deepest and most sincere sympathy and condolence of every member of this House.

THE DISTURBANCES AT THE SOO.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Sir. F. W. Borden). I would like, Mr. Speaker, to bring to the notice of the House a paragraph in the Montreal 'Star' of yesterday, alleging negligence on the part of the government with reference to sending military protection to Sault Ste. Marie.

The paragraph is as follows :

> Much indignation is expressed among all classes of citizens over the manner in which the Dominion government ignored the repeated demand that the troops be sent to protect the town properly, as it became apparent that the presence of the militia was necessary. That the troops are now guarding the town and the company's property is something for which the militia authorities at Ottawa are not entitled to any credit. In fact the Ottawa authorities have not even yet countenanced the sending of the militia. The story of the government's negligence to comply with the town's request for troops is an interesting one, as related by Mayor Plummer. When the attitude of the men began to predict trouble the mayor promptly wired to Ottawa, asking that fifty troops be sent without delay. He received a reply directing his attention to a clause of the Act which empowered him to call out the troops on his own responsibility.

I think that the question is of sufficient importance to be brought up in this way, because it is not a party question and it is exceedingly desirable that the community at large should understand what the law is, and that the government has not been negligent. This paragraph admits that the mayor of the 'Soo' did receive an answer to his telegram. As a matter of fact, telegrams were sent by the representatives of the company there and the mayor, to the Prime Minister and myself, and the only answer was sent which could be sent, and that was an answer calling to the attention of the authorities that paragraph of the Militia Act under which they could claim and secure the protection of the militia. That telegram was promptly sent and others were received afterwards, but they were all to the same effect. I would like to read the provision of the Act to which the authorities at the 'Soo' were referred :

> 1. The active militia or any corps thereof, shall be liable to be called out for active service with their arms and ammunition, in aid of the civil power in any case in which a riot, disturbance of the peace, or other emergency requiring such service occurs, or is, in the opinion of the civil authorities hereinafter mentioned, anticipated as likely to occur, and, in either case, to be beyond the powers of the civil authorities to suppress, or to prevent or deal with,—whether such riot, disturbance or other emergency occurs, or is so anticipated within or without the municipality in which such corps is raised or organized:
>
> 2. The senior officer of the active militia present at any locality shall call out the same or such portion thereof as he considers necessary for the purpose of preventing or suppressing any such actual or anticipated riot or disturbance, or for the purpose of meeting and dealing with any such emergency as aforesaid, when thereunto required in writing by the chairman or custos of the quarter sessions of the peace, or any three justices of the peace of whom the warden, mayor, or other head of the municipality or county in which such riot, disturbance or other emergency occurs or is anticipated as aforesaid, may be one ; and he shall obey such instructions as are lawfully given to him by any justice of the peace in regard to the suppression of any such actual riot or disturbance, or in regard to the anticipation of such riot, disturbance or other emergency, or to the suppression of the same, or to the aid to be given to the civil power in case of any such riot, disturbance or other emergency.

The civic authorities acted under this provision of the law. They applied to the senior military officer on the spot, Col. Elliot, and Col. Elliot took such steps as he deemed necessary to deal with the situation. As a matter of fact, the government has no authority to do anything. The power is given, under the Act, to the civic authorities who are on the spot, and who must be presumed to know best what the requirements are and what the necessity is for taking a certain course. The government is powerless to act at all. One can see how absurd it would be otherwise. Suppose that riots were imminent or believed to be imminent and some alarm was felt, are troops to be sent hither and yon throughout the Dominion ? The thing would be utterly absurd and never was contemplated by the law. As a matter of fact, the law has been literally complied with, the government has done its full duty, and I think it is in the public interest that this matter should be understood once for all.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the municipality be expected to pay the cost of transportation and maintenance of these troops ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is a matter of law.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Surely the government, under the Act, are responsible entirely for the number called out to suppress a riot. The mayor makes a requisition, and then the military officer on the spot has the authority to call out, not the number of troops required by the mayor, but the number he thinks may be required. The responsibility is upon him.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Certainly.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. He calls out the number required for the suppression of the trouble so that the responsibility as to the

number and the time they will be engaged is entirely in the hands of the military authorities.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As a matter of fact, the requisition does not necessarily call for any particular number of troops ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That must be determined by the senior officer. Would the minister read the portion of the statute which places that within the discretion of the commanding senior officer and also the portion which limits the period during which the troops are required ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There is no limit.

Mr. CLARKE. Have the government taken any steps to do anything towards providing that these unfortunate men shall be paid their wages ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I need not tell my hon. friend, for he is aware, that the government can do nothing of that kind. But I may say that I have information from a private source this morning that arrangements have been made, and the men will be paid to-morrow.

PRIVILEGE—NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—PETITIONS FROM BAGOT.

Mr. JOSEPH EDMOND MARCIL (Bagot). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I rise to a question of privilege. And before going into the matter to which I desire to draw your attention, I beg to ask the indulgence of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, as I intend to speak in the English language, with which I am not so familiar as with French, my mother tongue. Last week several petitions were presented from different constituencies of the Dominion asking this parliament not to proceed further with Bill (No. 235) relating to a National Transcontinental Railway, as the petitions pretend that this parliament has not enough information——

Mr. SPEAKER. I may call the attention of the hon. member (Mr. Marcil, Bagot) to the fact that, in a few moments, there will be a motion for Committee of Supply, and, if he does not intend to conclude with a motion, he might wait for the motion for Supply, when he will be free to speak.

Mr. MARCIL (Bagot). At the conclusion of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I shall move the adjournment of the House. I was saying that the petitions presented pretend that this parliament should not proceed with this Grand Trunk Pacific Bill. Many such petitions have been presented, particularly from the county of Bagot which I have the honour to represent in this House. Amongst the petitions from the county of Bagot there is one from the parish of St. Théodore d'Acton, with whose electors I am well acquainted, and in which I have the honour to be well known. One reading these petitions and assuming them to be correct would, no doubt, form the opinion that a certain number in the county of Bagot are opposed to this transcontinental railway. Let me say that I was particularly surprised to read a petition from St. Théodore d'Acton presented to this House by the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Morin).

Mr. MORIN. I have not done that Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MARCIL (Bagot). The name of my hon. friend (Mr. Morin) is endorsed on the petitions.

Mr. MORIN. I did not put the names on the petition.

Mr. MARCIL (Bagot). I say the hon. gentleman presented the petition to the House. Knowing the opinion of the farmers of St. Théodore d'Acton, I was much surprised reading these names, particularly :—Damase Gregoire, Alexandre Vanasse, Ovide Tremblay, Isidore Jodoin, Laurent Brodeur, Victor Laliberté, Alfred Benoit, Octave Picard. Having remarked that most of the names on that petition were in the same handwriting, I thought it would be well for me to ask one of my friends in the town of Acton to make a little inquiry in the parish of Théodore d'Acton to see if these people had signed that petition. The time has been so short, my friend told me that he had not been able to see all, but that he had gone to the village of St. Théodore d'Acton and had seen some of those whose names appeared on this petition. I may be permitted, Mr. Speaker, to read to the House a statement showing the result of the inquiry made by my friend Mr. Bordua, secretary of the town of Acton, in the parish of St. Théodore d'Acton. The statement is in French, but I translate it :

We, the undersigned electors of the province of Quebec, for the county of Bagot, certify by these presents :

That we have never placed signatures, nor authorized any person whomsoever to inscribe our names on a petition addressed to the honourable Senate and House of Commons of Canada in parliament assembled, protesting against a measure now submitted to parliament concerning the subject of transportation facilities. We declare that we approve of the attitude taken by the government of the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier in regard to this project. We have entire confidence in his administration, and we confidently hope that the line of railway proposed by the government will be the object of a law before the prorogation of the present parliament. And each and all of us make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it has the same force and effect as if it were made under oath, and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.

Declared before me at Acton, this 30th of September, 1903.

(Sgd.) A. CHABOT, J.P.

(Sgd.) DAMASE GREGOIRE,
his
ALEXANDRE X VANASSE,
mark
OVIDE TREMBLAY,
ISIDORE JODOIN, jr.
LAURENT BRODEUR,
his
VICTOR X LALIBERTE,
mark
his
PIERRE X PETIT,
mark
ALFRED BENOIT,
OCTAVE PICARD,

Witness :
(Sgd.) J. M. BORDUA.

The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) drew your attention to this matter, Mr. Speaker, and I thank him for having done so. In 'Hansard' of the 30th of September, I find the following attributed to yourself, Sir, in reply to the hon. member for Bellechasse :

Mr. SPEAKER. It certainly would be irregular that the signatures on petitions presented to this House should be signed by the same person. Petitions should be signed by those whose names are supposed to be attached to them. Rule 84 says :

Petitions to the House shall be presented by a member in his place, who shall be answerable that they do not contain impertinent or improper matter.'

If an hon. member when presenting a petition is answerable that it does not contain anything impertinent or improper, I should think he should be responsible if there is anything impertinent or irregular in the petition presented by him. I have no doubt that these petitions have been sent in order to mislead the House and the hon. the Senate; and I may be permitted to say that if enough time were allowed to see all those whose names appear on these petitions, I am sure it would be possible to obtain from a great majority of them the same testimony as I have read here from some. I should think that, for the honour of the hon. member for Dorchester it would be well for him to ask permission to withdraw these petitions. If the law of our province permits of the vindication of the honour and the rights of the electors of the county of Bagot, I may say at once that as soon as the session is over, I have the intention of taking the opportunity to do so. This is all I have to say, and, I hope that, in saying it, I have not been offensive to anybody. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MORIN. I would like to say a few words in regard to these petitions. I may say to the House that in regard to this Transcontinental Railway Bill I took no part directly or indirectly in any of the counties of this country. Petitions have been sent here from the county of Dorchester, but I know nothing about them, I do not know who sent them here, I do not know who wrote to the county of Dorchester to have these petitions signed. Some days ago a gentleman was here who had a handful of those petitions, and he said to me : Will you present them ? I never read them, I do not know where they came from. I took no part whatever in procuring those petitions, and I have nothing to be sorry for. I can throw the first stone therefore in regard to that matter.

Mr. TALBOT. Before the hon. gentleman takes his seat, I desire to ask him if he knows anything about these petitions from St. Prospère and from St. Malachie, in the county of Dorchester, which petitions I now hold in my hand ?

Mr. MORIN. Very well, am I guilty because the hon. gentleman holds them in his hands. I have already stated that I took no part directly or indirectly in procuring these petitions. I have said that petitions have been sent here from the county of Dorchester but that I know nothing about them. The hon. gentleman may hold whatever he pleases in his hands or in his hat, he is responsible for them himself.

Amendment (Mr. Marcil, Bagot) negatived.

SUPPLIES FOR GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.

Bill (No. 258) to amend the Act respecting the Department of Railways and Canals, was read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We have no copy of the Bill.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This Bill is in the exact words of the resolution (page 11189 of the 'Hansard,' which has already passed the House.

Mr. MORIN. Is the Bill printed in French ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

On section 1,

1. Advances may be made from time to time, out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, to the Minister of Railways and Canals, to enable him to obtain, produce, manufacture, use and dispose of all necessary materials, equipment and stores required or used in connection with the construction, renewal, maintenance and operation of the Canadian government railways, and for the establishment and conduct of railway stores.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It seems to me this is giving new powers to the minister. I understood that everything used in the construction and maintenance of that railway, that was ordinarily charged to capital account, would have to be voted by the House. This is simply for the purpose of balancing the stores account. You did not intend to make any purchases unless the money was

voted by the House, purchases either chargeable to capital account or for improvements.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid that is hardly the correct way to describe it. Assuming that the stores account stands at this date at a million and a half dollars—I have not the latest figures, but the latest return in the blue book is about a million and a half—assuming it stands at that figure, this Bill will not give us power to purchase one penny's worth, it will simply legalize the existing stores account which has been in operation for many years. It will not give us power to add one penny to it any time. As these stores pass out into the general service and are paid out of the appropriations, then we will have a standing credit to buy other goods ; whether they be for revenue account or for capital account, they would go into stores for the time being, in certain cases, and when they are charged out of stores, into track for example, they will then go to reduce the stores account. So this is not an enlargement of the powers of the government in any way, it does not increase the purchasing power by one dollar beyond what we have already, but it gives legal warrant for a practice which has existed for a quarter of a century.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. When stores account is depleted, then there is a credit to the Intercolonial to the extent of the depletion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Charged to the Intercolonial. If goods are taken out of stores then they are charged against the revenue expenditure or capital expenditure, as the case may be, against the appropriation of the year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No, you get a straight credit of the stores account. Suppose there is $1,200,000 at the present time, and you deplete that stores account by $300,000 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. How ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. In any manner you like, by payment, or sales, or in any other way, out of stores account. Does not that leave you a credit between the difference of the sales and the actual amount of the credit ? Then you have the absolute disposition of that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. You would credit the stores account.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You have the absolute disposition, for the use of the Intercolonial, of the difference.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We cannot spend any money for any purpose that has not been appropriated by parliament. What we do by this Bill is simply, if I may use a homely illustration, to open a shop. We have goods in stock for which we get credit, and as they are used out of stock, they are charged up against the particular service in which they are used, and when they are so taken out of the stores account and charged against working expenses or construction, as the case may be, there is a credit to the stores account.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In connection with what my hon. friend from South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has just said in connection with the statute, it may be as the hon. Minister of Finance has sugested, but I would hardly think so. The words of section 1 of the Bill are very plain, it seems to me. They are :

> Advances may be made from time to time, out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, to the Minister of Railways and Canals, to enable him to obtain, produce, manufacture, use and dispose of all necessary materials, equipment and stores required or used in connection with the construction, renewal, maintenance and operation of the Canadian government railways, and for the establishment and conduct of railway stores.

Is that not equivalent to a parliamentary appropriation ? Does it not permit the government, in the absence of an appropriation, to make advances to the Minister of Railways and Canals out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is correct, but the advances have already been made and the goods are in store now.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). While there may be some goods in store as to which some advances may have been made, the section seems to be a general one which would operate at any time in the future, and which would therefore permit future advances to be made out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund as advances without a parliamentary appropriation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The only authority that would be given the government would be this : Suppose the stores account is $1,500,000 to-day and we took out of it $100,000 and put it into the track, it is credited to the stores account and charged to working expenses or capital account, as the case may be, according as parliament has appropriated the money. Then we have reduced the stores account to $1,400,000 and if we desired to do so we would have the right to put in another $100,000, but as long as the stores account remained as it is at present, we would not have purchased anything on this account. It is intended to give the government a standing credit for the Intercolonial Railway, but we cannot take out of the stores one penny's worth of goods except it be applied for the purpose for which parliament has appropriated the money, unless we sell the goods to outsiders, in which case they become a credit to the stores account. We might sell our goods and credit them to the stores account, or, if

we take rails out of the stores and put them into the track, we charge them against the appropriation for the year for that purpose.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Where is the limitation in the Bill to which the hon. minister refers, to the effect that if there is a balance to the stores account of the Intercolonial Railway the balance shall only be applied to the ordinary working expenses of the road, or to capital account, as parliament has authorized ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. You cannot use the stores account for any other purpose than for the purpose of the Intercolonial Railway, and you must charge it against the particular service for which the money has been appropriated. This account is not a new one. There is absolutely nothing new in this proposal.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I know there is not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are simply doing what my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) did for many years without law, but we are now proposing to do it with law. He had his stores account for a long number of years. He bought what he liked, and charged it to stores account. He did not require an appropriation from parliament to buy goods and put them into the stores account. That method has prevailed for a quarter of a century, and under our system of government anything which has become a custom begins to be almost regarded as a matter of law, but when my attention was called to this matter, I thought that it should be put in a proper legal shape. We have exactly the same principle now, though on a smaller scale, in connection with the King's Printer. The King's Printer has to buy and keep on hand a stock of materials for which he has no especial parliamentary appropriation. The appropriation for the printing is given to each department or to parliament, as the case may be, but the King's Printer must have his material on hand to do the work, and therefore he has a standing credit. He has had it for years, and last year we gave him by statute a credit of $100,000 for this purpose. He is authorized to buy goods, and these goods are charged to the stores account. If in my own department, for instance, I want some printing done, I have a vote of parliament to provide for the printing, and I buy that printing from the King's Printer, just as if I bought it from an outsider. In that way we simply provide the King's Printer with a means of carrying his stock. The same principle applies to the Railway Department. We provide the Railway Department with the means of keeping a stock on hand.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is no doubt as to what the intention of the hon. Minister of Finance is. The only doubt in my mind was as to whether when there was a credit to the stores account you limited the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway to the amount which had been appropriated to operating expenses or capital account. I suppose it is so, as the hon. minister says that any credit that is given to the stores account should be used for the purpose only for which it is voted, that is to say, for the ordinary expenses of the Intercolonial Railway, or to be applied to something for which it has been voted on capital account.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly, it cannot be applied to anything except that for which parliament has made an appropriation—either to working expenses or to capital account. There is no qualification as to that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I really cannot so understand it. It seems to me to be in the same position which was mentioned the other day by the hon. Minister of Finance when he inquired whether the statute for enabling the government to make certain increases in salaries would enable payments to be made without a special appropriation. The hon. Minister of Finance took the ground that the Bill itself was a parliamentary appropriation, and that no further parliamentary appropriation would be required. I am not dealing with the book-keeping methods of the Intercolonial Railway, but I think I can understand the words of the statute fairly well, and while section 2 deals with some book-keeping matter in connection with the Intercolonial Railway which I do not profess to understand as well as the hon. Minister of Finance or my hon. friend from South Lanark, nevertheless, section 1, which stands by itself distinctly states, that advances may be made out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada to the Minister of Railways and Canals for a certain purpose, and there is no limit upon it. It is true that you have at the end of the section the words :

> And for the establishment and conduct of railway stores.

But the use of these words does not place any limitation whatever upon the words which precede. These are supplementary to the language which precedes, and not in limitation of it. You have the distinct provision, as far as the word 'railways' in the last line of the clause is concerned, that advances may be made, and if you have a statute to that effect, what need is there of any parliamentary appropriation ? It stands in the place of a parliamentary appropriation. I do not know anything about the usage or practice itself. If it be true that moneys have been used in this way in the past without parliamentary appropriation, that is a matter to be considered. What we are dealing with now is the question as to

whether or not we shall authorize that by statute. I must confess that, after having given the best possible consideration to it, I am still unable to construe the statute in the way in which my hon. friend has done.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If we had section 1 authorizing the advance without section 2, I think the criticism of my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) would be just. There must be a parliamentary appropriation to allow of the purchase of goods to the extent of $1,500,000. Section 2 goes on to say that the existing stores account is to be taken as part of this. It says :

Stores accounts shall be established, as of the date 30th June, 1903, in connection with the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway.

And that these accounts shall be charged with all the different items in the different accounts as respects that. Section 2 is intended practically to say that it is not intended to enlarge your powers of purchase, but it gives you in addition the power to take your existing stores into account, and when you have taken your existing stores into account you have exhausted your powers of purchase. That is what it means, and if there is any doubt about the matter, I shall be only too glad to accept any suggestion that will make it clear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am most anxious to appreciate the arguments of the hon. minister, but I cannot see anything in section 2 which limits the broad language of section 1 in the way he thinks it is limited, and I would suggest to my hon. friend, in order to make plain what he desires, if I thoroughly understand his intention, that we should add a clause to the Bill providing :

Nothing herein contained shall be construed to authorize the advance of moneys in the absence of parliamentary appropriation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Oh, no, that would not do ; this is a parliamentary appropriation, but we have already expended it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am dealing with the future. We can arrange about the past as you like. I think that in the future we should provide that no money shall be paid out for capital account or operation of the Intercolonial Railway, or anything else, unless you have a parliamentary appropiation for the purpose. It seems to me to be a perfectly workable proposition to add a provision to the clause of this Act that in future advances shall not be made in the absence of the parliamentary appropriations.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That would not do ; that would defeat the purpose of the Bill. It would not do to say that no purchase shall be made without a special parliamentary appropriation. Undoubtedly if we did not have the stores on hand, this would be a credit in advance for the Intercolonial Railway of one and a-half million dollars. The only reason why it is not now an advance is that the expenditure has been made without any legal authority. Under the old system the goods are now in store. But it is intended to be, and should be, a credit to the Intercolonial Railway to the extent of a million and a-half dollars. That is to say, the officials of the Intercolonial Railway should not have the right to pay out money to the extent of one dollar without a parliamentary appropriation, but it will not do to say that they cannot have a stores account until you have provided for every particular item. The Intercolonial Railway officials must be able to carry on their business just as a merchant does. A merchant must have stock on hand to meet the demands that may arise. Just as the King's Printer, for instance, must have stock on hand to do business, so must the Intercolonial Railway, and it is now intended to give, in a legal way, the credit which they have had for twenty-five years past. But the Intercolonial Railway has no right to apply these goods to any purpose until parliament has authorized their use. The fiscal year closes on the 30th of June, and let us suppose that you have then a large stock of coal on hand. That stands in the stores account, and you have no authority to pay that out of the appropriation of that year. You can only take out of the appropriation for that year as much as will pay for the coal used up to the 30th of June. You must have the balance of the coal on hand, and where is your parliamentary authority ? This is your parliamentary authority ; by it the Intercolonial Railway officials are allowed to keep on hand a stock of various articles aggregating $1,500,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How would it do to put at the beginning of the clause :

For the purposes of a stores account advances may be made.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no objection to that, but it will not make it any better.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the acting Minister of Railways tell me that this is not placing in the hands of the Minister of Railways power to spend $10,000,000, or $15,000,000, or $20,000,000 every year, if he sees fit to do so, for the purposes of the railway, without coming to parliament and asking an appropriation ? You have $1,500,000 capital in stores on the first of July.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They are not necessarily on capital account.

Mr. TAYLOR. But they are paid for and are there in store. During July the minister

can use half a million dollars' worth of these stores, spreading them out over the different works. On the first of August he can go to one of his political friends and buy that half a million dollars' worth of stores and put them in store. On the first of September again the stores may have run down $1,000,000, so that there will be only half a million dollars' worth on hand, and then the minister can go to another friend and buy one million dollars' worth of stores, put them in store, and he can repeat that month after month.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What is he to do with the $15,000,000 of stores after he takes them out of the store ?

Mr. TAYLOR. He takes them out for the purposes of the road.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But he cannot do that unless this parliament has appropriated $15,000,000 or $20,000,000 for that purpose ; he cannot take a dollar's worth of goods out of store except for the purpose for which parliament has authorized the expenditure.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the Minister of Finance mean that the proposition is to convert a portion of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada into a supply of stores for the Intercolonial Railway, and then to use the stores only so far as you are permitted by a parliamentary appropriation ? Is that practically the object ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is it. That has been the practice for twenty-five years, but there has been no authority for it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What I want to know is why there should be power to convert a portion of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada into stores' supplies for the Intercolonial Railway without a parliamentary appropriation for that purpose ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is the parliamentary appropriation ; this Bill is a parliamentary appropriation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then, I was right in the view I first took, that you are doing away with the necessity of a parliamentary appropriation for the purpose of converting a portion of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada into a supply of stores for the Intercolonial Railway. I am not criticising the proposal, I am only endeavouring to understand.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A merchant will not sell all his stock within one year ; he must have a surplus to carry him over the year and to meet new conditions that arise, and just in the same way the Intercolonial Railway could not possibly order exactly the quantity of goods required to serve it for the twelve months after the end of the fiscal year, closing on the 30th of June. The fiscal year closes on June 30, and in May or April you may find yourself in want of coal. You could not figure out the exact amount you would require for the balance of the fiscal year, so you buy a lump amount, and if you are wise you look a little ahead. How are you to pay for this coal ? We want to give a legal authority for carrying it in stock, but before one ton of it can be taken out of store and used on the Intercolonial Railway there must be a parliamentary appropriation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The difficulty, suggested by hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Fielding) is the difficulty of knowing the quantity of stores that will be required ; but is that not a difficulty which we meet every day in making parliamentary votes ? We are told by the government : We do not know how much will be spent, but every dollar will be accounted for. Could you not do the same thing with stores, making a liberal appropriation, and then using such stores as may be necessary? You would, of course, have to make a generous appropriation, and then if an emergency occurred, could you not resort to Governor General's warrants ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What we are now proposing has already been done in another branch of the service, and it seems reasonable that it should be done with regard to the Intercolonial Railway. The condition in regard to the railway service is not exactly the same as in those services to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has just referred. We have had to do, in the case of the King's Printer, what we are now proposing to do in the case of the Intercolonial Railway. The two cases are exactly alike only that the appropriation for the King's Printer is a modest sum, and for the Intercolonial Railway you must have a larger amount. With regard to the particular words of section 2, to which my hon. friend has referred, I am afraid I am open to the criticism—although I may not get the credit for it—of allowing the Auditor General to have his own way. It is his suggestion that a clause should be worded in that way. In this whole matter I am trying to meet his wishes.

At one o'clock, committee took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. BARKER. With the explanations that have been given of section 1, so far as I have heard them, I do not see any great objection to it, except that I think that the words in the last line, ' and for the establishment and conduct of railway stores,' are somewhat indefinite. The words, ' produce and manufacture,' in the third line seem to me to cover everything that is necessary. I do not know what is meant or intended by establishing and conducting railway stores.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not attach any importance to those particular words. I think they are superfluous. I may say, however, that the clause was largely the work of the Auditor General himself.

Mr. BARKER. Then I would suggest, so as to bring all the advances and payments that may be made clearly within the provisions of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, the addition of these words: 'The making of such payments shall be subject to all the provisions and regulations in that behalf of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act.' I think that is important, because there are provisions made for the safety of the government and the people with respect to advances of all kinds, and it would be well to use such words here so as to make the meaning perfectly clear. If it is essential that there should be the utmost care and scrutiny about anything it is with regard to stores.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is certainly the intention of the Act, and if my hon. friend thinks the addition of those words will make it clear, I have no objection. As I have said, the wording of this Act is largely that of the Auditor General, and I thought that if he was satisfied with it, the rest of us might be. But I have no objection to the addition of those words.

Mr. BARKER. I spoke to the Auditor General about them, and he thinks they would be an improvement.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 2,

Mr. BARKER. I think that this section requires more consideration than would at first sight appear necessary. 'These accounts shall respectively be debited with the balance of stores then held on account of each railway.' I presume that means that the amount of stores to the debit of the accounts shall be accepted under this new arrangement as final.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not necessarily. They will be subject to audit like everything else.

Mr. BARKER. They were audited presumably in the past. On the 30th of June, 1903, say there is $1,000,000 of stores to the debit of stores account. That will have to be transferred at once to the debit of the new account. It is quite true that every year an audit takes place when the Auditor General counts the stores on hand, what may be called an ordinary stock-taking, but that goes on generally speaking in all railway companies. Yet I think there are very few companies that will not find, in the course of years, a large amount of material on hand which may be worth only one-third or one-fourth of what they are valued at in the accounts. I very little doubt that if a thorough stock-taking of all the materials in the stores on the 30th of June, 1902 were made by an expert railway man, he would cast aside all obsolete materials as so much waste iron, and there would be found an enormous difference between what appears in the stores account and the actual value. I would therefore object to this clause being supposed in any way to settle the stores account. I would object to its being held, assuming that $1,500,000 be transferred to stores account in pursuance of this resolution, that that should end the account. I think it is of the utmost importance that there should be a thorough stock-taking of all the materials in the stores of these two railways. I would prefer that the hon. minister had provided in this section that before a new account is established, there should be that thorough stock-taking, and placed to the credit of the stores account only the actual value for railway purposes of every article. I recollect very well that on the change of administration in the Western Railway a thorough stock-taking was made of every item in the stores, and it certainly did a very great deal of good. I think that there ought to be such stock-taking on the Intercolonial and the Prince Edward Island Railway at present. No merchant or manufacturer would be content with a perfunctory stock-taking, just carrying the items on from year to year at cost price, though many of them, may have become obsolete and have to be sold as old scrap. It does strike me that this second clause may be used as a very convenient way of getting over that under the plea that the Act of Parliament authorizes the amounts to be passed and charged up as they stand on a particular day. I would therefore suggest that this clause should be revised, and that before the new Act is started, there will be a thorough stock-taking, under the supervision of the Auditor General, and that the accounts shall then be started with the actual values of the materials.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I fail to see that there is any need for a revision of the clause in order to serve the purpose which my hon. friend has in view. That there should be frequent stock-taking at proper intervals and that these should have due regard for depreciation, I admit. This is not the creation of a new account. This account will have in the books precisely the same value, force and effect as it has to-day. It has been examined and audited by the Auditor General, with all the unlimited powers he possesses, and we have no reason to doubt that it is fair and correct. We propose to take that account because it represents the cost of these stores to the department and has been examined in the usual way. We are opening a new account but giving legal authority to the account as it exists. My hon. friend says we should

take stock and see whether there is depreciation, and he adds that that would be a very proper thing to provide in connection with this Bill. I do not see that by opening up a stores account under the name of 'new stores account' you do wrong by taking the figures exactly as they are in the old stores account, unless you suppose that those figures are not correct. But we have no reason to doubt their correctness. We are simply taking an existing account and giving it legal authority. It does not diminish anybody's rights to examine, criticise and condemn. We have to take the account as it stands until somebody shows there is something wrong in it. All that my hon. friend says with regard to stock-taking I admit, but I cannot see that it has any particular relation to this Bill.

Mr. BARKER. The reason I suggest that there should be stock-taking, now that the hon. gentleman is making a new departure——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, he is mistaken.

Mr. BARKER. I regard it as a new departure. The hon. gentleman tells us that an audit has already taken place under the supervision of the Auditor General. Well, the Auditor General told us in the Public Accounts Committee and he has told me outside that he has nobody who knows anything about the value of these things capable of going into the stores and picking out what is obsolete and what is not. Such an audit for the purpose of stock-taking is absolutely valueless, and as you are passing an Act of parliament to start a new stores account and are making a new departure, starting fresh in the year 1903, upon a balance appearing on the 30th of June, it is important that you should start that account upon a proper footing and that the debit to it should be the actual value of the stores taken over. That is especially necessary having regard to what the Minister of Finance says, that in the past everything has been accurately audited by an auditor who tells us he knows nothing about it. If it has not been audited by the Auditor General that is the Auditor General's own fault. This happens to be in that branch of the Auditor General's business in which we admit his right to deal with matters as he pleases. There are some things in which, I think, the Auditor General takes authority which does not belong to him, but, in this case he has complete authority to deal with the matter, and, if he has not carried out the audit, the fault is his own. Of course, I do not say this as reproaching the Auditor General. All I say is that he is responsible. If he says he does not know anybody who can do that work, that is not the fault of parliament or of the government. The statute—and we are dealing with amendments to the statute—gives him unlimited power in this matter—there is no limitation as to time or the person he shall engage for the work. If the audit is not satisfactory, we shall be glad to have him make it satisfactory. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) is quite mistaken when he says we are opening a new account or creating anything new. There is nothing new proposed. This account has been in existence for years. But attention has been called to the fact that it rests on no statutory authority, and we seek to amend the law in that regard. But, by creating statutory authority for the account, you do not create the account. That account is there, and we take it as it stands. If there is anything wrong in it, hon. gentlemen are as free to point it out in the future as they are to-day. The passing of this Bill does not change the situation one iota.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The object is plain. Those stores stand charged to the Intercolonial according to their valuation in the stores account. I can see that there would be a difficulty as the stores account has been kept in the past. Suppose that there is a sale of stores to the Canadian Pacific or the Grand Trunk. The amount of money received for the stores is paid into the consolidated fund of the Dominion, and not into the fund for stores. How are you going to get it back to the stores account unless you have a credit? You must have a credit account somewhere.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have it now.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You are constituting it under this Bill.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, we have it. We are giving it legal authority by this Bill.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not see how you can possibly have it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) may not see how we can have it, but all the years he was a Minister of Railways he had exactly this system to such an extent as he saw fit to use it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then, the government seek to legalize what was in vogue before. I can see the need for the system in order to get money back into the stores account in case of a sale.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are not worrying about the legal authority to sell, it is the legal authority to buy that is causing the difficulty. If we had $1,000,000 worth of stores and sold $100,000 worth to a railway or anybody else, that money would go into the consolidated revenue fund, as the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) says. It is then credited to the stores account of the Intercolonial, and we have the right to buy $100,000 worth of stores in place of what we have sold.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is what you want to do—to give credit to the stores account. You may have done that before, but you have no legal authority.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have no legal authority to buy—to spend the money. We do not worry about legal authority to receive money; we are ready to receive it without legal authority, if the owners will give it to us. But the legal authority to buy is what worries us.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Finance Minister has stated the course pursued in these matters in the past, and, no doubt, has stated it accurately. I can understand, as I say, that this credit has been necessary in order to get back money into the stores account in case of a sale. To give legal authority for that, I understand to be the object of the Bill.

Mr. BARKER. I do not know whether the last words of section 2 of the Bill are intended to carry out what the Minister says:

> And shall be credited with the values of materials, equipment and stores as issued and charged to proper appropriations or otherwise disposed of.

I suppose these words were intended to cover the case of sale?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is no doubt about what the intention of the Bill is. The minister has been speaking of what has been done hitherto.

Mr. BARKER. I would again call attention to the question of the audit of railway stores and other matters of that kind requiring technical knowledge. The Minister of Finance tells us again and again that the Auditor General has had every officer, every clerk that he requires for the purpose of such an audit. I can only say that the Auditor General tells me the direct opposite of that. He says that he considers it of very great importance that he should have an auditor of technical knowledge for such work, and that he has no such officer. It is absurd to say that you can take a clerk out of a merchant's office or a bank and set him to audit a railway stores account. He does not know that he is dealing with. You might as well ask me to go down and audit a druggist's stock in trade. I might find some stuff in a small bottle worth $10, and in the next bottle, twice as much in bulk worth 10 cents, and, having no technical knowledge of the value, I should have no means of knowing that there was a difference. You may send an ordinary bookkeeper to audit the stores of the Intercolonial if you like, but you might as well keep him at Ottawa and save his expenses. The store-keeper might show him thousands of tons of metal represented in the books by a certain amount, and the auditor might take that material as good value for the money, and yet, it might be mere scrap iron and unfit for use upon a railway or in railway construction. For a thorough audit there must be technical knowledge on the part of the auditor. The Auditor General has no such officer. And I wish to say further, on this question, that we do want the audit of an officer of the government. The Auditor General is not a servant of the government, but a servant of parliament, and so represents the whole people. The auditor at Moncton is simply an officer of the government of the day, and can be dismissed by the government of the day. He has no independent authority.

What we want is an officer, a clerk, an auditor, solely under the authority of the Auditor General, that he shall have such a man on his staff as will have sufficient knowledge to enable him to make an audit such as is required here. Now, the Auditor General has not such a man, he has told us in the public accounts that he has not any expert of that kind; he has told me personally that he has no such person. Yet the Finance Minister speaks as if the Auditor has everything he requires. The Auditor General perhaps has not asked for another clerk. We know the difficulty that heads of departments have in asking for extra expenditures for their staff. Even if the Auditor General has neglected to ask for it, in parliament we have the right to ask for it, and I say that the Auditor General should be supplied with an officer of that character, and that the accounts of the Intercolonial and the Prince Edward Island Railway should be audited in the future in a way they have not been audited in the past.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not made any allusion to the audit of any government official at Moncton or elsewhere. My observations this afternoon have reference to the auditing of the Auditor General. Now, there is a question of fact between the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) and myself. I stated the other day that we had supplied the Auditor General with all the officials he had asked for. My hon. friend says the Auditor General tells him now that is not true. Now I am bound to say that if the Auditor General stated that to my hon. friend, I cannot understand it, for it is at variance with the Auditor General's own statement to me within the last fifteen minutes, and I am bound to believe that there is a misunderstanding between the Auditor General and the hon. member for Hamilton. I again say that we have supplied the Auditor General with every official that he has asked for. Now he is the judge of how many officials he wants. We have a right to refuse, we have not exercised that right. But I say that the auditing of the public accounts is the business of the Auditor General; I say that while there are certain things that I think

the Auditor General is undertaking which do not properly belong to him, in this particular business he has a right to determine how he will audit the accounts of the Intercolonial, and they have been audited in the way that suited him. I say he has asked for no official who has not been given to him. If he says, I have not got an official—I cannot help that. We cannot go and thrust officials upon the Auditor General, we have no desire to do so. I say that he has audited all these accounts in such manner as he thought proper, and if he wanted any more officials it is not my business to go and thrust officials upon him, it is his business to say, I require further help. He has not been unduly modest in the past in asking for help—I do not say he has asked it improperly; but whenever he has found it desirable to have an additional staff he has asked for it, and got it. I want to repeat again without equivocation, that we have given the Auditor General every official he has asked for. He has audited these accounts in the past in the way that was pleasing to himself, and it will be quite time enough when he asks for further officials to supply them.

Mr. BARKER. I did not say that the Auditor General had complained that he had been refused any official by the government, any clerk, or any auditor—I said nothing of the kind. I simply said that the Auditor General had told me, and he had told the Public Accounts Committee, that he had not an auditor of the expert knowledge that was necessary to inspect these particular accounts.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Does not the hon. member for Hamilton mean to say that the Auditor General told him that he had not an officer who was a judge of the value of material, instead of saying that he had not an officer capable of auditing the accounts?

Mr. BARKER. Precisely, that is what I am talking about. I have endeavoured over and over again to explain what the Auditor General says with regard to the auditing and inspection of the railway accounts, that he has not an official on his staff with the technical knowledge necessary to enable him properly to audit those accounts. I have never said nor pretended to say that the Auditor General has asked anything that had been refused. He has stated in the Public Accounts Committee that he had no person with a technical knowledge that would enable him to do this, and I claim it was the business of the government, having heard that, to provide him with such an officer. Has the government done it? I have taken the opportunity on more than one occasion, both in the committee and in the House, to say that he ought to be supplied with such an officer. I say it is a farce to attempt to audit railway accounts by a man who is a mere bookkeeper, without any railway knowledge. A man cannot audit these accounts without information that would enable him to do so. I endeavoured to point out a few minutes ago cases where his audit would be absolutely useless unless from want of knowledge. As I said, he may come across tons of materials in store that are absolutely obsolete; he has no knowledge whether those should be classed as scrap-iron or not, or whether they should be charged up in the accounts for use upon the railway. He should be a man able to say to the general manager: Are not these obsolete articles? are they of any use? what is the use of lumbering the stores with them? should they not be sold as scrap-iron? Naturally a general manager may say: I do not want to sell these articles as scrap, they stand in my stores at five cents a pound, and if I sell them I will only get three-quarters of a cent a pound. But that is just what we want an auditor for. He should say: I cannot value these as railway articles, as railway appliances, they are of no value except for scrap-iron. That is the kind of audit we want. I am not complaining that the Minister of Finance has refused the application of the Auditor General for such a man, I say we ought to have such a man, and I say again that the Auditor General has told me several times that such an auditor would be of great value to him, because he himself is entirely unacquainted with that subject, and he has nobody in his department that is acquainted with that subject.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend appears to me to have extraordinary views of the duty and jurisdiction of an auditor of accounts. Take his own illustration. He says: How could any one audit the books of a druggist without expert knowledge. Now does my hon. friend say that a professional auditor must have expert knowledge of the values of every item that a druggist would purchase? A man who has experience in the prices of all kinds of goods may not be able to make up a financial statement, may not be able to go through those books. I think my hon. friend will admit that the officials of the department are responsible for the purchase of these things needed on the railway, they are responsible for the prices they pay for them. It is not the duty of an Auditor General to go over the accounts and say whether he thinks the prices paid were fair market prices; that is surely not what an auditor is for. The banks have a professional expert auditor, but he does not go over all the securities of the bank and say whether they are good or bad; the auditor of a loan company does not inquire into the value of the assets or the nature of the securities.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does he not inquire into the value of the securities ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The auditor does not value the securities. How could any professional auditor go over every item of the stock and say whether it was purchased at the proper value ? That is not his duty.

Mr. BARKER. If an auditor is going over the books of an investment company and he finds stocks valued in the security list at par, and he knew that they were only worth fifty cents on the dollar, do you mean to say that it is not his duty so to report them ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think my hon. friend would, if he was an auditor. My hon. friend being an honest man, if he was drawing money from a company to audit its books, and he noticed anything of that kind, no doubt he would report it to the president and directors of the company. That is the only duty he would have to perform. It always appeared to me that the Auditor General does not need a staff of experts for each department.

Mr. BARKER. I did not say that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Practically that is what it comes to. My hon. friend knows very well that an auditor of an investment company does not go over the value of each piece of property on which they have a loan, and say whether the value is a fair one or not.

Mr. BARKER. Is the hon. gentleman not aware that the expenditure on both capital and income account for one year on the Intercolonial Railway is about $10,000,000, and should we not have an expert auditor for that one item alone ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. You might keep an expert auditor for one item and not for another. The officials of railway departments are charged with the administration of the department. They are responsible for the conduct of the department. The auditor audits the accounts to see whether the stores have been purchased and the accounts properly kept. We are to be the judges of the conduct of the officers of the department. I think it would be a very proper thing for the Auditor General, if any of his staff in going over these accounts noticed any amount as having been paid which was excessive or extravagant or irregular, to report the fact to this House. But to say that the Auditor General should be the judge of the prices is an altogether different thing and it would be impossible that such a state of affairs could exist. In each department there are officers specially attached to each branch who have to certify before the auditor will pass an account that the price paid is fair and just. It is upon that expert that we place the responsibility and the minister assumes responsibility for his official. The minister comes before parliament and the country and is required to justify the conduct of his department. The Auditor General could not very well be called upon to judge in regard to every item as to whether the price paid is too much or not.

Mr. COCHRANE. How should I know as a member of the Public Accounts Committee anything about the values of the commodities in store if the auditor did not act as an expert and did not know the values ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The official of the department has to sign the account. He is an expert. He is our employee. He is the man we hold responsible.

Mr. COCHRANE. If he is the man who is held responsible what is the use of sending an auditor there at all ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The auditor has a different duty to perform. It is his duty to audit the accounts but that is a different thing from fixing the values. Each department could not wait to consult the auditor as to the price or value of goods before making a purchase. If the auditor notices anything excessive or unfair it would be his duty to report, it would be the duty of the officer who is responsible to give an explanation to his minister and the duty of the minister to explain to the House as to whether there was anything in the charge or not. The conditions and circumstances are so different in different sections of the Dominion and in different seasons of the year that nobody not familiar with the conditions at a particular time could judge as to whether the prices were fair and just or not. The chief engineer of the department is responsible for that. He has under him on the spot, in the locality where the work is going on or where the purchases are proposed to be made, a man in whom he places confidence and who reports to him as to values and whose accounts he endorses. It seems impossible to hold the Auditor General responsible for the conduct of every department. There would not be much use in having any departments at all if he were to be the sole judge as to how, when and at what prices articles are to be purchased. We have a large staff in each department and it is to the judgment of these men that we must look to determine whether the accounts are fair or not. The Auditor General simply deals with the money part of it. My hon. friend (Mr. Barker), on second thought, must see that the proposition which he makes is thoroughly impracticable. There is a responsibility upon the head of the department to see that his department is properly and economically managed and he has to answer to the House for the expenditure of the money which is appropriated to his department. The Auditor General should not be expected to become

responsible for the prices paid for goods. If, as the hon. member for Hamilton suggested, they were taking stock and if for that special purpose the Auditor General wanted a technical officer to place a value upon the stores at the time of stock-taking I could understand that there might be some force in what he has said, but to make a general proposition that the Auditor General is to be responsible for the prices paid for stores is to suggest something which is impracticable and impossible.

Mr. CLANCY. It does not seem to me at all impossible because the auditor might be an officer who had all the qualifications of an auditor and still have in addition to those technical knowledge that would enable him to perform the duties that have been referred to by my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker). My hon. friend pointed out a very striking case, namely, that in the stores account there might be the accumulations of years that were charged at the price at which they were originally purchased. Every person knows that many of the stores might not be worth one-tenth of what they cost. During the time that the accumulation is going on there must be a false account in regard to them.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They might be worth more.

Mr. CLANCY. Possibly, they might be in some instances. My hon. friend from Hamilton pointed out that there should be a technical officer who was an auditor as well. It is a case of stock-taking once a year. It is just the same as if an auditor were auditing the accounts of an insurance or a loan company. One of the things he would look into particularly would be the securities and the values of these securities and he would have to value them for what they were worth at the time. Why should we not have the same system in connection with the Intercolonial Railway? It is a very large concern. There are immense sums of money expended from year to year. I can quite understand that neither the government nor the general manager is at all anxious that these accounts shall be cut down. It is no reflection upon them at all when I say that. The general disposition is to make the best showing possible. The hon. Minister of Public Works says that the government are responsible, but I think he is going too far with his responsibility. The responsibility of the government only goes to the extent that we can turn them out of office when they do wrong. They do not redeem the losses that are made; their responsibility is not in dollars and cents and therefore there should be an officer to stand between the people and the government, I do not care how well meaning they may be. To have a healthy state of things you must have business carried on in a business way. There is absolutely no difference between auditing the Intercolonial Railway accounts by a technical officer who understands values and who would go into the stores and take stock, valuing the goods that were there, separating those goods that might be sold for purposes other than scrap iron from those that will be nothing more nor less than scrap iron——

Mr. HEYD. That would not be an auditor.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend (Mr. Heyd) does not seem to understand yet. He would be an auditor with technical knowledge.

Mr. HEYD. Where can you find an auditor with that technical knowledge? You cannot do it.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend has a very much smaller opinion of the possibilities of men of ordinary intelligence than either I or this committee have.

Mr. CHARLTON. Will the hon. gentleman tell us the difference between the functions of an auditor and of a valuator? It strikes me that he is confusing the work of two different classes of officials.

Mr. CLANCY. The difference is, in general terms, very distinct. The valuator is one who has a knowledge of the goods he is valuating. He must be an expert and a man of knowledge in that particular line, but it does not follow that he may not be a first-class accountant, an auditor in every sense of the word. Auditing is not a mere matter of seeing whether there are receipts for all the expenditures; an auditor must see whether the accounts were authorized how the money was provided, and whether the payments were legal or not. It does not follow that because a valuator has technical knowledge he may not be an auditor as well. It is possible to have a trained officer, as the member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has pointed out. It may be quite true that we have no officer of that kind now, but I reiterate what I said before, that it is very easy to get a man who is a first-class auditor in the true sense of the word who would at the same time go into the stores and say: Here, we will take stock; we will go through your accounts afterwards, but let us see what your stores are like. This seems to me so plain that it is not worth arguing.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would again place myself on record so that there may be no misunderstanding that on this question there has been no difference whatever between the Auditor General and the government. The Auditor General has unlimited power to audit these accounts. He has exercised that power. He has had all the officials he has asked for, and has had the most full and complete control of the accounts. I do not admit that it is the duty of this government to thrust officials on the Auditor General if he does not want them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is not a question of what the Auditor General wants, but of what is most in the public interest.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not in this instance, because he is the party who must make the application.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think the fact that the Auditor General has not made an application to the present parliament would prevent parliament from doing what it thinks to be most in the public interest. I do not propose to give up my independent judgment. There may be things that are in the public interest for which the Auditor General does not ask, and he may ask for things which I would think were not in the public interest. The question is whether or not there should be some audit with respect to stores and supplies of the Intercolonial Railway, made by an officer who is independent of the government.

Mr. CHARLTON. That would be a valuator, not an auditor.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does not the hon. member recognize that the present functions of the Auditor General are something more than what is popularly called auditing ?

Mr. CHARLTON. Would my hon. friend say that the Auditor General is called upon to value the supplies covered by the accounts which he has to audit, and has to decide whether the beef, the pork, and the various other articles were bought at proper prices ? He has nothing to do with that. He simply audits the accounts, sees that they are entered properly and that there are vouchers for the payment. He has nothing whatever to do with the values of the articles to which the accounts relate.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I desire to express as distinctly as I can my absolute divergence from the view expressed by my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton). Not only has the Auditor General that power, but he has exercised it over and over again. If my hon. friend will look over the Auditor General's Report for the last half dozen years he will see that the auditor more than once has sent out officials to measure work which has been done, and has made a report that he does not think that it is worth the amount sought to be exacted from the government. Did he not, under the late administration, send down to value some work on the Curran bridge.

Mr. CHARLTON. He was not called upon to say whether the work was worth so much a yard, but to ascertain if the work was performed. It was a scrutiny of the accounts.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) is not aware of what the Auditor General has been doing during the last eight or ten years. If he will look up the Auditor General's Report, he will find that whether or not the Auditor General has the power to do it he has at least been exercising that power frequently. The hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) seems to think that because there was an auditor in the Department of Railways and Canals, there was an end to the question. It does not put an end to the question, because the functions of the Auditor General are entirely different from those of an auditor who is under the control of the government. If the argument of the Minister of Public Works were carried to its legitimate conclusion, it would result in the abolition of the Auditor General, because every department of the government has its auditor. The Auditor General is the servant of the people through parliament, removable only by parliament, and not by the government. The point taken by my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) is that we should have an audit of the same kind as that made by the auditor of the department performed by an officer who is not dependent on the government, and who cannot be dismissed at the will and pleasure of the government. That seems to me to be a reasonable proposition. I do not suppose the Auditor General can value every dollar's worth of supplies, he cannot push this work to extremes, but you can give the Auditor General power to investigate where he has reason to believe, for example, that work at a particular station is being done at an excessive price or that the work for which a claim is made has not been done, or that the work is being improperly divided as between capital and maintenance accounts. Investigation of that kind must be performed by some one if you are to have any check. It may be done by officers of the department at the present time, but there should also be power in the Auditor General to supervise that work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is very little, if any, difference between the hon. leader of the opposition and myself. In closing my remarks, I said to the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) that if he had advocated for this stores account a valuation by an officer not under the control of the Railway Department, but under that of the Auditor General, I did not think there would be any difference between us. But he spoke of an audit in a general way, and it is in a general way that I thought and stated that it would be impracticable. The hon. leader of the opposition and myself agreed ; I did not take the position which he says I did. The logical conclusion of the principle he has enunciated in his remarks would be to abolish parliament and the departments, and to leave the whole thing to the Auditor General. That would be a more logical conclusion than the conclusion which he drew from what I said. I quite agree with my hon. friend that if the Auditor General

thought it desirable in any particular matter to have a valuator in his department, he should have one. I can quite understand in this particular case that if parliament was not satisfied with the way that stores account was being kept, or with the values put upon the stores by the department, parliament should ask their own official to make a valuation and report. But it seems to me impracticable, and ridiculous for any one to argue that the Auditor General and his branch must be held responsible for the value of the goods purchased, &c. I agree with my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, that the people of Canada do not want to have the Auditor General control all the affairs of this country; they look to parliament, to their representatives here. They must leave the power in the hands of parliament, even over the Auditor General.

The officials of the various departments, who are supposed to be perfectly capable and honest, must certify the accounts before they are passed by the Auditor General; just as every business man has to depend on the officials of the various branches of his business to certify to the correctness of the accounts for goods purchased. I would go so far as to say that if, for example, the Auditor General found accounts coming to him from the Public Works Department for lumber at $30 or $40 a thousand, which was purchased at some point where the ordinary price was $20 a thousand, I think he would be neglecting his duty if he did not report the matter to the minister, and inform him that he would report it to parliament if it were not properly explained. But to say that the Auditor General must be responsible for the prices paid by the department, I think every one will admit is a ridiculous position to take.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). Do I understand the minister to say that a proper inventory of these stores is made at stated intervals?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I presume there is. In so large a department as the Department of Railways and Canals, there must be a proper set of books, and the accounts must be properly kept, although they go through the Auditor General's department. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) suggested, as did the hon. member for Bothwell, that the officials of the department, or the minister, would desire to show that their purchases had not been improperly made, or that they had not bought more than they required.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman, I think, misunderstood me. I did not enter into the question of whether purchases were wisely or unwisely made.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That would be the result.

Mr. CLANCY. No, no.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was suggested that if they had overbought, and prices afterwards went up, they would try to hide the fact. In such a case the Auditor might appoint a valuator to go over the account; but as an expert book-keeper he could not value the goods. A man might have an expert knowledge of certain goods and be unable to read or write. In the same way, it would be improper to hold the Auditor General or his department responsible for the prices paid. On that point, there is no difference between the hon. member for Hamilton and myself, that if in stock-taking there was any doubt about the prices paid, the Auditor General might appoint an officer separate from the department to report whether the prices charged were fair or not.

Mr. CLANCY. Nobody would pretend to go so far in either direction as the Minister of Public Works has suggested. No one would go so far as to take away ministerial responsibility by making the Auditor General responsible for anything but neglect of duty. The Auditor General cannot be responsible for the payment of excessive prices. All he can do is to call attention to it. It is no new thing to have an account certified with the statement that the prices are reasonable and fair. I have often seen that certificate when I knew that the prices were not fair. Without attempting to place any wrong-doing at the door of any minister, we know that the tendency under all governments is to pass these accounts. It becomes largely a mere matter of form. The hon. gentleman may ask, have you no confidence in the officers? I do not think I need enter into a discussion of that phase of the subject at all. Confidence or no confidence, goods have been purchased, under former governments as well as under the present government, for which too much has been paid. That will always be the case under our system, where party favouritism is shown in the purchase of supplies. Let us not close our eyes to that fact, it is one of the evils of our system. It seems to me that it is a fair proposition that when goods are purchased at an excessive price, the minister and the general manager should be informed of the fact. The officer who makes the purchase or the officer who values the goods in the store, is not going to call attention to it; and the minister and the general manager will have no means of knowing it unless they get the information from some other source. It seems to me it would be of substantial benefit to both to have a technical officer who knew values. I think it is going too far to say that you could not get a man who had technical knowledge and was an auditor as well. There would be no difficulty about that. The hon. member for Hamilton has pointed out the great advantage of such an officer

in the department, where there are so many chances of leaks, and great leaks, in spite of the energy and close scrutiny of the general manager, upon whom the minister must rely. We must give him very wide scope. It is a very natural state of things. You destroy his usefulness if you do not do that. He cannot always run to the minister for advice. He must be a man capable of taking responsibility on himself. The minister, it is true, is responsible for the conduct of the general manager, but would not this greatly facilitate the work in the department? Let us shake off all the old usages that cease to be useful and enter upon a new, enlightened and intelligent method which will best serve every interest in the department. I think my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has called attention to a question which is not to be disposed of by saying: this is impossible. It is quite possible. Everybody knows that there is not one department in which goods are not purchased at too high prices. It is not possible for the minister to always guard against that, but let us guard against it as far as we can.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand the Minister of Public Works to say that the Auditor General has no responsibility as regards the fairness of the prices charged?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think parliament would expect him to be responsible for the prices. If he had reason to suppose that the prices were not fair, his duty would be to report that to parliament if he did not get satisfaction from the department; and it is for the people to punish their administrators for having paid excessive prices. Nobody would hold him responsible, except for not reporting.

Mr. CLANCY. He exercises his powers in every case to prevent a recurrence?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Of course.

Mr. BLAIN. I thought his duties extended further than that. In looking over the Auditor General's Report of last year, I see some correspondence that indicates something altogether different from the understanding of the minister. For example, some printing was done outside the Printing Bureau. The account was sent into the Auditor General, bearing a certificate that the prices were fair and just, but he refused to pass it, because he said it required another certificate.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. From the King's Printer.

Mr. BLAIN. It had a certificate from the King's Printer, but he said it required a further certificate that the prices did not exceed those which would be charged in the Printing Bureau. Therefore, the Auditor General must consider that he has some responsibility with regard to the prices charged by outside parties. If that be not the case, the officer of the Railway Department, whose duty it is to find out if the prices are fair and just, could send in an account in which the prices were double what they should be, and the Auditor General would be justified in paying it. Surely he must have some option, or he would pay every account that came along, and the responsibility would not rest in his department.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman says that the Auditor General would pay the accounts. It is not his business to pay accounts at all.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. minister will admit I am right in saying that no accounts are paid without the Auditor General's certificate?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The point taken by the Minister of Public Works, that the Auditor General ought not be held responsible for prices is correct. If the other view is correct, if he is responsible for the prices, and if what the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) says is correct, that many claims have been paid where the prices are excessive, then the Auditor General should be dismissed as incompetent. But he is not responsible for the prices. In the case of the King's Printer, the Auditor General claimed that a certain certificate was required; and if that had been attached, he would have passed the account.

Mr. BLAIN. What certificate was it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Act requires that the prices should not only be fair and just, but correspond with the prices at the Printing Bureau. A certificate to that effect was not attached; but if it had been, the Auditor General would have passed the account, and nobody would say that he was responsible for the prices. All he had to do was to see that he had the proper vouchers according to law. To hold him responsible for the prices would be to impose on him a responsibility which was never intended, and which he would not accept himself.

Mr. BLAIN. That contention is not justified by the letter of the Auditor General himself. The Auditor General did receive a certificate that the prices were fair and just, and still refused to pass the account.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He required another certificate that the prices were not in excess of those charged by the Printing Bureau. Under the Act, he must have that certificate, and it had not been given him.

Mr. BLAIN. That is what the Auditor General's letter says: I quote only part of it:

Please make no further payments for printing out of your letters-of-credit, except on vouchers whose certificate includes the fact that the prices do not exceed those which would be charged for such printing at the Government Printing Bureau.

I do not understand that the Act under which the Auditor General discharges his duties calls for such a certificate. If it does, the responsibility for correct charges of goods rests with the Auditor General.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In that particular case.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a distinction between being responsible for the charges and being responsible for the getting of a certificate. One involves judgment as to whether the prices are reasonable or not, and the other involves seeing whether the certificate is attached or not.

Mr. BLAIN. Of course, I do not wish to enter into controversy with the Minister of Finance on this subject, but I would like to understand it. I take it, from the letter I have read, that the Auditor General felt responsible for the correct prices in the accounts which I have referred to, for the reason that the account, when it went to the Auditor General, bore the certificate of the officer whose duty it was to certify that the prices were fair and just. That measured up to the requirements of the law——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Auditor General says it did not.

Mr. BLAIN. I feel sure that I do not misunderstand it, because the Auditor General does not say that the law requires a further certificate, but, as an officer feeling some responsibility in respect of the prices, he calls for a further certificate, not only that the prices are fair and just, but that they do not exceed those charged in the Printing Bureau.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) has misunderstood it. The Auditor General sometimes claims pretty wide and generous powers, but it is only just to him to say that I do not think he claimed in this case to judge whether the prices are fair and just. I speak from recollection, and, having none of the papers before me, subject to correction, but I think I am correct when I say that the Auditor General had been passing these accounts for many years with the certificate in the same form in which the hon. gentleman has quoted it, but it suddenly occurred to the Auditor General—I do not say he was wrong—that the statute under which he was acting required another certificate, and that certificate he demanded. We have passed an Act this session to make it clear that the additional certificate is not required.

Mr. CLANCY. The point that my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) has raised is this : This was a class of work similar to that being done in the Printing Bureau, and it was being done outside. As a gauge of what was a fair and reasonable scale of prices, he fixed the prices that would have been charged had it been done in the Printing Bureau.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Parliament fixed that.

Mr. CLANCY. I quite understand. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) has not enlightened me at all by his remark. The Auditor General is not guided merely by the statutes, but he must have some discretionary powers which it would be impossible to embody in a statute. This printing was being done outside, and the Auditor General said : I do not care what your certificate may be as to prices being fair and just, what I want to know is that the cost to the country is not more than it would have been if the work had been done in the Printing Bureau. It was not a question of complying with the statutes——

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Will my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) permit me a question ? Is he sure that the Act does not require that the certificate accompanying these accounts should be that the price is not in excess of the price that would be charged in the Printing Bureau ? I am not certain of the matter, but my recollection is that the Act under which printing is done outside the Bureau, as it was before the amended Act of this session was passed, required that the prices for work done outside should not be in excess of those in the Printing Bureau. That was got over by the legislation of this session.

Mr. CLANCY. If that were the law, it is not necessary to cure a difficulty or an imaginary difficulty——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, it is necessary to cure an imaginary difficulty. I will give my hon. friend the case.

Mr. CLANCY. I was pointing out to the Minister of Finance that the Auditor General might take the course he has taken in the exercise of powers which should properly be his. Where work is done outside, he should make sure that it does not cost the country any more than work done in the Bureau. No one would imagine that it would require a statutory enactment to authorize the Auditor General to do that—it would be within the proper exercise of his powers. And the case to which the hon. member for Peel calls attention seems to show that the Auditor General felt that it was not enough for him to see to it that the prices were reasonable, but that the cost to the country was not made greater through the work being done outside. That is the essence of the whole thing. If the hon.

minister will point out where I am wrong I shall be glad to be set right.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think it would be well to be drawn into a discussion of the merits or demerits as to this question of the cost of the printing. But I state my recollection of the case. Many years ago, in the time of the late government, an Act was passed intended to permit certain printing to be done in portions of the Dominion far from Ottawa, and it was provided—or seems to have been so intended—that if the prices were deemed fair and reasonable from the point of view of the local conditions under which the work was done, they should be accepted and approved. That appears to have been the spirit of the Act, and for many years the Auditor General allowed that spirit to prevail, under the late government and under the present government, and accepted and approved accounts which bore the certificate that the prices were fair and just. The accounts did not bear any certificate comparing the prices with those in the Printing Bureau. In fact the whole intention as I understand it was to recognize the fact that the prices might not be those of the Printing Bureau, the work being done under different conditions. But the Auditor General, after passing such accounts for many years, came to the conclusion—I do not say he was wrong—that the statute under which he was acting required a further certificate, and he recently demanded that certificate, claiming that it was required under the statute. I have not the Act under my hand, but I think he was correct. This year an amendment was introduced to carry out what was intended to be the spirit of the Act from the beginning, the spirit under which the Act was administered for many years under both governments.

Mr. CLANCY. Does that mean that excessive prices may be paid for the work done outside. If I understand the Finance Minister correctly, it means that the Auditor General has lost control in these matters. It means that the Auditor General has passed accounts for years, possibly at excessive prices—I am going to admit that, for, these things are as likely to have happened in the past as to happen now; let us be fair and frank about it. The Auditor General of course, like any other man, learns from experience. He had passed accounts year after year under both governments without inquiring whether excessive prices were being paid. Then, I fear, he made the discovery—a very useful one and one that should be within his powers without direct statutory authority—that his duty was, not to prevent work being done outside the Bureau, but to see to it that the cost of the work to the country should not be more than if it were done in the Bureau. That is plain. The government has relieved the Auditor General of that portion of his duty and of the exercise of that authority. It means no more and no less than that they have taken away the power from the Auditor General, and that now accounts are to be paid at such prices that, I repeat—and I regret to repeat it—the certificate is little more than a matter of form in some cases. But the conditions may have been such as did not warrant any government in getting it done there. The Minister of Public Works tells us that the government is responsible. That is a kind of responsibility we do not understand as having force in this country. Ministerial responsibility never repaid nor restored one cent to the people from whom it has been taken away, under any government. The more power you give an officer to prevent these excesses the better for the country and the more will the ministers be relieved of trouble.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are getting away from the real point involved. But I may inform my hon. friend that the change that was made with regard to the printing did not necessarily imply that an excessive price had been paid. This printing being done in different portions of the Dominion at places where it suited the convenience of the department to have it done, prices that were fair and just according to the rates current in the place where the work was done, would be the fair and just prices for that work. That is the point of difference. The Auditor General understood it that way for many years, and approved the accounts as not excessive, as being fair and just according to the standard prices of printing in the places where the work was done. That was the spirit of the Act, that was the way in which it was interpreted for many years. But when the Auditor General took it into his head to make a different interpretation, even though he had a statute to support him in doing so, it was thought well to make a change. However, that is going into the merits of the question. The origin of this part of the discussion was whether the Auditor General was responsible for the prices being fair and just. I say I do not think the Auditor General is responsible, or should be held responsible; that a part of ministerial responsibility. His duty undoubtedly will be to call attention to any case in which he thinks there was fraud, or dishonesty, or excessive charges, and so forth. But the responsibility is not his, the responsibility is the minister's. His duty is to call attention, to remonstrate if he likes, to blame, to spread the story out before parliament—that is the limitation, in my judgment, of his authority; he is not responsible whether the prices are fair or not.

Mr. CLANCY. I think the Minister of Finance will agree with me that it is the duty of a responsible minister of the government to place every power in the hands of an official to prevent these improper prac-

tices. That is the best way for the ministers to shield themselves, to protect themselves from the matters to which we are now calling attention. I quite agree that it would be impossible to make the Auditor General responsible for the prices. He could not help excessive prices being paid, and to censure him for that would be wrong, and impossible to carry out in practice. But what my hon. friend from Hamilton is pointing out is the desirability of placing at the disposal of the Auditor General every means of preventing these improper practices.

Mr. BLAIN. As to whether the accounts require a further certificate, as the Minister of Finance thinks they should, let me read three or four lines from a letter from the King's Printer, Mr. Dawson :

> I have given the certificate the Audit Act requires. I have certified that the prices are fair and just. According to the rules of equity there should be no hesitation to pay such prices.

The King's Printer says that he gave merely a certificate that the prices for printing were fair and just. I do not know whether the minister would go so far as to say that the King's Printer is wrong, and that it does require a further statement that the prices do not exceed the prices that would be paid for such printing elsewhere. The King's Printer says that he has been doing this for ten years.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Speaking from recollection, I think, the Auditor General took the ground that there was another Act somewhere dealing with the matter, which required an additional certificate, and that was the certificate he demanded.

Mr. BLAIN. When was that Act passed ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot say, it has been in operation for many years.

Mr. BLAIN. The King's Printer says there is no such Act.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the Auditor General was able to show that there was an Act somewhere which required that. He was merely acting, as he claimed, within the limits of some statute, and asking for certificates in accordance therewith.

Mr. BLAIN. The point is that the King's Printer says, over his own signature, dated December 26th, 1902, that the accounts have been paid continuously upon the simple certificate that the prices were fair and just.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is no doubt correct, that was the form of audit for a while. While the Auditor General accepted that certificate for many years, he recently required something else, and claimed that he had statutory authority to demand it.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). My opinion is that the Auditor General was quite right in requiring that the prices should not exceed those of the government office. I can understand that if the printing was given by tender there would be no necessity for the Auditor General making such a reference ; but from the fact of the printing being farmed out, it was necessary to have some basis upon which to arrive at the proper cost. Would the acting Minister of Railways and Canals tell me when the last inventory of stores was made, what was the value of the stores, and by whom was it made ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The inventory is made on the 30th of June every year. According to the books of the Auditor General for 1901-2, the value was $1,500,000; the value at the last inventory, at the close of the year 1902-3, was about $917,302.24.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). By what official was that inventory made ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The manager informs me that the inventory of the track stores along the line is taken on the 31st of October, and of the rest on the 30th of June. The general stock-taking is on the 30th of June but they prefer to take stock of the track stores at the end of the season.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). The hon. gentleman has not yet given me the information I have asked for. Who has charge of the stock-taking ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The accounts are taken by the officials of the Intercolonial Railway, men in the department specially assigned to make that investigation.

Mr. BARKER. I have sent for the Act respecting the Printing Bureau, and I see that there is nothing in it requiring a special certificate, and that the amendment made this session does not do away with such a certificate, because there was no certificate required. The amendment made this session provided that :

> Nothing in this Act shall require that stationery and printing for the purposes of the Intercolonial Railway or the Prince Edward Island Railway shall be obtained or done in the said establishment in any case where such stationery and printing may be more conveniently procured elsewhere at a cost not exceeding customary and fair commercial rates for similar work or supplies in similar quantities.

That section was brought in, not to do away with any certificate that had previously been required, but to enable the government to get its printing done apart from the Printing Bureau. Therefore, the Auditor General was acting within his right in demanding the certificate required by the statute.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My recollection is that the Auditor General d'd claim that he was acting under the

statute. However, the point is not of much importance, because I am simply contending that the House cannot expect to hold the Auditor General responsible for the prices paid for stores being fair and reasonable. All you can expect the Auditor General to do is to see that the accounts are correct, and that if in any case he has reason to believe that the accounts are improper, it is his duty to call attention to them and to investigate. But we could not hold him responsible for the prices paid for goods throughout Canada, and I do not think he would be willing to accept that responsibility.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I cannot understand who the official is who makes the inventory of stores. There will no doubt be an official in charge for the stores department, but these supplies will be scattered along the railway and will be at the different stations. Who makes out this inventory ? Is it the gentleman in charge of the stores or some other official ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The inventory is taken by the store-keeper, with the assistance of such officials as he has in his own branch and of others from other branches of the railway service as may be required.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Who fixes the valuation of these stores ? Is it the gentleman in charge of the stores ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The valuation of these stores is based on the prices which were paid for them, subject to any loss that may occur in keeping or handling them. The general manager has given me this illustration for instance : If a quantity of oil was placed in the store, in measuring it out there would be a certain amount of loss that would be charged up against revenue. You could not measure out exactly the same quantity of oil as you put in. In that case, the books would be balanced by charging the loss against the revenue account for the year.

On section 3,

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to ask the hon. minister if there is any classification of this large amount of money that is expended on the Intercolonial Railway ? If there is placed to the credit of the Department of Railways and Canals $1,500,000 for the Intercolonial Railway, do I understand that the minister would have the right to say that it should be expended in any way he wished ? Would it be apportioned in such a way that so much money would be voted for the purchase of steel rails and so much for the purchase of locomotives ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, it would be general.

Mr. BLAIN. Could the minister take the million and a half and purchase whatever kind of goods he wished ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is a very extreme case, but he could. But what would he do with them afterwards ? He would have to make use of these goods. There would be no great pleasure in having them in store, and he could only use them on the Intercolonial Railway at such places and for such purposes as parliament had authorized.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not think it is fair that the department should have the right to apportion the full appropriation made by parliament, or that the minister should have the right to expend the money in any manner that he wished. The minister should come forward and say that so many thousand dollars should be applied to one part of the railway and so many thousand to another part. But to give the minister carte blanche to expend this money seems to me to be giving him very extended powers.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think, if my hon. friend were starting a shop and wanted $100,000 to carry his stock, that he would find it convenient to state that so much should be devoted to goods of one colour and so much to goods of another colour. I would like to call the attention of the committee to the wording of the Act of 1893 respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery. It contains these words :

> Provided that nothing in this Act shall be held to require that the printing for the purposes of the Intercolonial Railway or the Prince Edward Island Railway shall be done in the said establishment in any case when such printing may be more conveniently done elsewhere at a cost not exceeding that which would be charged for such printing at the said establishment.

Therefore, what the Auditor General asked was that a certificate should be given in accordance with the words of the statute. His demand rested on the statute.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask if the Auditor General objected to these accounts without that special certificate ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know what the Auditor General did before the Act was passed in 1893, but I know that for long years afterwards he passed these accounts without the certificate.

Mr. BLAIN. The Auditor General did not enforce the Act in respect to the special certificate which the hon. gentleman has referred to ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I believe that is the fact.

Mr. BLAIN. That is rather suspicious. It looks as if somebody was trespassing in regard to the accounts, when there was no such trespassing in days gone by. Perhaps my hon. friend can tell us why the Auditor feels it to be his duty to enforce this law to the very letter now, when he felt it to

be his duty for many years not to enforce it at all ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Prices were fixed by Order in Council, and that Order in Council was passed by the late government.

Mr. CLANCY. And these were to be the prices not exceeding those charged at the Bureau ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, they were not.

Mr. CLANCY. That is what the Act says, and they could not pass an Order in Council contrary to the Act.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman says they could not. An hon. gentleman said a few minutes ago that whether the Auditor General has power to do a certain thing or not, he does it. That Order in Council was passed. We will take another illustration. Twenty years ago the Superannuation Act was passed, whereby a man was entitled, upon his retirement, to receive an allowance in proportion to the number of years of his service. After the Act was passed a case arose where a man had a few months over the year to his credit, and the question came up as to how it should be dealt with. The government of the day passed a very sensible Order in Council to the effect that if the number of months was less than six they should not be counted, while if there were more than six they should count as another year. For twenty years the Auditor General accepted that Order in Council as a good law, but a few months ago it occurred to him that it was not good in law, or in common sense, and he cut down the allowance of a lighthouse keeper, saying that this was not what the law, said, and this year we have had to change the law.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman will, no doubt, find cases of that kind. It is not to be expected that after years of experience, the Auditor General would not find out that in some respects he was not acting strictly according to the law, but the strange thing about the matter now is that just as soon as the Auditor General acted up to the law passed in 1893, the Minister of Finance comes in with a Bill and says to the Auditor General : The law of 1893 provides that while printing may be done outside it shall not cost this country any more than it would cost if it were done at the Printing Bureau at Ottawa ; it will not do for you to insist on a strict observance of the law, for if you do we will repeal that law so that we can close your mouth, and we will give such prices as may be charged to suit the conditions in outside towns. The government of the day is not justified in getting one line of printing done where the conditions are as favourable for economical work as they are in the Printing Bureau. You may say that it is more convenient to have it done here or there, but hon. gentlemen opposite know very well the evil tendency of pursuing a course of that kind. The pressure of party friends under our system is a great danger to the public, and the moment you take away the Auditor's power, and say to the Auditor General : True, you are living up to the Act of 1893, but under such circumstances we cannot give our friends any printing because their conditions are such that they cannot compete with the Bureau, and therefore we cannot give it to them. The government are not justified in doing this. There can be any number of conditions under which you can pay anything you like, and say that it is a fair price, that a man is not making any undue profit. One man may not be able to make even a living where another man can make a profit. The minister is taking a dangerous step in this, and one that he will have reason to regret.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman finds great danger in things that are done by this government, in which he saw no danger when his own friends were in power.

Mr. CLANCY. I am talking on general principles, and I said it was wrong if it was done under the late government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The merits of the printing question do not happen to be connected with this Bill, but let me state briefly the facts of the case. The late government passed an Order in Council; the hon. gentleman said they could not do so.

Mr. CLANCY. I said they had no authority to do so.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is now proving that his friends set the law of 1893 at defiance when they passed an Order in Council declaring that this work might be done in different parts of the country on certain terms and conditions having regard to local conditions. For years that system was carried on under both governments and the Auditor General allowed it to be done, accepting the certificate of the King's Printer that the price was fair and just. Then the Auditor General makes the discovery that this was not consistent with the statute, and says : I will live up to the statute. Then, we come in and say —I did not introduce the Bill, but I accept my share of responsibility--that that which was the understood policy of both governments for many years, and to which the Auditor Genereal did not object, should continue to be the system in force. In regard to the superannuation, much the same thing occurred. For 20 years the Auditor General paid the odd months to the poor lighthouse-keeper, but at this late stage he awakens to the idea that it is not legal and refuses to give the lighthouse-keeper the

benefit of these months. We step in and say that we will give the lighthouse-keeper the odd months, because it is fair and reasonable.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman cannot take shelter under that. The hon. gentleman is too intelligent not to know that when I said the late government could not pass such an Order in Council, I meant that in so doing they exceeded their authority. The Auditor General had a perfect right to call attention to the fact that if such an Order in Council existed it was contrary to the statutes. The fact that the former government did that does not justify the present government in doing it. We should adopt such a policy as will inure to the best interests of the country. I am not here to defend any act of the former government that is not defensible, I do not think it is the business of any man on either side of the House, because his party may have made mistakes or have gone too far, to justify these mistakes. Let us, I say, adopt such a policy and such rules as will inure to the best interests of this country. The hon. minister is trying to take shelter behind what? Behind the fact that the former government did it. Is he adopting all the virtues as well as all the vices of the former government? Has he laid down the rule that because a former government did this, whether it be good or bad, that he is to adopt it. Is it in the interests of the country to take this power from the Auditor General by repealing the Act of 1893, notwithstanding that the Order in Council has no legal effect? I ask him, too, if it is in the public interest to take that power out of the hands of the Auditor General and to permit printing to be done anywhere in Canada at prices which, under the conditions, can always be justified as being fair?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) has criticised the action of his friends in the late government. I will be more generous. I am going to defend the late government. I will not allow them to be maligned by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). When the late government passed the Order in Council—for, I think, the Conservative government dealt with both of these questions, with printing and superannuation—it was a common sense Order in Council. In relation to superannuation, where the statute had failed to take account of the odd months, it was reason and common sense that the government should say: where a man has seven months to his credit, we will count it as a year, and if he has only two or three months to his credit we will not count it at all. That was common sense and in carrying that out we have been simply doing what is fair and reasonable. The late government for years allowed their friends to do the printing. Our predecessors did it as we do it. I am here to defend the principle of giving our friends the preference every time provided the prices are just, and I am not in favour of concentrating all the work into the Printing Bureau at Ottawa If a portion of that work has in the past been done in other portions of the Dominion, I do not think we should concentrate it all in Ottawa. There has been no change in regard to method or price. The Conservative press did a certain amount of work for the Intercolonial Railway at a price settled by Order in Council. If that system has been continued by the present government at prices which are fair and just, I say there is no wrong to the public treasury, and I am here to defend the action of the late government in that respect.

Mr. BLAIN. I wish to differ from the policy of the government in respect to giving out printing to any other office than the Printing Bureau. I am not here to say whether the late government did what was right or what was wrong. In my humble opinion they did what was wrong, and I believe that where the government has a Printing Bureau, as they have in the city of Ottawa, capable of doing a large amount of printing, it is not wise to give the Railway Department authority to get their printing done in any part of Canada they choose. Whether the prices are fair and just or not, I do not express any opinion at the moment. I wish to express my dissent from the policy of the government in this respect. I do not think it will receive the endorsation of the people of this country.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is a little late; the Bill is passed.

Mr. BLAIN. I think it is the duty of the government to take away such power from the department.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think there was a division on the Bill; so I am afraid my hon. friend is bound by it.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps I should not say what is in my mind about that sort of criticism. The hon. minister sought to drag the superannuation question into this discussion. We are not responsible for that. I want to remind him of the promise he and the minister who sits behind him made to this country, that if they were put in power they would abolish the Superannuation Act. Yet, the charges to the country under that Act are now greater than they were under the late government.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have been waiting with great patience and expectation for the last ten minutes, thinking that the committee would stop this irrelevant discussion; but finding that they are widening it, I am constrained to ask them to be good enough to return to the question.

Mr. COCHRANE. I hope the Minister of Finance will take notice.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Yes, both sides.

Mr. BLAIN. It is very kind of the chairman to show so much patience ; but I notice that his patience generally ceases when a member of the opposition has the floor.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BLAIN. However, I bow at once to his ruling. I do not think the superannuation question should be discussed at this time. We are not responsible for the introduction of that question, and I have said all I have to say upon it. In my opinion this Bill gives too wide powers to the Railway Department. I do not think that department should have placed to its credit $1,500,000, with the right to purchase for the Intercolonial Railway whatever kinds of goods they wish, in whatever quantity, wherever they wish, and at whatever price they wish. I think the Act should specify that a certain amount should be placed to the credit of the department to purchase steel rails when required, a certain amount to purchase locomotives when required, and so on. I do not think such great powers should be given to the minister. The new minister seems to require very great liberty. I do not know whether his predecessor would think this a proper measure ; he is not in the House. For myself, I think it is very dangerous legislation, and I wish to express myself as against it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This morning I raised a point with regard to the first section, which I did not press very strongly, because the Minister of Finance and my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) both seemed to entertain a somewhat different view to that which I expressed. But I must say that I am not quite convinced yet. I think I understand the intention of the section, and the difficulty I have in regard to it is owing possibly to some lack of care in the way in which it is drafted. As the section reads at present, with the last line struck out, it provides that advances may be made indefinitely. There is no necessary connection between section 1 and sections 2 and 3. My difficulty would be to a great extent eliminated if you added after the word 'advances,' in the first section, the words 'on railway stores account.'

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no objection to adding these words though I do not think they change the meaning of the section. I move that section 1 be reconsidered, and that these words be inserted.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.

PILOTAGE ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine) moved second reading of Bill (No. 261) respecting the pilotage district of Montreal, and the port and pilotage district of Quebec.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I may say to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that I have a communication from my hon. friend for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), who says he cannot possibly be here to-day but that he will be here on Monday, and he would be greatly obliged if this Bill were held over until Monday. It concerns the interests of his constituents to a certain extent, and he would like to be present.

Motion withdrawn.

NAVIGABLE WATERS.

Bill (No. 260) to amend the Act respecting certain works constructed in or over navigable waters, read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. TAYLOR. I would ask the hon. minister to let this stand over until next session so that we may have time to consider it. This government has never given a dollar for the purpose of erecting a wharf on either side of Howe island there. The farmers, in order to get over from that island, have established a ferry service operated by cable, and have built a row of docks along both sides. Why should the government compel these people to take out a license and pay $5 for permission to use the ferry they have established themselves? This Bill will apply to ferries which have been running for the last fifty years.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine). I do not see why we should not have a law to regulate the use of these cables in order to protect life and property. In the case of certain ferries which have been long established, we might not charge any license, but it is necessary that they should be subjected to some regulations. There have been a number of accidents owing to the absence of any regulations. Nearly a whole family was drowned at Bout De L'Isle near Montreal a few months ago. A cable had been stretched across the channel without license. It was under water, not seen, and there was nothing to indicate its presence. These people came across this obstacle and their boat was upset and they were drowned. The only recourse their successors have is to sue in damages the parties who laid the cable. In Manitoba repeated accidents of a similar kind have happened.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman's argument is not sufficient justification for the

course he intends to take. There are many accidents on steamboats which are licensed and carry licensed engineers, captain and pilots. I do not see how there can be any danger in leaving these cables undisturbed, because they run along the bottoms of rivers. If the hon. gentleman will allow the Bill to stand, he will find that he will get representations against it from many of the provinces.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Does this Bill refer only to navigable waters ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, I do not intend to regulate the use of cable across waters which are not navigable. I am going as far as it is possible to go under the present circumstances, and am acting on the recommendation that has been made. If the hon. gentleman wishes to apply it to non-navigable waters, the Bill will be found still more objectionable to the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor). The principle is not new at all, but is involved in chapter 92 of the Revised Statutes of Canada respecting certain works constructed in or over navigable waters. This Act was passed in 1886, and the present Bill only expands the powers which are given under that Act and provides for the regulating of some things which are not regulated under the law as it stands. The non-regulation of which has led to loss of life and property.

Mr. CLANCY. I have in mind navigable rivers on which ferries are established by municipalities. If the present Bill becomes law, these municipalities will have to get licenses from the minister for a ferry, and, no doubt, he will send out an inspector to see that the work is done according to his regulation. If the hon. minister wishes to apply this to the North-west Territories, where they have no municipal institutions, I personally, would have no great objection. But if he wishes to interfere with the work in this respect now carried on by the municipalities in Ontario, I think he is going altogether too far. How does the hon. gentleman intend to provide for the proper arrangement of these cables ? Is he going to send out a travelling inspector ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). A lot of them.

Mr. CLANCY. I am afraid it is only a means of providing offices. I have not had an opportunity to study the Bill closely, but from the hon. minister's explanation, I am led to believe that he is not warranted in taking charge of ferries now controlled by municipalities and properly managed. Nor is there any reason why he should demand a license fee of $5 from a municipality for carrying on such a work.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Supplementing what the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has said—the hon. minister can answer both of us when he speaks. I understand that in the North-west Territories they establish these ferries and maintain them for the convenience of the settlers. Would not the hon. minister run foul of the North-west council there as well as of the municipalities in the case my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has referred to ? And, if a license is charged, would not the government be responsible for seeing to it that these ferries are kept in proper condition, and be liable in case of accidents ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) surely is not serious. If a bridge is constructed over a navigable water according to plans which have been submitted to the Governor General in Council and approved, and an accident occurs, would the hon. gentleman contend that the government is responsible ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Certainly.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He will not pretend that before a court, I am sure.

Mr. TAYLOR. In support of what my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has stated, I may say that one of the cables from Howe island to the main shore is owned and controlled by the municipality, and a man is paid by the municipality to operate it. The other, at the end of the island, is owned by a private individual. I do not know whether the hon. minister intends to provide that these ferries cannot be operated without making application to his department and paying $5. He says that this does not apply to non-navigable waters. Will the hon. gentleman define navigable and non-navigable water ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman must know that as well as I do—everybody knows what is meant by navigable water.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, will the hon. minister explain ? In referring to the remarks of my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Hughes) he spoke of non-navigable waters. What are non-navigable waters ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Waters on which boats cannot be used for regular transportation. The statute makes it very clear what is navigable water and what is floatable water. I do not see any object in having a debate on the subject.

Mr. TAYLOR. What, in the hon. minister's opinion, is a non-navigable water ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. One that it is not possible to navigate.

Mr. TAYLOR. With what kind of a boat ?

Mr. HEYD. With a canoe ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Even the smallest pond in the country can be navigated with a boat of some kind. So this would apply to every patch of water we have.

Mr. COCHRANE. The minister ought not to dismiss this question with a nod of his head. He seems to think that everybody ought to know what is a navigable water, but, being a layman, I confess that I do not know as much as the minister does on these matters. What is a navigable water ? The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) suggests that any water is navigable on which you can float a canoe. Does the minister agree to that ? Take the case of a river with an island in it. On one side is the boat channel, but on the other, between the island and the shore, boats do not go. Would the part not used be navigable under law ? Or, take the case spoken of by the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor). The island he mentions, if I remember well, is at the foot of Lake Ontario. The farmers have stretched a cable across to the shore in order to work a ferry. That channel may not be used for steamers, but is it or is it not navigable water ? Where municipalities have established these ferries, of course, the ferries are as well managed as they could be by the Department of Marine and Fisheries or any officer the minister might send. If the minister takes this under his control, would he insist upon the municipalities carrying out certain regulations made by his department, and would he insist upon their getting a license ? These are questions which should be answered before we pass this legislation.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think that nobody will deny that the Dominion has jurisdiction over all navigable waters, and that it would be a defiance of Dominion authority for any person to lay a cable in navigable waters that would interfere with navigation. As I understand it, the object of this Bill is to fix the liability. If my hon. friend or some of his friends happened to be navigating a river and met with an accident in consequence of these cables, and if he could not fix the liability anywhere, he would say that the government were neglecting their duty. As I understand the object of the Bill, it is simply to provide that these people shall pay a nominal fee, so that there will be some responsibility, and in order that this work may be carried on without interfering with navigation.

Mr. COCHRANE. Would the minister consider the River Trent, for instance, a navigable stream ? It is not navigable in its present state, but with certain improvements it may be made so.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Laymen like the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) and myself would get into deep water if we undertook to explain the legal meaning of a navigable stream. It may be, as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says, that a stream is navigable on which navigation can be carried on for commercial purposes, unless it has been declared not to be so by Act of parliament.

Mr. CLARKE. Declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are streams that are navigable, and might be construed to be navigable unless they have been declared by Act of parliament non-navigable streams. In such a case the jurisdiction over them would fall within the province instead of the Dominion. There are other streams where, at certain seasons of the year, not even a canoe could be paddled over them, and yet they are legally navigable streams, as I have found in my experience.

Mr. TAYLOR. As I understand the Act defining navigable waters, it places jurisdiction over them in the Department of Public Works. Now, why is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries going to take charge of these ferries when they properly belong to the Department of Public Works ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That may be correct in a general sense, but my hon. friend knows that fisheries and navigable streams are under the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and the old government, I think, put ferries under the Inland Revenue Department. But in a general way, I think my hon. friend is right, and it would be better, in the public interest, that the granting of licenses to these parties should be in the Marine Department rather than in the Public Works Department.

Mr. TAYLOR. If a party wants to build a wharf on any navigable water he must make application to the Department of Public Works, which has control of all navigable waters. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries may think that these cables are interfering with the fish that may resort to these waters. That may be the object of introducing this Bill, for fear that these cables stretching across these waters may interfere with the fisheries; otherwise, I do not see that it has any justification unless it is to bring some grist to his mill, and give him some more patronage. I do not see why we should have legislation spliting up departments, putting one part of a navigable stream under the control of Public Works and another under Marine and Fisheries. If the government have promised to give the Minister of Marine and Fisheries more patronage, let them come down with an Act and define what jurisdiction he has, instead of running in these little annoying Bills, taking parts of jurisdiction away from the

Department of Public Works that properly belongs to it. But aside from that, take the Rideau canal from here to Kingston, I know several of these cable ferries running from one side of the Rideau canal to the other, that have been working for years. Have these people got to stop using these ferries ? I ask the minister to point to a single accident that has ever happened to anybody navigating the waters of the St. Lawrence or of the Rideau canal, in consequence of these cables, or point to any other place in the Dominion, or cite one case where a family was going across in a row-boat and ran against one of these cables and were upset. That happens every day in the week without a cable. People get upset in row-boats and lives are lost. But merely on account of one accident, is he going to put the people of this country to this great inconvenience ? Does he pretend that if a rowboat is paddled over the water that makes it a navigable water ? Then, every stream in the Dominion is a navigable water. I never heard of an accident happening to a steamboat or a sail-boat coming in contact with one of these cables. These cable ferries are a great convenience to the people in all parts of the country, and the people, in order to have communication with each other, have a little boat which they pull across with a cable. That cable lies at the bottom of the river when it is not in use, and will not interfere with anything except when it is used to pull the boat across. Then the people see the ferry moving and can keep out of its way. But the minister wants to make a place for some half dozen men to go round and inspect these cables and collect tolls, putting the public generally to great inconvenience.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the minister had any demand from the province of Ontario for this legislation ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This legislation is not new at all, the principle was adopted nearly 20 years ago when the first Bill was passed regulating the use of navigable waters. That was a consolidation of many previous laws then existing. I refer to chapter 92 of the Act respecting navigable waters, which provides that bridges, booms and so forth shall be regulated in a certain manner, and when a bridge is destroyed and has to be renewed, or when a bridge needs repairs, the plans therefor must be submitted to the Governor General in Council, who will not sanction them unless it is made clear that they will not interfere with navigation or render navigation more difficult. Therefore, this legislation is not at all new. I did not expect, of course, that all these questions would be raised, otherwise I could have looked more deeply into past legislation. But I find that chapter 35 of 49 Victoria, refers to a number of Acts previously existing, which it repealed. Those Acts are the following : 45 Vic., c. 37, respecting bridges over navigable waters constructed under the authority of provincial Acts; 46 Vic., c. 43, respecting booms and other works constructed in navigable waters, whether under the authority of provincial Acts or otherwise ; 46 Vic., c. 44, to amend an Act of the present session respecting booms and other works constructed in navigable waters, whether under the authority of provincial Acts or otherwise; 48-49 Vic., c. 6, to amend the law respectng bridges, booms and other works constructed over or in navigable waters, under the authority of provincial Acts. This law of 1886 is a consolidation of all those statutes.

Mr. COCHRANE. Not a word in those Acts about ferries.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not about ferries, but about all the rest. At that time probably accidents which have occured since had not occurred and it had not been deemed necessary to pass such a law. I have cited accidents on the St. Lawrence river. There was also an accident on the Red river by which a man in a yacht lost his life because the yacht passed at a point where a cable was laid and there was no notice that the cable was there. I do not see that it would be a bad principle to protect the life of a citizen against such accidents as these if at the present time it is a good principle to protect the property only of the people. The law regulating booms, bridges, &c., on navigable waters is in the interest of protecting the life of citizens. It is in the interest of navigation pure and simple. I do not understand the hon. gentleman's argument. The hon. gentleman says that this law is introduced to create some patronage. I do not see where the patronage comes in. You might as well use the same argument whenever you undertake to regulate any matter affecting the public interest. In cities you might as well contend that there should be no police to maintain the law because it might involve a question of patronage. Some one has to see that the law is executed. It is not provided in the Bill that any officers shall be appointed to enforce the Act. It will be executed by the officers of the department. We have officers all over the Dominion and it will not be very much trouble to see that these cables are laid in accordance with the regulations. At the present time telegraph companies lay cables across rivers and streams and for their own protection they lay them in such a way as not to interfere with navigation because it would only be damaging their own property if their cables were interfered with. But, it is not so in regard to movable cables. The hon. gentleman says that they remain at the bottom of the river. That is not so. When the ferry passes from one shore to the other the cable is lifted and that is where the danger comes in. The hon. gen-

tleman says it is very easy for those who navigate those waters to see when the ferry is coming across and that they should guard against danger. Perhaps it is impossible for them to guard against danger if there is a very swift current because there may be no indication that there is a cable at the point at which their vessel or boat is. I think, for all these reasons that this legislation is reasonable and that the objections raised by the hon. gentleman should not be allowed to stand in the way of it. I think that he makes these suggestions only for the sake of wasting time.

Mr. TAYLOR. Because legislation has been passed regulating booms and bridges it is no justification for this legislation. We all know that if a man puts a boom across a navigable water a boat cannot pass. The boom is there and may be an obstruction. The same remark applies to a bridge. Legislation had to be passed to regulate the building of bridges over navigable streams in order that they might be placed at a proper height above the water. But, these cables do not interfere with navigation at all. They are generally put in a narrow stream and not in swift waters.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have seen them in swifter waters than are to be found any place in Ontario or Quebec. I have seen them across the Yukon river and if there is any swifter river in the Dominion of Canada I would like to know it.

Mr. TAYLOR. If they cannot get them anywhere else they may put them in a swift current, but they are generally put in a narrow stream and where the current is not swift. Those at Howe island are less than one-eight of a mile long and there is no boat navigating that water except possibly a row-boat or sail-boat. They can see the ferry as it is starting out and they can remain where they are until the boat reaches the opposite shore. The ferry at Howe island has been operated for the last thirty years by the municipality. I think the city of Kingston furnished the cable and that the municipality of Howe island operates it. At the lower end of Howe island a farmer has a little ferry operated by a cable and if any one wants to get off the island he runs the boat over. It is not operated every hour of the day but only as there is a demand for it. It has never interfered with navigation, there has never been an accident and why should this poor farmer be obliged to come down to Ottawa to see the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in order that he may keep up this ferry for the purpose of accommodating the people of this little island? Why should he have to come down and ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to give him a license and pay him $5 in order that he may be be able to oblige the farmers of Howe island? This government has never contributed a dollar to build a wharf for the poor people of Howe island. The Municipality of this little island built the wharf there, and the hon. minister now says that he will oblige them with a license and take $5 from them. I think it is an outrageous proposition. What is happening there will happen in almost every municipality in Ontario where the people have these little ferries which are operated with a chain or wire cable. I think, as I have said, that it is an outrageous proposition to demand that these people must take out a license to operate these two ferries or be liable to a fine of $100 or more if they fail to do so.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am at a loss to understand the opposition to this Bill. This Bill provides that nobody shall interfere with navigable streams or navigable rivers. Any man who puts a chain across a navigable river puts an obstruction in the river which is liable to cause accident. There may be places where this may be tolerated without any serious inconvenience being caused to anybody, because, although the stream is navigable, it may not be navigated, but there are places where it would be a serious inconvenience to the public if a party were allowed to put such an obstruction in a navigable river. Under such circumstances it seems to me to be only a wise precaution that nobody should be allowed such a privilege without having permission from some authority who can go and look into the circumstances of the case and see whether it is advisable to grant such permission or whether it is inadvisable to allow such a cable to be laid. There may be places where it is advisable and there may be other places where it would not only be the reverse of advisable but perhaps dangerous. Nobody could find fault that it should not be within the power of any man, however meritorious his intention might be, to put an obstruction in a navigable river because the consequences might be very injurious. The statement made by my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) that there are places where little ferries are kept is very true. It does not follow that the owners of these ferries shall be obliged to come to Ottawa and take out a license. It does not follow that they will be obliged to pay $5 for it because the Bill says that the license fee shall not exceed $5. It may be $1, or it may be twenty-five cents. But, the principle of the Bill seems to be a proper one.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not think that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, or perhaps the right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier), has quite considered how far-reaching this is. I may point out a case that comes under my notice almost every day. There are two branches of the river Sydenham, which is navigable for from 12 to 16 miles of its length, and on each of these branches boats are being operated con-

stantly during the season of navigation. This river does not separate municipalities, but it runs through municipalities, and each municipality maintains ferries instead of bridges, as the construction of bridges would entail a greater expense on the municipalities than they could undertake. Under the Ontario Act, there is a provision by which ferries may be established and controlled by municipal councils, and provision is also made for the establishment of ferries between two municipalities, but in that case, of course, the assent of the Lieutenant Governor in Council is necessary. I am putting the simple case where the ferries are established by the one municipality, and on this river there are five or six of these. That is not an interference with navigation, and these ferries are under the control of the municipality, which is responsible for them, and is more concerned than even the department here could be to secure the safety of life and property. The intention cannot be that the municipality, after operating one of these ferries for half a century, having the greatest care for the protection of life, should have to come down here to ask for consent.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I desire to move that the committee rise and report progress, because the hon. member for Two Mountains (Mr. Ethier) has a Bill from the Senate which he desires to put on the Order paper before six o'clock.

Progress reported.

OTTAWA VALLEY RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. ETHIER moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 264) respecting the Ottawa Valley Railway Company.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and second times, and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

NORTH SYDNEY HARBOUR.

Bill (No. 262) to amend the Act respecting the harbour of North Sydney, in Nova Scotia, read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This is the style of drafting which I think is objectionable, inasmuch as looking at the Bill one has no idea whatever as to the effect of the amendment proposed. Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to read to us section 8 as it will read after this amendment has been passed ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (reading) :

The salary of the harbour master shall be at the rate of not exceeding five hundred dollars per annum.

On section 2,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This section is open to the same objection. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to read section 10 of the Act as it will be after this amendment is passed ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (reading) :

The said harbour dues shall be collected by the collector of customs at the said port, who shall not grant entry inwards or clearance outwards to any ship until the harbour dues on her are paid ; and shall, after deducting five per cent for his remuneration, pay the balance.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SHIPPING CASUALTIES ACT.

Bill (No. 263) to amend the Shipping Casualties Act, 1901, read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. CLARKE. What does that mean.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It means that in case of stranded vessels there shall be an investigation held. That has not been provided for before.

On section 2,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman was to give us the recommendations of the British Board of Trade in regard to this matter on the second reading of the Bill, or, as we would have preferred, at some previous stage.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The object of the amendment is to enable the minister to appoint a permanent commissioner. An accident happens, it is reported to the department, and the minister happens to be absent, or for some reason or other he cannot be reached at once, and the matter is delayed. On the representations made to the department by the British Board of Trade, we have thought that it would be in the interest of navigation and for the improvement of the St. Lawrence route if in such cases it should not be necessary for the commissioner to wait the arrival of the minister to get the necessary authorization. I think the members of the committee will see that no harm can result from this, because the officer who is charged by the department to hold these investigations is generally the same officer, and he appoints his assessors. By this amendment he will not be delayed in holding the investigation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend promised us, when the resolution was going through the Committee of the Whole, that

he would produce the request of the British Board of Trade. It is that I was referring to.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not with me to-night, owing to the absence of the deputy minister, the representations which were made to the department on this subject. But I suppose the hon. gentleman will take my word that this amendment has been demanded in the interests of navigation and shipping.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, I would be happy to take my hon. friend's word, although he has hardly kept his promise with regard to producing the document. We might look at the suggestions of the British Board of Trade from a different standpoint; and, as the hon. gentleman was making some material changes in the Act, I thought it would be just as well to have their recommendation before the House when considering the Bill. Perhaps we might let it stand in committee until my hon. friend brings down this document.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We might delay the third reading, in order to produce this correspondence. After all, this is only a domestic Bill. It is only a matter of organization in the department. I will bring down the demands that have been made and the suggestions regarding the amendments which are considered fair and reasonable.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think that would be satisfactory. If my hon. friend will undertake to produce those suggestions and let me have an opportunity of looking at them before the third reading, that will suit. Will he be good enough to let me know when he does lay them on the Table, in case I should not be in the House at the time, so that I may have an opportunity of reading them before the third reading.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will send them directly to the hon. gentleman.

On section 3,

Mr. CLARKE. This is intended to apply to masters, mates or engineers. Why not apply it also to pilots ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Because there is a Pilotage Act which deals with them.

Mr. CLARKE. What provision is there in the Pilotage Act to cover such cases ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Chapter 180 of the Revised Statutes of Canada contains all the provisions respecting pilots.

Mr. CLARKE. As I understand it, this Bill is intended to provide speedy means of inquiry into marine casualties, but the power given the officials appointed to investigate only covers certain officers. Why not make it competent for them to inquire into the conduct of the pilot ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Because all that is dealt with in the Pilotage Act. We have special legislation as regards pilots.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Take the case of a stranded steamer in which it is perfectly clear the stranding is due to the fault of some one. There is a dispute as to whether it was due to the fault of the pilot or the captain or some of the officers. You are taking power to investigate the conduct of the officers, but can you use the investigation for the purpose of dealing with the pilot. If not, why should you make any distinction between the masters or officers and the pilot.

Mr. CLARKE. Especially as it is not likely you could know in advance who is responsible. It might be the pilot.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Investigation into the conduct of pilots is provided for in chapter 80 of 49 Victoria. And I may say that one of the reasons advanced in favour of the Department of Marine and Fisheries taking charge of the pilotage between Montreal and Quebec and the River Saguenay is precisely the reason advanced by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke). In order to put the whole thing under one control, another Bill has been introduced ; the consideration of which has been postponed until Tuesday next. This Bill will have the effect of putting under control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries investigations to be held as regards the conduct of pilots. That is under chapter 74 of 49 Victoria.

Mr. CLARKE. But this Act contemplates the appointment of an official to inquire into cases of stranding and so on. Why not give this officer power to deal with the pilot as well as with the master, mate and engineer ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot do it under this Bill, and that is why another Bill has been introduced. If that passes, then, under the amended law, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would be authorized to make regulations and give power to an officer to investigate casualties, and to take cognizance of offences of the pilot as well of the other officers. I think it is a good move and, as I stated when that Bill was under discussion, it has been recommended by the Board of Trade of Montreal, the shipping interests, and the harbour commissioners. And, to the credit of the pilots of the district, I must say that they have unanimously asked to be taken under control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. That is the reason for bringing the Bill before the House.

Mr. CLARKE. Suppose that an investigation is held under the provisions of the Bill now before us and the investigating officer finds that the master, engineer and mate are blameless, but that it is the pilot who is responsible, what will be the modus then ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Under the Act which I am proposing to amend by this Bill, the investigating officer will have no authority, because it is a different class of people who have to be dealt with and they must be dealt with in a different manner and under a different law. But, in order to attain the end that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) desires, the Pilotage Act also will be amended so that the commissioner who is called upon to investigate casualties under the Act may investigate, at the same time, the conduct of the pilot but with a little difference because there are certain provisions which will be followed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the Bill to which the minister refers printed ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes. It is the Bill, the consideration of which has been postponed until Tuesday, at the request of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax), in order to allow the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) to be present when it is discussed. Under that Bill the pilotage authority which now rests with the Harbour Board of Montreal, will be transferred, with the consent of everybody, to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And Quebec too ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, as regards Quebec, I have to say that we have been unable to come to an understanding. And we do not care to coerce them. After all, as everybody consents to the change that is proposed respecting pilots between Montreal and Quebec, it might be just as well to wait and see how this law works. If it is satisfactory, no doubt the pilotage authority of Quebec will come to the same conclusion as that of Montreal, and so the authority of the Department of Marine and Fisheries will be extended, with the consent of the harbour board and pilots of the district of Quebc.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Prefontaine) refer to Bill (No. 261) respecting the pilotage district of Montreal and the port and pilotage district of Quebec, as the Bill that has been fixed for consideration for Tuesday next ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. In what way do the provisions of this Bill bring the pilot who m y be in charge of a vessel below Quebec, for instance, and who may be found to have been derelict in his duty in case of stranding or other accident, under the discipline—if I may use the term—of the commissioner who is to inquire into cases of marine accident ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It will not bring the pilots below Quebec under the authority of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, for the reasons I have explained, that we could not come to an understanding with the pilots and harbour commissioners of Quebec. So, the law regarding casualties cannot be adopted to apply to those pilots. But, under the authority of the law that is proposed, it will apply to the pilots from Montreal to Quebec.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think the hon. minister has quite met what is suggested by my hon. friend form West Toronto (Mr. Clarke). The Bill (No. 261) will place the pilots between Montreal and Quebec under control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but not so the pilots below Quebec. This Bill that we are discussing will have no effect upon them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Of course not. If I had succeeded in getting the control of all the pilots on the St. Lawrence route I could have consolidated the two laws. But, as the control by the pilotage authority of Quebec over their own pilots remains, including the control of investigations, I thought we might as well leave the two laws existing, but change the authority vested in the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. If, in a year or two, it is possible to come to an understanding with the pilotage authority of Quebec, we can consolidate the two laws, and have authority which will deal with faults or negligence on the part not only of masters, mates and engineers, but of pilots as well.

Mr. CLARKE. I believe the hon. minister is working in the right line. Personally, from all I have been able to gather concerning the state of affairs, I think it is better to have the authority vested in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. But take section 21 of the Act as it is proposed under this Bill :

> The certificate of a master, mate, or engineer may be cancelled or suspended by a court holding a formal investigation, if the court finds that any loss, or damage, or the abandonment or stranding of any ship, or any loss of life has been caused by the wrongful act or default of such master, mate, or engineer——

and so on. I would ask the minister if it is not possible and practicable to add the word ' pilot ' either before or after ' master,' mate or engineer,' so as to give the commissioner who is to be appointed under the provisions of this Act, power, after having made an investigation if he finds a pilot

guilty of dereliction of duty, to impose a penalty upon him ? This Bill only gives the commissioner power to impose a penalty upon a master, a mate or an engineer ; why not include the pilot as well, if he is the officer of the ship who was primarily responsible for the accident ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. For the reason I have explained. On account of the misunderstanding that exists we have to keep the two statutes separate. I have explained that the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec, and the shipping interests as well as the pilots, who are a corporation, were strongly opposed to any change.

Mr. CLARKE. Have we not power in this parliament to make any regulation we please ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly we have, but it would be a change involving the obliteration to a certain extent of a corporation which has existed for nearly a century. The pilots are jealous of their rights and privileges, and think they can manage their own affairs better under present conditions than the Department of Marine and Fisheries could do it for them. Well, after studying the question, we thought the present was not an opportune time to force them, especially in view of the fact that the shipping interests were not favourable to a change. If the shipping interests were favourable to the change we might then have concluded that, in the interest of transportation and of the safety of the St. Lawrence route, we would be justified in ignoring the prejudices of the pilots, and passing such a law as we thought proper. But none of the interested parties were willing that we should make the change, in fact they all opposed it ; so we concluded that if we could not get a whole loaf, we would take a half loaf. In the city of Montreal the case is different, for there all the interested parties acceded to the wish of the government, and we are proposing a law which will be discussed by this House in a few days that will apply to Montreal. We could have included in the provisions of that Bill the Quebec pilots as well as those of Montreal, and bring them all under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but, as I have explained, the Quebec pilots and the shipping interests there were opposed to it.

Mr. CLARKE. Then this Bill does not interfere with the pilots, and does not apply to any investigation into their conduct ? Is the government afraid to tackle the question ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, we are not afraid of the pilots, but when we found that all the interested parties, all those who were interested in making the navigation as safe as possible were opposed to the change, we did not insist upon making the change.

Mr. CLARKE. Did the harbour commissioners and the shipping interests oppose this Bill, or did they suggest that the government should not make provision in this measure for the appointment of a commissioner to inquire into the conduct of the pilots as well as into that of the masters and mates ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They did. The harbour commissioners, the shipping interests as well as the corporation of pilots all opposed any change. I sent the same memorandum to the harbour commissioners at Quebec, to the pilots and the shipping interests of Quebec, that I sent to the shipping interests in Montreal, to the board of trade and to the pilots of Montreal. In Montreal everybody consented to the change and approved of it, asked that it should be made ; in Quebec, on the other hand, they all opposed it.

Mr. CLARKE. If it is in the public interest that a speedy and efficient means should be adopted to ascertain the cause of marine accidents and to impose penalties upon the officer responsible therefor, whether it be a master, a mate or an engineer, why should it not apply as well to the pilot, if he is the person in charge at the time the accident takes place ? Why not make a provision in this Bill to impose a penalty upon him ? I presume the minister is not consulting the interests solely of the pilots in Quebec or Montreal, but of the shipping interests generally, and endeavouring to improve the reputation which the St. Lawrence has. I think this is a very commendable Act, and I cannot understand why the government did not include pilots in the list of officers who may be dealt with by the commissioner.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It appears that I have failed to make myself understood by the hon. gentleman. I said that the pilots of Quebec, the harbour commissioners and the shipping interests of Quebec were all opposed to any change.

Mr. CLARKE. Opposed to the government providing a simple means of having an investigation speedily made into the cause of accidents to vessels ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. They have that already in Quebec.

Mr. CLARKE. Is this Bill to apply only to the river between Quebec and Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. With respect to pilots, yes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This Act does not apply at all to pilots, but only to masters, mates and

engineers. The corporation of pilots is dealt with by a different law. The pilotage authority will be amended as regards the district of Montreal, but it will not be amended as regards the district of Quebec, because in the latter place everybody is opposed to it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I may be allowed to say a word with respect to the conditions existing at Quebec. The pilotage authority for the St. Lawrence is divided into two parts. For that part of the St. Lawrence extending from Quebec eastward to the gulf, it is under the control of the harbour commissioners of Quebec. The harbour commissioners of Quebec have succeeded to what was formerly known as the Trinity Board, and they are now the pilotage authority. They are the authority having absolute control over the pilots' certificates, and they alone can grant a certificate to a pilot, they alone can withdraw the certificate in case of default or misconduct on the part of the pilot. With respect to the pilotage between Quebec and Montreal, heretofore the pilots were under the control of the Montreal harbour commissioners. The Montreal harbour commissioners, as I understand it, granted the pilots' certificates and also had control over the pilots in case of an accident in the river. My hon. friend introduced this Bill for the purpose of dealing with masters, mates or engineers. These are under the control of the Marine and Fisheries Department, their certificates are under the control of that department who can deal with them under the law, and they now have the power of appointing a commissioner, acting under the Department of Marine and Fisheries, for the purpose of dealing with their certificates. They can deal with them in so far as they deal with the certificates of masters, mates or engineers who are under the control of the Marine and Fisheries Department. But, take a certificate of an English captain who comes out here. This certificate can only be dealt with by the board of trade on the other side. In so far as pilots between Montreal and Quebec are concerned, my hon. friend intends by the Bill that he proposes to deal with on Monday next (Bill 261) to place the pilots between Montreal and Quebec under the control of the Marine and Fisheries Department. If that is done, then, it will be optional with him to allow this officer, whoever he may be, to investigate all matters connected with the pilots there because they will be under his control. But, as the pilots below Quebec are left under the control of the Quebec Harbour Commissioners, the investigation in the case of an accident is held by the Harbour Commissioners. I may say that the investigation is as speedy as could possibly take place here, because the Quebec Harbour Commissioners are made up of a certain number of gentlemen who are appointed by the government, men representing the city of Quebec, the ship-owners and the merchants and for the purposes of pilotage there is added to the board the president of the corporation of pilots, a gentleman possessing expert knowledge. So that, there is a very speedy mode of dealing with the pilot at the time the accident occurs. The captain is obliged by law to report the accident forthwith and the Quebec Harbour Commissioners are obliged to hold this investigation. They have held these investigations and the results have been fairly satisfactory. As my hon. friend pointed out, when it was suggested to make a change all those interested in Quebec opposed any change. Speaking for myself personally I think it would be in the interests of the shipping of the St. Lawrence if all these accidents which occur on the St. Lawrence below as well as above Quebec were investigated by a court of competent jurisdiction, or by the admiralty court. I would like to place these investigations absolutely beyond the control of such a thing as local influence and I think it would be a step in the right direction if my hon. friend could see his way clear to make a change so that whenever an accident occurs on the St. Lawrence it would be promptly investigated by the admiralty court, a court which is absolutely qualified to investigate these measures, and the judges of which court have power to appoint assessors for the purpose of assisting them in work of that sort.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Do the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec get power to deal with these matters under the Pilotage Act or under some special legislation applicable to them ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The Act which is applicable to the harbour commissioners gives them power to deal with these matters independently of the Act respecting pilots.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is not under the general Pilotage Act that they proceed ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No. Chapter 80 of the Revised Statutes provides for the functions of these commissioners and they get control of the matter under their Act.

Mr. CLARKE. Am I correct in saying that the hon. Minister of Justice has just stated that the powers of the Quebec Harbour Commissioners are limited to investigating the conduct of pilots ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, they have no jurisdiction to deal with engineers, mates or masters, because they have no control over their certificates.

Mr. CLARKE. May I ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries if there was

an investigation held into the accident to the Carolina wrecked in the Saguenay some time ago ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not yet.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there going to be an investigation ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, instructions have been given.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That does not come under the control of the Pilotage Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The difficulty about the position, notwithstanding what the hon. Minister of Justice says, is this : I have had some experience in connection with the investigation of accidents under the very Act which is now being amended. Take such a case as that of the French steamship La Burgoyne which collided with the English ship Cromartyshire off the coast of Nova Scotia. We had an investigation under this statute and examined a number of persons who were not ordinarily resident in the province. They were witnesses who were going away in two, three or four days. They could never have been made available for an investigation by the Pilotage Commission, because the commission would not act quickly enough for that. The investigation was held two or three days after the arrival of the damaged ship in the Halifax harbour. If the suggestion of my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) could be accepted, the evidence obtained in that way could be made available not only for dealing with the masters, officers and engineers, but for dealing with the pilots, whereas under the law as it stands at the present time, you cannot thus deal with the pilots. Suppose a collision should take place off the harbour of Halifax and the witnesses left in, two, three or four days, or immediately after the investigation under this statute, how are you to get your evidence for the purpose of the investigation into the conduct of the pilots before the Pilotage Commission ? There should be no need of doing the work over again because the evidence which is available for dealing with the masters, engineers and officers should be available in considering the case of the pilot. You close your investigation and the commissioner reports. You can deal with the masters, engineers and officers, but you cannot deal with the pilots. You may go on and hold your investigation before the Pilotage Commission but you cannot make the same evidence available and that seems to be a strong feature of the suggestion which my hon. friend makes. The pilots stand apart—in a different class altogether.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I admit that the difficulty exists. We are trying to correct these difficulties but it takes some time to convince people that certain things should be done in a certain way. That is the reason why we have been obliged to proceed slowly, but we are moving as quickly as possible towards the point that we desire to attain. In regard to the pilotage of the Montreal district, if the department had gone into this question without a spirit of conciliation or without a little diplomacy we would have been face to face with very great opposition. The Harbour Commissioners of Montreal might have been as jealous of their privileges as the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec have been, and they might have said : You are taking away part of our privileges and we object to it. The pilots might have said : We would rather be under the control of the Harbour Commission of Montreal because we know the members of the commission and the result would have been that this change might have been delayed for two or three years more. Instead of that we used persuasion, and we tried to convince them that it was in their own interests and in the interest of shipping that this change should be made. They have consented with a good grace and I hope this will be found to be a move in the right direction. I hope that the district of Quebec will come to the same conclusion, especially if this law gives satisfaction to the shipping interests.

Mr. CLARKE. I notice in to-day's paper an account of an accident which occurred to the steamer 'Hibernian' leaving the port of Montreal, within a mile or two of her dock. An accident of a similar nature occurred to another steamer about two months ago right in the harbour of Montreal. Was there an investigation into the circumstances of that accident ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There was.

Mr. CLARKE. Might I ask the result ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The accident was found not to be the result of any fault of any of the officers ; it was a pure accident that might happen at any time. The accident was due to the fact that at the moment when the steamer was turning around to take the channel, when it was essential that the pilot should be able to see in order to clear his course, a very heavy storm broke over the ship so that the pilot could not see ten feet before him ; the boat sheered and went aground. There was no fault on the part of the officers. It appears from information I have gathered in the department that the accident this morning occurred under somewhat similar circumstances. I do not wish to pre-judge the case, but it seems from information we have received that possibly those in charge of the steamer allowed the tug to leave her at a point too high in the

channel. An ordinance has been adopted by the harbour commissioners providing that steamship companies are not to allow the tugs to leave their steamers until they come to Maisonneuve, about a mile below the point where the accident occurred this morning, and it may be discovered that the accident was due to the fact that having full confidence that everything was all right, the tug let go and the steamer took a sheer. These accidents are sometimes due to special circumstances, and in this case it is stated that the steering apparatus became entangled in some way just at that moment. Of course, we will know the cause of the accident after the investigation has taken place.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY—RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the motion passes, might I again inquire as to whether the government proposes to bring down any railway subsidies, and if so, when we may expect to have them ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, railway subsidies will be brought down, I hope on Monday, certainly not later than Tuesday.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We will take up an item in the main estimates that seems to have been overlooked.

New Brunswick—harbours and rivers—Campbellton wharf, extension and repairs, $14,400.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think that this item was passed in a previous sitting but there seems to be a misunderstanding about that. It was allowed to stand at one time. The question arose as to whether the property was being acquired by the department by purchase or whether it was being acquired by expropriation. The information was not furnished to me by the officers of the department at the time, but I find that the property is being acquired by expropriation, and the matter is now in the Justice Department. They were served with notice under the Act and the property was taken over by the government at the time, but we have not yet had a report from the Justice Department regarding the matter.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Might I ask the minister why the item stood ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, I was not able to inform the House how the department was acquiring this property which belonged, I think, to a Mr. Shives, of Campbellton, New Brunswick.

Mr. CLARKE. The government is acquiring it in the regular way ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The government is acquiring it by expropriation and the property is now occupied by the Marine Department. It is returning good revenue.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will take up the supplementary estimates for the Public Works Department at page 9.

Public buildings, Ontario—Ottawa Parliament Buildings—additional accommodation, &c., $7,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is intended to cover some further improvements in the attic of this building, which have been asked for by the senators. They complain that their committee room is rather small, and they have made application to the department for a larger one.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In this connection I would like to ask the minister to put the lavatories and bathrooms of the House of Commons into a somewhat more modern condition. There is not a shower bath in the whole establishment.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will ask the engineer to look into that matter.

Mr. CLARKE. I must say that the senators set us a good example. When we go to that end of the building and see what commodious accommodation they have, they put us to the blush.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are living in hope that we may reach there some day.

Mr. CLARKE. In the meantime, it might be well for us to pay a little more attention to the accommodation we have here, though perhaps some of us may not require it very much longer. In this connection I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the atmosphere that permeates some of the rooms. Through the courtesy of the hon. gentleman, several of us have a room up stairs ; but that room, after it has been closed for ten or twelve hours, is positively not habitable for some time after the door is opened. There must be something radically wrong with the ventilation, not only of that room, but of several other rooms and of this Chamber as well. If the hon. minister would look into the subject of the ventilation of all the rooms of this building, he would do the members a substantial service.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The ventilation of this building has been a subject of discussion almost every session. I think there has been some improvement in this Chamber from the fans which have been put in. I am inclined to think that while the air is close, we get more fresh

air than formerly, and without a draft. Owing to the construction of the building, it seems impossible to keep the air fresh. I will bring the remarks of my hon. friend to the attention of the chief architect.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The accommodation around the House of Commons for people who have to do any work is very bad. I have got so tired of calling attention to the kind of accommodation we have in the vicinity of No. 6 and No. 4 that I am almost ashamed to mention it again. My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Clarke) comforts me with the assurance that No. 6 and No. 4 will not matter much to us after this session, whatever he means by that. If there is to be any additional accommodation for the Senate side, I would be inclined also to put in a claim for the House of Commons side. We have 214 members here, some of whom have to do a good deal of work during the session, and they have their choice of doing it either in the House, when they should be listening to what is going on, or doing it under circumstances of very great inconvenience. Members are frequently obliged to hold interviews with people in the hall or in one of the corridors; and when I hold an interview with any gentleman who comes to see me I have to do it to the accompaniment of the click of the typewriter, or else the stenographer in my room has to go out into the hall and wait till the conference is over. While I do not know very much about the disposition of the rooms available at present, I certainly do think that the House of Commons side is in need of additional accommodation, perhaps to a greater extent than the Upper House.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no doubt considerable lack of accommodation. The ministers themselves have not the proper accommodation to receive those who want to see them. Parties desiring to interview the ministers have to wait out in the corridors. We are proposing, however, to give from six to eight additional rooms for the accommodation of members by fixing up the upper flat. There are some rooms to be fitted up on the commons side in addition to enlarging the committee room on the Senate side.

Mr. BELL. The most important change required is the ventilation of this chamber. Although this subject has been discussed hundreds of times and efforts made from time to time to improve the ventilation, still it is very bad. After the House has been in session a number of hours, and particularly when the gallaries are filled, the air is almost poisonous. I would suggest that the Minister of Public Works should get some of the chemists in the department to test the air after the House has been some hours in session ; and if they demonstrate that it is dangerous to human life, possibly something may then be done to improve it. A good many years ago, while the subject of ventilation began to attract attention in London, specimens of the atmosphere were collected in some of the court houses and houses of parliament and other public buildings, at certain hours when the ar was in a vitiated condition, and analysed, and it was found that it was a source of danger to the lives of those who were compelled to breathe it. A good many of our members can obtain relief by remaining away, but those who desire to attend public business steadily, have to sit here almost continually when the House is in session and there can be no doubt that they suffer from the bad effects of breathing a vitiated atmosphere. So far as I can judge by my sense of smell, it is certainly not advisable to breathe the air of this chamber any length of time. Still, as one may be deceived by his senses, I would suggest that we should utilize the services of some of the skilful chemists in the government departments and get them to inform us of the exact character of that atmosphere in this chamber. Almost every prominent public man in Canada, ever since we have had a parliament has complained from time to time on this subject. I remember reading a speech of Mr. Edward Blake, in which he complained that he was actually suffering from a species of poisoning when condemned to spend long hours in the House. He was afflicted with head-aches, which he had every reason to believe were caused by the impure air. It is notorious that a great many members suffer from illness during the session. Any one who comes in here from the pure fresh air, after the House has been in session some time, can satisfy himself that it must be the cause of a great deal of the ill-health of members of parliament. It is discreditable to us that such a condition should not be remedied. No man can do his best work intellectually when he is not breathing pure air. A foul atmosphere causes excessive drowsiness which is a species of poisoning. If we are to do our best in this parliament, the atmosphere must be purified.

Mr. CLARKE. Especially the political atmosphere.

Mr. BELL. I am not going to introduce anything of a partisan character. I am very much in favour of having something done. For the last thirty-six years this subject has been discussed but nothing satisfactory has as yet been done. No doubt the officials in charge of the ventilation are doing their best with the facilities at their command, still no reasonable man who has to spend hours in this chamber can fail to feel the ill effects of this vitiated atmosphere. But unless some demonstration be obtained, which can easily be had by making use of skilful scientific men, of the actual con-

dition of affairs, we will go on suffering the same evils.

Mr. CHARLTON. This question of the ventilation of the chamber has provoked a good deal of discussion. The problem of securing adequate and proper ventilation is indeed a most difficult one. This chamber in which we are assembled is a box surrounded by passages, with no sunlight except at these upper windows, and they are made as dark as possible. The radical defects in the construction of the building are so great that it is, perhaps, almost impossible to thoroughly remedy the difficulties under which we labour. I imagine that if we had these passages taken out and had this room extended to where we could get sunlight in through the windows and get air when we need it, a great improvement would be affected.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is this change the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) suggests ?

Mr. CHARLTON. I am about to suggest a slight amelioration of the condition. We have at last, I believe, adopted a plan that I advocated for years, of forcing air into the Chamber by means of fans. Formerly the air was brought in by subterranean ducts from openings at the side of the hill. Thus, the air came to us practically through sewers, and it was poisonous and deleterious to our health. A good many long discussions had to take place before we could secure the remedy of that evil. I believe the air is brought in now from where it is pure and forced in by fans. If we would adopt the precaution of allowing the air to escape, and so establish a current through the building, we should have tolerably fresh air. But there is a singular dislike on the part of many individuals to the feeling of a current of air. I have noticed it in crossing the continent on the train. If an attempt is made to ventilate the car, about half the inmates object, the ventilators have to be closed and the air left vitiated and impure. We used to have windows opened at the top of this Chamber. I am told that, in consequence of putting in the fans, the opening of windows is not advisable, because the fresh air escapes by the windows, while the foul air settles near the floor. If we could have the doors and the outside windows open, and allow the air to pass in and out, the air in the Chamber would be improved. I frequently secure the privilege of having that done, and when it is done, I can realize almost instantly the improvement of the atmosphere in the Chamber. But when it is done persons in the Chamber complain of draught ; then the doors must be closed and the current of air stopped. The atmosphere is allowed to stagnate and so to become foul. I advise that the doors be kept open when the weather is moderate enough to allow of this being done without danger. If the doors are kept closed, the air that is forced in lies dead and grows stagnant, carbonic acid gas is formed and the atmosphere grows more and more deleterious. And the consequence is, as my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) suggests, headaches, lassitude and depression, and all the other results that attend foul and vitiated air. Whether we can ever thoroughly remedy the defects of the ventilation of the Chamber is a question ; but the simple plan I have suggested would give relief. Why it is not permitted, I am unable to understand. Of course, there may be a little current of air in some part of the Chamber that may not be pleasant, but that can be met by putting on additional clothing if a person feels the draught. I secure the opening of doors when Mr. Speaker is in the Chair, and I hear no complaints. If we were simply to allow the air to enter and leave the Chamber that would be a partial remedy of the evils from which we suffer.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few words on this subject of ventilation, as I think the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) who has just taken his seat are directed at me. When the windows and doors are open, there is, as you can well understand, a draught passing through the Chamber, and those of us who sit at the Table have our legs bathed in cold air. All three of us, after some hours of such an experience, have had our legs as numb as they can be to the knee. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat is not very often in the House, nor does he remain very long when he comes. He is free to come in and go out as he pleases. And I have told him, when he has come to me to have the doors open, that it is well enough for one who is free to enter or leave the Chamber, but that I was nailed to my seat for about seven hours a day for months past. The hon. gentleman could go out and get fresh air if he wanted it, without compelling myself and others to sit in a draught that would bring on illness. Regarding the thing simply as a matter of self-preservation, I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) is safer in his seat than I in mine, and he should have some compassion and pity on those of us who are forced to remain in the Chamber.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Might I ask why Mr. Deputy Speaker does not, under such circumstances, call the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to the Chair ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think that is what I shall have to do.

Mr. CHARLTON. I shall be glad to show that it can be done without injury to one's health.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Let me tell hon. gentlemen of another thing which nearly destroyed us who sit at the Table. Under the Table is a box that covers a register, through which a fan down below drives cold air. The cold air, striking the under side of the Table, was carried along so that we who sat at the Table had our legs bathed in it constantly. The 'Hansard' reporters were often forced to raise the lid of the letter-box at the end of the Table so as to keep this cold air from blowing in their faces. After two or three sessions, I discovered by accident last year that there was such a trap for our health, and, of course, I went to the engineer and had it closed. I believe I have the thanks of the parties who were being destroyed by this system of ventilation for what I did. Unless a better system of ventilation were adopted I certainly would resign my position and go home, rather than stay in the draught between the doors and windows. Then, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) were appointed to my place, he also would go home, not to his own house, but to his long home.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Eight or nine years ago this matter received a good deal of attention, and I was requested by some hon. gentlemen then on the government benches to look into it. As a result of suggestions of mine, some improvements were made in various parts of the building. My object was to draw the foul air off. That was the proper principle. The foul air could be drawn out below and the pure air sent in higher up. You will find that the case at the present moment. At times the atmosphere is almost unbearable in this Chamber. The temperature at the present time is nearly 70; that is too high for men to sit long in one room. I am satisfied that a very simple principle of ventilation could be evolved. The system at present in vogue appears to be this: The air is forced in over the towers from the underground ducts below. It enters the Chamber from above the galleries. It is bumped over the towers on the sides of the Chamber at both ends. I do not know where it comes in, but it should come in from points high up in this Chamber, and should come in in good volume. If necessary that air could be warmed in cold weather, so that it would not be dangerous to hon. gentlemen who are getting baldheaded. But if taken hold of in a business-like way, I think a satisfactory system could be evolved, and I trust the Minister of Public Works, before he leaves the office, will secure for us a modern system of ventilation by which the air is drawn out at the bottom and brought in, either cold or warm, at the top.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will bring the remarks of the hon. gentleman to the attention of the chief architect, who I know has given a great deal of attention to this matter. I am afraid that it is owing to the peculiar construction of the building that we have this difficulty.

Mr. WILSON. I have not heard any very lucid explanation of this $7,000 that is asked for. I have not heard of any plan being submitted. I think the minister ought to give us some idea of what is to be done with this money. He says in a general way there is some fixing up to be done in the third or fourth stories.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not got detailed plans and specifications.

Mr. WILSON. Tell us how you got that $7,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have taken $10,000 in the main estimates, and I then gave all the information of the purposes for which it was required. In addition we are asking for this $7,000 with which the chief architect informs me he can fit up additional rooms in the attic, I think three or four. Then a committee of the Senate consisting of the Speaker, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, and the Clerk, I think, waited upon me and asked that some change should be made in the Senate Committee Room. The chief architect thinks that with this $7,000 additional he will be able to make the improvements that were asked for.

Harbours and rivers—Port Arthur and Fort William, additional dredging, $75,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is the amount which the chief engineer thinks should be spent at present in these harbours under the plan we have adopted. All the details of the plan have not yet been worked out. The total cost at Port Arthur under the general plan will be about $163,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Is that all for dredging?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Practically. It gives twenty-one feet clear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this work to be done both in the harbour at Port Arthur and on the river?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does it involve any work on the Mission river?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. I gathered together all the plans and asked the engineer to make a report. The general plan as outlined here is being carried out. All the appropriations have been spent under a general plan at Port Arthur and Fort William. These improvements will cost in the neighbourhood of $500,000. Those to be done with this money are the most urgent, so that boats may be enabled to get up to the present wharf.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the present expenditure involve the deepening of the Mission river, or is that only part of the larger plan ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All this work is being carried out under a general plan, and includes the deepening of the Mission river and of the Kaministiquia river, and the dredging for the wharf. I do not think any work will be started on land this season.

Mr. CLARKE. How much is to be spent on the Kaministiquia river ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think, to make all the improvements provided under that plan, it will take about $115,000.

Mr. CLARKE. What depth of water will there be in the river ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Twenty-one feet clear.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Is this work being done by contract or by day labour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think most of the dredging is done by contract, at fifteen cents a yard.

Mr. BROCK. I would like to ask the minister if this sum is in addition to the large amounts of money that have been spent in these harbours during the last five or six years, now amounting to an enormous sum. This is in addition to the very large amount of money that was spent on these harbours during the last eight or ten years. You are going to spend a large amount of money on this harbour. I suppose this is to accommodate the large vessels going in there and taking cargoes of grain from that port. I did expect that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) would rise up in his might and say that we are wasting the money of this country, because we are going to be able to carry such enormous quantities of grain by the cheap route that he is advocating that this harbour will become useless. You must accept one horn of the dilemma or the other. We must understand whether we are going to spend this money well in improving our water-ways or whether we are going to spend a large amount of money badly so that as the hon. member for North Norfolk has said grain can be carried so much more cheaply by the all-the-year-round route that he speaks of. I do not know why we should go on and spend so much money on a harbour which is going to be closed up during a portion of the year. Either one plan or the other must be at fault and I would like to know which plan is at fault.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman should bear in mind that the blessings to be derived from the transcontinental railway, which will be all that I have depicted, cannot be secured to the country for five or six years yet. In the meantime, we will need to improve our present methods of transportation from the west, and I apprehend that we shall never entirely dispense with the lake route for reaching the sea. In looking to the future, we have the fact before us that in all probability we shall have a very large market for our food products in the United States. The tendency in the agricultural states is to lessen, year by year, the produtcion of wheat. I remember when the state of Illinois and the state of Iowa were great wheat-producing states, when these two states made a leading business of the production of wheat. To-day neither of these two states grows its own bread.

Mr. BROCK. Does our grain go in there duty free ?

Mr. CHARLTON. You can travel over both of these states for hours and hours without seeing an acre of wheat. It is said that the state of Minnesota will cease to produce its own bread within 25 years. Under this condition of things, with the urban population of the United States increasing as rapidly as it is, and there being ten millions or twelve millions of inhabitants in the cities of the central and middle states, we look forward to the time when the United States will be a very large consumer of the food products of our western prairies. Already there is an agitation in the United States for the removal of the duty upon wheat. The removal of the duty upon wheat will be secured in a comparatively short time. When we reach that enormous market we will not reach it to any great extend by the transcontinental railway. The transcontinental railway will serve the purpose of carrying our export wheat on its way to Europe, but with the cities that are now existing, the cities that are growing rapidly, and with the towns of over 4,000 population, having a large number of inhabitants in New England and the middle states, the time is coming when they will depend very largely upon the prairies in the Northwest for their food, and while building the transcontinental railway will improve our facilities for reaching the market of the world and will secure, as far as circumstances will allow, the trade for our own seaports, we will still have in that great country, which has now a population of eighty millions, and likely to be one hundred millions within the life of some men in this House, an ever-increasing market. The shackles placed upon the trade of these two countries will be removed to a large extent, and we shall need the great lakes, we shall need the harbour of Port Arthur with 21 or 22 feet of water, we shall need improved facilities for navigation upon the lakes, and this will not interfere with the operation of the transcontinental railway or with any other mode of communication that we may adopt for reaching our own sea-

ports for the purpose of exporting our food products to Europe.

Mr. BROCK. We are really grateful for this essay, this delightful word picture, from the hon. member for North Norfolk. While it is not very practical, it is certainly very pleasing to listen to. We are going to have the markets of the United States as a result of the deepening of the channel that we are now speaking of. This is going to afford us a market in the United States of one hundred million people. We have it on authority of the hon. member (Mr. Charlton) that the United States are going to remove the duty on wheat and breadstuffs and allow the products of this country to go in free, and on that account we are required to deepen the waters of Port Arthur. I do not know what traffic that magnificent railway he has advocated that can draw such an enormous number of trains, each of 2,000 tons of wheat the year round and every day in the year, is going to secure, but he promises to develop the North-west country to a most extraordinary extent. I think that the government should be startled at the extraordinary development that is to be brought about by the hon. gentleman in connection with this railway scheme. I do not think anything could bring home to the minds of the people more clearly the ridiculousness of the project which has been advocated by the hon. gentleman than the statement that we are going to have a market of one hundred millions of people to the south of us for our breadstuffs.

Mr. CLARKE. Why not take it round by way of Quebec, and send it from there ?

Mr. BROCK. I think our friends at Quebec will find that they are going to have a lean time with that road north of the height of land, up in that magnificent clay belt. I say we should call a halt, because we must accept either born of the dilemma. Either we are doing wrong in building that railway or we are doing wrong in expending a lot of money in improving our navigation. I contend that the government are perfectly right, and that the country is perfectly right in going on and improving the navigation of our water-ways and in providing every facility for getting our grain out in that direction. I believe that we should adopt the plan that was suggested not only by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), but by the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), and spend our money in our own country to bring out our grain to our own ports. I contend that we should spend our money on such projects as are before us, and that we should not go ahead and spend money upon the projects which has been advocated so loyally, so strongly and so learnedly by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I have no objection to spending money on the harbour of Port Arthur and upon the harbour of Fort William. This is in the right direction.

Mr. BENNETT. Will that $160,000 to be spent at Port Arthur give a depth of 21 feet of water ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is the estimate of the chief engineer of the department.

Mr. BENNETT. Then, as to Fort William, how much is it proposed to spend there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Including the river, and to give a depth of 21 feet all around, it is proposed to expend $300,000, and probably a little over that.

Mr. BELL. How much has been spent in the past ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Since confederation there has been $550,000 expended.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I do not object to the expenditure in connection with the deepening of these harbours, but do think that where so much money of the people is expended that it should be expended in a proper way and under proper supervision. A large amount of money is paid out for the dredging of these rivers. Would it not be better to have a proper plan for the whole work, and to let it by contract ? I am satisfied that in that way it could be much more cheaply and satisfactorily done. I do not see why, on an important work of this kind the government of Canada should find it necessary to do part of this work by the day and part of it by the yard, instead of having a proper plan and estimate made, and then letting the work by contract. I am satisfied that a great deal of money would be saved if that were done. I do not object to the expenditure, but I think we should have some better system. I would ask whose dredges are doing this by the day or by the yard. I have been talking with contractors about this work at Port Arthur and they say that we are not getting the best value for our money, and that the work there is costing too much.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think my hon. friend has been misinformed. I know Mr. Boone, of Toronto, and I think he has the best dredging plant in Canada. From the reports of the auditors of the department, I learn that no contractor has given better satisfaction than he has. I may say that I have heard from parties who have been pressing for this work, absolutely no complaint. Neither the mayor, nor the members of council, nor leading citizens, men interested in the shipping irrespective of political parties who have been here have complained to me of the work that is being done. The hon. member finds fault with everything we are trying to do. I admit as he does that pos-

sibly we may not get the best value for our money owing to the fact that we have not a plan, but I am having a plan and survey made and then perhaps we may be able to let the work by contract and perhaps get it done at a cheaper rate, but so long as we have no survey and no plan it will be understood that owing to the great variation in the nature of material to be moved you cannot very well make a contract except at various prices, because any person knows that you cannot move hard-pan and rock, &c., for the same price as you can earth, so that we either have to have it done under our own supervision and pay for it according to the material moved or have a plan and survey and let a contract.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I can quite understand that where there is a small contract there can be no objection to the department letting the work by the yard or by the hour, but where nearly half a million dollars is being expended it seems to me to be remarkable that we should have to farm it out by the yard. It is not that the work is not properly done, I suppose you can always get the work done, but at a great cost; my objection is to the amount the work is costing when let in this manner. I suppose that this gentleman is a competent contractor, and that his plant is a good one, but that is not the question. Sixteen cents a yard seems to be an enormous price, more particularly when there is such a large amount of work to do. The department have under contract the dredging of Owen Sound harbour, and I am satisfied that if the department had done that by the yard it would have cost them twice as much as they are paying by contract. Hence I think it would be better for the government to either cease work or to do as little as possible until they have prepared plans and specifications in order that a contract may be let for this work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is exactly what I am trying to do now.

Mr. BENNETT. We are approaching, if I understand the minister's estimates, an expenditure of $660,000. First there is the work at Fort William costing half a million dollars and then there is the work at Port Arthur costing $160,000, but the vote asked up to the end of June of next year is altogether only $75,000. It seems to me that such a trifling estimate can only be a drop in the bucket for such a large expenditure and I would ask the minister how he proposes to apportion this $75,000, what proportion he intends to spend at Port Arthur and what at Fort William and whether the work will be done this fall or next spring.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman has rather exaggerated the figures I gave.

Mr. BENNETT. I think $500,000 was the right amount for Fort William; I took it down at the time.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total estimate of the engineer was $593,000. My hon. friend's error has arisen through his taking the $600,000, or properly $593,000, which is the total estimate for both, Fort William and Port Arthur and adding to it the $163,000 which is the estimate for Port Arthur. It is true that this is a very large expenditure, but my hon. friend will see that we have an amount in the main estimates, I do not remember exactly what amount, and between that and the $75,000 I think we will make very fair progress in that work. This vote is only until the 30th of June of next year. The work is going on now under the estimate. I agree with my hon. friend, I would like to have been in a position to have plans for this work which will be of great assistance in improving our transportation facilities. When we have completed our improvements there and at Port Colborne I have every confidence that we will reap very material advantage. After we have perfected our plans and completed the surveys we will probably get a great deal more value for our money, but at the same time we could not afford not to go on with this work now because we have had boats standing outside the harbour in the deep water lightering into the wharfs because they were not able to come alongside. Therefore a certain amount of this work had to be proceeded with and I am pleased to know that it has been done on plans that are part of the general plan so that there is no wasting of money in the works that are now going on and they are giving great satisfaction this season because they enable the boats to get up to the wharfs. This is very important as some of the finest elevators on the continent are now being built there. We are pressing the work. I am unable to say how much is being done at each of these two places because the chief engineer places the dredge wherever the work is most urgent in order to enable the boats to get to the wharfs.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Does the hon. gentleman not think that 16 cents a yard is an enormous figure for dredging at Port Arthur? I am satisfied as I said that Mr. Boone is competent to do the work and that his plant is all right, but the price that is being paid is extremely large. Is work being done at as high prices in any other place? The ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) expressed the opinion that it was much cheaper when the work was done by dredges owned and controlled by the government. He said that in that way the work could be done for one-half what contractors charge. I believe that and I think he estimated that dredging could be done by the government dredge for 3 cents

per yard. If that is the case, 16 cents a yard is an enormous price.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say 16 cents; the average rate estimated by the chief engineer is 15 cents. The price depends altogether on the materials and the conditions under which the dredging is being done. I do not think that any one who is an authority on these matters would be able to stand up and say whether it can be done better by contract or by government-owned plant; the cost will be regulated altogether by the conditions. Some material at Port Arthur costs as much as $1.25 to move, some costs 40 cents and the average is 15 cents.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). The dredging at Port Arthur is not hard as the material is principally mud, and therefore I think that 16 cents is a very large amount. Have you any similar work being done on the Georgian bay except at Port Arthur where the price is as high as 16 cents a yard?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The price is fifteen cents not sixteen cents. The chief engineer informs me that that is the average price for the same kind of work all over the Dominion. The prices on the American side are very much higher—so much so that some of the dredges have left Canada, and we had to offer extra inducements to keep some of the plant here.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I am surprised that any one in the department should say that the government are in the habit of paying fifteen cents per yard for dredging on the Georgian bay. Four or five years ago it was done at half that price. I think it is desirable that all these harbours should be deepened to twenty feet. At the same time, I think we shall get very little for the amount of money we are spending. The contractors will make immense profits. Who is doing this work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Great Lakes Dredging Company.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Is that the only company you have at work at Port Arthur?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, we have also Mr. Boone, of Toronto. There are four dredges at work. I am anxious to press on the work faster, but it is impossible to procure more dredges at the present time. I am acting under the advice of the chief engineer, and according to his estimate, these amounts of $85,000 and $75,000 will cover all the work for which we can procure plant.

Mr. WILSON. Will the minister tell us how the prices he pays for contract work will compare with what it costs to do the work with our own dredges?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am unable to tell the hon. gentleman, the conditions vary so much.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey).

Mr. WILSON. The officials of the department should be able to keep track of the work, so that the hon. minister could tell.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If we had a systematic set of books we could probably make comparisons. But my hon. friend is asking me to give him the information now.

Mr. WILSON. When may I expect it, if not now?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I can give the hon. gentleman the cost of dredging at any particular place.

Mr. WILSON. I think the minister will admit that the question is a fair one, and is not at all captious. I simply wish to know whether it pays better to do the dredging by contract or with our own dredges and under our own supervision.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not able to answer that question.

Mr. WILSON. Can you do it during the session?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say. It would require considerable experimenting. For instance, the work in the St. Lawrence channel is estimated to cost three cents a yard. That of course does not include interest on the plant, expenses during the winter, payment of officers, and many other things; nor are the conditions there to be compared with the conditions in small harbours. If a dredge is sent to do dredging for a week at a small port, the expense of its going and coming would form a large part of the cost.

Mr. WILSON. I quite understand the statement made by the hon. minister. I know that he pays more for a small job than he does for a large one. At the same time, we have owned some dredges for a good many years, and it seems to me that the department ought to be able to give some information as to the cost on this point.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not consider my hon. friend's question a captious question at all; but if my hon. friend understood the conditions as I do, he would see the difficulty of making the comparison. I do not know of any work that has been done for some time which would afford a basis for comparison.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). The ex-Minister of Public Works gave a good deal of attention to this matter. He made a statement to the effect that the government with their own dredges could do this work at half the figures the contractors charge. The dredging at Port Arthur is not difficult because it is soft substance and ought to be the cheapest class of work. The hon. gentleman is paying fifteen cents per yard while the ex-Minister of Public Works said that the gov-

ernment dredges would do the work for three cents a yard. There is an appropriation of $75,000 here. No doubt it is a year or more since the government entered into a contract to pay fifteen cents per yard, and this is for additional dredging. Does the hon. gentleman purpose asking for new tenders in connection with the expenditure of this $75,000, or will he simply hand it over to these people and pay them the same prices they have been charging all along ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The intention is to go on with this work at the prices arranged for. I have already explained that some dredges have left Canada already because they get better prices on the other side. That applies to the northern and southern districts.

Mr. CLARKE. Are Canadian dredges allowed to work at American ports ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, in bond, under the same regulations as American dredges are subjected to here.

Mr. CLARKE. Are the government satisfied with the work 'J. Israel Tarte' is doing this year ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The dredge or the gentleman ?

Mr. BENNETT. The gentleman is turning up more mud than the dredge.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman quoted the ex-Minister of Public Works, I am not going to assume responsibility for statements made by the ex-minister. Any statements I make with regard to this or other matters will be on information obtained by myself and for which I will be responsible. Sometimes the dredge 'Tarte' does very good work.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the government dredge which was lost on Lake Ontario at Bowmanville been taken up yet ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have already stated several times that no government dredge was lost at Bowmanville. There was a dredge called after the First Minister lost there but it had no connection directly or indirectly with the government.

Mr. BELL. Is this the only item for dredging in the supplementary estimates ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I am sorry to say it is not. We will come to Nova Scotia by and by.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). The minister has not answered the question I have put him. Is it his intention to spend this $75,000 by handing over the work to the companies doing it at their present prices ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not exactly like the term used by my hon. friend. It is not the intention to hand this money over to anybody, but to have the work done under the contract made with the department.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). When was it made ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This season. It was a renewal of the prices last season.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). It is simply a renewal of the contract at the same prices. Did the hon. gentleman ask anybody else to tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, we have been very active in asking all over the country, and I am sorry to say we had to go to the other side of the line to get some of our work done.

Mr. CLARKE. Who are the partners in this Great Lake Dredging Company ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know, but I will get the information and bring it down.

Mr. BELL. In view of the fact that there is difficulty in getting dredges, is the government considering the propriety of building additional dredges ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think that is a matter of very great importance. I am asking several votes which I hope will meet the approval of the House.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Is not this firm an American one ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think that Mr. Bowman, of Southampton, is the principal man, but cannot say positively.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Are they Canadian or American dredges ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Altogther Canadian, so my chief engineer informs me. I shall get the information and bring it down.

Mr. CLARKE. The names of the partners —and where the headquarters are ?

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Is Mr. Connolly or Captain Sullivan in that company ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not that I am aware of. I know nothing directly or indirectly, but they may be.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the department know whether or not the deepening of the Mission river will result in lengthening the season during which grain can be carried from Fort William and Port Arthur to the Georgian bay ports ? Last year I went to the mouth of the Mission river in a tug boat, and it was pointed out to me that the opening of the river and the use of the new channel created in that way would result in lengthening the season by ten or twelve days.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Representations have been made to the department that that would be the result, but the chief engineer will not take the responsibility of endorsing them. When we have these surveys completed, we will have more definite information to work on.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I understand that the hon. minister has promised to bring down the names of those who were in the firm, where their headquarters are and who are connected with this Great Lake Dredging Company.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Kingston graving dock—to pay amount of award made in favour of contractors Connolly & Co., by Mr. Justice Burbidge, July 2, 1896, under Orders in Council of January 29, and May 7, 1896, together with price of steam derrick purchased from said firm, interest thereon to be paid at the same rates as that received by the government on their counter claims against Connolly & Co., $46,096.12.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I found that Connolly & Company had several claims against the government and the government also had claims against them, some of them under judgment. This vote really represents some $5,000 or $6,000, being the difference between the amount which Connolly & Company owe the government and the government Connolly & Company. As I understand it, the position the Auditor General took was that the so-called judgment against us that Connolly had was an award of the judge of the Exchequer Court, and not a judgment, and that it was still at the discretion of parliament to pay the amount of that award or not. This matter has been standing for a long time, and I thought it unfair both to Mr. Connolly and the department, that these claims should remain so long. I referred the matter to the officials of the department, and they arranged with the Auditor General and the Finance Department and all matters between the government and Mr. Connolly were adjusted, the balance being something between $5,000 and $6,000. The reason I cannot give the exact amount is that the Finance Department objected paying the interest that Connolly claimed, the award —or judgment, as he called it—of the Exchequer Court carried with it. I believe it was finally decided that on the judgments that we had against Connolly and the amounts due to him the rate of interest should be the same. This item is put in the way the Auditor General and the Finance Department worded it. So, I cannot give, to a few dollars, exactly what the difference would be, but it will not be more than I have stated. Practically we are voting this to ourselves.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why does not the hon. minister take a vote only for the amount to be paid ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Because the Auditor General objected to having it that way, and I am anxious to meet his views.

Mr. CLARKE. What work is this award for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The principal amount due to Connolly is in connection with the Kingston graving dock, and the principal judgment we have against Connolly is in connection with the Quebec harbour works. And there is another in the hands of the Justice Department, in connection with some security given by Connolly for some person.

Transportation facilities—Port Colborne improvements—South-east breakwater, $25,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This item will involve considerable discussion.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There will be another item with relation to this work.

Mr. CLARKE. And the subject of this item can be discussed when the other comes up ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, if hon. gentlemen wish it.

Some resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What business will be taken up on Monday ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We shall proceed with supply.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, October 5, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

CALGARY AND EDMONTON RAILWAY.

Mr. SCOTT asked :

1. Is it required by law or regulation that mortgage deeds, such as are executed to safeguard the purchasers of the bonds of a railway company, shall be deposited in the office of the Secretary of State?

2. Is the mortgage deed, executed in favour of the trustees for the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway bondholders, and is the mortgage deed executed in favour of the trustees for the Calgary and Edmonton Railway bondholders, so deposited in the office of the Secretary of State ?

3. If so, does the mortgage deed relating to the Calgary and Edmonton Railway indicate that the money to construct the road was obtained by 'sale of the land grant and the sale of the bonds,' or does it indicate that such money was obtained by sale of bonds only ?

4. Is it stated in such mortgage deed and in the bond certificates, that the bonds are secured by conveyance, by way of mortgage, to the trustees of the company's railway, with its revenues, &c., including an annual subsidy of $80,000, 'it being, however, expressly understood that the subsidy or land grant from the government, excepting as it forms an actual part of the company's line of railway, shall be excepted from the operation of the said mortgage and shall form no part of the security for the payment of the said bonds or the interest thereon '?

5. What amount of money was obtained by the sale of the Calgary and Edmonton bonds, and what sum of money was actually expended in construction of the railway ?

6. What area of land was granted to the company under its Land Subsidy Act, and to whom was such land actually granted or patented ?

7. What proportion of the land grant, if any, was utilized in aid of construction of the railway ?

8. Who obtained the portion of the land grant, if any, which was not so utilized in aid of construction ?

9. If any such portion as mentioned in question 8 was obtained by the Calgary and Edmonton Land Company, what persons compose the said Calgary and Edmonton Land Company, and who are the officers of the company ?

10. In the aforementioned mortgage deed is it recited that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should, after notice, have an option, on July 1, 1896, to redeem all the bonds at ten per centum premium on the face value, to the extent of $18,500 per mile, and acquire the capital stock of the company ?

11. What was the amount of the paid-up capital stock of the company, and of such amount, what proportion was paid in cash ?

12. Has the attention of the government been called to section 6 of the twenty-second annual report of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which recites that the said Canadian Pacific Railway Company have made arrangements to lease the Calgary and Edmonton Railway for ninety-nine years, guaranteeing in rental 4 per cent per annum on the Calgary and Edmonton Company's debentures, amounting to roughly $5,500,000, and to purchase all the capital stock of the Calgary and Edmonton Company for the sum of $500,000 ?

13. In chapter 84, 53 Victoria, 'An Act to incorporate the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company,' does the name of Edmund B. Osler appear as one of those originally incorporated as the company, to which, by chapter 4, 53 Victoria, was voted a land grant of 6,400 acres per mile for 340 miles of railway, and to which, by chapter 5, 53 Victoria, a further guarantee of $80,000 per annum for twenty years was voted ?

14. What amount of money was obtained by sale of Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan bonds, and what sum was actually expended in construction of the railway ?

15. In subclause (e) of section 1 of an agreement between the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, confirmed by chapter 82, 53 Victoria, is it recited that the former company 'shall not issue any bonds secured, directly or indirectly, on its land subsidies or any portion of such land subsidies, except so much of those lands, if any, as shall be actually taken for the line of railway and stations '?

16. By subclause (c) of section 3 of the aforesaid agreement, is it recited that 'it is understood and declared that the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Company may transfer one-half of the land subsidy from the Dominion government, from time to time, as it shall be earned, to any person or persons, as it may deem proper '?

17. What area of land was granted to the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company under its Land Subsidy Act, and to whom was such land actually granted or patented ?

18. What proportion of the land grant, if any, was utilized in aid of construction of the railway ?

19. Who obtained the portion of the land grant, if any, which was not so utilized in aid of construction ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I find it impossible to answer this question, and I would ask the hon. gentleman to let it drop, promising that I will try and get any information that is available.

PORTRAIT OF HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria)—by Mr. Ingram—asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to have a portrait of His Majesty King Edward painted and placed on the north wall of the House of Commons Chamber opposite that of Her late Majesty Queen Victoria ?

2. In the preparation of the portrait will the government give consideration to one of Canada's many fine artists, such as Sherwood, Forster, Harris, Grier and Shannon, of London, England, all distinguished Canadians ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). The matter is receiving consideration.

COAL MINING ON BANFF RESERVE.

Mr. NORTHRUP—by Mr. Ingram—asked :

1. Has the government leased any rights of mining coal on the government reserve at Banff to any person or company ?

2. If so, to whom, and what rights ?

3. What limit, if any, has the government placed upon the price to be charged for coal so mined ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) :

1. Yes.

2. Lease issued to W. H. Merritt, of Toronto. The lease gives the lessee the right to mine coal upon the land therein described for a period of twenty years, in accordance with the provisions of the regulations of the lease. An annual rental of thirty cents per acre, payable half yearly in advance, and a royalty of ten cents per ton on all coal taken out of the mine. The lease to Merritt is dated 1st July, 1903.

3. No limit mentioned in lease as to price of coal mined.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Mr. WILSON asked:

1. What amount of bonuses or subsidies have been voted by parliament each year to railways during the years 1900, 1901 and 1902?
2. How much of the said bonuses or subsidies has been paid during the said years, and up to 1st September, 1903?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Would the hon. gentleman let that stand? That appears to be a repetition of a previous question.

CONTRACTS FOR THE TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. GRANT—by Mr. Calvert—asked:

1. Is it the intention of the government, in building the eastern portions of the proposed Transcontinental Railway, to favour the letting of construction contracts for short sections (say, of fifty miles each), rather than for long stretches?
2. Is it the opinion of the government that it would be desirable to avoid the usual subletting that takes place when contracts are let for long stretches of work?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The question seems, in the present condition of legislation, to be premature.

DREDGING IN THE GRAND RIVER.

Mr. LANCASTER—by Mr. Ingram—asked:

1. Is the government aware that a dredge is now at work in the Grand river at Dunnville?
2. Under what conditions or arrangement is such work being done?
3. Has any contract been let, and if so, to whom and at what price, for such dredging?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland):

1. Yes.
2. It is removing obstructions to navigation at the mouth of the river.
3. The work is being done for $12 an hour.

THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION.

Mr. CLARKE asked:

1. Have the transportation commissioners recently appointed by the government held any meetings yet; and if so, when and where were such meetings held?
2. What business has been transacted up to date by the commissioners?
3. Do the commissioners propose to take evidence respecting the transportation question; and will the meetings of the commissioners be open to the public?
4. Will citizens who desire to testify before the commissioners be entitled to be heard by the commissioners?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). The commission has not yet been organized, as the commissioners are waiting for a vote of parliament, and have not yet met. Without being able to state definitely, I am of the opinion that the commissioners will take evidence from all parties from whom they think they can get information, and that the meetings will be open to the public.

MR. BORDEN'S (HALIFAX) RAILWAY POLICY AND PETITIONS.

Mr. DAVIS—by Mr. Calvert—asked:

1. Has the government received any petitions in favour of Mr. Borden's (the leader of the opposition) alternative railway policy?
2. If so, how many?
3. What parts of the Dominion did they come from?
4. How many names were subscribed to each?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). No petitions have been received.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Public buildings, Nova Scotia—Sydney Mines, $8,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). Sydney is the headquarters of the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, and is a very important place of 4,000 inhabitants. They have been pressing strongly for further accommodation. The proposed public building will be used for a post office, custom-house and other government purposes. Judging from the cost of buildings elsewhere, I should think the total cost would be between $15,000 and $20,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the site been obtained?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No; there has not been any previous vote for this work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The building will be erected by tender and contract, I suppose?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No site has been chosen, no plans prepared, and no estimate made as to the cost, except that it will not exceed $15,000 or $20,000—that is all the information we can get.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We can hardly buy the site, or go to the expense of preparing plans or making estimates until we have a preliminary vote by parliament.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). At any rate, that is all the information that the minister can give?

Mr. BLAIN. How will the minister go about the purchase of the site?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The officials of the department will purchase the site at the lowest possible price. If the price of the site chosen is not deemed satisfactory the property will be expropriated.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there any estimate as to what the site will cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. As in any other case, we obtain the site on the best terms, sometimes we ask the town in which the building is to be erected to contribute to the cost of the site.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the estimate the minister has given include the site as well as the building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. That is, the site and building together will cost, at the outside, $15,000 to $20,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, Sydney Mines is an important and growing place, largely for the reason the minister have given, namely, the development that has taken place through the operations of the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company. It seems to me, however, that the better course to pursue in matters of this kind is that which used to be followed some years ago by the department. The minister should give the House the plans of the proposed building and some more accurate estimate of the cost than my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works has been able to give. The House having been in session for so many months, one would think that, this estimate being now brought down, a little more information might accompany it. I do not see, for my part, why the estimate should not have been included in the main estimates, if we are to have no more information than that now given us. I am not objecting to the vote because I know this is an important town and one that, I believe, will largely increase in population. But I do think it is a little irregular for the minister to come down with practically no information either as to the plans or as to the cost of the building.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It has been the custom of the Public Works, or, at least, for many years, to provide for new works in the supplementary estimates of the year. As I said before, I do not see how the department could either procure a site or make plans and estimates until it is authorized by parliament to proceed with the work. I do agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) that there ought to be as definite information as possible as to the cost of any proposed work. Under the advice of the chief architect I think I am safe in stating that the outside cost will be $20,000. In giving information, the main point to be considered and observed, it seems to me, is that parliament and the country should be advised as to the total expenditure that is to be undertaken. I have found fault in the past with ministers who have failed to give that information, but I think that when it is given the information as to details is not so important.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). I may be permitted to say, in regard to the procuring of a site, that I have given some little attention to the matter and have made inquiries about it. I have the assurance of the general manager of the Nova Scotia Steel Company—and the rapid growth of the place is largely due to the enterprise of that company—that a site can be secured for a reasonable amount. I am not authorized to say what figure they will ask, but I feel assured that the department will find the figure very reasonable indeed.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the size of the site ?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). When discussing the matter with the gentleman I refer to, I spoke of a site about 100 feet square, which I thought would be a fair size. I need not say anything of the necessity for this building, for that is generally recognized. I think the work had better be proceeded with at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. CLARKE. Better get the plans first.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Better get the money first.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister tells us that $15,000 or $20,000 will purchase the site and construct the building. Does that estimate include heating and other equipment ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think probably it would.

Halifax quarantine station, Lawlor's Island—improvements, renewals, repairs, &c., $4,500.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the need of this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This includes partitions and other changes in the detention building; rebuilding walls of hospital ward, detention building; fitting up two rooms in the hospital; and general repairs. There is due for plumbing, $1,700, which comes out of this vote of $4,500. The money was spent, not for new plumbing, but for overhauling plumbing which was out of repair.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose that work was done by tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. That was not found possible. The work was done under the superintendence of Mr. Dodwell, the engineer of the department in Halifax.

Halifax—new Public Building, $20,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for work now under contract.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the total cost of this building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total probable cost of this building, exclusive of site, will be $318,000.

Mr. CLARKE. How much will the site cost ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The site was purchased some years ago at a cost of, I think, $25,000, if I remember.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Twenty-four thousand. I find that the $318,000 is the estimated total cost including the site.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). When is it anticipated that this building will be finished?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contract calls for its completion on the 15th September, 1904. There was some delay, but the chief architect tells me that they are making very good progress now.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have not been in Halifax for a good many months, and I do not know from observation what progress they are making. The progress did not seem to be very rapid up to the time I left. I suppose this vote of $20,000 is in addition to a vote already in the estimates ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much is the total vote ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. One hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it anticipated that the work will be finished at the time fixed for completion ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief architect thinks it very doubtful if the work will be finished by the 1st September, 1904, but he thinks it will be finished by the first of the following year.

Mr. CLARKE. What departments of the public service will be accommodated by this building ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is nominally a customs house, but the building will also be available for other branches of the public service. No building has been erected for the general offices of the Dominion in Halifax since confederation. The officers of the Dominion have been in the building which was erected before the union, and various buildings have been rented from time to time for the accommodation of the public service, but no general public building has been erected since confederation. This is intended to meet the difficulty and to obviate the necessity of renting buildings for the different offices. Though it is called the customs house, it will also provide accommodation for other officers of the public service.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How many stories will the new building be ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Four stories above the basement.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will there be an elevator ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, two elevators.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose no arrangement has been made as to which of the officers now in the other building will be removed to the new building. Of course, the customs house officers will go. The post office, I suppose, will be continued in the present building ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As the post office is very much cramped now, the intention is that it shall have the main floor of the present building, which is at present divided between the post office and the customs house, the customs being entirely transferred to the new building, and probably the Marine and Fisheries Department also. Except as to the customs no definite policy has been determined upon, although I think it will be found convenient to also transfer the Marine and Fisheries Department to the other building. The idea is to afford the customs house sufficient accommodation in the new building, to give the space made by the removal of the customs house from the old building to the post office, and then to distribute the rest of the space amongst the other officers. A portion of the present post office might be assigned to the savings bank, which is now in a private building, and that will give the bank a front upon Hollis street, which is in the centre of the business district of the city. Subject to that qualification that we hope to give the post office the space which was formerly divided between the post office and the customs house.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If I remember rightly on an upper floor of the present building there is a collection of some objects of interest in connection with the province of Nova Scotia. It is at present in a very inaccessible place.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The museum has been removed. While it occupied the Dominion building it was always a question whether it belonged to the province or the Dominion. The province owned the museum, but it claimed that it had the right to a place for it in the building. For a long time the museum occupied a place in this building, but the local government procured accommodataion for it in the old Burns building opposite,

the museum has been transferred to that building, and I believe that under the care of Mr. Piers it is now in very good condition. I do not know what the space thus vacated in the old building is applied to at present, but while in that building the museum was inaccessible and unsatisfactory in all respects.

Halifax immigration building — additional story over the one story portion, &c., $11,000.

Mr. CLARKE. What is that for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The improvements to this building are being made at the request of the immigration branch of the Interior Department. An additional story is being put on the one story part of the building. It has been represented that they had not sufficient accommodation for immigration work and on account of these representations the improvements are being made.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the additional accommodation required for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. More accommodation is required for immigrants. This is partly a one-story and partly a two-story building, and we are putting a second story on the part which is now one story.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think I saw in one of the newspapers that some examination had been made of this building, and that it had been reported unsuitable. Is not that the case ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It lacks sufficient accommodation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it because the examination which has been made of the building by some official or officials that this additional vote is being asked ? I do not know anything about it, except that I saw it referred to in the public press.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In regard to buildings of this description which are under the control of other departments, we go very much on the representations of the officials in particular charge of the work. No information is given to the chief architect or to the deputy minister to show that the building is not in good condition, and suitable for the accommodation of this branch of the service, but the trouble is that it is too small. Since this matter has been considered, we have had further representations made to the department that even with this proposed improvement there will not be sufficient accommodation. But, as far as I know, the accommodation they have is very good.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This application was made by the Department of the Interior on behalf of the immigration branch, during the present session of the House, and it has recently appeared that these representations are confirmed and that more accommodation is needed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). By whom was this examination made ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it was by some medical gentleman connected with one or other of the provinces. I forget whether it was by an official of our own government or not. At all events it was stated in the public press that there was a need of greater accommodation, and when I noticed it I was glad to know that the Department of the Interior had already asked for this accommodation, and that the hon. Minister of Public Works was about to provide for it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the additional story be constructed by tender and contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, I may say that. We are to expend $11,000, and it is quite a sufficient work to have detailed plans drawn and the work let by tender.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is $11,000 expected to be sufficient to complete the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief architect informs me that it is sufficient according to the plan.

Digby public buildings—improvements, $1,800.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This provides for a clock in the tower, and some improvements in the public buildings.

Antigonish—new fittings for post office, $1,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for general improvements. Some of the floors are in bad condition and the letter-boxes are very old. This is to provide new floors, screens for the public lobbies, two hundred new letter-boxes, and general repairs to the building.

Mr. CLARKE. What kind of letter-boxes?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They will be the ordinary brass letter-boxes.

Mr. CLARKE. I have noticed different kinds of letter-boxes, some very much more convenient for the use of the public than others. I have seen some in the Northwest which are a great improvement on any that I have seen down here. The letter-box which I think should be put in is one to which the owner can have access at any time without having to go to the wicket to inquire.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are putting in the improved kind.

Mr. CLARKE. Who supplies the boxes ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Rubenstein & Co., of Montreal, make the most of the boxes for the department.

Sydney—addition to public building (revote, $5,000), $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to provide an addition to the present building 40 feet by 30 feet, with two stories, attic and basement. It is represented to be necessary on account of the growth of the place. The postal revenue is between $17,000 and $18,000 and the customs revenue about $150,000, and the money orders issued amount to nearly $200,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Is this to be the entire cost of the addition ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, the total cost is estimated by the chief architect at $15,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How is the work to be done—by tender and contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

North Sydney public building, $1,100.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for general improvements. Some of the brick walls are out of condition, iron columns have to be taken out and some doors changed, modern letter-boxes are to be placed in the building, and other repairs are to be made.

Charlottetown armoury—additional accommodation for orderly rooms, &c., $2,550.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This has been expended by the department in accordance with a request from the Department of Militia.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Are all militia expenditures by the Department of Public Works made on the requisition of the Militia Department ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think all of them. I do not know of any exception.

Mr. HACKETT. Is this work going on at present ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, it was undertaken some time ago, and is practically completed.

Mr. HACKETT. This work was very much required, and I must compliment the department on having it done.

Mr. CLARKE. Is the work done by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, it is done under the superintendence of the militia officer in Charlottetown.

Mr. CLARKE. Who did the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have the details of the cost of the work, but not the names of the different parties who did it. I would be pleased to have a memorandum made giving the information the hon. gentleman asks for. I imagine that it was so general that the militia officers did the overseeing themselves.

Mr. CLARKE. That is a new role for militia officers.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not sure that it is not a good plan, as they have an interest in seeing that the work is well done.

Charlottetown Dominion building—improvements, additions, &c. (revote, $8,000), $12,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for the construction of an annex in the rear of the Charlottetown Dominion building, also for alterations, repairs and renewals. The estimated cost is $12,350.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Is this annex something new put in the estimates this year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, there was a vote taken for this some time ago.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Has this annex been proceeded with yet ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No ; the plans were prepared and tenders advertised for, and the contract was let a short time ago.

Mr. LEFURGEY. To whom was the contract let, and at what figure ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The tenders were received only a few days ago and the information is now in my notes. The deputy does not remember the name but I will bring it this afternoon.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the lowest tender been accepted ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The lowest tender was accepted.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What is this annex to be used for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Generally in connection with the post office.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems to me that this is a large amount for an annex to the post office in Charlottetown.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I had myself the pleasure of being in Charlottetown a year or two ago and complaint was then made of the lack of accommodation in the post office. I am told that the improvement is very urgently required. I think almost all of the officers connected with the department are in the one building. It contains the post office, savings bank, customs and inland revenue offices, weights and measures office and the marine office. I think this addition is being made principally on the strong recommendation of the postmaster there, Mr. Brecken, an old friend of ours who used to be in this House. He

has written to me several times in connection with this matter since I have been in office.

Mr. CLARKE. Will this vote cover the amount of the tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The amount we are now asking will cover it. There is a revote of $8,000 and a new vote of $4,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Will this complete the annex ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will complete the work.

Public buildings, New Brunswick—Campbellton public building, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. An application was pressed on the department for a public building at Campbellton, New Brunswick. I looked into the matter personally and found that it was quite a growing and thriving place. The postal revenue has increased until last year it was nearly $4,000 and the customs duty nearly $7,000. It is a seaport town and the business has very largely increased ; I thought I was warranted in asking parliament to authorize me to construct a public building there.

Mr. CLARKE. What will the total cost be ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Between $20,000 and $25,000.

Mr. CLARKE. What will be the price of the site ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot give the price of the site as it has not yet been purchased.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What is the population of Campbellton ?

Mr. HENDERSON. About 7,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am sure it is not 7,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sorry to say I have not the population here.

Mr. CLARKE. Have the plans for the building been prepared ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. General plans have been prepared.

Mr. CLARKE. General plans for this building, and these plans show that the building will cost $20,000 or $25,000 but the site has not yet been looked up.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It has not yet been purchased. I may say that if parliament authorized me to undertake any public building and I found that the price asked for a site was not reasonable I would not go on with the work. I think that parliament has a right to expect to acquire a site at a reasonable price. Such as other people would have to pay. We all know that when the government undertake a work people seem to think they can get an exorbitant price for their property. I have several times taken the position that if I could not acquire a site at a reasonable price I would not go on with a work and have found it to work satisfactorily.

Mr. EMMERSON. Campbellton is a terminal point on the Intercolonial, a very large seaport town with large shipping interests, with large lumbering operations, and it is also the centre for a large section of New Brunswick and for a section of Quebec. A portion of Bonaventure is tributary to Campbellton and its business centres in that town. It is a very enterprising town ; there are large milling establishments and it is deserving of recognition in this way if any town in the Dominion of Canada is deserving.

Moncton public building—improvements, $1,200.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for general improvements to this building. I find the postal revenue is something like $16,000, and the customs revenue between $38,000 and $40,000. This is for small improvements at Moncton.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will this be put under contract and tender or will it be done by the department ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think this can hardly be done by tender.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The preceding item will I suppose be by tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, certainly.

Newcastle public building—improvements, $800.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to provide for 272 lock-boxes which will cost a couple of hundred dollars and some other improvements which will aggregate about $800.

Tracadie Lazaretto—improvements, &c., $1,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote is asked to make provision for a small steam disinfector. We had application from there for a number of other improvements but we thought they might stand in the meantime.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Does the minister know anything about the condition of the Lazaretto and how many persons are afflicted with leprosy. Are they increasing or decreasing ? This Larazetto has been in operation for a long time and it is nearly time that the disease was cleaned out of that locality.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman might renew his question when the estimates of the hon. Minister of Agriculture are under discussion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the government any information as to whether this disease is increasing or decreasing in Canada? Statements are made from time to time in the public press as to its increase and it would be desirable for us to know whether there is any official information which can be communicated to the House with regard to it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As I said before it will perhaps be better to ask this question when the estimates of the Minister of Agriculture are under consideration.

Mr. TURGEON. I may state in answer to the inquiry that leprosy has been decreasing for some years in that locality. Sometimes when the doctors grow jubilant in the belief that no more cases will be found, a case may arise in a family which has been free from it for a generation. The children escape the disease, but their children become its victims. Still the number is decreasing. When this Lazaretto was transferred to the control of the Dominion government there were about twenty-three or twenty-four cases, but now the number arising in the locality is fourteen or fifteen. The number has been added to by the importation of three or four cases from British Columbia and Manitoba, and I believe that one of these died last year.

Mr. CLARKE. How many are there altogether?

Mr. TURGEON. I do not know the exact number, but I believe it is about 19 or 20, of whom 14 or 15 are from the locality. I believe that the Department of Agriculture has all that information.

Mr. CLARKE. Of what nationality are the people who were brought from British Columbia?

Mr. TURGEON. Swedes or Norwegians, I believe.

Mr. CLARKE. No Chinese among them?

Mr. TURGEON. No. I believe that the Dominion government refused to accept the Chinese for this Tracadie hospital.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It would be advisable that the Department of Agriculture should be ready, when its estimates are before the House, to explain how the lepers were transported across the continent and what means were taken to disinfect the cars in which they were carried.

Mr. EMMERSON. The disease is not contagious.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) is mistaken.

Woodstock—armoury and gun shed, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Originally it was proposed to ask for $11,000. But at that time it was intended to provide a new building. Since then we have been informed by the Militia Department, which has requested this expenditure, that there is a building there which can be utilized, with some alterations and repairs. So, this estimate of $5,000 is proposed, which, it is expected, will cover the expenditure for the present year. The total cost is estimated at $11,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the work be done by contract?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. What would have been the cost of the site and new building?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About $25,000. That was the original estimate.

St. John immigrant building, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to provide additional accommodation in the St. John immigration building. The estimates as originally prepared to meet the requirements of the immigration department provided for a two-story addition to the present building, to cost $6,500; furniture, $1,500; superintendence and incidentals, $2,000; making a total of $10,000. But, this estimate was made before the fire took place in the freight shed of St. John, burning part of this building. This will make necessary a new arrangement, but it is estimated that the sum of $10,000 will still cover the cost. I understand that a joint arrangement is made between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Interior Department for an extension.

Mr. CLARKE. That will probably be a further supplementary estimate.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No, I understand that this is to cover the cost of repairing the damage done by the fire, as well as the improvements?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All the expenditure by the Public Works Department will be covered by the amount I have stated.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the work be done by tender and contract?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, our work will be let by contract. There may be some small repairs outside of the contract, but this contract will cover the main part of the work.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Permit me to draw attention to a point which was under discussion a little while ago—the public building in Campbellton. Now, Campbellton is a nice little village. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), as I understand it, stated that the population was 7,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. I said 7,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The whole population of Restigouche county is about 10,000 and Campbellton is between 800 and 1,000.

New Brunswick—Woodstock public building —improvement, $3,900.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to provide for new letter-boxes and to make some repairs to the building.

Mr. CLARKE. Is this the drill shed again ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, this has nothing to do with the drill shed. We have a public building in Woodstock. About $2,000 had to be spent in repairs, including the building of a retaining wall.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the work been done by contract or by day labour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There will be a contract for the boxes, which will be the principal amount. The work already done was done by day labour.

Fredericton military buildings—officers' stables (revote, $1,500), $2,400.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to build a stable in place of one that was demolished as useless. This is under contract now. The revote of $1,500 was not paid out at the end of the year. It is let by contract to C. J. B. Simmons.

Fredericton military buildings—Sergeant-major's quarters, $2,300.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a revote of $1,000 and $1,300 additional, and is to make provision for the sergeant-major.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). How many sergeant-majors are there ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I suppose there is only one, but he may have a large family. I think it includes sergeants as well as the sergeant-major.

St. John quarantine station—water service, &c., $7,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total cost is estimated at $24,000. We had a long discussion on this quarantine station when the main item was up. This is simply a revote of an amount which was not spent at the end of June last. The station is on Partridge island. The water supply comes from the city.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Can you not get an adequate water supply on the island ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am told by the deputy minister that they have expended a lot of money in sinking artesian wells, and they cannot get any fresh water.

Mr. CLARKE. Has that quarantine station been used at all ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot give the details I would like to. This expenditure is made by the Department of Public Works at the request of the Department of Agriculture. I have no doubt that in the winter time this is much used.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I presume the minister has taken precautions that the pipe should not form an obstruction to vessels when the tide is low. There was some difficulty in Toronto on that account.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work is being done under the supervision of the engineer for the province of New Brunswick, and I presume he will look after that.

St. John drill hall, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote is put in at the request of the Department of Militia and Defence. Judging from my experience of such buildings in other places, I would not take the responsibility of saying that this building, when completed, will cost less than $100,000. The drill hall in Windsor cost $75,000 and that in London considerably more. I do not believe a suitable drill hall in the city of St. John could be erected for less than $100,000 in round figures.

Mr. EMMERSON. I wish to make a correction of a statement I made with respect to the population of the town of Campbellton, which I gave from the impression I obtained from visiting it and seeing that it was an important place. I find that Campbellton has a population of about 3,000. It is an incorporated town, and comprises almost the whole of the parish of Addington, in the county of Restigouche. It has been incorporated for a number of years, and has a mayor and council and a water system.

Mr. CLARKE. It is an ocean port, is it not ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). When the hon. gentleman makes a statement in the House that the town has a population of 7,000 inhabitants, when at the outside it has not more than 1,200, naturally I feel a little delicate in pointing out that the hon. gentleman is in the wrong. He says that it is incorporated. It is not incorporated ; if it was, it would be put down in the census as incorporated.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is incorporated by special Act of the legislature of New Brunswick, and has been for a number of years.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If it was incorporated as an ordinary town, it would be put down in the census as a separate municipality, whereas it is not mentioned in the census as a separate municipality.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We have passed the item for Campbellton, and the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) having made his explanation, we cannot say any more on this item.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to get some more information about this St. John drill hall. The Minister of Public Works has told us, with his usual candour and lucidity, that it is likely to cost $100,000. Have we got a site purchased yet? Have we any engineer's estimate? Do we know where we are at? He is asking us for $10,000, not knowing what the ultimate expenditure will be.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I was about to explain to the committee that a site had not yet been purchased. Some of the officers in St. John think that a new site should be purchased and that the government land should not be used. Others of the officers are of the opinion that a site located upon the land at present owned by the government is satisfactory. I have not had an opportunity yet, personally, to look into the question, but I intend to do so at an early date. I am not able to offer an opinion, but we have a good deal of land which was formerly occupied by the British government for military purposes and handed over to the Dominion at the time of confederation, and I had hoped that it might be possible to find a suitable site on that land. The cost of a suitable drill hall for a city like St. John cannot be less than somewhere about $100,000. That would be the figure I would name. Cities of similar population, such as the city of Halifax and other cities, have had drill halls erected at somewhere near that amount. The Halifax drill hall cost a good deal more—probably more than it ought to have cost. I will put the cost somewhere between $50,000 and $100,000, not to exceed $100,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Have there been any plans prepared yet?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We have had general plans for such a building, but the particular plans that would be used in the city of St. John have not yet been completed.

Mr. CLARKE. It would cost from $50,000 to $100,000?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. How many regiments have their headquarters at St. John?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There is the 62nd, a large infantry regiment, and there is a large garrison artillery regiment. I am not sure that there is any other regiment at present at that place, but in addition to that there are the field hospital and the bearer company.

Mr. COCHRANE. In connection with these estimates, if the hon. Minister of Public Works would take a suggestion from me, he would come down and tell us the amount that it will take to complete the building. I have in my mind cases in which some innocent looking estimates have come down for a few thousand dollars, and the expenditure terminated in about ten times as much as it was expected the building was going to cost. I think the question of the cost of a public work should be settled by the department before the hon. Minister of Public Works comes down and asks for any money at all. I do not think it is necessary to take the whole amount at first, but it appears to me that it would be more satisfactory to the committee to first determine the cost and then to carry out the plan as originally intended. In this case, they tell us that the building may cost $100,000, and they are only asking for $10,000 to commence with. The hon. Minister of Public Works will remember some similar cases in which small amounts were first asked, but in which the buildings cost a great deal more than the committee anticipated before they were completed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I had thought that I should rather have received a compliment from the hon. member from Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) than criticism. He and I are agreed that such a full statement should be given of a work that is intended to be undertaken that parliament cannot be deceived, and I think in this case that I have only been carrying out my promise to the House in that regard. These works are undertaken on the representations of the Department of Militia and Defence, and they have estimated that the cost of this building will run between $50,000 and $100,000.

Mr. BELL. The hon. Minister of Public Works states that this building is now estimated to cost between $50,000 and $100,000. Has there been any estimate made?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The department in preparing the plans has the experience of the cost of buildings similar to the one which it is now proposing to erect. The department, having stated that the cost of the building will not exceed $100,000, if the plans are not in accordance with that estimate, it has no right to go on with the work.

Mr. BELL. What did the Halifax drill hall cost?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Speaking from memory, it cost between $250,000 and $300,000.

Mr. BELL. Why is it estimated that you are going to provide St. John with a drill hall with an expenditure of from $50,000 to $100,000?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think they have other accommodation in St. John. Our effort, which is seconded by the Department of Militia and Defence, is to try and keep down these large expenditures as much as possible and to spread the expenditure more wisely over the country. If we can get sufficient accommodation for a reasonable expenditure, I do not see why we should go to any more expense than is really necessary.

Mr. CLARKE. Would it not be a better business proposition for the Department of Militia and Defence, if they want a drill hall at St. John, to ascertain what the strength of the force that will require accommodation is likely to be, and then prepare plans and give the committee the actual information as to what the cost will be? In four or five cases this morning votes of $5,000 or $10,000 have been asked for public buildings, and when we have asked if a site had been procured or if plans had been prepared, we have been answered in the negative. The department are in blissful ignorance as to what the cost will be, and we have to go it blind. Of course, we can assume no responsibility for such a lavish and reckless expenditure as this.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I hope my hon. friend will not object to this vote. It is not a large vote. It is true that all the data may not be forthcoming that ought to be available, but I think the committee can trust the minister and the government not to proceed with any expenditure until all the information has been obtained that is necessary, and until proper plans have been made. I am satisfied that additional accommodation is necessary at St. John. Recently the district officer commanding that district has been moved from Fredericton to St. John. Therefore, it has become a more important military centre. I am satisfied that if proper accommodation is provided the active militia at St. John will be increased, and I think it is desirable that at a point like St. John, which is a point of strategical importance, the strength of the militia should be increased. It will not be increased until sufficient accommodation is forthcoming. I will hope that as an earnest of what is intended my hon. friend will not object to the vote of $10,000. My hon. friend will find in the estimates later on an item which he will approve of, an item for the extension of the drill hall at Toronto. The necessary plans for the expenditure of that vote have not yet been matured. It is in very much the same position as the vote for St. John. I hope, therefore, that my hon. friend will not object to this.

Mr. CLARKE. I am sure the Minister of Militia does not want to misrepresent my course in this matter. We do not object to constructing drill sheds at these different strategic points, but we think it is very bad strategy and very bad business for the government to come to parliament and ask for a vote of $10,000 for a building which every one knows will cost perhaps ten times more, and at the same time, give us no information whatever about the matter. We want to know what kind of a building it will be; what it will cost; whether a site has been purchased and what is its cost, and whether the municipal authorities of St. John have been approached with the view that they might donate a site. All this information should be given by the government.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. They do not know even where the building is to be situated.

Mr. CLARKE. As a matter of fact the government give us no information whatever, although they are pledging parliament to what may ultimately be a very large expenditure. I might be called to order were I to discuss the item further on in the estimates for the extension of the Toronto drill hall, but I may say here that the militia force of the city of Toronto will appreciate the action of the minister in asking an appropriation of $20,000 for that purpose. Whether the vote is sufficient or not, I cannot say at the present moment, but if the department has not had proper plans prepared for the extension of the Toronto drill hall they are open to just the same criticism as in the case of the St. John drill shed. What we object to is that we are voting this money practically in the dark.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I must take exception to that.

Mr. CLARKE. To this method of doing business?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. It is impossible for us to do what the hon. member (Mr. Clarke) suggests. We cannot purchase a site until we are authorized by parliament to go on with the work, and purchase that site. Then, as to the character of the building, a good deal would depend on what site is selected. It is impossible to ask the chief architect to draw a plan, except in a general way for a public building, until he knows on what kind of ground it will be erected. We are asking here for authority to undertake a certain work, and we state what that work is estimated to cost, and there can be no deception in the matter whatever. I agree that if we ask for a further vote, after the original vote is taken, we should be able to give details.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Are we to understand that this money is to purchase a site ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It can be used for that.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I think the minister will find that the present military property owned by the government at St. John it not well situated for a drill shed.

Mr. CLARKE. Why ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Because the land owned by the government is situated on the sea coast, and also because it is too far removed from the centre of the town.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is what some of the military gentlemen in St. John say.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If the government property were selected, the men would have to walk from a mile to three-quarters of a mile from the centre of the town. I think the minister will find that it is advisable to build the drill shed in a more central location.

Mr. BELL. The point has been taken by other oppositions, as well as the present opposition, that such a vote as this is simply committing the country to an expenditure as to the ultimate amount of which we have no idea. The government are to be authorized to spend $10,000 by this vote and year after year further sums are asked, until in the end the cost may be $150,000 or $200,000. When a further vote is asked, the argument is used that the $20,000 or $30,000 or whatever it may be, must be voted, or otherwise the original expenditure is useless, and so we are led on step by step into an expenditure, which perhaps parliament would not consent to if it knew in the first place what the total expenditure would be.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not in the case spoken of to-day.

Mr. BELL. The only case cited to-day was the case of Halifax. Halifax is a city of not much more importance than St. John—perhaps the hon. gentleman from St. John will not admit that it is of any more importance. A small sum was originally voted for the drill shed at Halifax, and year after year other votes have been taken, until the amount has reached nearly $300,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There has been a change of government since then.

Mr. BELL. And I presume there will be another change of government before this building at St. John is finished, which might be a reasonable guarantee that the cost will be cut down. I have no doubt that the great cost of the drill shed at Halifax is to a certain extent attributable to the change of government, while another change may work reform in the opposite direction. What we are objecting to is the principle on which this is done. The government ought to be able to inform parliament as to the site which will be chosen, and then if there is an architect of experience in the service of the department, he should be able to estimate within $10,000 or $15,000 the cost of the building.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is exactly what we have done in this case. As minister, I should feel that if it were found that the expenditure would be considerably in excess of the amount which I stated to parliament, I would not go on with the work until parliament had sanctioned that change. I have always contended that it is wrong to do anything else, and I expect to have the support of my hon. friend (Mr. Bell) now. I have stated to the House about what the cost will be, but it is impossible to bring down a detailed plan until the site has been purchased.

Mr. BELL. I do not think, that the criticism of the minister on my course is justified. What I maintain is, that we should not be drawn into large expenditures by these small degrees. No business man or no business corporation would embark in an enterprise, under such circumstances as confront parliament in this case. The government do not know the cost, and actually, they do not know where they are going to erect the building.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. But we are not doing that.

Mr. BELL. We have been told here to-day that this building will cost from $50,000 to $100,000. That is an enormously wide margin ; it is in fact no estimate at all. The Minister of Public Works would not transact his own business in that way. The procedure in this case is utterly unbusinesslike.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think so. If you are putting up an addition to a factory and you know the maximum amount it will cost, then any business man would be safe in proceeding with the purchase of the site, and the details could be figured out afterwards.

Mr. BELL. Would a business man be satisfied that an estimate which varied from $50,000 to $100,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I quite agree that it would not be right to take a vote for $10,000, and after the statement is made that the work would only cost $10,000, then proceed to spend $100,000. But in this case, we have given the maximum cost as nearly as possible.

Mr. BELL. Then I suppose we must accept the statement of the minister ; that

so far as he is concerned, and if he remains in office, he pledges the government to the statement that this expenditure will not exceed $100,000; of which we are now asked to vote the first instalment of $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Having made the statement to the House that the estimated cost will not exceed a certain amount; then, if when the plans are made out it is found that the building would largely exceed that amount, I would not feel justified in going on with it until I asked the sanction of parliament to the change. That is the position I take.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the $100,000 include the cost of the site? The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) points out, that because of strategic reasons, the government land is not suitable on which to erect this building; and also because the men would have to walk a mile, or three-quarters of a mile, from the centre of the town to the drill shed, if it were erected on the property owned by the government. In view of this, another site may have to be purchased, and I would ask if the $100,000 estimate includes the cost of that site?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. One of the reasons why we have not decided as to the site, is that objection is taken to the land owned at present by the government as not being suitable. Perhaps the Minister of Militia might dispose of the government land if another site is purchased.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, I do not think so.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As the Militia Department has not come to a decision, of course, I cannot speak as to that.

Mr. CLARKE. We are fortunate in having both the Minister of Militia and the Minister of Public Works in the chamber at the present time, and I would ask, is it not a fact that the city of St. John offered a site some time ago, for the purpose of erecting a drill hall thereon?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is not a fact. There has been correspondence between the department and the militia officers in St. John, and the department pointed out, that if it is not in the public interest to construct a building on our own land, then the municipality ought to provide a site. I regret to say that I have not discovered from the correspondence between the city authorities and the government, that there was any desire on their part to purchase a site and hand it over. A site has been selected by them which they would like; it is not a very expensive site, but up to the present there is no agreement between the department and the civic authorities as to who should pay for it.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. We do not object to having proper drill halls erected for the accommodation of our militia in the different centres of the country, but we do object to proceeding with such works without the government giving adequate information to parliament. We have in this case, a vote for $10,000. It goes to the public that this is all that will be voted for that purpose, and the electors never dream that in the end the cost may be perhaps $150,000. The Minister of Militia ought to be able to lay before the House all particulars with regard to this drill shed. This is a very loose way of undertaking a work of this kind. I am quite prepared to justify any reasonable expenditure for the accommodation of our militia force, but I cannot approve of the government proceeding in this way. The minister knows very well, that if we pass this vote now, there will be no hope of getting a site from the municipal authorities of St. John. If the government brings down a matured scheme there will be no difficulty in getting a vote passed through this House. We are not objecting to the expenditure of $10,000, or $100,000, but we do object that the country should be committed to a large expenditure without being placed in possession of the details.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I do not think it is desirable that we should threaten the city of St. John, that they will not get a drill hall, or a vote for one, until they agree to give us a site. If that is a good policy, then we have the cards in our own hands, and we can say: Unless you give us a site we will build on our own property. I can tell my hon. friend that I have satisfied myself that the present accommodation in the city of St. John is inadequate, and the military authorities have informed me of that fact. I have further satisfied myself, that a suitable drill hall can be erected for $100,000. We have general plans, which can be adapted to the city of St. John when the site is secured. It would seem to me that the information which has been given with regard to this vote, is far more ample than has been usually given with regard to similar votes. The criticism made by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) has no doubt a good deal of force; but if he will go back during the whole time since confederation, he can apply that criticism to almost every public work that has ever been proposed in this House. I admit with him that it is a question for consideration; but if we are to reform our course, I suggest that we put it off until next session, and allow this item to go through.

Mr. BELL. I think I suggested that the argument I used was one which had been used not only by this, but by previous oppositions. I think I was laying down a sound

basis as to the mode in which these moneys should be voted, and I am glad to have the assurance of the hon. Minister of Public Works that he feels seriously disposed to look on the statement he makes in the House as made on his responsibility as a minister. I suppose we may consider that a limit has been fixed to this expenditure by one who is authoritative.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). My own idea is that when a particular item is brought before the House, it should be explained at the time; but with regard to the purchase of a site for a public building, I think the proper plan is to be ready to close the purchase as soon as the land is selected, which could not be done if the minister had to wait till he could come to the House for a vote. With regard to a new drill shed for the city of St. John, I have no doubt that if the members from that city were here, they would admit the necessity of a new drill shed being erected in a suitable place in the centre of the populous part of the city. At present it is off at one side, and it is not convenient of access.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there a drill shed in existence in St. John now ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it practicable to use the site on which the present drill shed stands ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Possibly it may be, although I think the department would first have to consider the question whether it might not be advantageous to dispose of that building and realize upon it.

Mr. CLARKE. Is the present drill hall up in the city or down near the water front ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is not in the centre of the city.

Mr. BLAIN. There seems to have been some correspondence with respect to the site. Perhaps the government could tell us what amount of money this site will cost.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no correspondence in the Public Works Department except what we have had with the Militia Department.

Mr. BLAIN. The Minister of Militia said that there had been some correspondence between his department and the municipal authorities, and that the site had partly been selected. If that site or some other like it is to be purchased, what amount of money will be required for it ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am not able to give my hon. friend a figure; but I will make a note of it, and when my own estimates come up I shall be able to tell. There is correspondence, and a site has been selected, which is approved of by the city and by some of the military men there. I think one of the military officers secured an option upon it in his own name. The government is in no way bound by that however. I presume that the price is named, but I do not remember it at this moment.

Mr. BLAIN. Did the municipal authorities refuse to purchase the site, and do they expect the government to purchase it ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think they do.

Mr. BLAIN. If that be correct, then I suppose some portion of the $10,000 now asked for will go towards the purchase of the site ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Not necessarily As I have already explained, the government own land there. I do not care to give an opinion with reference to it, but a very prominent officer in the city of St. John has assured me that the land owned by the government is perfectly suitable for a drill hall, and I propose to investigate that question carefully by sending down an officer from the headquarters staff before I advise the Minister of Public Works to purchase a new site.

Mr. EMMERSON. Before this item is passed, I would crave the indulgence of the committee to make an explanation, although it is not in order. I want to be correct in all my statements in this House; and if I find that I have made an incorrect statement under misapprehension, I want to be the first to correct it. I made the statement that the town of Campbellton was incorporated, and that the number of its inhabitants was about 3,000.

Mr. CLARKE. 4,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. My last statement was that it was about 3,000. My hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) questioned my statement that the town was incorporated, and said that it was not. I have in my hand the statutes of the province of New Brunswick, by which I find that the town of Campbellton was incorporated in the 51st year of the reign of Victoria—that was in 1888—and it has continued to be an incorporated town down to the present moment. It has grown largely in population during that time. I believe it has grown very materially since the last census.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Might I ask why Campbellton does not appear in the census as an incorporated place ?

Mr. EMMERSON. If you refer to Westmoreland——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. I do not think I can allow this to go any further.

I have allowed the hon. gentleman to make his explanation that Campbellton is an incorporated town, and the discussion must end there.

Mr. CLARKE. I submit, with the greatest possible deference and respect, that the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) was asking a very pertinent question. He has the official census, and he points out——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We cannot go into the question of the correctness of the census at this moment.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I have made all the statement I want.

Lévis—public building, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a supplementary vote in addition to what has been taken in the main estimates.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is that a new building or an old building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A new building.

Mr. CLARKE. What is its total cost to be ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have forgotten. I made the statement about a year ago, at the time the first vote was taken. I think it is about $25,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Is this building under construction ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the site been purchased ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We intend to use a site owned by the Crown, under the control of the Railway Department. We have not yet had it transferred.

Mr. CLARKE. The work will be done by tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Quebec marine and fisheries stores building, $1,200.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This $1,200 is to instal electric light and fixtures in the public building used by the Marine and Fisheries Department at Quebec.

Quebec Citadel—drill shed for school of gunnery, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to build a school of gunnery at the citadel at Quebec. It is being erected for the Department of Militia and Defence. It is most important that this should be provided for the next fiscal year, as new guns have been ordered, and accommodation should be provided for that.

Mr. CLARKE. What will this cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the item is allowed to stand I shall bring down that information this afternoon.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it a permanent school ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that this building is required on account of the new guns.

Item allowed to stand.

Quebec military buildings—main store building at Dominion arsenal, $11,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in connection with the Dominion arsenal. It is really a stores building for extra stores there, required on account of the increase of the work.

Mr. CLARKE. Is this to give additional accommodation for the storage of military supplies ? I would like to ask the minister in this connection if there are other stores departments where separate supplies of ammunition may be kept ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My hon. friend will find in the estimates that provision has been made for the construction of a magazine in the city of Toronto, and for a large storehouse and magazine in Winnipeg, and I think for one at London, Ontario.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Early in the session I drew the attention of the minister and of the House to the necessity of having not only stores at various points, but also arsenals, and I pointed to the example set to us by the United States. All their arsenals are inland ; Springfield is in the centre of Massachusetts, and Rock Island is on an island in the Mississippi. Nearly all their private manufacturing arsenals are located remote from the sea-coast in order that in case of necessity they can be used by the United States government. It would be really advisable that arsenals should not be established even in Toronto because it is on the coast of Lake Ontario. They would be better at inland centres, at Ottawa, or some place remote from the shore.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would like to ask the Minister of Militia if these premises will be occupied by the troops which the hon. member for North Norfolk is going to send down ?

At one o'clock, committee took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am advised that this amount will cover the total cost of the main store building. That is the answer to the question I was asked before recess.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Some question was asked, just before the committee rose for recess, whether anything similar was being done for general stores elsewhere.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Minister of Militia pointed out that in the estimates there are amounts to provide places at Toronto, Winnipeg and some other points.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What are these general stores ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden). This is for the cartridge factory chiefly.

Mr. MORIN. I was not present when the item for the Lévis public building was under discussion. If the Minister of Public Works will bear with me, I would like to ask some questions. What is this public building for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. For all the services of the government, particularly post office and customs.

Mr. MORIN. We voted an amount of $5,000 last April, I think, for a public building in Lévis.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes ; I explained that this was an additional vote.

Mr. MORIN. How much will the building cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My recollection is that the estimate was $25,000.

Mr. MORIN. Has the government purchased the ground ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We do not need to purchase it, unless we have to pay the Department of Railways and Canals, in whose name it is now held.

Mr. MORIN. Has the minister received tenders for this building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not yet. I explained that there had been delay in making over the site from one department to the other.

Mr. MORIN. Does the hon. minister know when he will commence construction on the building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sorry there has been delay, but I think we ought to be able to begin at once.

Mr. CLARKE. The Minister of Militia made some statements with regard to buildings in London and Toronto, in which military stores, ammunition and military supplies, are to be stored.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) misunderstood me. In these estimates we are asking, I think for the first time, to make provision for the establishment of stores buildings at different points throughout the Dominion.

Mr. CLARKE. Can the hon. minister give further information on the subject ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There is provision in these estimates for the construction of a store building at Winnipeg and magazine at Toronto, a magazine at Winnipeg and a magazine at one other point, I think London. There is a general store building, as my hon. friend knows, at Toronto. Perhaps I might explain, with regard to Toronto, that it is quite possible, in fact quite probable, that there will be a new building constructed for the city of Toronto if certain negotiations, which are now pending, come to a successful termination. Therefore, probably, any estimate for the construction of a building will be delayed for a short time.

Mr. CLARKE. These magazines will be for arms and ammunition ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. For ammunition.

Quebec Citadel—drill shed for school of gunnery. $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The estimated cost of this building is $30,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the school of gunnery permanently established at Quebec ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it a compulsory course ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It will be. We have never had a suitable building for carrying out this sort of instruction, though it has been carried out, of course, to some extent. But now, in connection with the arsenal at Quebec, we are able to carry out the repairs of all the guns used by the artillery throughout the Dominion. If anything goes wrong with a gun we send it there, instead of having to send it back to the old country. We are putting in all the necessary machinery to repair the most delicate guns in use. It is, therefore, convenient to have a school of gunnery at that point. The very fact of carrying on this work of repair enables the teachers to illustrate and explain the different parts of the gun. We are having this building constructed, which will cost $30,000, to enable this to be done efficiently.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, I understand this does not include instruction in musketry, but does it include light field guns as well as heavy guns ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Guns known as guns of position —the 7·5 and a larger class of guns.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would this include the guns used by field batteries ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, field guns or heavy artillery.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Including such arms as gatling guns ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Well, no ; that would hardly be included. Although it might be. This building would be sufficient to do that ; but I think that what is particularly had in view is training with reference to the different parts making up the field guns and larger pieces, and the use of such artillery.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Are you getting the new class of guns that have been adopted in the British army—the latest ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Of rifle ? Yes ; we have ordered half a dozen of these guns, and we expect them here very shortly.

Mr. CLARKE. What are they for ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We are ordering them for the purpose of comparing them with our own rifle which is being constructed by the Ross Company.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I mean heavy guns —artillery. There is a new gun lately adopted by the British army, and I think we ought to have the same.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. A fifteen-pounder ? Of course, we have no official information that the War Office have decided on any particular gun, although I have seen the statement in the newspapers which the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) refers to. We have ordered, subject, of course, to the decision of the War Office. I understand that the one likely to be adopted was the 18·5 pounder.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Have any of the new rifles being manufactured in Quebec been finished yet ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. When does the hon. minister expect them to be delivered ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They should be delivered at the rate of 1,000 a month. I am told that before the end of the year they will be delivered.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Can that rifle use the same ammunition as the British arm ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes—·303.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose the difference between the Ross rifle and the British arm is not very great ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is very trifling indeed. The Ross rifle is what is known as a straight-pull rifle ; the other pulls back with a twist.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are any of the parts interchangeable in the two rifles ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Not as between the Lee-Enfield and the Ross, but the Ross rifle is being manufactured so that all the parts are interchangeable. I mean to say that, taking a dozen rifles and separating the parts, you can make a new lot of rifles with the interchangeable parts. They are not made for an individual rifle but for any rifle.

Mr. CLARKE. How do they compare as to cost ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We think the Ross rifle is the better of the two, I think it is quite as good. The contract laid on the Table of the House shows that the cost of the Ross rifle is $25. I had a communication the other day from the War Office offering a new rifle, and I find that if the expense of inspection, freight, &c., were added, it just about comes up to the cost of the Ross rifle, possibly a little less.

M. BORDEN (Halifax). Does this company supply the rifles to people generally or only to the government of Canada ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They are not under restriction not to furnish it to any one else, but I think that our requirements will probably test their capacity to the full extent. They have agreed to supply us 1,000 rifles a month.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In England, is the production of the rifles supplied for the British army restricted to that purpose alone, or can it be sold to others ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It can be sold. Most of the rifles used in the English army are made by the trade, as it is called. During the South African war the trade was restricted.

Montreal examining warehouse, additions and alterations, including fittings, furniture, &c., $20,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in addition to the $15,000 previously voted for repairs and alterations in the examining warehouse at Montreal. I may say that the principal item is $21,000 for freight elevators. This work has been under way for some time. The total cost will be $35,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has this been reported as necessary by the officers of the department ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. The old one was discarded at the request of the Customs Department. Most of the work is being done by contract. Some

small repairs are being done otherwise. The contract for the elevator has not been given out yet.

Mr. BLAIN. I noticed when this matter was up last year the minister stated it would cost $30,000, now he says it will cost $35,000. Can the minister explain the reason of the different estimates ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know that there is any explanation that I could give. The difference is not large in an estimate for repairing a large building like this.

Terrebonne, public building, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to provide for the erection of a new public building in the town of Terrebonne. Although a small town with a population of only about 2,000, according to the last census. I understand it is the most important place in the district. The post office revenue is about $17,000. The money orders issued amounted to $9,670, and those received to $34,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Has a site been provided by the municipality ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The site has not been provided. The total cost including the site will not be over $12,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it to be used for any other purpose than that of a post office ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is to be used for customs and excise as well as a post office.

Acton Vale public building, $6,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a new building. I understand that Acton Vale is the principal town in the county of Bagot. The population according to the last census was 1,175. It is estimated to cost about $10,000.

Mr. BENNETT. It is refreshing to see a large sum like this voted for a public building in a village of the population mentioned, while the promise made by the Minister of Customs and others that the large and flourishing town of Owen Sound should have a public building, has been entirely overlooked.

St. John's—public building, $6,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This building is to be used for the customs and other government officials as well as for a post office. It will be situated in the central part of the town. I believe there is no other public building in the country. If will cost about $10,000. The population of St. John's is over 4,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Does the minister say there are no other public buildings in the county ? What about the barracks?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I mean for a post office.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Further down in the same list I see there is a vote proposed for an examining warehouse.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the site been procured ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The site has not been procured.

Mr. CLARKE. And the plans have not been prepared ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, they are prepared.

Mr. CLARKE. Of course, the work will be let by tender?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Have there been any negotiations with or propositions from the municipality in respect to a site ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I am informed there has been no correspondence in regard to that.

Mr. BLAIN. What proportion of this amount will go to a site ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The deputy minister informs me that the site will cost over $1,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the balance complete and equip the building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief architect thinks that this amount will complete it, but my experience is that the fittings generally are extra.

Mr. MORIN. Have they not a drill hall in St. John's already ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They have a barracks, but no drill hall. They have a military school there.

Mr. CLARKE. The plans of this building have been prepared. It was thought wise to prepare plans for this building and not wise to prepare plans for other buildings?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend has misunderstood me. The plans were only prepared for this building because we are erecting similar buildings in other places. In speaking of the St. John, N.B., drill hall, or of any other large building, it is necessary to prepare special plans, but in this case the plan which is available for other buildings only requires to be changed to suit the site.

Mr. CLARKE. Then, as a matter of fact, the plan has not been prepared ? It is a general plan ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The plan is prepared for similar buildings,

and that is the plan we go upon in making this estimate.

Mr. CLARKE. A model plan ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A model plan.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the post office and customs revenue at St. John's ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The postal revenue for the last year was $6,912 and the customs duties $119,549.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). For Acton Vale also.

Mr. BENNETT. The post office revenue at Acton Vale is $838.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $838.23.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And the customs revenue at Acton Vale ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is an outport.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is that not a pretty large building for an outport?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A public building there is only defensible under the policy which has been adopted of giving one building to the shire town of each county.

Mr. CLARKE. The case is a desperate one.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are just a few counties which have no buildings, and it seemed rather invidious to have these counties without a building. The policy which I have indicated was adopted rather to give the shire town or county town, as we call it, a public building ?

Mr. CLARKE. Why does not Owen Sound get one ?

Mr. BLAIN. What is the policy in respect of caretakers in public buildings in Quebec ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In a great many cases the officer in charge lives in the building and takes care of the building at an average cost of about $60 a year.

Mr. BLAIN. Will there be a caretaker appointed for this building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think that there is any doubt that the postmaster will be called upon to be the caretaker of this building, whether he lives in it or not. In some cases where the postmaster does not live in the building, he has to take care of it, for which he gets this allowance.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The building at St. John's and the building at Acton Vale are practically to cost the same?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are practically to cost the same, but my hon. friend will notice that there is a very large postal and customs revenue at St. John's. It is now proposed to erect a new building in a more central part of the town for the accommodation of the people using the post office.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is to be used for a post office only ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Assuming that it is, still the postal revenue of St. John's is eight or ten times as much as that of Acton Vale. If a building of that character is sufficient for St. John's, one would suppose a very much less expensive building would be needed for Acton Vale. What is the revenue at St. John's ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Nearly $7,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And the revenue at Acton Vale is $838. Why should you have two buildings at practically the same cost ? If a building of this character is reasonably sufficient, and I have no doubt it is, for the post office at St. John's, where the postal revenue is nearly $7,000, upon what principle do you spend the same amount of money at Acton Vale, where the postal revenue is only $838?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If we had been putting up a government building for all the officials of St. John's, the building which we propose to erect would not be large enough, but this is wholly for a post office. At Acton Vale I do not think we could put up a suitable public building for much less than the figure I gave. The population of the town or village does not indicate the number of people who use the post office. People come in for half a mile or more from the surrounding country.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). One would think that the postal revenue would indicate that. I think we started with the same premise that each of these buildings is to be used for the purpose of the post office. There is a separate building at St. John's for the custom-house. If you can erect a post office building at St. John's which is reasonably sufficient for the public needs for $10,000 to transact a business of nearly $7,000 a year, how is it that you are spending the same amount of money for erecting a post office at Acton Vale, where the total postal revenue is less than one-eighth of that amount ? I am afraid the hon. minister has not made himself very clear upon that point.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend perhaps is right, but a man could build a house for the accommodation

of two people which would have the same capacity as a house built to accommodate ten people. When we want a certain number of offices of practically the same size, the difference in the cost of the two buildings is not material for that reason. I do not know whether we could expect to have a permanent and substantial building erected for much less money.

Mr. BLAIN. What rent does the government pay for the public building at present in use at Acton Vale ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We do not pay any rent.

Mr. BENNETT. An allowance for rent is made to the postmaster ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The post office is furnished by the postmaster, unless there is some special arrangement which I do not know of.

Mr. BLAIN. What allowance is made to the postmaster at Acton Vale for supplying the building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in the Post Office Department, and I know nothing about it.

Mr. BLAIN. It is information we should have when you are taking a vote for such a large sum for a public building.

Mr. BENNETT. This post office has a revenue of $838 a year, and probably the postmaster is allowed $50 a year for rent. Therefore, we are spending $12,000 for a building when we can rent a suitable one for $50 a year. And yet, in the town of Owen Sound, where the postal revenue is $14,500 a year there is to be no public building erected. This is a shame. The Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) should take some interest in this. He ran an election in North Grey one time, and he promised that Owen Sound should have a public building.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. So far as I am personally concerned, I am prepared to admit that the town of Owen Sound should have a public building. There is no town in the province of Ontario, and no town that I know of in the Dominion, that is more entitled to a public building than Owen Sound. I am prepared to take that up later on.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Is it the intention of the government to bring down a vote this session for the erection of a public building in Owen Sound ? I gathered from a remark made by the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) earlier in the session, that it was the intention of the government to place a sum in the estimates for that purpose. I do not see any appropriation in this batch of estimates for Owen Sound, and I wish to know whether any further estimates will be brought down ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Thomson) will find any statement of mine in 'Hansard' to that effect. Speaking for myself, I said I was in favour of making a recommendation for an appropriation to erect a public building in Owen Sound, but it is impossible for me to say what will be in the estimates before they are published.

Mr. COCHRANE. Owen Sound is entitled to some consideration from the Minister of Customs. His supporters promised during a certain by-election, that if the Minister of Customs were elected a public building would be given to the town. They voted for the Minister of Customs, but instead of getting a public building they got cold justice. The Minister of Customs is under an obligation to Owen Sound, to implement the promise of his supporters. I can assure him, that though he may fool the people some time he cannot fool them all the time, and if he goes back there for an election he is sure to get beaten.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). It is to be regretted that the government have not submitted an appropriation for the erection of a public building in Owen Sound. In 1896, when the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) came there to seek election, distinct promises were made that there would be a public building erected in Owen Sound if the hon. gentleman were returned, and in consequence of those promises he received a large majority. I regret to say that the riding of North Grey never received so few favours from the government, as when the Minister of Customs represented it. At a later election, similar promises were made, and Dr. Horsey was returned. During the late by-elections supporters of the government swarmed the riding, and they declared openly that a public building would be erected in Owen Sound if a supporter of the present administration were elected. I may tell the Minister of Public Works, that notwithstanding that Owen Sound is Conservative, it gave a Liberal majority in 1896, for the Minister of Customs on the basis of the promises then made. There is a normal Conservative majority of from 100 to 150 in Owen Sound, and yet Dr. Horsey, in 1900 secured a majority. In the last by-election the promises were repeated and Owen Sound again gave a Liberal majority of 33. Thus, on three occasions, Owen Sound, although a Conservative town, gave a Liberal majority, because of the promises held out by the government. It is time that these election promises were done away with, and that Owen Sound should receive a public building on its own merits, irrespective altogether of political considerations. It shows base ingratitude to Owen Sound, that the government have not carried out their promises. The postal revenue of Owen Sound is about $15,000; the customs revenue, $40,000; the Inland Revenue, $100,000; and not-

withstanding that over $1,000 a year is paid in rents for the accommodation of the officers of the government, it is left without a public building; while a little place like Arichat, in Nova Scotia, with 600 inhabitants and $600 postal revenue gets a $22,000 post office. All through the supplementary estimates the same thing occurs; the government are erecting public buildings in small towns, and side-tracking an important commercial centre like Owen Sound. For instance, Campbellton, New Brunswick, with a population of 2,000 inhabitants, and a postal revenue of about $3,000, gets a public building costing $35,000, and the Minister of Public Works justifies his policy by saying that it is a seaport town and gives so much revenue. But, here is Owen Sound, with 10,000 inhabitants; with a postal revenue of $15,000 a year, and the Minister of Public Works, and the government of which he is a member, refuse to erect a public building in it. Well, the government have fooled the electors of North Grey two or three times, but they cannot continue fooling them for ever. When the next election comes around, the electors of Owen Sound will not fall so easily into the Liberal trap as they did on the past three elections, and the government will have to try some other electioneering dodge. I exceedingly regret the conduct of the government in this respect because I would far rather see Owen Sound with a post office and giving a Liberal majority, than without a post office and giving a Conservative majority. I hope that even at this late hour, the government will bring down an estimate to erect a public building in Owen Sound, I trust that they will not longer neglect so important a town in the great province of Ontario.

Mr. CLARKE. I understood the Minister of Public Works to speak very nicely about Owen Sound, and to be in favour of giving a public building. Does he intend to make any recommendation now, so that an estimate may be passed for the work this session ? Is it not time to fulfil the promises, solemnly repeated again and again to the electors of North Grey ? Surely the Minister of Customs will use his influence to get an appropriation for Owen Sound, which is one of the finest towns in Canada ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no knowledge of any promise having been made with regard to the erection of a public building in Owen Sound. I did say, speaking for myself, personally, that I was in favour of the erection of a public building at Owen Sound. My hon. friend knows that I am not in a position to say just now what I can do. My hon. friend brought politics into the matter. I have no knowledge of that nor of any promise having been made. All I know is that the town of Owen Sound, from its commercial importance, is entitled on its merits to a public building, and it will have my best assistance in that direction.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have said all I desire to say about the town of Acton Vale. It seems to me that the building proposed to be erected there is rather large, considering the revenue, especially as compared with the town of St. John's. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works a moment ago said that he would take up the town of Owen Sound as soon as he came to it. What I cannot understand is why he should come to the town of Acton Vale, which has a revenue of only $838, and a population of only 1,175, so long before he comes to the town of Owen Sound, with a postal revenue of $15,000, a large revenue from customs and excise, and a population of about 10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend must know that it is impossible for any minister to meet all the applications at one time. However, I have not changed my opinion with regard to the claims of Owen Sound.

Montmagny—public building, $6,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Is this a new building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. This is an unfortunate building. It did not belong to the Dominion, and it collapsed in a storm. There were certain conditions with regard to it between the municipality and the department, which seemed to me to be objectionable, and I did not feel like rebuilding it unless those conditions were removed to some extent. It is also a question for the chief architect to decide whether that would be the most economical course. I am taking this vote for the purpose of leaving the matter in the hands of the department, and seeing whether satisfactory arrangements can be made with the municipality. It will cost between $5,000 and $7,000 to erect a building, and it would probably cost about the same amount to reconstruct the old building.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the population of that town ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About 2,700.

Mr. MORIN. Does the minister remember that some time ago there was $2,800 voted for that building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, and the money was not spent for the reasons which I have just stated.

Mr. MORIN. The minister should have sent an engineer to examine the building. In 1897 the member for that county at that time got $7,500 voted for the purchase of this building, and he knew very well from whom he was buying it. The building cost $7,494.75. That building was built on props, right over a mud hole, and that is the reason it went down last winter. There are many

buildings about it which did not go down. The fact is the man who put up that building was sick of it, and he sold it to the government five or six years ago. There is almost $5,000 gone, and the minister asks the House to vote $6,000 more; that will be $11,000 for a population of 1,119.

Mr. CLARKE. I think we ought to have a fuller explanation from the minister after what the hon. member has said. Is it the intention of the government to erect another building on the same site or to purchase a new site?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend says the officials should examine these buildings. He will at least commend me for having taken action in not spending money to repair it. The chief architect examined the property and reported this to me, and that is the reason this money was not spent before. Unless the conditions are changed, we shall not perhaps repair that building, but may find it more economical to build a new one. My hon. friend's statement is quite right, so far as I have been able to investigate the matter.

Mr. TALBOT. I would like to ask the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Morin) what he means by saying that the post office of Montmagny is erected over a mud hole and on piles, which I suppose he means when he speaks of props?

Mr. MORIN. In the first place, that building was not built for the post office. It was 25 or 30 per cent too large for that purpose. If I am not mistaken, it was used as a club or as a place where music was taught. If you put up another building there, do not build one as large as that.

Montreal post office—improvements, $13,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for putting in an elevator, improving the two passenger elevators, constructing a new street receiver, and making small repairs running from $400 down to $150.

St. Hyacinthe drill hall, $15,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total estimated cost of this building as furnished by the Militia Department is $24,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What regiment occupies this drill hall?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The 84th regiment of infantry of St. Hyacinthe which is now a city battalion of four effective companies.

Mr. CLARKE. Has a site been purchased?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No site has been purchased. Negotiations were going on some time ago for a very fine site, a large piece of ground on which we had an option at $4,000. A disastrous fire took place in the city, and the municipal council approached us with regard to another site near the river. Negotiations for the purchase of the original site would probably have been concluded before now but for that fire.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I would like to have a statement prepared showing what drill sheds have been established in military centres in each of the provinces, giving by numbers the regiments occupying them, and the cost of each. I think that the province of Ontario has acquiesced in the spending of more money for this purpose in other provinces than in Ontario, although these provinces have not as strong militia forces as we have in Ontario.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will get the information in detail, but I have some votes in Ontario coming up later on, and on them I will be glad to explain our policy in regard to this matter.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice that a small amount of money was voted in 1901 for the purchase of the site for this building. In 1902 that amount was increased to $5,000, and now we are asked for $15,000. This seems a strange condition of things as the $5,000 has not been spent and the site is not yet purchased. Does the minister regard that as being consistent with the principle he laid down last session, that he would deal with matters of that kind on business principles?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) did not hear my explanation. When I asked for a vote of $5,000, we had an option for the purchase of a site, but after the disastrous fire in that city the municipal council approached us with regard to the purchase of a site. If the original site is purchased, this would be all we could possibly spend between now and the end of the fiscal year. The estimated cost of the whole building is $24,000. My idea is that we will be able to prepare specifications, advertise for tenders, and start this work early in the spring, and that $15,000 will be all that we will require for the work to be done up to the end of the fiscal year. The balance will be asked for at a future session.

Mr. BLAIN. What amount have we to pay for a site?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Four thousand dollars was the amount of the option we had on a site before the fire.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the proposition now to change the site?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The municipal council proposed purchasing some property near the river, and they want us to take a portion of it. They have submitted a by-law to the people, and we are waiting for the result of that vote before we decide definitely on the purchase of a site. My hon. friend will understand that

in a large place like that the government and the department are anxious to meet the views of the municipal council, representing the views of the people.

Mr. CLARKE. I think that this is a case where we can congratulate the Militia Department. The site has not been procured yet, but I understand the plans are ready. If the Militia Department had the plans ready in advance in some other cases, work would get on more rapidly. I commend the action of the Minister of Militia in having the plans of this building prepared in advance.

St. John's—examining warehouse, $3,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a revote of $3,500 to provide for the erection of an addition in rear of the St. John's public buildings for examining warehouse purposes. The present examining warehouse is an old wooden building set up on blocks; neither wind nor water-tight; unfit for use and beyond repair.

Mr. BENNETT. Is this the same town in which the new public building is being erected?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Are there to be two distinct and separate public buildings there? Why cannot they be combined?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I explained that two or three times.

Mr. BENNETT. Why, the item has just been called, and I do not see how the hon. minister could have explained it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I explained it on the other item, that for the post office building. This is an annex to the public building for an examining warehouse.

Mr. BLAIN. When the department is putting up a new building cannot they make it sufficiently large to meet the requirements of this branch of the public service also?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As I explained, this building is not suitably situated for the post office. The customs business there is very large, yielding a revenue of $120,000 a year.

Three Rivers customs house, new heating apparatus, $1,600.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to reconstruct the heating apparatus.

Mr. CLARKE. When was the old apparatus put in?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief architect tells me that it was put in more than twenty years ago.

Longueuil public building, $5,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Is this a new building?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, this is in the county of Chambly. The population of the town is 2,757, and the postal revenue $612.92.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the cost of the building and site?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The building will cost $10,000. The cost of the site will be small.

Mr. BENNETT. Will this building serve any other purpose besides that of the post office?

Mr. CLARKE. It will serve election purposes.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for a post office only. In customs, this town is an outport of Montreal.

Mr. BENNETT. This is even worse than the other case we have had under discussion. The appearance of this in the estimates is due to the fact that this town is in the district to be presided over by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) in election time, and he is going to be true to his record in the past to make elections not with prayers alone, but with something else. I have looked up the report of the Post Office Department, and I find that the public are being served there in a building for which a rental of $40 a year is being paid. There is no complaint that the building is not sufficient; nor does it appear that the postmaster makes any complaint that $40 a year is not a sufficiently high rent. And the total revenue of this post office is $612. I am surprised that the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) sits there with no word of protest against what he would have called in the old days a scandalous and outrageous expenditure. I remember one occasion, under the previous government, when the hon. gentleman who is now Minister of Customs and others of the opposition of that day held the House for a whole night to discuss a proposition that was much more defensible than this one. I know by the way in which you are looking at me, Mr. Chairman (Mr. Macdonald) you would like to have an opportunity to protest against this expenditure. It is refreshing to see these gentlemen, so blatant in the past in their professions of economy, proposing an expenditure of $10,000 for a public building in a town like this. Not only must that building be paid for, but it must be heated and lighted and a caretaker for it must be paid. I congratulate the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on securing this grant, and I sympathize with the Minister of Public Works, because I know that it is against his will that this grant is going through.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Not only is this a violation of the professions of hon. gentlemen in times past, but it is also an injustice

to many of the larger towns in the province of Ontario. There has been added to my constituency another township and town, a very important town—Meaford. The population is about 2,000 and the revenue from the post office is between $3,000 and $4,000. Money orders to the amount of $25,000 are issued there yearly. That town is left without a post office. There ought to be some principle or rule to guide the government in making these grants for public buildings. It is to be regretted that such grants as these are proposed. They involve a flagrant violation of the promises made by hon. gentlemen opposite when in opposition. They may think it very clever; they may think they can 'fix' a constituency by this means. But it is no credit to the Liberal party. It is something that they will have to defend, and that will always furnish ground of attack on the part of their opponents. It is a shame that a government that came in under such splendid auspices should descend to such a despicable means to keep themselves in office.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The town of Bracebridge which has 3,000 or 4,000 inhabitants was promised a post office building. I see the promises made to that town are being carried out in part by giving them a dock. But they were promised a post office during the last election. I regret that the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Grant) is silent, and that the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) is not here to insist on the Minister of Public Works putting in an item for that building. I trust we shall yet hear from the hon. member for North Ontario.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it not possible to get a little more light on this subject? We are putting these estimates through with very inadequate information. What is to be the total cost of this building? Has the site been secured? Are the plans prepared? We seem to be going it blind in most of these cases.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) must admit that I have given that information already.

Mr. CLARKE. I did not so understand it. What is to be the total cost?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I gave that, but I will repeat it. It will cost $10,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Ten thousand dollars. In a place with postal receipts of only six hundred dollars?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Its being the only building in the county is the only defence I can put in, aside from the population and the receipts.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the minister will give us the policy of his department on this question. It is rather difficult for us to understand why very much larger towns in other parts of Canada, having a much larger revenue, are overlooked. Now, the minister feels it his duty to grant this request made to him, and we are not complaining of that; but we think the public should understand what is the policy that guides the minister in the erection of public buildings, whether it is the population, whether it is the revenue that is paid into the Customs and Post Office Departments, or whether it is merely a political reason. It is very important that the public should know what policy is guiding him, so that they may know when to come to the government for a public building.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have explained to the committee the policy with regard to the erection of these buildings. I am willing to admit that the revenue and the population should be the principal considerations. My hon. friend knows that it has been the policy to give at least one public building in each county.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I may say that the receipts of the post office at Longueuil, my native town, have been a disgrace to the place for years. To my knowledge petition after petition were sent to the Conservative government during many years, asking for a public building there. But no attention was paid to them, for the reason, I believe, that the town was Liberal. I cannot see any other reason. Since the advent of the present government, in 1896, petitions have been presented time and again, and the people have been promised a new post office. The fact that the town is situated on the south shore of the St. Lawrence, opposite the city of Montreal, probably accounts for the revenue being so small, because the people who go over to Montreal in the daytime take their letters with them and deposit them there. The letters would reach their destination sooner if deposited in Montreal than if deposited in Longueuil. Also many people receive their letters in Montreal instead of Longueuil. The grievance complained of by the people with respect to their post office ought to be remedied and is going to be remedied by the present government. For myself, I have had nothing to do with it. I no longer represent Chambly since 1896, when that county was joined to Verchères.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is it not a fact that a great portion of the people of Longueuil work in Montreal and cross over every day by the ferry?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is what I have just explained.

Mr. BENNETT. It is plain from what has been said by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that this is more of a job than

ever. He says that a good many people living in Longueuil have their business connections in the city of Montreal as a matter of course, and as a consequence there is little or no necessity for a post office building in that town. He also says that for the last seven years—I suppose he is now taking a fling at the Postmaster General in his absence—in saying the post office in Longueuil has been a disgrace to that town.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not say for the last six or seven years. I said that for years gone by, for the last twenty-five or thirty years.

Mr. BENNETT. That only makes it worse. The hon. gentleman says that for many years the people have been complaining of this grievance. There was a course open to them, simply to make a complaint to the Postmaster General that the premises were not sufficient for the post office business, and then it would have been the duty of the Postmaster General either to provide suitable premises or to resign. It was not to be expected that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would be looking after matters so trivial as the public good of Longueuil, seeing that the more important interests of Montreal took up his attention. Being a suburb of the city of Montreal, the people cross over to Montreal to do their business, and consequently we have only the trifling receipts of $600 at the post office. Yet now the country is to be plunged into an expenditure that will probably run up to $15,000. Moreover, you will require a caretaker for that bulding, you will have to pay the interest on the money, and pay for the heating, lighting and so forth. Once more I congratulate the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that, if he is not given more patronage in his department, he is at least allowed the privilege of dispensing the loaves and fishes to the electors in the district of Montreal.

Mr. COCHRANE. I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a very important town in East Northumberland, the town of Campbellford. The post office receipts at that office are $3,241; money orders, $20,870; and the allowance for rent is $140. I am safe in saying that is one of the most flourishing manufacturing towns in that section of the country. I know it has been said that Cobourg has a public building, but I want to draw the attention of the minister to the fact that Cobourg is the county town of the united counties of Northumberland and Durham. Campbellford is between thirty and forty miles from Cobourg, and I think it has strong claims upon the department for additional public buildings. I think there has been a vote this session for Bowmanville, in the county of Durham. I want to draw the hon. minister's attention to the fact that as there are three or four manufacturing industries at Campbellford, there must be quite a large revenue from the customs and post office. I am satisfied that if the hon. minister will agree to put an amount in the estimates for a building there the town will gladly furnish a site.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice that when the hon. minister was in opposition he had a principle in respect to the expenditure of money for public buildings, and perhaps, although the hon. gentleman has been in office for some years, it might be well to refresh his memory in regard to it. In discussing the vote for a post office in 1895, the hon. minister said:

> The hon. minister disregards altogether the amount of revenue received under the various departments but that should be recognized as a principle governing the erection of these public buildings irrespective of party reasons.

May I ask the hon. gentleman if he holds the same opinion now?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, I hold the same opinion still, and I am trying to carry it out as far as I am personally concerned.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. minister has not changed his policy in so far as his statement goes, but the practice does not quite live up to the statement. If that be the policy of the hon. gentleman now, would he be good enough to tell us why he has not considered it his duty to recommend an appropriation to erect a public building in Owen Sound, which has been referred to by my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Thomson), and which has a population of 10,000 and a revenue of $15,000, while he has conceived it to be his duty to recommend an appropriation for a place which has a revenue of $600 and a population of 2,400? The hon. minister has made the statement that it is the policy of the government that one of the principal points, the shire town in each county shall be recognized. May I remind the hon. gentleman that Owen Sound is the county town of Grey. This matter was brought to the hon. gentleman's attention at the last session of parliament, and he is very well informed as to the condition of things there. Would he be good enough to tell us why it is that in making these further appropriations, Owen Sound has been overlooked?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have already told the hon. gentleman that it has not been overlooked. The matter is under consideration, and I did say that the policy which has been laid down by a majority of the members of this House, and which I think is a good policy, that the revenue should be the most important factor in connection with these public buildings, ought to be considered. It seems also to be the idea of the majority of the members of the House that one public building should be given to a county. My hon. friend has

said that Owen Sound is entitled to consideration from both of these standpoints, and I acknowledge it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How am I going to explain to my constituents the principle upon which money of this kind is allocated? Here are two little towns in lower Canada, Longueuil and Acton Vale, one with a population of 1,200, and the other with receipts altogether from customs, excise and post office of less than $600. The government probably get about $100 a year of revenue from Longueuil. Yet they are building a post office which will involve an expenditure of anywhere from $10,000 to $15,000. The town of Perth has no public building of any kind erected by the government. The receipts from the post office are nearly $6,000 a year, the amount deposited in the post office savings bank is larger than that deposited in any town of a like population in Canada; the population is a little over 4,000; it has inland revenue receipts of $95,000, and customs receipts of about $30,000. The government are receiving in all about $126,000 a year from the town of Perth, and there is no sum at all given for a public building. If this happened to be located somewhere near Terrebonne or in some of the maritime provinces there would have been a large allowance for a public building. If the proportion of population and revenue considered sufficient to justify the erection of a public building in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick were applied to the town of Perth, nearly every third building would be a public building, but, there is no public building at all.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are not many more counties to be supplied and the town of Perth will have to be considered.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I would like to ask the hon. minister if he proposes to bring down further supplementary estimates this session? I can scarcely realize that in face of all that has been said, they will not include so important a town as Owen Sound. I felt very confident that the government would make some provision this session for a public building there, and I am very much disappointed that it has not been included in these supplementary estimates. I would therefore ask the hon. minister if he is going to bring down further supplementary estimates this session?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot answer that question at the present moment.

Mr. COCHRANE. The hon. minister did not give me any consolation about Campbellford.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) certainly made out a very good case. I have noted the matter, and it will receive consideration.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). The constituency of my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) is in Ontario. I notice that at Campbellton, where they have a revenue of $3,800, just the same as Campbellford, and a population of about 1,000, they are spending about $35,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Where do you get the population from—the census?

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). It is not an incorporated town as far as is shown by the census, but it is an unincorporated village. Yet, the government purpose spending $35,000 for a public building.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is in New Brunswick.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). It is very similar in name to the town that my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) brings to the attention of the hon. minister, but the fact of my hon. friend being in Ontario seems to debar him from getting any assistance towards the erection of a public buillding in Campbellford.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend from South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has referred to the maritime provinces. I would like to inform him that the maritime provinces are not in this class at all. I have been looking at the post office revenue in Nova Scotia, and I find that there are thirty or forty places without public buildings in that province which have a larger revenue than these two places which are now to have public buildings.

Montreal—barracks for permanent corps, $20,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Would the hon. minister please give a full explanation of this item?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a new vote of $20,000 for the erection of a barracks for one unit of the permanent corps at Montreal. The estimated cost is $126,000. We own the site, and the city of Montreal, as I am informed, have placed to our credit $25,000 to be devoted to this object.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Where are those barracks to be?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. On Lafontaine park, formerly known as Logan's Farm.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What corps is to be brought there; is it to be a new addition to the strength of the force?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The idea is to have a battery of garrison artillery and a detachment of infantry—in all, 200 men. It is estimated that the accommodation for these will cost from $100,000 to $125,000, of which the city of Montreal has voted $25,000. It would seem to me very desirable, in the public interest, that in a great city like Montreal there should be at least a small detachment

of the permanent force. It has been found to be very useful in Toronto.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Does the minister purpose retaining the corps at St. John's ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is proposed to transfer the infantry from St. John's to Montreal and to establish a cavalry corps at St. John's.

Mr. CLARKE. There will be an addition to the permanent militia force ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There is an addition of 200 involved in this.

Mr. CLARKE. The building is to cost $125,000 and $25,000 of that is provided by the municipality of Montreal.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is it, and the site is now owned by the government.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I heartily endorse the idea of having an institution in Montreal, in which officers, or non-commissioned officers or cadets, could get a military training. As the minister knows, I do not believe that the proper plan for giving that system of instruction is to have a permanent corps, in the ordinary sense of the word. I think it can be accomplished much more economically and much more efficiently by the means which I have already explained to the House.

Quebec drill hall—addition to building, $20,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to provide for additional ground adjacent to the drill hall

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). You cannot get any more ground than you have there.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think that is an error. There may be a small corner in front of the drill hall that ought to be acquired, but I do not know that it is necessary. The explanation is this. A certain sum of money was contributed by the Quebec government and by the city of Quebec towards the construction of the drill hall originally, and it was understood that the city should have the right to use the building for exhibition purposes, &c. This dual ownership has not worked satisfactorily, and as the military corps have increased in Quebec, it has been found impossible to give them the accommodation they ought to have. The local government and the city have intimated to us that if the government will give the increased accommodation, which is very desirable, they would absolutely give up their title to the drill hall. There are now in the city of Quebec no less than eight different military units.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Not counting the permanent corps ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Not counting the permanent corps.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the total strength?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I cannot remember. There is a battery of field artillery; two squadrons of cavalry, the Queen's Own; a regiment of garrison artillery; the 8th and 9th battalions of infantry, both first-rate regiments; No. 1 company, A.S.C.; No. 5 bearer company, and No. 3 field hospital corps. It is absolutely necessary that additional accommodation should be provided, and it seems to me that the offer made by the provincial government and the city of Quebec ought to be accepted.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It is stated in an evening paper that No. 3 battery is to be removed from Kingston to Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That statement is without the slightest foundation; there is not a word of truth in it.

Mr. CLARKE. Is $20,000 the total sum required for this purpose ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I would not like to say that it will be sufficient.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is the explanation given to me.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Of course, the Minister of Public Works would know, but I should think that it would cost more.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What is the status of the government of Canada in relation to the Plains of Abraham ? That ground is being rapidly handed over for building purposes, and this historic spot, in which the people of Canada have some interest, is being hedged around with houses, so that you can hardly see Wolfe's monument at the present time. It is needless to remark that both the English and the French people regard the Plains of Abraham with some veneration.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The Plains of Abraham were purchased by the Dominion government and handed over to the city of Quebec for a park, to be used only for the purpose of a park, and subject to the right of the Department of Militia and Defence to use the grounds for military purposes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is no building going on upon the plains under these conditions ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I do not think there is.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The city of Halifax has certain rights in the northern com-

mon of Halifax which are subject to certain conditions imposed by the imperial government, namely, that no buildings shall be put up within a certain distance; and this condition is rigidly adhered to, so that when a little temporary shed was erected on the common a few years ago the imperial government got an injunction to prevent it being continued, although it was of the most flimsy character and was intended to be kept there only a few weeks. If the government have similar rights with respect to the Plains of Abraham, I think these rights should be enforced, and no buildings should be allowed to be erected there.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will make inquiries at once. I think our position with respect to the Plains of Abraham is as strong as the position of the imperial government with respect to the Halifax common.

Sherbrooke drill hall, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is one of a number of votes which I am asking the House to authorize for the purpose of furnishing proper quarters for the militia force throughout the Dominion. I feel that we might almost as well give up our organization unless we provide better accommodation, both for the men and for the arms and accoutrements. The present lack of accommodation has been discouraging to officers and men who give of their time and means for the maintenance of a militia force in Canada. We have had a good deal of complaint in the House from time to time as to the expensiveness of our system, and I think the provision of better quarters for the care of arms and accoutrements will be a measure of economy. We have given the subject a good deal of attention, and, as the result of conferences with the officials of the Militia Department, we have come to the conclusion that we can erect a building which will be permanent, substantial and suitable in each of the larger places throughout the Dominion for about $25,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I might point out that Sherbrooke is the largest centre in the eastern townships.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not speaking specially of Sherbrooke. I am speaking generally. My hon. friend will agree with me that we cannot spend from $125,000 to $150,000 in each of these places.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What is the St. Hyacinthe drill hall to cost?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $24,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). And you propose to spend the same amount in a place like Sherbrooke?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think that in places like Sherbrooke, Belleville and Stratford we can erect a building which will give satisfaction at a cost of about $25,000. It will be an encouragement to the officers and men of the militia force to have this accommodation, and it will protect our property. We all know that many of our valuable guns have been destroyed and the accoutrements have been injured for want of proper care, sometimes before they could be used in a second camp.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Sherbrooke is the centre of what the minister is very properly turning into a cavalry district; so that there will be infantry, cavalry and artillery there, and the town occupies a very important strategic position. I think the minister should make provision for a drill hall suitable for the wants of the whole district. If he can afford to vote $24,000 for a small centre like St. Hyacinthe, where there are only four companies, surely he ought to be prepared to appropriate $125,000 for a large centre like Sherbrooke, which is surrounded by cavalry, infantry, and artillery.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Not artillery. I may say that it is intended to carry out at St. Hyacinthe the very scheme of organizing cavalry to which the hon. gentleman refers. I believe it will be an admirable district for recruiting at least one cavalry regiment. In Sherbrooke there is at present one cavalry regiment and one infantry regiment.

Three Rivers custom house—retaining wall, $2,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to pay the balance of the contract. The work is completed.

St. Louis de Mile End—public building, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to make provision for the erection of a public building for post office purposes. The population is 10,933.

Mr. BENNETT. It seems extraordinary that the post office receipts at that point are only $640.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The receipts go into the Montreal office. The policy of the department seems to be to accommodate the people with these postal stations.

Mr. BENNETT. What will the total cost of the building be?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About $15,000, including the site.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This town will be annexed to the city of Montreal in a short time. Its population is increasing at the rate of about 1,000 a year. It is where the Canadian Pacific Railway locomotive works are situated.

Montreal new postal station—fittings and furniture, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In this particular case we rented a building on very favourable terms on St. Catharines street, and we are establishing a postal station there. This vote is for the fittings and furniture.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is a postal station as distinguished from a post office ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As I understand it the idea is that instead of having all the mail sent to the head office, as at present, involving delay in sorting, the mails will be sorted on the train or at the railway station, and sent to the postal stations for distribution, each station serving a certain district of the city.

Magog—public building, $5,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is there any other public building in the same constituency ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote is to make provision for the purchase of a site for the erection of a public building in the town of Magog for post office and customs purposes. The population at the last census was 3,515, the postal revenue $2,500, and the customs revenue, $6,312.

Mr. BENNETT. What are the site and the buildings to cost respectively ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This building will cost about $12,000.

Mr. BENNETT. And how much for the site ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I suppose the site will cost between $500 and $1,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is there any other public building in the county ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand there is one at Coaticook.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think there is a public building at Coaticook, although I am not quite sure. The two towns are at the extreme ends of the county.

Mr. CLARKE. Which is the shire town ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is no shire town. A circuit court is held for each place, but municipal meetings are held at Ayer's Flat, which is mid-way between the two places, and has a population of 100 or 200.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). How does the minister explain his rule that he will only give one public building in each riding ? He seems to be departing from it in this case.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are exceptions, and as the Minister of Agriculture has pointed out, there seems to be a town in each end of this riding.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In order to justify these votes, I think that more than one reason is necessary.

Public buildings—Ontario, Belleville armoury, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The armoury at Belleville was condemned and ordered to be pulled down. This vote is in accordance with the policy of the department of establishing these headquarters for the militia throughout the province.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I do not see any item here for a drill hall for Lindsay. While I had command of the regiment there, I felt more or less delicacy about asking for the drill shed. I may call attention to the fact that the town has furnished many good military men, and is nearly three times as large as some of the towns in other provinces to which $10,000 and $25,000 halls are being given. I trust the Minister of Militia and the Minister of Public Works will not allow many more estimates to pass through without placing in them an item for a drill shed in Lindsay.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Did I understand my hon. friend to say that Lindsay was considerably larger than towns to which military appropriations are given ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It is about three times the size of St. Hyacinthe.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think St. Hyacinthe is much larger than Lindsay.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is nearly 15,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I hope the hon. minister will be good enough to take this into his serious consideration and let us have a drill shed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What will this building cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This building is expected to cost about $25,000. I wish it to be distinctly understood that this is one of those buildings that will come under the category of which I have spoken. My chief architect tells me that probably we are making too low an estimate, but I think the architects ought to be able to make arrangements for good headquarters for about that money, and I think that my hon. friend will admit that the Militia Department in making these recommendations and carrying them out has had regard to the necessities of the militia, and has made the recommendations without regard to political considerations. The recommendations made are generally for places where the necessities are urgent, and these are the larger places.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Belleville is headquarters for two infantry regiments and will require a good armoury.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In these places some distinction has to be made. More or less room is required in the armoury according as they are to be used for infantry, or for cavalry and artillery.

Mr. BLAIN. Will tenders be publicly called for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All these, Mr. Chairman, will be built by contract after tenders are publicly called for.

Mr. CLARKE. We ought to be able to see the plans.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The plans are under consideration between the Militia and Public Works Departments.

Peterborough—armoury, $10,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The present building in Peterborough is quite unsuited for the requirements of the militia there and the minister is perfectly right in building this drill shed. There are two corps there, in fact, there are parts of three corps, an infantry regiment, one section of artillery, and a couple of squadrons of cavalry.

Mr. CLARKE. What will the building cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About the same as the others—$25,000.

Guelph—armoury, $10,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Will this building be of the same size and cost as the others ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At Guelph there are two batteries and one of the largest rifle regiments in the district. In that case there will be additions necessary for the artillery. Except for this, the building for the armoury will be about the same.

Mr. CLARKE. What about the site ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There will be no difficulty about the site.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I may say that this building is very badly needed, as the militia in Guelph are not at all well provided for. There are ten companies there. The present building used for the storage of guns is so completely filled that it is difficult to pass through it. There are twelve guns, with limbers, wagons, harness and accoutrements. It is proposed also to have in Guelph a branch of the Army Service Corps, and it will take a building of considerable size to store their equipment. The rifles are now stored in the cellar of the drill shed. It is headquarters also for the regimental band.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Does not the hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie) think that he has neglected his constituency when he has allowed this state of things to continue ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Thomson, Grey) were Minister of Public Works or Minister of Militia, he would acquit the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) of being at all neglectful. He has been very persistent in his demands.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There are two batteries in Guelph, and excellent batteries they are. No doubt the Minister of Militia and the Minister of Public Works will allow for the fact that it will require a larger building than an ordinary drill shed to accommodate the guns ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I explained that that was taken into consideration.

Mr. BLAIN. I see that very considerable sums are to be voted in these supplementary estimates for the construction of new armouries in certain towns in Ontario. I would be glad if the hon. Minister of Militia would give us a statement of the policy of his department in connection with the construction of buildings for our militia in central towns in this province. A considerable number of towns have been recognized but a still larger number seem to have been forgotten.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Blain) will understand that it is impossible to do this work all at once. It will involve between one and two million dollars, and perhaps more, to properly house the different militia corps throughout this country. We are going on as rapidly as possible throughout the country, and I assure my hon. friend that we are selecting the places in which these buildings are to be constructed on the advice of military men and from a non-partisan, a purely military point of view. With regard to the rural districts and the smaller towns where there is only say, one unit, my idea is that we should construct a substantial building which can be headquarters, armoury and storehouse, and with a room sufficiently large for a lecture room, where the officers who take an interest in military matters can bring their men together in the evening, and, by means of blackboards and so on, illustrate military affairs and give necessary instruction. This is the idea I have, and that I hope to be able to begin to carry it out in the near future. My plan will include every village of any importance in the Dominion of Canada.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How many years will it take to carry that out ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think it can be done in five or six years, and that the total cost will be in the neighbourhood of a million and a quarter or a million and a half dollars.

Mr. COCHRANE What has been done with reference to the armoury in Cobourg ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The site has been procured, the plans are about complete, and advertisements for tenders will appear at an early day.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I should have added that there is a vote in the estimates of a lump sum for the Public Works Department for the construction of smaller armouries.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not the Public Works.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. At any rate, the places have not yet been selected, all of them at any rate. If my hon. friend has any particular place in mind, if he will bring it to my attention, I shall be glad to consider it.

M. BLAIN. I brought this matter to the attention of the government at two former sessions of parliament. I may say that the Minister of Militia has been very very kind in the matter. I would like to know if the town of Brampton, the headquarters for the 36th Peel Battalion, which is a rather important militia corps in Ontario, has been provided for in the general vote ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENSE. I have not the information at hand, but I will make a note of the matter and will be able to give my hon. friend the facts when the Militia estimates are before the committee.

Mr. BLAIN. I may say that the 36th is a very large and rather important corps. At present they have practically no place for the storage of their arms, and the officers are complaining constantly. They find the membership of the company is decreasing because of the difficulties under which the corps labour. I do not wish to complain, but it does seem that some one must be at fault if even a small amount cannot be appropriated for the purpose of remedying this state of affairs. I think the suggestion of the Minister of Militia is a very good and reasonable suggestion, and I hope he will be able to carry it out in the near future, and that some appropriation will be made for the corps I have referred to.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I would point out that the regimental district joins the city of Toronto and the county of York, and the very fact that he complains of in relation to the regiment, is verified by the condition of affairs there. Many of the officers of that regiment belong to the city of Toronto, and the entire absence of armouries or places where the officers can meet and instruct and drill their men, has a tendency to diminish greatly the number of officers from the county, and the young officers in the city have taken the places of those who belong to the county. I know of no place in the rural districts where an armoury is more needed than in the county of Peel.

Mr. BENNETT. I hope the minister will take into consideration the claims of Orillia, where no less than three companies have their headquarters.

Mr. COCHRANE. I desire to draw the attention of the minister to the fact that there is a cavalry company and an infantry company having their headquarters at Colborne, and who complain of insufficient accommodation. Colborne is so far away from Cobourg that the cavalry have to have a storage room of their own.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister, I hope, will also provide for the filling up of that 'skeleton of a skeleton' of a regiment that is centred in the county of Haldimand.

Mr. CLARKE. I think the member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) hit the nail on the head when he said that it was simply ridiculous to expect men to go to drill for 50 cents a day.

Mr. RICHARDSON. While provision is being made for drill sheds in various parts of the country, I would call attention to the condition of the drill shed in the town of Flesherton, which is now getting into a bad condition of disrepair from leaky roofs. It was erected by the government a number of years ago, and the officers have repeatedly made application for money to repair the roof and to put the building in fair condition for drill. They have an armoury in the building well fitted up but unserviceable owing to leaky roof. I have heard the officers complaining again and again that they cannot get an appropriation for repairs.

Toronto drill hall—additional accommodation for new corps, $20,000.

Mr. CLARKE. We are obliged to the hon. gentleman for this appropriation. Is it expected that this sum will be sufficient to give the additional accommodation that is required ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, I do not think it will. I feel strongly on this question, and I think that we should do something and do it promptly, and in order to make a beginning we are asking for this vote.

Toronto military buildings—building for storage of wagons, &c., of engineer, $3,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where is this to be erected ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On a site provided by the Toronto University. This building is required for the storage of the baggage of the Toronto engineer corps.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The engineer corps is a new college corps, and the university is providing the land.

Mr. CLARKE. I drew attention to the fact that there are some small store-rooms

in St. Andrew's hall being used by the militia authorities for storing supplies. Is any provision being made for the construction of a building in which to put these stores?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am not able to answer that question.

Ottawa departmental buildings, Western Block, overhauling heating apparatus, &c., $6,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This heating system has been in operation for 40 years and is working very unsatisfactorily. The air accumulates in the radiators, and the consequence is a terrible noise, which is a great nuisance. This work is intended to be done by the present staff. The chief architect has made up a detailed estimate of the cost, and he thinks this will complete the work. The noise is something fearful, and the clerks are complaining all the time. In addition to that, it does not give the heat it should.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In this connection, I would point out that the ventilation of this House could very easily be changed for the better, the only drawback to a perfect ventilation being the fact that the fans make a little noise. I have examined the apparatus since the subject was up the other evening, and I am satisfied that the system is almost perfect as it is, if it was only put into operation, but it is never operated because the fans make a little noise; therefore, the machinery is shut off, and the consequence is that we sit here breathing foul air. The thermometer at this moment registers over 70. I would suggest that the fans be removed a little higher up, and we can change the air every two minutes.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The attention of the chief architect will be called to the matter.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I may say, at the same time, that I do not think the lighting is as good as it should be. The lighting of this chamber is not at all as good as it was under the former system.

Rideau Hall and grounds—repairs and improvements, $4,500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman explain that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Sixty-two square yards of galvanized roof, $775; shingling, $302; painting, $1,280; sidewalks, $750; kitchen equipment and other items, making altogether $4,500.

Ottawa departmental buildings—steel drawers and rollers, shelves, &c., $63,000.

Mr. BIRKETT. Have tenders been asked for these steel drawers and rollers?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We do not advertise for tenders. There are only three manufacturers in Canada making these things.

Mr. BENNETT. Where are they?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At Gananoque, Ottawa and Toronto.

Mr. BENNETT. What about the Newmarket one?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That has its head office at Toronto. When the different departments apply for equipment these firms are asked for figures, and they give us quotations on the specifications and requirements of the different departments.

Mr. BIRKETT. I understood that there was not a fair distribution of these contracts, that the Ottawa manufacturers were not satisfied with the proportion of the cabinets that they were asked to supply to the government.

Mr. BENNETT. What amount of goods of this class was purchased from the Newmarket Company last year, or from the company which has its head office in Toronto?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not that information here. But I will have a statement made out and lay it on the Table of the House, or I will give it to my hon. friend, of the different purchases that have been made.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it a fact that the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) is a large stockholder in the Newmarket Company?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know, but I would assume that there would not likely be any foundation in the fact for the statement that the hon. Postmaster General is interested in that company in any way.

Mr. BENNETT. I am sorry that the hon. Postmaster General is not here at the present time, but it must not be assumed that the hon. minister cannot be interested in that company. In the first place, Newmarket is in the hon. gentleman's constituency. The hon. Minister of Agriculture was interested in a stock company that had very large transactions with this government, in a company that was taking thousands of dollars from a department. It is quite true that the hon. Minister of Agriculture transferred his stock to a near relative. Perhaps the hon. Postmaster General may have followed the good example of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and transferred his stock to a near relative before having any dealings with the government. Perhaps, when the matter comes up again, the hon. Postmaster General may be here, and we can renew the question.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, let him speak for himself.

Mr. BENNETT. I may say that in the town of Newmarket the hon. Postmaster

General is credited with being interested in this company.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to ascertain just what the plan is that has been adopted. There are three firms manufacturing these steel drawers and rollers. It is proposed to take $63,000 for the purpose of purchasing this equipment for the departmental offices. What plan is adopted ? Are public tenders asked for, or are circulars simply sent to these three firms ? Sixty-three thousand dollars is a very large item.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Most of this money is to pay for orders that have been given. Since I have been in the department I have not given orders to any of these firms. I think when there are only three manufacturers if they are all asked for prices, we can get as low a price as if we advertised in the papers. There is quite as good competition as if we spent money advertising in the papers.

Mr. BLAIN. Surely the hon. minister does not understand that to be the proper policy in respect of public competition ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What would my hon. friend do if he wanted to buy cheaply and there were only three manufacturers in the country ? Would my hon. friend spend $40, $50 or $100 for advertising in the papers instead of asking the three manufacturers to submit prices ?

Mr. BLAIN. I would. I would have no hesitation, and I think the country would justify the hon. minister in spending $40 or $50 in advertising and asking for tenders for supplies involving an expenditure of $63,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Let me inform the hon. gentleman that this is made up of 25, or 30, or 40 items. This is not for $63,000 worth of supplies to be furnished at one time. The various offices apply for small quantities at different times.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand that. I think the equipment is about the same in each of the offices. I am not complaining about that. It seems to be modern and up to date. But surely, when the hon. minister asks for $63,000 to be appropriated for a specific purpose, the public would expect that he should ask for public tenders. The hon. minister will not say that he is always posted as to how many firms are in a position to supply these goods. It may be that there are many others than the three manufacturers to whom the hon. minister has referred who are in a position to supply them. It will be quite within the range of possibility that these three manufacturing establishments may hear of this discussion and will understand the policy of the government. We can readily understand that it would be an easy matter for them to come to an arrangement whereby each would supply $20,000 or $25,000 worth, and there would be no competition at all. I think the public will expect the hon. minister to change the policy of the department, if that is his policy at the present time, and that when he is going to ask for supplies to the value of $63,000 he will put an advertisement in the papers and allow all the people that are overdue ? If I understood the supplying this class of goods to tender, so that the public will understand that there is public competition rather than that three manufacturers in this country should simply be asked to submit prices for the supply of these goods.

Mr. BENNETT. Are we to understand that the hon. minister during the coming year is going to expend $63,000 on these articles, or is this vote applicable to articles of this class that have already been supplied, and if they have been supplied, to what extent ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will have to have a full statement made out in the accountant's branch as to what is due and what orders have been previously given. Applications come from the various departments. This would not supply all the applications of various departments for these equipments, but it will cover the most urgent ones and pay the orders that were previously given. I will make inquiry and bring down a memorandum.

Mr. BENNETT. For the orders that were given in the past, is the House to understand that no tenders were called for, but that the hon. gentleman's department obtained a certain portion from each one of these three companies, and that the three companies settled the price that they were to uniformly charge ? Is that correct, and if so, is it to be the practice this year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was suggested that the department should ask for quotations from all parties in the business, and where a special article is being manufactured by three or four firms only, I think every business man will agree with me that better results are obtained from this system than from advertising in the public press, unless it be that you purchase in the United States. The Auditor General, who is very strict in regard to accounts of this kind, holds that where there are only a few well known reputable firms manufacturing special articles, it is quite sufficient to ask them for tenders by mail. The officers of the department would be able to judge if the prices were fair, and they would know if there was any attempt to unduly enhance the prices.

Mr. BENNETT. The majority of these post office fittings are imported from the United States, and are not made in Canada.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Since I have been in the department, I have never given an order outside of Canada.

Mr. BENNETT. The postmaster in my town supplies them himself, and he brings them in from the United Statets.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not done by the department.

Mr. BENNETT. But here is a supply costing $65,000, and instead of publicly calling for tenders, you ask three firms to make offers, and leave it to some gentleman in the department to decide whether or not the price is fair. Suppose you carry that principle out further; if there are three mail routes running out of a village, the Postmaster General will not arrange privately to have the service performed, but will call for tenders, even if the cost is only $50 a year. Here is a contract for $65,000, and no tenders are asked. It is strangely suspicious that the company that is getting the largest end of the order, is a company which I am informed the Postmaster General is supposed to be interested in; and even if he is not so interested, they carry on business in the leading town in his riding.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no order given for more than $2,000, unless the department were fitting up a very large building and it would not be more than $5,000 at the outside. I have no particular objection to advertising, but I believe it to be a waste of money.

Mr. BENNETT. I am rather suspicious that there is something in it, for the reason that I am bound to say that there are no tenders called for these large red boxes on the street corners in which you put newspapers. They are made up at a little foundry in Aurora, in the riding of the Postmaster General. I know that, because I saw one of them placed on the train the other evening, when I was coming through. The Postmaster General is simply bringing grist to his own mill in every direction. We had an example of it here a few weeks ago, when he was dragging and collecting mail bags from one end of the Dominion to the other. I am still strong in the suspicion that the Postmaster General is one of the stockholders in this company and that he has been using his influence not to have public competition, but to be able to place the orders for these goods at their own price.

Mr. BLAIN. What proportion of this $65,000 has already been expended?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will bring down that statement.

Mr. BLAIN. I differ from the minister with regard to the method of purchasing these goods. I admit, that if tenders are called for, they should specify that the goods should be manufactured in Canada, but I do not think that the minister or his department should be the judges as to how many firms in Canada are in a position to supply these goods. Whether that be right or wrong in the interests of the government, it is certainly not in the interests of the people. The practice advocated by the minister in this respect will at least be always open to suspicion. I think the minister should state to the House now, that in future, he will ask for public tenders and give every man in the country an opportunity to supply these goods. How does the minister know that there are only three manufacturers of these articles in Canada? I think I could put my finger on half a dozen manufacturers in Ontario alone, who would be able to turn out these goods. It may be said that these three are the largest firms, but if it is understood that the government will put this contract of $65,000 a year up to competition, and give it to the lowest tenderer, there is no doubt in the world but that others will engage in the business.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As this was a special line I got my information from the chief architect, and the deputy minister that there were no other firms in this business in Canada; but after the assertion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain), I certainly shall try an advertisement, and see whether we get any returns from it or not. I have no desire to favour one as against another.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARKE. The minister said he thought the public interest would be protected, because the officers of the department would be able to judge by the prices asked, as to whether there was any attempt on the part of the manufacturers of these articles to unduly increase the price. What experience have the officers of the department had in the matter of the manufacture and procurement of articles of this class? How do they know that there is not a combination, or whether the prices are proper prices?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They can make the comparison only from their experience and by getting prices from other countries where these goods are manufactured, and comparing them.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the minister also bring down copies of any circulars or price-lists the officers have obtained from foreign countries respecting the value of these goods? I would also like to have information as to the quantity of these goods purchased, the names of the firms who have supplied them, and the prices in each case.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will bring this return down. My hon. friend asked how the officers could make these comparisons. I did not say they had

made them, still the chief architect tells me that he is sometimes called upon by representatives of foreign firms, and he may have some of their price lists. If he has any price-lists or circulars from foreign firms, I will have them brought down.

Mr. CLARKE. It is a fair business proposition that if these goods are manufactured in Canada, Canadian manufacturers should have the preference, but it is not a sound business proposition to say: There are only three firms manufacturing these goods in Canada, and we will not advertise for tenders, but will send a circular to these firms, and buy from the firm putting in the lowest tender. I would ask what proportion of the vote asked is to pay accounts that are overdue? If I understood the minister, he has not himself contracted for any of this work, but is asking for this money in order to pay accounts outstanding.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will bring down the information.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much of this vote is intended to be expended for this purpose? The sum of $63,000 should furnish a very considerable amount of space. It is not intended to provide fire-proof accommodation, I presume. I have seen these steel drawers in the safes of municipal and other large corporations where there are a great many documents to preserve, and I should think some system of that kind would be much better. With $63,000 worth of drawers you should accommodate a great many documents, and I will ask how much my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works expects to expend in that way?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The instructions to the officers are that after paying the accounts that are due and settling for the orders given, the expenditure is to be kept within the amount voted. The amount would be divided amongst the partments according to the judgment of the officers as to which is the most urgent. The system referred to by my hon. friend is a good one, but it would be very expensive. This is intended more for files; the shelves are equipped with rollers for handling heavy books. With steel instead of wood fittings they are much more satisfactory, and are, to a great extent, fire-proof. The accumulation of dust, &c., on the wooden shelves makes them very inflammable.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister also bring down a statement of the full amount that has been expended for these modern office furnishings during the five or six years since their introduction.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have promised to bring down the first memorandum immediately, because it is one that I can have made in an hour or so. The second one I will also bring down, but it will require a little more time.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose there must be some fire-proof accommodation in some of these buildings for certain documents.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think there is any fire-proof accommodation in Ottawa outside the vaults in the Department of Finance. The intention is to ask parliament at an early date for a vote for the construction of a fire-proof building, not necessarily a large one, in which the records and archives of the country may be kept without danger of destruction by fire.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I thought that in the repairs to the west block after the fire, the building was made fire-proof.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The building is supposed to be fire-proof.

Kingston—Royal Military College drill hall, $6,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote is included at the request of the Militia and Defence Department for the erection of a hall at the military college to be used as a drill hall and skating rink combined.

Mr. CLARKE. For the amusement of the cadets?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Both for their amusement and their instruction.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I notice the absence of any item providing for the furnishing of a water supply for the college. The present water supply is very inadequate. As the Minister of Militia and Defence knows, a number of the students were attacked with typhoid owing to the fact that they were using water polluted by the drainage of the city of Kingston. The engineer of the Militia Department is proposing to employ a suction system of water supply. He proposes to have a station near the college buildings, to extend the in-take pipe out in the water, and to draw the water to the college by suction. For all the difference in the cost, it would pay the government to place the pumping station over on Garden island, to have the in-take pipe in the pure water beyond the island, and to force it across to the city. The only extra cost would be an additional half mile of pipe, and as the pressure on the pipes would be from within, no pollution could enter them through any leak that might occur in the pipes under the bay, whereas the suction under the system proposed by the engineer would draw any impurities into the pipes.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has brought this matter up, and I will call the attention of my officers to it. I had understood, however, that the water

which it is proposed to bring in had been tested, and had been found satisfactory. I may say also in this connection that I think that there was some slight doubt as to whether the fever was due to the water supply or to the milk supply, or some other cause. At any rate, it was found that the milk supply was not what it should be. To remove any possible doubt, we decided to change the water supply, and while there is no item for the purpose here, there is an estimate in the main estimates providing for this change. The engineers and scientific people connected with the college, as well as the officers of the department, have looked into this matter, but since my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) has referred to it—and I know he was on the spot not very long ago as one of the visitors of the college—I shall call the attention of my deputy to it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The United States have recently voted $5,500,000 for additional improvements at West Point and they propose voting during the coming vear another $8,000,000 for the same purpose. Now for an institution like the Royal Military College, where the finest young engineer officers are being prepared for civil and military life in Canada, I would recommend the minister not to do any cheeseparing in providing this water supply. If he places the pump-house, as I may call it, on Garden island and has the in-take pipe on the other side of the island where he can get absolutely pure water, he can force it across the bay. Then, whether the pipes leak or not the water will go through pure, because the pressure will be outward. The system proposed by his engineers is to put a pipe out into the bay on which the military college stands, and have the in-take beyond what is called the danger limit. Then, with the pump house on the main shore, the water will be drawn in. Experience shows that these pipes are never water-tight. The movement of the waves, a touch by an occasional vessel, the dragging of an anchor, will cause leakages, and then, with the suction, the foul water will be drawn into the pipe. I trust the hon. minister will bring this matter before his engineer. And let him not be content with the report of his own officer. The engineer is not specially informed about these matters. If he will not take into consideration the elements of a proper water supply let the hon. minister consult any sanitary engineer. I am sure that such a man will not endorse for a minute the proposition of the engineer of the department, but will insist on having the other method; and I am sure that the House and the country will support the minister in any additional expenditure that may be necessary.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Sir F. W. BORDEN.

Toronto post office—additional story over the rear one story part of the building; furniture, fittings, &c., $20,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to cover the cost of an additional story over the rear one-story part of the Toronto post office, 104 feet by 72 feet; also for the furniture and fittings for it.

Mr. CLARKE. Were tenders asked for this work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Tenders will be asked.

Mr. CLARKE. In the early part of the session a vote was taken for repairs and alterations in the Toronto post office. Tenders were asked for that work, and, if I understand the situation correctly, three tenders were received. One of them was from Mr. A. B. Coleman, another from Mr. Carlyle, and the third from Messrs. Brown & Love, all reputable and well-known contractors. Mr. Coleman's tender was by some $500 lower than either of the others. He received no intimation as to the reason why the work was not awarded to him; but he received back his deposit, some $1,000 or $2,000, without any explanation. When we were discussing the matter before, I asked the Minister of Public Works why Mr. Coleman's tender had been set aside, and he informed me that the action was taken upon the advice of the architect of the department, that the work which was to be done in the Toronto post office was of a peculiar nature, consisting largely of repairs and alterations, having to be done at night, and that, as Mr. Carlyle had done work for the department before, he recommended that his tender be accepted. It was also stated that Mr. Coleman had had difficulty in completing some contract on other Toronto public buildings. That was the statement made, so far as I can recollect it. I have looked into the matter somewhat, and, so far as I can find, there was not sufficient justification for setting aside Mr. Coleman's tender. Mr. Coleman is a reputable and well-known contractor, having the necessary means and experience, and all the qualifications to fit him for doing that work as well as either of the others. Of course, it is a perfect farce to ask for public tenders, especially where a deposit of 10 per cent of the amount has to accompany the tender, if the lowest tender is not accepted. A very strong case should be made out for not doing so. I think the evidence goes to show that Mr. Coleman was very unfairly treated. I made inquiries of the architect of the building in the exhibition ground on which Mr. Coleman did the carpenter work, and asked him if Mr. Coleman was to blame in any way for the delay which had taken place in the completion of that building, that having been one of the reasons given by the architect of the department why Mr. Coleman was not awarded the contract; and I re-

ceived this reply from Mr. Gouinlock, who is one of the leading architects in the city :

Toronto, June 8, 1903.

E. F. Clarke, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Your favour of May the 26th received. Replying thereto, would state that Mr. A. B. Coleman, contractor for the carpenter and joiner work on the Manufacturers' building, Industrial Exhibition grounds, is not responsible for the delay caused in connection with the erection of this building. The delay in this work is almost entirely due to the contractors for the structural iron and steel work. Mr. Coleman's contract on this building is about $18,000, and he has given the work every attention and carried it out in a manner satisfactory to myself. He has carried out under my instructions smaller contracts, but has one at the present time for the carpenter and joiner work on the Alexandra apartment building, University avenue, in this city, for the Union Trust Company, his contract alone amounting to $30,000. He has also given this work the very best attention. I consider him a thoroughly capable and competent contractor. I feel certain that had the work on the Toronto post office been given to him, he would have given it every attention and carried it through as successfully and expeditiously as any other contractor in the city.

Trusting this information is satisfactory, I am,

Yours truly,

GEORGE W. GOUINLOCK.

From this it is evident that the reason given for setting aside Mr. Coleman's tender must fall to the ground. I make bold to say that before that reason should have been accepted by the head of the department, he should have seen that closer inquiry was made as to the real cause of the delay in the construction of that exhibition building. He should have made inquiries from the architects and builders of the city of Toronto as to Mr. Coleman's standing. I think that under the circumstances a very grave injustice has been done to Mr. Coleman. I have a lot of information respecting Mr. Coleman's status, and it is of the most satisfactory character. Mr. Coleman stands the peer of any other contractor in the city of Toronto in his line of carpentering. I will read another letter :

Hamilton, Ont., April 17, 1903.

To whom it may concern :—

This it to certify that we, the undersigned, have been doing business with A. B. Coleman, general contractor, lately of the village of Burlington, during the past ten years or more. He has carried out a large number of contracts from out of our office, and carried them out well and faithfully and fully up to the requirements of the plans and specifications and to the terms of his contracts, and to our entire satisfaction in every case. We have always found him to be a pleasant and an honest man to deal with, never found him trying to shirk any of his responsibilities with us, and we would without any hesitation upon our part give him any contracts from our office that he tendered upon, provided he was the lowest tenderer.

We highly recommend him to any party or parties who may be intending to build any structure. We may further say that during these many years of business with him we have never been under the unpleasant necessity of speaking an unkind or unpleasant word to him on account of any of his contracts from our office.

This document is signed by W. H. Stewart, architect, Hamilton, formerly of Stewart and Strickland, architects, Toronto. I have also a communication from Richard A. Waite, architect of Buffalo, N. Y. The Minister of Public Works knows the reputation and standing of Mr. Richard A. Waite as an architect. He stands very high in that profession, is one of the foremost architects in the United States, and has carried through to completion some of the finest buildings in Canada, amongst others the parliament buildings in the city of Toronto. This is what Mr. Waite saye :

To whom it may be of interest :

Within the past few years, Mr. A. B. Coleman has fully carried out several contracts both large and small under my supervision, and in the matter of time as well as competency and responsibility, highly commendable.

This is dated from his office in Buffalo on the 22nd of April, 1903. I have another one from Mr. C. J. Gibson, known, I presume, to the minister as another one of our leading architects. This is dated from his office in Toronto on the 23rd of April, 1903.

To whom it may concern :

This is to say that Mr. A. B. Coleman, general contractor, has within the past ten years put up a great many buildings for me, some of them very large and important, and he has always carried out his contracts quickly and intelligently to my entire satisfaction, and I can confidently recommend him as competent to complete any contracts he undertakes expeditiously and conscientiously.

I will read one more communication in connection with this matter, as I do not wish to take up the time of the committee—I will read a letter from the city clerk of Toronto, Mr. W. A. Littlejohn, dated 27th of May, 1903 :

My dear Mr. Clarke,—I have your favour of the 26th instant, asking whether Mr. Coleman, the contractor for the carpenter work on the main building in the exhibition grounds, has been reported as being derelict in his work or not. Mr. Geo. W. Gouinlock is the architect for the building, and in reply to an inquiry told me over the telephone to-day that he had a line from you and would write you to-night giving the fullest information possible on the subject. I may say that there has been no formal complaint laid against Mr. Coleman. There has undoubtedly been delay in the completion of the building, but other trades seem to be responsible.

I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that I could make out a much stronger case than I have made. I present these documents to the committee and I enter an emphatic protest against the action of the department. Here is a case where public tenders are asked for and where responsible contractors reply to the advertisements calling for tenders, and

put in their bids on work the department contemplates, giving their marked cheque as security for completion of the work. I say I emphatically protest against the course that has been pursued in this case, a course that must be inimical to the public interest, in ignoring the lowest tenderer and giving the contract to another one who is probably $400 or $500 higher. I make no complaint at all against Mr. Carlyle, for I am fully convinced that Mr. Carlyle has had a good deal of experience, but in fair competition his bid was some $500 higher than that of Mr. Coleman. I repeat it is most unfair and unjustifiable under these circumstances, in view of Mr. Coleman's experience and reputation, to have put his tender aside and given the contract to another contractor.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would be very sorry if any injustice has been done to the gentleman who tendered. When my hon. friend brought the matter to my attention I furnished him with a copy of the report and other evidence of what the architect actually did. I had no knowledge whatever of Mr. Coleman myself. At that particular time it was notorious that the city architect asked a committee of the council, I think, who had this work in charge, for Mr. Coleman's dismissal from the work. There was considerable difficulty between them.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman is thinking of another work entirely different from this one.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Who was the engineer in charge ?

Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Gouinlock.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It would have been a great mistake on the part of the architect, for the sake of a few hundred dollars, not to have brought this matter to the attention of the department. There was no feeling in the matter, and any action that was taken was based upon these reports. I am sure the chief architect had no feeling at all against Mr. Coleman, and he was guided in his action by the conviction that Mr. Coleman was not able to carry on the work. My hon. friend perhaps has forgotten the reports that appeared in the papers at the time, of the discussion over the difference that existed between the architects in charge of that work and the contractors.

Mr. CLARKE. There was no architect that I know of.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend will remember that I handed him a report at the time, showing there was great difference between the architect himself and the contractor.

Mr. CLARKE. There was a difference of opinion between the architect and some of the contractors for other portions of the work that were required to be put into this building. There was no difference, so far as I remember, between the architect and Mr. Coleman. The fact that the architect has given me the letter that I read is the strongest proof that I am right in my contention. I have read for the information of the minister the statement from the city clerk of Toronto, I have also read the opinions of leading architects, men who are in the front rank of the profession, to show that the reasons urged, at least one of them, that this man was dilatory in his work, was not well founded. It may be merely a coincidence. There were three tenders presented for the work. Of course politics would not enter into consideration in awarding the contract. There were three tenders submitted in response to the request of the department. Mr. Coleman's was the lowest. The next was Mr. Carlyle's and the next was from Messrs. Brown & Love. Mr. Coleman's was set aside, Mr. Carlyle was given the contract for the post office at his own figures and Messrs. Brown & Love were given a contract to repair, alter and block up the custom-house without any tenders at all. It may have been only a coincidence, but still it does not look very well, to say the least of it. It is a matter, I respectfully submit to the hon. minister, that ought not to be permitted to occur again in his department, if there are going to be bona fide public tenders for public work. If people are invited to tender, if they give the security and they have a reputation for doing good work, their tender being the lowest, they ought to get the contract.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Whether it is a coincidence or not, I can only say that I have given the committee the reasons that influenced the architect in coming to the conclusion that he did arrive at. It may be, as my hon. friend says, that it was not the fault of the contractor that delay was caused at the exhibition building, but that it was due to delay on the part of some other contractor. It certainly appeared by the newspapers as if it were the fault of the contractor.

Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Gouinlock, the architect, pointed out that the delay was entirely due to the contractors for the structural iron and the steel work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would be very sorry if it should appear from the evidence that he was a very capable man and that there was no reason why he should not have carried out the work satisfactorily, but it was only on account of the difficulties that were found to exist, and that were reported in the press, between this contractor and the architect that this action was taken in regard to the work on the post office.

Mr. CLARKE. The secretary of the exhibition board, in a statement regarding the matter, says that the work was :

In no way delayed by any lack of ability on the part of Mr. Coleman. I believe him to be thoroughly honest and in earnest and in this case working against very great difficulties.

One of the difficulties being the failure of the Canada Foundry Company to complete their contract for the structural iron work. While having the greatest possible respect for the permanent officials of the department, I hardly think that sufficient investigation was made by these gentlemen. I think if they had gone to Mr. Gouinlock, who was the architect under whom Mr. Coleman was doing this work for the Exhibition Association, or if they had gone to the secretary and manager of the Exhibition Association, who was vitally interested in having the work done as speedily as possible, or if they had gone to the city clerk of Toronto, who is responsible for the accuracy of the minutes of council and the care and filing of any documents which are presented to council, he might have obtained reliable information. I think the chief architect was not justified in making the report that he did against Mr. Coleman, which gives Mr. Coleman such a black eye, and which resulted in having his tender set aside, without having gone to the officials who are directly responsible and who are interested in the matter. He should have applied for a statement of the facts to the secretary of the Exhibition Association, Dr. Orr, or to Mr. Littlejohn, the city clerk of Toronto. Before Mr. Coleman was turned down either one of these officials should have been consulted about it. I have presented the facts, and I will leave it to the hon. minister to say whether he thinks Mr. Coleman was fairly dealt with.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This letter admits that there were difficulties, but the only question is as to whether there were such difficulties as Mr. Coleman could control.

Mr. CLARKE. Your architect might have found out if he had gone to the proper person and inquired.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The city architect did not seem to know that, because he had taken the unusual step of taking the work out of the contractor's hands. It was on that action that this recommendation was made.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not quite gather what the reason was for not accepting the lowest tender, because it seems to me there is something more in this than has yet appeared. There is a question as to why the lowest tender should not be accepted. Was the reason given in the report of the chief architect ?

Mr. CLARKE. I will read the report which the minister sent to me :

Public Works, Canada,
Chief Architect's Office,
Ottawa, November 6, 1902.

Sir,—Referring to the tenders for the additions and alterations to the Toronto post office.

Tenders were invited for the works referred to, by public advertisement, and three tenders were received as follows :—A. B. Coleman, $21,470; David Carlyle, $21,949, and Brown & Love, $22,238.

The principal work to be done consists in taking down the present vault, removing the greater part of the basement and the first floor rear main walls of the building, putting in foundations and the provision of iron columns and girders to carry the upper stories of the rear main wall.

As this class of work is both difficult and dangerous, proper precautions will have to be taken, otherwise serious results to the building might follow.

There being only a difference of $479 between the two lowest tenders, as above shown, I would strongly recommend the acceptance of Mr. D. Carlyle's tender. Mr. Carlyle has done considerable work for this department in the past and he has been found an efficient and reliable contractor. Further, as the work will have to be done so as to interfere as little as possible with the post office officials and the public, and part of it will, in all probability, have to be done at night ; any delay or dispute that might arise with the contractor would be a very serious matter.

I have been informed that Mr. A. B. Coleman is the contractor for the Industrial Exhibition building at Toronto fair grounds, and that the said building was to have been completed for the fair held in August last, but at that date it was not ready for the roof owing to misunderstandings and disputes with the contractor.

The foregoing are my reasons for recommending the acceptance of Mr. Carlyle's tender.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) D. EWART,
Chief Architect.

Fred. Gelinas, Esq.,
Secretary, Department of Public Works.

The only reason given was the alleged delay on the part of Mr. Coleman in completing the work at the exhibition building.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There were these two reasons : First, at the time it was urgent that this work should go on. It was important when dealing with a large building and removing some of the stone and iron pillars, that the work should be placed in the hands of an experienced contractor. Secondly, it was a matter of public notoriety that Mr. Coleman was at serious variance with the architect in charge of the work at the exhibition grounds. I am sure my hon. friend would say that under these circumstances we would not be warranted, even if he were a good contractor, if he had more work than he could do, in giving him this contract. The explanation which the hon. gentleman has given to some extent puts a different face on the matter, but this serious difficulty seemed to exist between the

architect and the contractor. These two reasons, that is the reason of urgency and the difficulty which I have mentioned, no doubt influenced the chief architect in recommending the acceptance of Mr. Carlyle's tender.

Mr. BORDEN (Halfax). I would be inclined to think that the matter had been dealt with in a very casual way, in so far as inquiry into Mr. Coleman's ability is concerned. There are two reasons assigned for the course which was adopted. One is that the highest tender was from a contractor who had already done considerable work for the department and had been proved an efficient and reliable contractor.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is no reason as against Mr. Coleman. That is no reason why he should not have got the contract.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I quite agree. I quote the language of the gentleman who makes this report.

> I have been informed that Mr. A. B. Coleman is the contractor for the Industrial Exhibition building at the Toronto fair grounds, and that the said building was to be completed for the fair held in August last, but at that date it was not ready for the roof owing to misunderstandings and disputes with the contractor.

That deals with the matter in a very casual way indeed. He does not tell us from whom the information came, but he simply says, that he has been informed of so and so. The fact that Mr. Coleman was contractor for a building that was not ready at the time agreed on, is no basis for a charge against Mr. Coleman, unless he were in default in some way. There might be a dozen reasons why the building was not completed in time, none of which would in the slightest militate against the acceptance of Mr. Coleman's tender in this case. I do not think the minister was justified in accepting so indefinite a charge against Mr. Coleman as a reason for putting aside the lowest tender. It would be the duty of Mr. Ewart or any one else, before making a report on which the lowest tender was rejected, to inform himself explicitely as to the facts. If loose methods of this kind are to be followed, you could set aside almost any tender. You could get such a report against almost any contractor who ever did any work in Canada. We discussed in the House last year a case where a contractor had hardly commenced some work in Manitoba at the time the contract should have been completed, and I do not think anyone would venture to say that that gentleman is not an efficient, and able, and capable contractor. There is only one reason given in the letter, and it is a mere hearsay reason and after all it does not charge anything. It says, that the building was not ready for the roof owing to misunderstandings and disputes with the contractor, but it does not necessarily follow that the contractor was not perfectly right in every position he took with regard to that matter; it does not follow that the people with whom he was dealing were in the right and yet on a casual, indefinite, inconclusive statement of that kind, this man's tender has been set aside, and the next highest tender has been accepted. I do not know anything about Mr. Coleman; I never met the gentleman; I never heard of him before to-night, bnt I do say that in the public interest, it is not right that the tender of Mr. Coleman or of any one else should be set aside by the minister, or by any of his officers, by reason of any such inconclusive and casual statement as is contained in this report.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will admit that the delay in carrying out the work would not of itself be a sufficient reason, but there was evidence attached to that memorandum which I think will change the opinion of that gentleman very much. They wanted this work done immediately and if my hon. friend himself knew that a man had more work than he could do, he would not likely employ him to do work which had to be done in a hurry. There was a statement originally appended to that report which showed that the architect had publicly asked the committee for the discharge of that contractor.

Mr. CLARKE. I suppose the minister will produce the document containing that statement?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) must have forgotten that it was pinned to that report when I handed it to him.

Mr. CLARKE. I handed the hon. minister back the documents which he gave me, and I was afterwards sent a copy of the letter which has been read.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was reported in the newspapers that the architect in charge of that work was asking the committee for the dismissal of the contractor on account of these delays and disputes and misunderstandings, and for other reasons. I will give my hon. friend a copy of the document which was attached to that, and I think he will see that our action was perfectly warranted. I would be sorry indeed if any injustice had been done to Mr. Coleman.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am dealing with the case presented in that report, which does not refer to any other evidence being attached to it. I can hardly understand how the architect, Mr. Gouinlock, could have been calling for the dismissal of Mr. Coleman in view of this letter which is produced by my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke):

> Toronto, June 8, 1903.
>
> Dear Sir,—Replying to your favour, I would state that Mr. A. B. Coleman, contractor for the

carpenter and joiner work on the manufacturers' building, industrial exhibition grounds, is not responsible for the delay caused in connection with the erection of this building. The delay in this work is almost entirely due to the contractors for the structural iron and steel work. Mr. Coleman's contract on this building is about $18,000 and he has given the work every attention and carried it out in a manner satisfactory to myself.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Was that the architect who had charge of the work ?

Mr. CLARKE. He says so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know whether Mr. Gouinlock was the architect or not, but my hon. friend from Toronto is of opinion that he was, and Mr. Gouinlock himself states that he was. Whether or not Mr. Gouinlock was the architect at that time I do not know.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I suppose I have a copy in the department of the report, showing the proceedings before the committee, and if I have I will bring it down, and the hon. gentleman can judge for himself.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The rest of this letter of Mr. Gouinlock, refers to other work which Mr. Coleman is said to have performed in a satisfactory manner under the superintendence of Mr. Gouinlock. If Mr. Gouinlock's statement can be relied upon, it is absolute proof that Mr. Coleman was not responsible for the delay charged against him.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the statement as reported in the papers is correct, it would put a different phase on the question.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not wish to take up more time now, but I present this view of the case to the minister : Mr. Coleman is a well known contractor in the city of Toronto. If reports appeared in the newspapers condemning the work done by Mr. Coleman, and if the officer of the department thought these reports were sufficiently important to justify him in making the report he did, it was only fair to Mr. Coleman that the officer of the department upon whose recommendation he was turned down should have gone, first to the architect who had charge of the building for the city and the Industrial Exhibition Association, or second, to the city clerk, or third, to the secretary and manager of the Industrial Exhibition Association. The architect of the department, so far as I know, ignored these gentlemen, who were in a better position than any one else to give him reliable information. Suppose the most inflamatory statements against Mr. Coleman had appeared in the newspapers. Even that would not have justified the architect of the department in making a report derogatory to Mr. Coleman without being advised by the gentlemen most intimately connected with the work that those reports were accurate. If the hon. gentleman will bring down the information he has, we shall learn what allegations were made against Mr. Coleman by the architect of the exhibition building ; because I shall be surprised to learn that Mr. Gouinlock asked permission to dismiss Mr. Coleman, and afterwards wrote the letter to me which I have read. Under whose supervision, may I ask, is this work being done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Curry, I believe, is the local architect.

Mr. CLARKE. Had the department any communication from Mr. Curry advising that Mr. Coleman's tender be not accepted ? Was it upon his advice that Mr. Coleman was turned down ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, there was no communication from Mr. Curry.

Mr. CLARKE. The more this thing is investigated, the less creditable it appears. Mr. Curry was the local architect, the gentleman who looked after the construction work on government buildings in the city of Toronto for years before this contract was given to Mr. Carlyle. As a matter of fact, Mr. Curry was an alderman of the city of Toronto at the time, and I believe is yet. Was it not extraordinary that the chief architect of the Public Works Department would pass over Mr. Curry, the local architect, and take a newspaper report as his reason for asking the minister to turn down Mr. Coleman ? He did not consult Mr. Curry, a local architect of standing, under whom the work was being done, nor the secretary of the Industrial Association, nor the city clerk. Might I ask the minister, when bringing down this information, to ask the chief architect why he did not think it worth while to obtain information from Mr. Curry ?

St. Catharines drill hall (revote, $10,000), $20,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A vote was taken for this work some time ago, but a dispute arose as to the site which had been chosen being unsatisfactory ; and after some delay, the city secured another site which met with the approval of the Department of Militia and Defence and the Department of Public Works. The contract amounts to $56,000, and the work is now going on.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the city furnishing the site ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, a fine site.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What will be the total cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total cost is estimated at $85,846.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How many regiments does it accommodate ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think there is only one regiment at St. Catharines.

Sault Ste. Marie—public building (revote, $10,000), $25,000.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the cost of this to be ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is estimated by the architect to cost $88,395. Tenders are now being advertised for.

Mr. CLARKE. Has a site been secured ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. It was procured in January, 1902. It cost the department $8,200, and the locality contributes something. There are 84 by 100 feet at the corner of Queen and East streets ; also lots five and six on East street, 56 by 81 feet.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey). For what reason are you erecting a public building of this kind at Sault Ste. Marie ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no proper accommodation there. My hon. friend knows that the place has grown very fast and that there are some very large manufacturing institutions there. Last year the postal revenues amounted to $18,551 and the customs duties to nearly half a million dollars.

Mr. BENNETT. What purpose is the building intended to serve in addition to a post office ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Customs and Inland Revenue Departments.

Mr. BENNETT. In what part of the town is the site, and from whom was it purchased ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is in the old part of the town. It was purchased from Mr. J. Dawson and Mr. W. H. Plummer. The marine office will also be in this building.

Mr. CLARKE. Is that building of stone ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Stone and brick.

Mr. BENNETT. Is the time for receiving tenders yet up ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No ; the tenders are due some time this month.

Mr. BENNETT. $85,000 seems an extraordinary expenditure for a town the size of Sault Ste. Marie, when towns of the importance of Owen Sound and Peterborough and others throughout Ontario have no public buildings, and others of equal importance have buildings costing from $15,000 to $20,000.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Mr. WRIGHT. I might say that three weeks ago a friend of mine called on me and I asked him how things were getting on at the Soo. He said that the worst feature was that they could not get their mail matter delivered. A number of families had to club together so that the ladies of these families would get the letters in turn during the day time, because when night came the post office was so crowded that they could not begin to get the mail. Such a condition of things as that should be remedied.

Woodstock—public building, $5,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work is under contract.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I understand that this is in the constituency of the hon. minister. What is the necessity for erecting this building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The necessity is that Woodstock is the most important town in Ontario. The revenue is also larger than that of any other town. I suppose that the government some years ago thought that it was proper to have a public building there. It is a very modest building, and this is to pay the balance on the contract.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I would not have mentioned this matter if the hon. minister had been as generous with his gifts to others. The only thing I regret is that he did not consider North Grey.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think that Owen Sound must rank next in importance to Woodstock.

Brantford drill hall—additions and alterations, $15,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to make provision for additional accommodation for armouries to be built along one side of the drill hall. The addition is to be two stories high. It is also to provide better sanitary arrangements. Brantford is a very important and growing city of some 15,000 or 16,000 people. The city have expended a very considerable amount of money in connection with this work. They have contributed $10,000 to the building and site, and now they have purchased a piece of ground beside this building and are turning it into a park ; I think the monument to the volunteers who went from that district to South Africa is being erected there. It seemed, from some representations made by members of parliament and by the people of Brantford, that we should make the improvements, which are really required in the interest of the local militia.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the size of the addition being made to this hall ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. One hundred and seventy-five feet by one

hundred feet. The city allows us to extend the building twenty feet on the side of the park. This provides a band-room, shooting gallery and other improvements.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it the intention of the department to level the armoury grounds at St. Thomas ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Neither the chief architect nor myself has any recollection of that matter being brought to our attention.

Mr. INGRAM. The armoury would be almost useless if the grounds are not levelled.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will bring this matter to the attention of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence and see what report he has received. We deal with matters of this kind in connection with the Department of Militia. Representations are made to them by the local officers.

Mr. INGRAM. I am simply drawing the attention of the minister to the necessity of this work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They appear to have taken it off our hands as satisfactory ; the St. Thomas building was completed some time ago.

St. Mary's—public building, $8,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a new work, which it is estimated will cost between $20,000 and $25,000.

Mr. BENNETT. St. Mary's is in Perth and so is Stratford. Stratford has already a large public building. The minister had better give up that rule as an excuse.

Mr. CLARKE. Has a site been purchased for the St. Mary's building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). The population of St. Mary's is 3,400 and the total revenue derived by the postal authorities is $6,000. I would ask the hon. minister what justification there is for this building, and what it will cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total estimate, including the site, is between $20,000 and $25,000. This is not for a post office alone, but for all the departments of the public service.

Mr. INGRAM. Has a site yet been selected ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Would the minister explain why he is spending $25,000 in St. Mary's—not that I at all object to St. Mary's having this public building. St. Mary's has a revenue of only $6,000 and a population of only 3,400. Why does he give it a public building at a cost of $25,000, when he refuses a public building to Owen Sound, with nearly 10,000 inhabitants and a revenue of about $15,000 ? The minister lays down a principle as justifying the building a post office in one place, and yet refuses to recognize that principle in other cases. There is something very unsatisfactory about the way the money is distributed for public buildings.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have already said that if the hon. gentleman thinks I have left Owen Sound out of consideration he is mistaken. I do not leave unconsidered the case of Owen Sound.

Mr. BLAIN. How much will the site cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no figures on that subject. The amount I have quoted includes the cost of the site.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think it will do Owen Sound a great deal of good to have my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) merely consider it ? He considers Owen Sound, but when it comes to the other places he gives them appropriations. We have had instances of town yielding not one-fifteenth of the revenue yielded by Owen Sound and to which the public buildings are given. We had one in which the revenue was $612 and another in which the revenue was $838. As my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) has got beyond the consideration stage with regard to these towns, why is it he cannot do the same with regard to Owen Sound ?

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). It is all the more to be noted because, as I said this afternoon, the town of Owen Sound, which is really a Conservative town, has, since 1896, given Liberal majorities because hon. gentlemen opposite have been promising them a public building and public works. Even in the late election, Owen Sound gave a Liberal majority of 33. They gave the late representative, Dr. Horsey, a Liberal majority. And when the Minister of Customs ran, they gave him a majority of over 100, because he promised them something in the way of a public building and public works. But now, when they see some of the smaller towns, such as St. Mary's and Woodstock, and other places, having large sums of money spent on them, while Owen Sound, the most important town in Western Ontario, receives not a single dollar, they begin to wonder what the promises of hon. gentlemen opposite are worth.

Oshawa—public building, $8,000.

Mr. BENNETT. This is a new work. What is the building to cost when completed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Between $20,000 and $25,000. The post revenue is $7,000, and the customs duties

nearly $28,000. Oshawa is a very prosperous town.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there a public building in Whitby, in the same county ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think so.

Mr. BLAIN. Whitby is the county town, a very important town, and larger than Oshawa.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am afraid my hon. friend is not always precise in his information. I think he will find that Whitby is not so large as Oshawa.

Mr. BLAIN. It is the county town and an older place than Oshawa, and a very important town.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is a very important town and a very pretty town, and some day——

Mr. INGRAM. I understood some time ago that we were going to have a new system, and that when a public building is proposed to be built we should have a proper estimate of its cost, instead of carrying on the old system of having a certain sum voted and then coming down year after year for more money to complete the work. I hope the Minister of Public Works will inaugurate the new system and stick to it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In every one of these items I have given the committee the maximum estimated cost, and I have stated that if, on completing the plans and getting tenders, the price greatly exceeded the estimate, I should not feel justified in going on until I had further consulted parliament.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). What will the electors of South Ontario think of their representative, who lives in Port Perry, not securing a public building for Whitby, the county town ?

Mr. ROSS (South Ontario). I think I am quite capable of looking after the interests of South Ontario. I am very pleased to be able to say that Oshawa should have a public building. We in South Ontario are very proud of Whitby and Oshawa, particularly proud of Oshawa as an industrial centre. The hon. minister gave the returns for Oshawa for 1902. I have the returns for the year ending the 30th of June, 1903, and they show that both the post office and customs revenues are increasing rapidly. While, for 1902 the post office revenue was about $7,100, for 1903 it was over $7,900—or nearly $8,000. And, while the revenue from customs for 1902 was $28,000, last year it amounted to about $35,000, showing a splendid growth. The town has an electric railway and its industries are going ahead very rapidly. They have an old shack of a post office there, in fact the post office is kept in a store. The accommodation is not at all suitable for the town, and I have been able to convice the minister that Oshawa deserves this public building. While Whitby is the county town and while we are very proud of it, while, as the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Thomson) says it is an old and important town, and in my opinion it should also have a public building, still, Oshawa seems to need this building at the present time. I think this vote will meet with the approval of the people of South Ontario.

Mr. BLAIN. Has there been any correspondence between the municipality and the government with regard to the site ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. BLAIN. What proportion of this money will be paid for the site ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think I am in a position to give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) any direct information. It is a growing town, but I should think a site would not cost more than $4,000, or $5,000 at the outside.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the hon. member for South Ontario who is familiar with the locality would be able to give us that information. No doubt he has been consulted.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He wants to boom prices; we want to keep them down.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) asked me a question about the site. There is nothing definitely settled that I am aware of regarding the site. I think it would not be wise to say where the site is to be, because perhaps the price of the property might advance. But I am advised that the prices of property have been rapidly advancing in Oshawa during the past year or two. A good many buildings are going up, but no doubt the government will be able to get a site suitable for the purpose.

Mr. INGRAM. How many sites has the hon. gentleman in view ?

Toronto—additional postal station, $25,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Where is this branch post office to be constructed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This appropriation is made on the request of the Post Office Department, carrying out their policy of spreading out these branch stations. This will be station D, I think it is on Yonge street.

Deseronto public building—to pay balance due on contract, &c., $1,500.

Mr. BENNETT. What does that building cost altogether.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is estimated that $25,000 will cover every-

thing, including the site, furnishings and so forth.

Mr. ALCORN. I notice on page 7 of the supplementary estimates, sessional paper No. 5, there is an item of $4,500 for a Deseronto public building. Does one item include the other, or are they separate ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That was for the year 1901-2, and was to pay a contract then entered into. This is to complete the whole work.

Bridgeburg—public building, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to build a custom-house at the end of the International bridge. The building is estimated to cost $10,000.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). What is the population ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Less than 2,000. But it is not built on account of local business, but at the request of the custom-house authorities there. Officers are stationed day and night at the end of the bridge, where a good deal of travel takes place between the United States and Canada.

Hamilton public building—alterations and improvements for inland revenue purposes, $5,000.

Mr. BRUCE. Are these improvements to be made on the new property that has been recently acquired ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Windsor public building—repairs, improvements, &c., $1,300.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is practically for new letter-boxes.

Mr. BLAIN. Are they put in by tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All by tender.

Picton public building—to complete, $1,000.

Mr. ALCORN. Could the minister say what work has been done on this building, if any ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was for levelling, sodding and a sidewalk. The retaining wall is to be paid out of this. This will complete the whole work.

Mr. ALCORN. The laying of this sidewalk is a very small affair, and the levelling and sodding amount to next to nothing. The whole job could not cost $200, but I see the appropriation is $1,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The sidewalk, including the excavation and the levelling, cost $460.

Mr. ALCORN. There was no excavation. only a little sand had fallen in, that is all. Was this part of the original contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, this was not done by contract, it was done by some of the local authorities, at so much per foot.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). How much per foot was paid for it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief architect thinks it was eighteen cents a foot.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Is not that an extraordinary price ? There is hardly a town in Canada pays more than ten or twelve cents a foot for a concrete sidewalk.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend had better look at the city of Ottawa and see what they are paying. I think he will find that they are paying over eighteen cents.

Mr. ALCORN. Was there any tender for this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, not exactly. Prices were asked for. As this is only to pay a balance due, I have not got the detailed information, but I can get it for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. ALCORN. This cannot possibly be the balance due on the work the minister mentions. I would not consider the whole work was worth more than $200.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will give my hon. friend a memorandum, and he can see what it is.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I think this is a justification for the argument which was set up here a while ago, that asking for prices from contractors is not quite satisfactory. There is nothing like public tender. Asking for prices leaves an opening for extortionate charges, and I am sure the hon. minister must admit that 18 cents a foot for this work is entirely too much. It is 50 per cent higher than is paid in almost any town in Canada, and it must be very unsatisfactory to the people of Picton, who are having this work done. They are charged $400 odd for work which might have been done for two-thirds of the amount.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I agree with my hon. friend that up west they have been getting these sidewalks built for an average of from 12 to 14 cents a foot, but down here it seems to be more expensive. I was rather surprised to notice a few days ago that in the city of Ottawa they are paying 18 cents a foot. However, I will get my hon. friend the information he asks.

Mr. ALCORN. I am quite sure the town has not paid nearly that price for a large amount of similar walks laid down during the past couple of years.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Then I must be mistaken, because I am

sure the chief architect would not, unless some misrepresentation was made, pass an account which exceeded the municipal price.

Ottawa departmental buildings—new elevator for west block, $6,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who is putting that in ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This will be let by contract.

Toronto drill hall and armouries—contribution towards paving Armoury street with brick and laying a concrete sidewalk on University street, $2,645.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We intend to make a contract for these improvements.

Toronto military buildings—magazine, $3,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These magazines are being erected at the request of the Militia Department.

Mr. CLARKE. Is this to be constructed on the old ordinance reserve land at the west end ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would not like to speak with certainty, but I think so.

London military buildings—magazine, $3,000.

Mr. GILMOUR. Is that to be built on Carling Heights ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I expect it will be built on Carling Heights.

Mr. GILMOUR. Will this $3,000 finish the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These sums are put in at the request of the Militia Department, which says that $3,000 will be the cost of these magazines.

Ottawa public buildings—new coal shed, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that as a result of the improvements which are going on, the property which has been used for this purpose has been confiscated. It will be necessary to build a coal shed somewhere on the canal basin for our supply of coal. It will be built on our own land.

Mr. CLARKE. Will it be built of cut stone ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief architect thinks we ought to build it of stone. Perhaps it would last longer, but I do not think it will be cut stone.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Would it not be better to put this building up in cement blocks ? It will be much cheaper than stone, and it will be quite as substantial. If you had a sample building in Ottawa, it would be an advertisement for what is becoming a very important industry in this country. They are manufacturing cement in Ottawa, and it would be well for the government to put up a building of cement blocks.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very much in favour of cement work. It is getting to be a very important local industry, and I shall certainly have the chief architect ask for a report in regard to the price of cement. If it is as satisfactory and cheaper than stone, I would be very glad to adopt it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why is it necessary to have a coal shed at all ? I thought the government purchased all the coal supplies by tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. But we must have some place to store the coal. We use between 6,000 and 8,000 tons, and we must store it somewhere.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why do you not require the contractor to deliver it as needed, and to store it until delivered ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We would pay a great deal more for it. It is brought in by water, stored in our own sheds without any cost either to the contractor or to ourselves, and delivered by the contractor from time to time as wanted.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Would it not be rather unwise for the hon. minister to advocate the use of any particular cement stone until it has been thoroughly tested in this country ? I do not think we have had enough practical experience of it to warrant its being used even upon coal sheds.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sorry my hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey) lives so far back in the country that he is not aware of the value of cement for building purposes. In our part of the country we have been using it for years, and we find it very satisfactory.

Mr. CLARKE. We have two cement buildings on the Toronto exhibition grounds, and I would invite the hon. minister, if he has not seen these buildings, and if he can spare the time, to go out and see them.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I was through them, and I was very much impressed with them.

Mr. CLARKE. They are using cement for curbing and other purposes that it was not thought possible to use it for a few years ago. There is a splendid proposition across the river in Hull, where the finest quality of cement will be turned out. I think the House will strongly support the hon. minister in putting up a building with this cement. It will be an object lesson, and it will give a satisfactory opportunity of testing it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is better cement at Owen Sound.

Mr. CLARKE. You can put up the public building at Owen Sound in cement. I certain-

ly think that there should be some public building erected of cement, because this country is going to develop a great business in the production of cement, and if the government will put up one building in cement, it would be an object lesson.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am quite serious in regard to this matter. I will ask for a special report from the chief architect's department.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). For the information of my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Lefurgey), I would say that Owen Sound is the original home of the cement industry in Canada, and that some of the finest residences that we have in Owen Sound are built of cement blocks. They are in appearance handsomer than stone, and certainly they are substantial. They stand our climate excellently, and are very durable. I hope the hon. minister, when he is in Owen Sound, will take a look at some of these buildings, and I can assure him that there is nothing in stone that can compare with them.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand the minister to say that the department purchases a large quantity of coal and stores it away ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. You have to buy coal in Ottawa when it can be carried by water. We receive it in the coal shed, and then the contractor delivers is as it is wanted by the different buildings. It would cost a good deal more unless we had some place where we could store a large quantity.

Ottawa post office and customs-house—improvements, $16,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Is this work to be done by tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work has all been done under the supervision of the officers of the department, and by the men in the employ of the department.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand the minister to say that the work has been done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work has not been done. The estimated cost of this work is a little over $15,000, composed of a number of small items. it is done under the supervision of our own officers.

Kingston Royal Military College—stable, $5,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will this be let by tender?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. I questioned the estimate of the Militia Department, but they told me they could get the kind of stable they wanted for this sum.

Sarnia—public building (revote), $13,800.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the explanation of this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It has already been voted, but the work was not completed in time to pay it before the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. BLAIN. Was it let by tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. The contract was $62,000, and this money is to pay the contractor.

Toronto examining warehouse—addition to, $25,000.

Mr. CLARKE. What kind of an addition will be erected ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to build an addition to the warehouse 70 feet by 44, and four stories high. The estimate of the chief architect is $30,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Of course, the work will be let by tender ?

Cobourg—improvements, $5,000.

Mr. ALCORN. What is this money for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for changes and improvements in the Cobourg post office. The hon. gentleman knows that this is a building which did not receive any attention for a long time, and it had fallen into a bad state of repair. This will cover the total cost of the work.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it to be done by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Kingston—barracks for Royal Canadian Field Artillery, $25,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This makes provision for the construction of new barracks at Kingston, with the understanding that the money will not be spent until after the sale of the present barracks which are reported to be unfit for occupation, owing to the impossibility of affording proper drainage. The Tête du Pont barracks are to be disposed of for the benefit of the crown.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is the minister going to dispose of the site of the Tête du Pont barracks ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am taking this vote on that condition.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Where are the new barracks to be located ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think the city offers a new site, and speaking from memory, it is on the present fair grounds, which is said to be very suitable. I estimate that the present property will bring us $40,000 or $50,000, so that the whole change can be made at a cost of some $40,000 or $50,000 to the country. However, I will ask the Minister of Militia to

give further information when his estimates are under consideration.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the total cost of the building to be ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Do you mean the total cost to the country ?

Mr. CLARKE. That is what we are interested in.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand it will be $40,000 or $50,000. The total cost of the work would be three times that, including the site and so on.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Fifty thousand dollars would not commence to erect a barracks with the necessary buildings, and so on. It is a reflection on Canada that new barracks have not been provided in Kingston years ago. The present barracks have no sanitary arrangements ; they are old buildings some of them dating from the time of Frontenac. The minister should be very careful about these plans, and he should have them examined critically by more than one authority before adopting them. Does the hon. gentleman intend to restore old Fort Henry, so as to make it habitable, or at least presentable ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no appropriation for that purpose at present.

Mr. CLARKE. This building is costing between $45,000 and $50,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, it is costing between $100,000 and $150,000. I am taking this vote on the condition that the arrangement is carried out. I said that the city would present a valuable site, the old exhibition grounds, and the present barracks are to be sold, and, I understand that the difference between the value of that and the total cost will be $45,000 or $50,000. We are doing this, as hon. gentlemen know, at the request of the Militia and Defence Department.

Hawkesbury—public building, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is quite a prosperous place. The last census gives its population as over 4,000. We have not been able to lease or rent any accommodation for the post office, and the people have sent in a large petition for a building. We propose to erect one costing $6,000 or $8,000. The place is a large manufacturing place and the revenue is very considerable.

Mr. BLAIN. What about the site.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The site will be very cheap.

Ottawa public buildings—paving front of parliament building, tar macadam, $6,900.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is an item in which all the members of the House are very much interested. I think the matter has been brought up in the House at different times, and strong representations have been made as to the disagreeableness of the dust. We think that may be overcome by having the ground paved with asphalt or tar macadam. We have taken a vote for the cheaper pavement, tar macadam.

Wingham—public building, $8,000.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Give us some information about this building. Wingham is a very important town doing a good business.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (speaking from the floor, Mr. Holmes in the Chair). I will take the minister's place, if any information is necessary in regard to the Wingham building.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The population of Wingham is 2,392, the postal revenue $4,507 and the customs revenue $6,449.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In what riding is Wingham ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In the riding of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would just say to the members of the committee that Wingham is one of the best commercial centres west of the city of Toronto.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Chiefly Tory, isn't it ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I will come to that. It is one of the best commercial distributing centres. It is served by two branches of the Grand Trunk Railway and one branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We have no less than six passenger trains leaving and six arriving each day, in addition to freight trains. It is also a large manufacturing centre. It has a large foundry and stove factory. It has several woodworking factories, furnishing material for house building. It is also one of the largest furniture manufacturing centres in the Dominion of Canada, employing in that industry between 300 and 400 hands. There are four furniture factories, though they are now combined under the furniture syndicate of Ontario. We have also very fine buildings, including three banks. It is one of the prettiest towns that any of you ever saw. Our streets are veritable avenues, lined with beautiful maple trees. We have no less than fourteen miles of granolithic sidewolks, for which we paid $25,000.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). How many hotels in the town ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am not so much interested in the hotels as I am in the general welfare of the town.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). To whom does the hon. gentleman assign that work in his campaign ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I get very little support from the hotels on the Tory side. If I were asking for this on political grounds, it would be different ; but the town has only one public building. Unfortunately for themselves and the welfare of the country, a majority of the people of Wingham vote against me ; but nevertheless, I am not going to forget them in the days of their necessity, and I am asking for a post office, not for any political or personal purpose but because the town needs a public building.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Has the Deputy Speaker purchased a site yet ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I will come to the site. I have been serving my party here for the last seventeen years, and I may say that if this grant is given it will be the first public money that has ever gone into East Huron since the first tree began to grow there.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). You had the rake-off in some other way.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Therefore I do not ask it for political reasons ; I ask it because we need it. The present post office is situated in an inconvenient locality, and it is not adapted for post office purposes. For the year 1901-2 the postal revenues amounted to $4,500 ; for the year ending the 30th of June, 1903, we collected $4,806. In addition to that the customs collections for 1901-2 were $6,500 and for 1902-3, $9,303 ; and so far this year they amount to $1,000 a month. When a town of that size and character demands a post office, I do not think there is a single man on the opposition benches who will say nay. I leave it in their hands. With regard to the site, we have several available. I do not think the site is going to be very dear, though I would not like to mention any sum. There is a site in view which I think will be selected if the owner is willing to sell it at a reasonable price. If not, the council will probably look elsewhere. I may say that this vote is only an instalment. To put up a building that would be in keeping with the other buildings that will surround it, would involve an expenditure of from $16,000 to $20,000. The bank of Hamilton stands on one corner, a magnificent structure, and the Dominion bank has fitted up a building across the street from it in a style that is equalled by very few banks in the city of Toronto. It is a brick building, which the bank has rented for twenty-five years. These bank buildings are covered with slate. On the other corners there are splendid buildings, and we want the government to erect a building that will be in keeping with them. We take a pride in keeping our town as clean and neat as possible, and if any of you visit it, you will come away with the impression that it is one of the prettiest and neatest towns west of the city of Toronto.

Mr. RICHARDSON. We have listened with some interest to the very eloquent address of the Deputy Speaker regarding the town of Wingham. I may say that we have in the constituency of Grey three towns that can claim everything that has been said on behalf of the town of Wingham, and in some cases a good deal more. Something has already been said about the town of Owen Sound. I doubt if there is in the whole of Canada a town of its population, with such important manufacturing industries and with such a great commerce, that has not had one dollar of public money expended in it for public buildings. Then I come south to the town of Durham. I asked last year for a public building there. It is a thriving and prosperous town, with a population of double that of some towns that are getting handsome buildings. And a little further west of Durham we have the town of Hanover which has no less than four furniture factories and other manufactories as well, yet it has never had a dollar of public money expended in it for public buildings or for any other purpose. While lake ports claim a good deal for their harbours, or docks, or elevators, or dredging, inland towns like Durham and Hanover have no claims of that kind, and therefore no public money is expended in them. I would again ask that they should have some fair consideration. In some cases too much money is expended on large ornamental and expensive buildings for post office and custom-house purposes to the detriment of other smaller places. The hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Thomson) has already spoken for Owen Sound. I doubt if there is any town of its size in the whole of Canada which has been so neglected as it has been in regard to public buildings.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). What is this building in Wingham to cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Between $20,000 and $25,000.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister will remember that he is breaking the rule he has laid down. There is already a public building in that constituency at Goderich.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Goderich is thirty-five miles away.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister should admit the principle that their votes are all based on political expediency and necessity.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I find that the members of the government are being provided with public buildings in their own constituencies. The Minister of Customs has a building at Brantford, the Minister of Public Works at Woodstock and the Deputy Speaker at Wingham. I do not know how they have come to side-track the Postmaster

General. I would again point out the inconsistency of erecting a public building in a place of 2,200 inhabitants, with a revenue of about $4,000 or $5,000, while no public building is erected in the county town of Grey, with a population of 10,000 and a revenue of $10,000.

Mr. MACLAREN (Perth). I would ask the hon. minister if he has received any application for a public building from the town of Listowel? Listowel is not very far from Wingham, and is one of the most important towns in that part of the country. If Wingham and other towns are to get favours of this kind, Listowel should have some assistance in the way of a public building; a post office and custom-house are badly needed. It is a large shipping and manufacturing centre, and I would like to see something done for Listowel.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think it is a wilful waste of public money to spend such a large sum as $20,000 or $25,000 in building a post office in a small town containing 2,000 or 2,500 population, which has no prospect of becoming a very large town. This is an inland town, and a post office costing $10,000 would be quite sufficient. When the Conservative government was in power I asked for a public building in my town, which is a large manufacturing town, and a post office was built costing $10,000 or $12,000 at the outside. The town gave the site and the government put up a building at that price. To spend $20,000 or $25,000 in a little village like Wingham is a wilful waste of public money. The government should establish a rule that unless there is a population of a certain number and a revenue of a certain amount the town has no claim at all. In the case of a frontier city like Toronto or Montreal we should, in the interests of the country, make our buildings respectable buildings, but to meet all the requirements of a post office building, which is all that is needed at Wingham, a building costing $8,000 or $10,000 would give all the accommodation required.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Listowel has a revenue of $4,496.77 and Wingham a revenue of $4,507—a difference in the revenue of about nine dollars.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have a statement from the Post Office Department showing the statistics for Wingham for this year. It is as follows:

Gross revenue	$ 4,805 85
Number of money orders	2,066
Amount of money orders	$22,411 00
Number of money orders paid	1,237
Amount of money orders paid	$20,157 00
Amount of postal notes	2,116 00
Customs in 1902	6,900 00
Customs in 1902-3	9,300 00

And during the last three months, $1,000 per month.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I might say that Listowel is a magnificent town, equally entitled to a post office, and I would be glad if the minister could see his way clear to gratify the request of my hon. friend from North Perth (Mr. MacLaren).

Mr. CLARKE. I had the pleasure of visiting Listowel the other day in company with the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. MacLaren), and I was delighted with my visit. It is a right smart town, the very centre of the great cheese industry. Experts in the cheese business come from the old country to visit its great cheese market very frequently. It is growing steadily, it has many fine business establishments, a great many beautiful private residences, and is in fact a thoroughly modern up-to-date town. Everything that has been said for Wingham can also be said for Listowel. If there should be a public building in Wingham, Listowel should stand a good chance also. It is a great manufacturing centre in a fine agricultural district, with large cheese, butter and other products. I strongly support the proposition of the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. MacLaren) that something should be done in this case.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I agree with the representations made as to the importance of Listowel. It is near my own home and I know it well. We are proud of Listowel. I had not thought particularly before of the matter to which my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Thomson) drew my attention, but I think he will find there is not very much party politics in this list of public buildings. If he will run his eye over the list, I think he will find that very little favour has been shown to the Liberal constituencies to the neglect of the others.

Mr. TAYLOR. You are bribing the others.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I think the applications have been considered very fairly. Going over the list, I think any impartial man would be surprised to see how many strong Conservative towns represented in this House by Conservatives are receiving post offices or other public works. I shall be glad when I have an opportunity, to remember the requirements of Listowel.

Mr. BENNETT. Every new public work in this list is for a riding represented by a Liberal in this House.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Who is the Liberal member representing Stratford?

Mr. BENNETT. There is no new public building there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. An armoury. I was speaking of the list of post offices.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I am going to make a strong appeal on behalf of Meaford

which has been added to the constituency of North Grey. Here is a splendid town, situated in my constituency as at present constituted which, I think, should have a special claim. It has a population of 1,916, and a postal revenue of $3,199, while the amount paid in post office orders is $26,000. It is one of the most important towns on Georgian bay and is the centre of a splendid agricultural district. Its inhabitants are a fine, industrious class. The town has a splendid harbour and I am glad to say, the government have done something to improve it of late years. I would make a special appeal to the Minister of Public Works for a building for Meaford.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think we are dealing very liberally with the harbour of Meaford and my hon. friend (Mr. Thomson, Grey) must give some of the inland people a chance. I know Meaford is a fine growing town, and after some of the inland towns have been provided for, I hope we shall be able to meet the requirements of Meaford.

Stratford—armoury, $10,000.

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

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About the same as the others.

Woodstock—armoury, $10,000.

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

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About $25,000—the same as the others, Stratford, Sherbrooke, &c.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the site been purchased ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I think the county council will contribute to the site. They have communicated their intention of doing so. There is a first-class regiment there of eight companies.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In Woodstock, or in the county ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In and around Woodstock.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I would point out to the minister what was incidentally touched on before, that in centres like Stratford, and Woodstock too the militia is growing. In a short time Stratford will have a city battalion of its own, and, likely a battery of its own. Woodstock should have cavalry, being in the centre of a fine agricultural country where many people own horses. I think the minister would do well in preparing the plans, to provide, as far as possible, for housing the artillery, and for storing the saddlery in case cavalry units should be formed.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand the county council will furnish the site in Woodstock. If this is so, who furnishes it in Stratford ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What I said was that we had had a communication from Woodstock asking with regard to the plans, showing the local interest in the militia there. The county council, irrespective of politics, are anxious to contribute something, as they do from time to time, in the payment of the militia.

Public works—chargeable to income—Manitoba—Winnipeg—district military stores building, $10,000.

Mr. PUTTEE. Where is this building to be erected ? At Fort Osborne ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to provide for the erection of a building for military stores, district No. 10, Winnipeg, to contain (A) the mobilization stores for troops of the province of Manitoba, and (B) quarters for the foreman of stores and district offices This is to be constructed at the request of the Department of Militia and Defence.

Winnipeg—new immigration building and postal station, $60,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to provide a new immigration building for the reception of immigrants in the city of Winnipeg. It will contain also Dominion land offices and accommodation for the Post Office Department for sorting mails, &c. The intention is to erect this building near the Canadian Pacific Railway station. This is represented by the Department of the Interior to be a matter of most urgent necessity. They are suffering now for want of accommodation in this respect.

Mr. McCREARY. Is this building intended to take the place entirely of the present immigration hall ? Is the present immigration hall to be dispensed with ? If so, this amount is entirely inadequate.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say to my hon. friend that we are adopting a scheme submitted by the imperial authorities. The total cost of this building is $125,000.

Mr. McCREARY. The present immigration hall is about 60 feet by 250 feet in length, three stories high. This $60,000 will not build a building one-half that size.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). By what department has the plan of this building been prepared ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. By the Department of the Interior.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The present building, as any one knows who has visited Winnipeg and seen it, is unfit for the purpose to which it is assigned. The com-

partments in which the immigrants have to sleep are placed around the sides of the wall, and are much like stables. In these narrow compartments the immigrants and their children have to sleep and dress. There is no ventilation, and very little light. I trust that in the plans that are being prepared, some attention will be paid to these requirements. The present immigration hall is situated on a low flat spot, which is very muddy in wet weather. Some attention should be paid to the sanitary condition of the buildings.

Mr. McCREARY. The building the hon. member speaks of is merely for the temporary detention of immigrants on their way through. They remain over night and pass on the next morning. This new building should not be so close to the station, but should be one or two blocks removed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) says is quite correct, that every provision should be made in the form of bath rooms, closets and that sort of thing, for the sanitary welfare of the immigrants.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Is it the intention to retain the old buildings and to make a separation between the immigrants, some of them being of an inferior class ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understood that in the plans submitted it was the intention to retain only the hospital building.

Winnipeg—addition to public building, $40,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If there is any place in Canada which requires increased accommodation frequently it is the post office at Winnipeg. The chief architect has reported plans for building two additional stories, a new stairway and an elevator, in the Winnipeg public building, at a probable cost of $65,000.

Mr. PUTTEE. Will you be able to start on this work at once ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The plans are being prepared, and as soon as this vote is given, instructions will be given to proceed at once.

Winnipeg military buildings—quarters for non-commissioned officers including guard-room, &c., $6,000.

Winnipeg military buildings—magazine, $3,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Does the Minister of Militia and Defence know where this magazine is to be situated in Winnipeg ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I cannot give the exact point, it is near the city of Winnipeg. I may say with regard to these three votes at Winnipeg that that city is becoming an important depot, a point at which military stores must be placed. At present we have no suitable buildings there for that purpose, and it is absolutely necessary, as the country is filling up, and if we are to pretend to defend it, or to assist the civil power, that we must be in a position to do so. These buildings are being constructed for the purpose of holding military stores which will be sent west. As to the magazine, I cannot give the exact location, but it is at or near the city of Winnipeg. The previous item of $6,000 is for the accommodation of non-commissioned officers who are now living, some of them in rented houses ; and as we have plenty of ground, it is thought much better to build our own houses for these men.

Mr. TAYLOR. As this is a military item I want to ask the Minister of Militia a question relating to the item of $25,000 for the barracks of the Royal Canadian Field Artillery at Kingston. I want to ask if there is in that appropriation an amount included for repairing the martello towers around the harbour at Kingston? They were dismantled by storms two or three years ago, and have been allowed to fall into disrepair. At Fort Henry also the walls are tumbling down, and everything is becoming dilapidated. I think in the interest of the country these martello towers should be kept in a first-class state of repair. I drew the attention of the department to it last year, and fully expected that provision would be made this year for taking proper care of that property.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There is a vote for general repairs out of which a sum might be taken for the purpose the hon. gentleman mentions. I quite agree that these repairs should be made, unfortunately, we have not had money to do it with. With respect to this vote of $25,000 at Kingston, I would like to explain to the committee that the city of Kingston has offered the government a block of land, some twenty-five acres, used now for exhibition purposes. The city offers that as a free gift to the government in the event of our wishing to construct new barracks. The present barracks are found to be unsanitary, and productive of fever. There appears to be some difficulty in disposing of the sewage of the city in such a way that it will not be a nuisance to these barracks. It is intended to sell the property there and realize what money we may, and to construct a new barracks probably on this land, although I may say that at this moment the question is being considered of restoring the Fort Henry property. I know that the deputy minister who has been there and has examined the property thinks that we might occupy that with great advantage. I spoke to General Lord Dundonald the other day about it, and he is very much inclined to that view, so that it is possible that this vote may

not be used. I think it is only fair to the committee to make this statement as to what is going on.

Mr. TAYLOR. I fully agree with the view of the hon. minister, because the government have any quantity of land east of Fort Henry, and it will be a better site than that in the city.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think so, too.

Mr. TAYLOR. If you want a healthy location, you have it at Fort Henry and upon the ground east of it, along the river front.

Mr. ALCORN. In regard to this group of items, will these buildings be erected by tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, except the repairs to the immigration building.

North-west Territories—Edmonton jail—(revote, $5,000), $35,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is under contract.

Prince Albert court-house and post office, $10,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is that the total amount ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is being erected on the recommendation of the Department of Justice, and it is a necessity there.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). As soon as the territories get provincial autonomy the new provinces will erect their own court-houses. A post office is certainly necessary there, but I think the court-house part of it might be reconsidered, as it is a provincial more than a Dominion building. It is quite evident that the hon. minister does not intend to give the territories provincial autonomy.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not say that. So long as the territories are under the jurisdiction of the Dominion, and as the country is filling up very fast, we must of necessity meet their requirements. I have not the total cost of this building.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It looks as if it was going to be one building—a court-house and a post office.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If a province is created there this building will have to be handed over to the province as a court-house, or else retained and used for some other purpose.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Even if it is, at an early day more space will be required at that place.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Certainly.

Moose Jaw—public building, $5,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is this building for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A post office. We will have to make some provision here, as there is a rapidly increasing population at Moose Jaw. I understand that the post office receipts increased by over a thousand dollars last season and they will have increased this season probably by a very considerable amount.

Mr. TAYLOR. How expensive a building are you going to put up ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This building will cost between $15,000 and $20,000 ; but in view of the rapidly growing population, I will have to ask the House to give me sufficient latitude to enable me to reconsider the matter.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Has Moose Jaw no public building at all ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. The customs receipts increased by $2,000 between 1901 and 1902. When I get a full report from the officers, I propose to recommend the erection of a building suitable to that growing place.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). This is the headquarters of the Pasqua branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, although it really branches off at the junction a few miles down. I think this is a very small building for a town like Moose Jaw.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will take that into consideration.

Barracks for permanent corps (Strathcona Horse), $10,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Where is that to be located ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not prepared to say. The Militia Department made representations that it is desirable to erect a barracks at some place in the North-west Territories.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is it to be in Edmonton or in Strathcona ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Some representations were made that Calgary would be a good point, but no decision has been come to in regard to that. It depends on the representations made by the military authorities.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is there going to be an increase in the permanent force ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, by about 100 men.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Are you going to retain the police force in the same region ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The police force is gradu-

ally being moved to the northward, and as it is moved forward the militia will take its place in the southern portions of the territories. The police will vacate the barracks at Calgary. It is intended to establish a new militia depot at Calgary, and the police will be moved northward from Calgary to Edmonton. The police will transfer, I expect, their accommodation at Calgary to the new military depot, and it is probable that this accommodation will be quite sufficient.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Oh, no; not for a hundred men.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Well, for eighty men. It is sufficient at any rate for a good start. Perhaps it would not be inopportune to say now that the depot which is to be established in the west will perpetuate the name and fame of the Strathcona Horse. All the contingents which served in South Africa have their names preserved in different branches of the permanent force, except that of Lord Strathcona. It was thought fitting that the memory of this one should be perpetuated, and it is proposed to call this one the Strathcona Horse.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I think this is very proper. There is at present a squadron of Canadian Mounted Rifles in Winnipeg.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, they are called the Mounted Rifles.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Officers training for certificates for the mounted corps, can obtain them either in Winnipeg or Calgary.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Nelson public building—to complete, $18,200.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete the contract. The total cost is $84,230.60.

Rossland—public building to complete, $8,000.

Mr. BENNETT. When I was there last fall, the building was about to be occupied and appeared to be completed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to pay the contractor for fittings for electric light, &c.

Mr. BENNETT. What was the total cost.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $76,666.

Mr. BLAIN. The Minister of Public Works stated last year that the work was under contract for $49,000, and now we are told that it has cost over $76,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That was the contract price for the building, but the cost of the site, fittings, furniture, letter boxes, heating, electric light, &c. had to be added to that.

Vancouver—public building, $60,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will the total cost of this be?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will probably cost in round figures $100,000. The city is growing very fast and accommodation to about that extent is required. We are now paying very heavy rentals and I think it is a good business proposition to have all our offices in one building in Vancouver.

Mr. BLAIN. Last year we had a statement that a certain building would cost $49,000, but we now find that it has cost over $80,000. Is the minister giving us the same kind of an estimate with regard to this building?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I must be fair to the late Minister of Public Works, and state, that in that case he gave the contract price. If he were asked about the site and so on he would have given the information. I have stated on several occasions to-day, and I repeat that my desire is to state to parliament the maximum estimated cost in each case. I have said that if after we advertised for tenders it was found that the cost would be considerably more than I stated, I would not go on with the work before coming back to parliament.

Mr. BLAIN. What does the minister mean by saying that the Vancouver building will cost $100,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Plans have not been prepared for that building, but I consider that a building suitable to the requirements of a growing city like Vancouver will cost about $100,000. If it shall be found to cost very much more than that, I would feel that I should come back to parliament.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the Minister mean that $100,000 will include everything?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, no. I understood the hon. gentleman to ask the cost of the building. The total cost including the site and everything will be more than that. I will not ask parliament for another vote for this until I give full information.

Mr. BLAIN. That is where the misleading part of it comes in. The minister should give us a plain matter of fact statement as to what the total cost to the country will be. Every one knows that a building in this country has to be heated and equipped. If that equipment costs about as much as the building itself, the public are misled.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In almost every case, I have endeavoured to give a fair estimate of the total expenditure. This is the first instance to-day in

which we have not sufficient information to give that estimate, and I say that if it exceeds greatly the amount I have stated, I will not go on with the building until I inform parliament what the estimate is. In almost every case I mentioned to-day, I have included the total cost.

Rossland armoury, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These buildings in British Columbia will cost about $10,000 if built in wood, and $15,000 if built in brick. The Rossland building is expected to cost not more than $15,000.

Mr. BENNETT. How many companies are in the town of Rossland ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think only two.

Mr. ALCORN. With regard to these public buildings in British Columbia, will tenders be advertised for, and will the work be given to the lowest tenderer ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That has been done in the case of all the works under construction. The two new works will be let by tender and contract.

Yukon Territory—White Horse public buildings—post office and customs fittings, &c., $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete post office and provide fittings.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the total cost of the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not the details here, but the deputy minister tells me from memory that its total cost is $18,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it brick or frame ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A wooden building.

Rents—Dominion public buildings, $13,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in addition to the vote in the main estimates.

Mr. ALCORN. Has the minister any objection to placing before the committee a statement showing the various buildings rented in Ottawa, and the rents paid ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A return giving that information was brought down this session. If the hon. gentleman does not find it in the office and will let me know, I shall be glad to bring him a duplicate.

Some resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. What will be the business to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I expect that we shall go on with the Public Works estimates at least part of the day, perhaps all day.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, October 6, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

TREADGOLD COMMISSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to inquire from the government whether or not any report has yet been received from the commissioners who were appointed to investigate certain matters in connection with the Treadgold and other concessions in the Yukon ? If the report has not been received, I would like to inquire whether or not the evidence has been received, and in either case I would like to know the intention of the government as to printing that evidence in full.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS Hon. James Sutherland). The right hon. the Prime Minister is not at present in the House, but I will mention the matter to him, and my hon. friend might renew his question when he is present.

SUPPLY—MAIL SERVICE AT PICTON.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock) moved that the House go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. G. O. ALCORN (Prince Edward). Before the House goes into Committee of Supply, I desire to call the attention of the hon. the Postmaster General to the very unsatisfactory condition of affairs at Picton post office. The mails for Picton are delivered from the Grand Trunk Railway over the Central Ontario Railway. The trains over this railway arrive very irregularly, and in consequence the mails are not delivered in the post office until long after the proper hour. The railway company carries the mail on the same train that they use for shunting and handling all the freight at the stations along the line, so that its arrival at Picton is very irregular. While the railway company is largely to blame, the staff of the post office is also highly inefficient, and the time occupied by them in the sorting and distribution of the mails is utterly unreasonable. In fact the staff has never been an efficient staff. The postmaster has had no clerical training and the hands in the office have been boys, also without training. With the exception of one young man named Belch, there has never been a really efficient or competent official in that post office under this Government. I hope the Postmaster General will find means to remedy this evil,

which is a cause of inconvenience to all of the inhabitants of Picton. Mails which should be delivered at 9 a.m. o'clock, or 9.30 a.m. at the outside, are frequently not delivered until 11 o'clock, and a similar state of affairs exists in the afternoon.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am sorry to learn from my hon. friend (Mr. Alcorn) that any cause for complaint exists, and I will take all possible means to remedy any evil. As to the first portion of the hon. gentleman's complaint, that mail trains are used for handling local freight as well as for handling passengers, I fear the remedy is beyond the control of the government. As to any inefficiency on the part of the post office staff, that is a matter for which the government is responsible, and if this condition should continue it would be a ground of complaint against the government. Therefore, I assure my hon. friend that any ground of complaint of that kind will cease at the earliest possible moment. As to the former ground of complaint, I will bring that matter to the attention of the railway in question and ascertain whether it would be possible for them to improve their methods.

AMERICAN COASTING LAWS.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. William Paterson). I wish for a few minutes to allude to a question on which some difference of opinion occurred in the House the other day, and which I think it is desirable to have cleared up. I refer to the differences of opinion between the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and the right hon. Prime Minister and myself with reference to the bonding privilege and coasting laws as exercised by the United States. It will be remembered that the Prime Minister thought that goods could not be shipped from one point or place in the United States to another American port or place except in American vessels. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) thought he was wrong in that, and that it might be shipped in Canadian vessels as well as in American vessels. On that occasion I read the law of the United States, which is :

> Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled: That no merchandise shall be transported by water under penalty of forfeiture thereof from one part of the United States either directly or via a foreign port or for any part of the voyage in any other vessel than a vessel of the United States.

The leader of the opposition on that occasion said it would depend upon what interpretation might be put upon the word 'voyage,' and asked if there had been any decisions of the Supreme Court in that case. I said I was not aware, that the commissioner of the department was looking to see. Well, the commissioner has not been able to find any decisions. But we have here the customs regulations of the United States, the instructions given to their officers by the Treasury Department, which they are to carry out in this respect, and they are set forth in article 707 :

> Merchandise in transit from one port or place within the territory of the United States to another by a route a part of which is by land carriage through the Dominion of Canada, and a part by the great lakes and the rivers connecting the same, or by the River St. Lawrence, may be transported by water in American vessels only from ports on the northern frontier of the United States to ports on the Canadian frontier for transhipment to railway cars, from points on the Canadian frontier at the termini of railway transportation, to ports on the northern frontier of the United States.

It is as the Customs Department thought, and as the Prime Minister thought; it is absolutely forbidden by their statute as interpreted by their customs regulations, to carry goods otherwise than in American vessels from one American port to another. However, while the department felt sure, it did not like to speak too positively, and we thought we would find out positively how this matter stood, and for that reason the Commissioner of Customs wired Mr. Drewitt, who is Canadian Customs Officer at Depot Harbour, on October 1st, 1903 :

> Regarding freight originating in Boston destined for Duluth, carried by railway to Depot Harbour, will American officer allow this to be carried from Depot Harbour to Duluth in British vessel, wire reply.

The reply is as follows :

> Depot Harbour, Ont., October, 1903.
>
> To John McDougald,
> Commissioner of Customs,
> Ottawa.
>
> American customs officer will not allow freight originating in Boston destined for Duluth to be carried in British vessels from Depot Harbour to Duluth.
>
> (Sgd.) F. J. DREWITT.

While that has reference to package freight, we wanted to be sure. It was suggested then that they might allow it to be carried for export, that grain originating at Duluth or Chicago might be sent to Liverpool via Boston. I said at the time that I did not think that could be done. But I did not wish to speak too positively, and in order to find out that point positively, the commissioner, on the 1st of October, wired Mr. Drewitt, the customs officer at Depot Harbour, Ontario, as follows :

> Regarding American wheat from Duluth to Liverpool transported by railway from Depot Harbour to Boston, will American officer allow this wheat to be carried in British vessel from Duluth to Depot Harbour ? Wire reply.

This is the reply :

> Depot Harbour, October, 1903.
>
> To John McDougald,
> Commissioner of Customs,
> Ottawa.
>
> American customs officer will not allow American wheat from Duluth consigned to Liverpool

via Depot Harbour and Boston to be carried on other than American vessels.

(Sgd.) F. J. DREWITT,
Customs Officer.

Now, I think that places the question in such a clear light before the House, that there can be no further doubt, and I have read these telegrams thinking they might be useful to the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman has made a portion of that matter fairly clear, but there is one aspect of it which he has not made clearer than it was before, and as to which I do not think his references have any application. It is perfectly clear, notwithstanding what the hon. gentleman has said that we can bring grain or any other freight capable of being stored in an elevator, from Duluth or Chicago to Depot Harbour, consigned to Depot Harbour, and store it in an elevator there; then, after it has been so stored, we can route it thence either by Boston or by any port in Canada. But I would like to point out to the Minister of Customs that what the right hon. gentleman said in the course of the debate to which he has made reference, is something very different from that which the Minister of Customs has placed before the House to-day. Here is the language of the right hon. gentleman to be found on pages 12647 and 12648 of 'Hansard':

> We would have to manag a fleet of steamers. There is something more. The fleet maintained on the lakes for the purpose of supplying traffic to the Canada Atlantic Railway is composed in part of American bottoms. It would be impossible to have the trade we have to-day unless it was carried in American bottoms. We can carry Canadian freight in Canadian bottoms, but you cannot take freight at Duluth, Chicago or Milwaukee or any of the western ports and bring it to Depot Harbour except in American bottoms.

The PRIME MINISTER Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). That was qualified.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The right hon. gentleman did not qualify it at all. I am reading his own language.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is not all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will read it all:

> The bonding privilege of the Americans has been so devised as to make that a necessity. Therefore the Canadian government would have to become the owners of a fleet of steamers under American register.

It is perfectly obvious, not only from the fact that the right hon. gentleman did not qualify his language, but from another circumstance, that he was under that impression at the time; because we were not proposing to acquire the Canada Atlantic Railway or any other extension of the Intercolonial to the Georgian bay for the purpose of taking freight to Boston, we were proposing to acquire that railway for the purpose of taking freight to Halifax, and St. John, and Quebec, and Montreal. That is what my right hon. friend was dealing with, if he was dealing with anything. Nothing could be more absolute, nothing could be more unqualified than his language which I have just read. The right hon. gentleman was dealing with a railway which, we will say, transports a considerable portion of grain from Duluth and Chicago to Depot Harbour. That grain, so far as I am aware, is carried principally if not altogether from Canadian ports. I asked my right hon. friend the other day whether he was aware that any considerable portion of this grain was exported from United States ports—I am referring to grain brought to Depot Harbour and carried by the Canada Atlantic Railway to Montreal. My right hon. friend was not able to say that any considerable portion of that grain did go by American ports. What we were dealing with was bringing American grain to Depot Harbour and transporting that grain to Europe via Canadian ports. My right hon. friend obviously was of the opinion that that could not be done, otherwise he would not have used the absolute and unqualified language which he did use with regard to that matter.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have only one word to say. I cannot find at this moment my language, but I am satisfied that if my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) will look again and see what I said, he will find that I stated that the traffic of the Canada Atlantic Railway was American traffic passing from American ports to American ports and that that traffic could not be carried on the lake except in American bottoms to be bonded on the Canada Atlantic Railway. That is the statement which I made at the time, certainly which I intended to make and I am pretty sure that I did so in so many words in some part of the remarks which I made.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My right hon. friend (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) stated that two days afterwards in reply to a question put to him, but I do not think he stated it at that time. May I be permitted to bring another matter to the attention of the government, and it is the very negligent and careless way in which the returns have been brought down in compliance with an address of the House of Commons dated the 11th of May, 1903. I moved on that date for copies of all Orders in Council, memorials, letters, telegrams and other correspondence relating to the granting of provincial autonomy to the North-west Territories. On the 19th of June, I directed the attention of the government to the fact that these documents had not been brought down. On the 26th of June my right hon. friend the Prime Minister brought down certain documents and said that there were some more to follow. On the 29th of June I moved that these documents should be printed. On the

20th of July, after having examined these documents which had been brought down, I spoke of this return and pointed out a very long list of documents which I had been at great pains to tabulate, and which had not been included in the return brought down. Some of the documents which had been omitted were of the most important character. My right hon. friend said that these further documents would be brought down. On a subsequent occasion the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) made a request for the postponement of the discussion of certain financial questions touching the North-west Territories to which I agreed. This was on the same day, the 20th July, and I suggested that the documents should be put in chronological order and should be printed. On the 24th July the hon. Minister of the Interior brought down a further return. I pointed out to him once more that a number of documents which were of very great importance had not been included in the former return. He stated that certain of these documents could not be found, and I offered to supply copies of the documents which could not be found, because I had obtained them from the printed proceedings of the North-west Territories. The first return which was brought down is printed as Sessional Paper No. 116, and the second return is printed as Sessional Paper No. 116a. These returns are still imperfect as a very large number of letters have been omitted and particularly two letters of very great importance, one from the right hon. Prime Minister to Mr. Haultain dated the 8th of June, 1903, and Mr. Haultain's reply dated 15th June, 1903. Besides those I believe from the very hasty examination of the return that a very considerable number of other letters to which I called the attention of the government have not yet been brought down. I do not know whether they are of great importance or not because I have not had time to go over the matter again. I spent half a day in July in going over the documents, and I gave a long list of the letters which were required and which will be found at pages 6891-2 of the revised 'Hansard.' The right hon. gentleman will find that I gave a list of between thirty and forty letters that have not been included in the first return brought down. I do not know whether it would be possible at this period of the session to bring down these documents and have them printed. I do think a little more care should be exercised in regard to these matters. I know there was some difficulty because a certain portion of the correspondence was in the Department of the Interior, and a certain other portion was in the hands of the right hon. Prime Minister. The return which has been brought down is in a most embarrassing condition. You look for a letter of June, 1901, and you find it at the end of Sessional Paper No. 116a, the second return, while you find another letter of a subsequent date at the beginning of the first return. The letters seem to have been thrown together in a confused heap and printed just as they were brought down. To place these important documents before the House in that way is of no assistance to any member of this House who desires to understand the position of affairs as disclosed by this correspondence. If there is not enough clerical assistance in the service of the government or in the service of this House to see that the returns are put in proper order, I think we had better make a sufficient appropriation to provide for that work. I would be ashamed as far as any work in my own business is concerned, and I think any corporation would be ashamed to have documents brought down in so irregular and confused a condition for the purpose of discussing a business question of any kind, and why we should have to submit to this in connection with the public business is more than I can understand. It is not for want of attention on my part, because I spent nearly a whole day some time before the 20th of July for the purpose of ascertaining what documents had not been brought down and of suggesting to the government the importance of having these documents brought down in an orderly arrangement. I trust that when documents of great importance are brought down in the future there will be some attention given to the work of having them arranged in chronological order. It would not be out of place where documents are somewhat voluminous to have the return accompanied by an index and to have the printed return accompanied by an index, so that we could readily get at any document that we require. But really a great waste of time is imposed upon those members who desire to study documents brought down in this manner and there must be an absolutely unnecessary waste of time under the circumstances of this case.

The PRIME MINISTER. There are two documents which perhaps my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) would like to have; those are the letter of myself to Mr. Haultain of the 8th of June, and the answer of Mr. Haultain of the 15th of June. I can bring these down this very day. In regard to the remarks made by my hon. friend, I must admit that the returns are brought down in a very slovenly manner. I shall give directions at once that an officer shall be appointed whose duty it shall be be to prepare all documents properly for presentation to this House. In former years I had often to complain of this matter. I am very sorry that we have not made very much improvement in this regard. I agree with what my hon. friend has said.

If I may be permitted to revert to the subject which was mentioned a moment ago, I would call my hon. friend's attention to page 12647 of 'Hansard,' where he will find the remark that I made:

I come now to the main proposition of my hon. friend. He proposes to acquire the Canada Atlantic Railway as it exists to-day. But though the government may acquire the Canada Atlantic Railway, it certainly could not operate it. How could you expect that a Canadian government could possibly, with any advantage to the country operate the Canada Atlantic Railway. It is within the knowledge of everybody that at this moment three-fourths at least of the business of the Canadian Pacific Railway and three-fourths of the business of the Canada Atlantic Railway is American business. It is business connected with the western states and carried to its destination in the eastern states. The Canadian government could not compete for that business if we were to acquire that railway.

Then I proceeded to give the reasons.

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

Abbott's Harbour, N.S., $700.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). This is to build an addition to the beach protection 30 feet in length. This is the amount estimated to complete the work.

Mr. CLARKE. What county is it in ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yarmouth.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Would the minister be good enough to state what county each work is in ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And the object of the expenditure in each case.

Abram's river—wharf, $1,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for rebuilding a small stone wharf in Yarmouth county which was built 25 years ago. This is the total amount estimated by the chief engineer. These repairs will be done under the supervision of the engineer in charge.

Mr. CLARKE. Who fixes the wages when it is done by day labour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The engineer in charge.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the fair-wage officer interfere in any way ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I suppose he would if there was any complaint, but we have never had complaint.

Mr. CLARKE. I suppose the fair-wage officer is held in reserve in case of emergency.

Bayfield harbour works—repairs and improvement, $6,850.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Antigonish county, and this sum is the total estimated cost.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any considerable commerce at Bayfield, or is this for the benefit of the fishermen?

Mr. McISAAC. This is a very important harbour. To show how important it is, I may say that the Conservative government in 1889, voted $3,500 to commence the building of a wharf, and between 1889 and 1896 they expended $40,000 on this wharf.

Mr. CLARKE. Is not that enough ?

Mr. McISAAC. Since the Liberals came to power only $1,000 has been expended. This present expenditure has been reported by the engineer to be urgent, in order to keep the work from going to decay. There was a breakwater built by the Conservative government, and there has been since no expenditure on that work until now. The engineer has reported that the whole covering has been swept away by the storm last year, and it is to rebuild the covering of the breakwater that the sum is necessary.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the vote be sufficient ?

Mr. McISAAC. So the engineer reports.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any considerable commerce at this point ?

Mr. McISAAC. Before the building of the Intercolonial Railway to the strait of Canso, it was the most important shipping place in the county, and although it is not so important now, still there is considerable business done in the shipping of cattle to Newfoundland. As Antigonish is almost entirely a farming county, that is an important industry with us. During the summer, two or three vessels make fortnightly trips between Bayfield and St. John's, Newfoundland. It is the chief port for Newfoundland vessels.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How will this money be expended ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is practically for repairs, and it will be done under the supervision of the government engineer.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is Mr. Dodwell the engineer ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Milledge is in charge.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How many resident engineers are there in Nova Scotia ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are two, Mr. Dodwell and Mr. Milledge.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think Mr. Locke has jurisdiction in the western part of the province.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, there are three altogether.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the minister think that there is necessity for three resident engineers for that province—there may be ; I am only asking for information ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer says he should have more. Now that the matter has been brought to my attention, I will inquire into

it at an early date. I can understand that when a lot of money is being expended at different places it would be a saving to the country to have a responsible man in charge.

Baxter's Harbour—reconstruction of breakwater, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in King's county. It will cost $3,000 to reconstruct the work, and put it in good shape. There is considerable local trade from fishermen and farmers in that district. The money will be expended under the supervision of the local engineer. This is practically repairs, and cannot be done by contract because you do not know when you commence how much work you will have to do.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will this vote cover the total expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, the total cost is $3,000.

Benoit's Cove—improvements to boat landing $800.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is the total cost of improvements that have been made at this point—the removal of 183 yards of boulders and the placing of 183 yards of stonework.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). For what purpose is the boat landing used ?

Mr. McISAAC. This is for the benefit of a large fishing district. There has never been a wharf on the east side of Harbour Bouche. Although there are forty or fifty large boats engaged every year in the fishing industry in that part of the harbour, there is no protection whatever for them. Benoit's Cove affords splendid natural protection for boats except for a number of boulders which obstruct the navigation. An investigation was made by the resident engineer last year, and he has reported that by the removal of these boulders very safe and secure shelter would be afforded to the fishermen in that locality.

Big Harbour (Port Bevis)—wharf, $3,700.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to cover the cost of building a wharf 80 feet long and 12 feet deep at low water on the west side of the harbour. It is in Victoria county, N.S.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this a new wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, this is a new work, and this $3,700 is the total cost estimated by the engineer.

Mr. CLANCY. I am not going to find fault. I merely wish to say that there is a disposition to extend works in many cases and to build new works, which no doubt the people of the localities served may not object to ; but the question is whether they are of a character so pressing that they should be undertaken. These works not only involve present expenditure, but they become a public charge for all time. Our experience under all governments has been that once you construct the most useless work, the people of the locality will never listen to the suggestion that an end should be put to it, though they know it is useless. I am not sure that the governments of the day are inclined to turn a deaf ear to these demands, especially on the eve of elections. Only a short time ago the Minister of Labour, Postmaster General and acting Minister of Public Works—I do not know that that trinity exists now—sent out a circular inviting applications for works, I presume, of this kind. I would like to ask the present Minister of Public Works if this work is the result of that invitation, or if it is a work of absolute necessity. While I am not prepared to say that it is not a necessary work, because I have no information on the subject, I do say that this committee should scrutinize with great care any expenditure of this character, unless it is shown to be of some importance and of some lasting benefit. Will the hon. minister give us some statement as to the necessity of this, and what the engineer reports.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The representation made to the department is that the farmers and other inhabitants of that district can only dispose of their produce by taking it to Baddeck, a distance of nine or ten miles, and that this small work will give them accommodation by water.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the report of the engineer ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am reading now from the report of the engineer.

Mr. CLANCY. When was that report made ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On the 14th of April last.

Mr. OSLER. How many people are tributary to that part ? What is the nature of the country around ?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). As one who knows a little about the district, I may say to my hon. friend that this is not a useless work by any means. The community that is to be served by this wharf is a rather important community. It is a good farming district, and there is considerable fishing besides. The people live in a part of the country which is not served by a railway, and there is no likelihood that there will be a railway in the near future. Their only means of communication is by water. I repeat that it is not by any means a useless work, but is a necessity to accommodate the farmers and fishermen of the district.

Mr. CLANCY. Can the minister tell the committee how near this harbour is to other harbours ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As I have already informed the hon. gentleman—I suppose he is only asking for fun——

Mr. CLANCY. I want the hon. gentleman to understand that there is no fun about this.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I thought it was for amusement, because I have already within five minutes stated twice that at present the people have to haul their produce to Baddeck, which is nine or ten miles away. I am not able to say how far distant the nearest harbour is.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). The nearest harbour is Baddeck.

Mr. BLAIN. Might I ask the minister if there is any revenue derived from any of these wharfs ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When the work is completed by the Public Works Department, it is transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, which collects the revenue. I should fancy that the revenue in this particular district would not be very large.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose the question whether there will be any revenue is taken into consideration by the government ? I notice that in these supplementary estimates there are votes for 103 places in Nova Scotia.

An hon. MEMBER. There ought to be 203.

Mr. BLAIN. That shows the hon. gentleman's idea of public expenditure.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). How many harbours are there in Nova Scotia ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition said the other day that there were several thousand.

Mr. CLARKE. In what county is this wharf located ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In Victoria. It is to connect the government wharf with the public highway, and the cost is $5,528.29.

Mr. BLAIN. Was there any contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work was let by contract.

Mr. BLAIN. When this item was up for discussion last year the minister said that the contract was let and that the work would be completed in June.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My information is that it was completed in June.

Mr. BLAIN. The statement was made last year that the vote then taken would complete the work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer informs me that the statement then made was that the vote being taken would complete the work then under contract. The estimate now asked is for the building of a road 2,100 feet long connecting the wharf with the public highway, this being a different work from that to which the hon. gentleman refers.

Mr. BLAIN. Might I ask the hon. minister how much money has been expended in the past few years on this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am most happy to repeat again that the amount is $5,520.29.

Mr. BLAIN. The $4,000 voted last year was the first investment in that wharf and this is an item to complete it, making the total cost over $5,000 ? Does the hon. gentleman expect there will be any revenue from this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I should think there should be some small revenue from this wharf.

Mr. CLANCY. Is that roadway a new work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. Was the land on which it is built purchased ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, the chief engineer informs me it cost $70.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would like to ask if this is not a new departure, building wharfs and also highways to connect them. I should think that when the public of Canada contribute money to build a wharf the people of the municipalities might build a road to connect with it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a good deal in what the hon. gentleman says, but it is not a new departure. There is a great deal in what my hon. friend says that localities might do some of this work.

Mr. LANCASTER. Has the minister considered that by undertaking to build highways which are properly within the control of the municipalities by virtue of the delegation of control over highways to provincial governments and the municipal authorities, this government may become responsible for the maintenance and repair of these highways and for any accidents that may occur upon them ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I suppose that if the work is done on our own property the liability of the government will not be the same as if this was on a public highway.

Mr. ROSAMOND. Would the hon. minister kindly give us some idea of the principle underlying the distribution of this pub-

lic money all along the Nova Scotia coast? It seems extraordinary that a public wharf is built on the coast where there is no means of access to that wharf.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have made as great an effort as has my hon. friend from Lanark to find out what principle has governed in this matter in the past. I am sure that he must know, as a man of great experience, parliamentary and otherwise, that I found difficulty in discovering what principle has governed in the past. However for the present these works have been governed by the principles of the public necessities and the development of trade in the different sections.

Mr. FRASER. I may say in reference to the vote for Nova Scotia generally that these works are certainly required in the public interest. A wharf for example may be required in a fishing village. The highway runs parallel to the coast and between it and the shore there may be small cultivated pieces of land. The wharf is located at the place where it will best suit the people of the district. There may, however, be no road running down to it and it may be necessary to build a road from the highway to the wharf which may be some little distance.

Mr. ROSAMOND. I would like to know whether a public port must be constructed for every one or two farmers along the coast. It seems to me an extraordinary thing that public money should be squandered in this manner, frittered away—I can only say it is—by building wharfs and places that require to be kept up later by the government, for which there is so little public use that there is no roadway into them at all, and the government have not only to make the wharfs but to build a road to them for the benefit of one or two farmers. If public money is to be squandered in that fashion, and if claims like that are to be set up for one province, why not for every other province? Why should not wharfs be built along little rivers? There are rivers running through my county, and lots of places where it would be convenient for the farmers to have a wharf.

Mr. FRASER. Simply for the reason that these wharfs are built on the seaside where they are the only modes of communication the fishermen have. Besides, the sum total for these little wharfs is not equal to one single expenditure made in some of the other provinces. Here is a district, we will say, where 500 fishermen live by the seaside, and the only mode of communication they have with the outer world is by one of these wharfs. When they get the wharf they need a roadway running from it some distance to a highway in the country. The most suitable place is selected for a wharf, and then in order to get to it or from it you have to have a road. As to one of these wharfs being for only one or two farmers, I trust the hon. gentleman's intelligence will not allow him to speak in that manner.

Mr. ROSAMOND. Does the hon. member for Guysborough mean to say that the fishermen on that coast have a right to have wharfs all along the coast? That is an absurdity.

Mr. FRASER. How could a schooner get to land unless there was a wharf to which she could be attached? If the hon. gentleman understood anything about the lower provinces he would know that wharfs are the only method of communication the fishermen have with the inland. It is not at all like a river in Ontario, it is a coast where storms are frequent and violent.

Mr. ROSAMOND. Does every fisherman require a wharf for himself? It seems to me an extraordinary proceeding to build wharfs all along the coast for objects of that kind, as if these fishermen were not clever enough to get from the coast inland, or to go to some neighbouring town where there is a wharf already built.

Mr. COCHRANE. I did not raise this question as to the advisability of building wharfs, I raised a question in connection with the road to the wharf, and there has been no explanation given why we should build roads as well as wharfs. Now where a wharf is necessary I do not object to furnish the money. But there is a question in my mind about building such a great number of wharfs—we have built hundreds of wharfs, I think I am safe in saying, since the present government came into power. And I want to remind you, Mr. Chairman, when the Conservatives were in power, how your heart was grieved at seeing the government buying up the people with their own money. I remember how the heart of the Minister of Trade and Commerce used to be grieved, and his righteous soul was vexed from day to day, with the unholy acts of the Tory party, when the people of Ontario were being 'bled white,' as he used to say. Now he is not only willing to sit in a position that he used to say was a sinecure, and that never should have been created, but he remains perfectly silent and is willing tamely to submit to this iniquity being perpetrated year by year to a still greater extent. I know, Mr. Chairman, that you feel grieved about it, but the Minister of Trade and Commerce takes it very coolly, he never says a word against it. He is not only willing to see the constituencies bought up by the building of wharfs with the people's own money, but he is willing to sit by and allow the hard-earned money of the people to be used to build roads down to the wharfs. Now I say that we on this side are willing, as a general thing, to vote money for the erection of wharfs where they are necessary, but we draw the line there, and we say that we should leave to the municipalities or to the

local legislatures the charge of building roads for the public to get to these wharfs. I hope that the Minister of Trade and Commerce will come to the rescue of the public exchequer on these lines, and not allow it to be robbed, not allow the farmers of Ontario to be bled white as he said they used to be in days gone by.

Mr. LANCASTER. I understand the member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) to say that these roads are necessary to connect with highways at some distance from the wharf. I would ask that hon. gentleman in what position that will put this government after it has constructed a road from an existing highway to the wharf. Now the Dominion government, as has been pointed out by my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane), should build a wharf where it is necessary, but after we have built the wharf for Dominion purposes, in the interest of the whole of Canada, I would like the hon. member for Guysborough to tell us who becomes responsible for keeping up that road to the wharf. I do not care whether the road is short or long. The hon. member for Guysborough says some of these highways are a long distance from the wharf, I presume he means a mile or two away. Now is that connecting road under the jurisdiction of the provincial legislature, or of the municipality, or does it remain under the jurisdiction of this parliament, and is the Dominion of Canada responsible for keeping it up, and responsible for all the accidents that may occur upon it? This involves an important principle, and now is the proper time to discuss it. In what position is the province, is the municipality, is the Dominion government, going to be in regard to liability for accidents as well as for keeping this roadway in repair? Why should not the municipality build this roadway, expropriate the land for the purpose, and keep control of it? If a municipality which expropriates the land and builds the highway in the public interest, thereafter becomes responsible for keeping it up, on the same principle does not the member for Guysborough think that the Dominion government becomes responsible for keeping up a highway that it has constructed? Does he not think that the municipality can say: We did not construct this highway, you did it yourself, and you must be responsible? Cases have arisen in the province of Ontario where a municipality being asked to take over the control of a highway have said to the government: You must give us a sum of money which, capitalized, will allow us sufficient income to keep this in repair. For instance, we want $50,000 from the Dominion of Canada to furnish us an income with which to keep this highway in repair. I can assure the hon. member for Guysborough that this is not as light a matter as he thinks. There is a wharf, and some distance away there is a public highway, and now the Dominion of Canada is asked to build a roadway to connect the two. Who is to be responsible for keeping that up? I want the member for Guysborough to enlighten us on this point, if he can.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not a lawyer——

Mr. CLARKE. The Minister of Justice is a lawyer.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I submit as a layman that the action which we may take under a vote of this kind does not in any way affect municipal rights, or Dominion rights, with regard to our responsibility for highways. That question is not involved at all. My hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) is like myself, he does not understand the legal aspects of the question.

Mr. COCHRANE. You had better let somebody answer who does understand it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There will be no different responsibility on the part of the Dominion in reference to this property than in reference to any other similar property in the country. The property will belong to the Dominion.

Mr. BLAIN. I wish to point out the reckless manner in which the government is voting this public money. The hon. minister stated a few moments ago that the total amount required to construct this wharf would be a little over $5,000. I asked the hon. minister if there had been any revenue from this wharf and he said no, that it was a new work last year. Do I understand the hon. minister correctly in making that statement? The hon. minister shakes his head. I would be very sorry to misquote him. Perhaps he would make a statement as to whether this was a new wharf commenced last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman is mixing the discussion of this item with that of other votes. I said this wharf was completed in June, 1902.

Mr. BLAIN. But I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the first expenditure was the $4,850 voted last year. When we were asked to vote this sum last year the then minister said:

> The work is not completed yet and there is no revenue from it. It will be completed on June 30th.

The hon. minister said in discussing this vote that $4,850 was the whole sum voted for the wharf. I turned up 'Hansard' of 1901, the session previous, and I find that the minister asked for an appropriation of $1,100, and that when this was given he said:

> This will complete the work.

The government came forward and asked for $1,100 and the then minister made the statement that it would complete the work.

On the following year the minister came forward and stated that he had the work under contract and this year the hon. minister says that the amount of the expenditure upon it is $4,850. Now, the hon. minister comes forward and says if you vote this $670 the work will be completed and it may be that we will get some revenue from it. That is the ground of complaint we have on this side of the House. We have the promise of the hon. minister that in no case will he ask for an expenditure until he is prepared to give the committee a proper estimate of the cost of the work. I hope that when this $670 is expended my hon. friend will not come back next year and ask for another vote.

Breton Cove—boat landing, $4,600.

Mr. CLARKE. What county is this in ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Victoria county. This is to provide a boat landing at Briton's Cove. It is practically a wharf for the fishing industry that is going on at that point.

Mr. CLARKE. Is this a new work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a new work.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the character of the boats that land there ? What class of people are being served now that were not served before, and how were they served before ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I believe these people unfortunately had to get on shore by clambering on the rock or in any way they could manage it. The desirability of having this work constructed is greater now than in the past, because a lobster factory has been established at this point. Ten regular fishing boats are employed and the industry will give employment to quite a large number of people.

Mr. CLANCY. If I correctly understood the hon. gentleman he said that a packing establishment had been recently established there. How long is it since that was established ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was established during the last season and it was enlarged during the present year.

Mr. CLANCY. Who are the parties interested in it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no infomation.

Mr. CLANCY. How much capital is invested in it ? Is it a very large establishment or a very small one ? If it is a very large establishment there can be no complaint about expending money there and I suppose the hon. gentleman is prepared to give that information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have given all the information I can in regard to it. I do not know what amount of capital is required to start an establishment of that kind. They have ten regular boats engaged in the fishing industry. The agricultural pursuits in the district, the fishing industry and the establishment of this factory give employment to a great many men and a large number of fishing boats ?

Mr. CLANCY. Are these large or small fishing boats ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am unable to give my hon. friend the size of the boats.

Mr. CLANCY. Can the hon. gentleman tell the size of the factory or the amount of business done at that point ?

Mr. ROSAMOND. It seems to me that this is a proposal to spend public money for the benefit of that company or individual who has established this lobster factory. Is there any authority for the government spending public money to benefit private individuals ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is very difficult to pass any legislation here that does not more directly affect one citizen than another. Even our tariff legislation has sometimes that effect. This expenditure is for the agriculturists and fishermen of the county, and while this factory may benefit, there is no doubt that the people of the locality will reap the greatest benefit from this work.

Mr. HACKETT. How far is this harbour from the nearest place of refuge which fishermen might use ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am informed that the nearest refuge is about fifteen miles distant.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the name of that nearest point ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Ste. Anne's, in Antigonish county. This is in Victoria county.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the minister read the salient points of the engineer's report on this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The report says that this is in Victoria county, on what is called the north shore, the residents being engaged in agriculture and fishing. Some of them fish off the shore near their homes, and others at French river, which is quite a distance.

Mr. CLARKE. Who is that report signed by ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Milledge reports to the chief engineer, who is responsible to me. There is a lobster factory employing ten regular boats and buying fish from others. I suppose these are the salient points.

Mr. CLANCY. Did the engineer report on the number of men employed in the lobster factory, or the magnitude of the business ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Perhaps, as an engineer, he would hardly be expected to report on these things. I understand that the extent of a lobster factory is judged by the number of boats more than by the capital invested.

Mr. CLANCY. While the engineer might not be expected to report on these things, yet the minister ought to be in possession of information to justify expenditure on this harbour. The minister does not know the value of the output of this factory, and he does not even know who the owners are. The minister has a great many items before him, and it would be just as well that the committee would look with some anxiety for information regarding these very large expenditures.

Mr. BLAIN. How far is this cove from Livingstone's Cove, in the same county ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Is Livingstone's Cove in the same county ?

Mr. BLAIN. Is it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot find from the map that it is.

Mr. McISAAC. Livingstone's Cove is on the mainland in the county of Antigonish, and this is in Victoria county.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think that any hon. gentleman in this House would object to giving reasonable accommodation for the boats of the fishing population in the province of Nova Scotia, or in the province of Quebec, or in the province of New Brunswick, or elsewhere in Canada. The difficulty about these appropriations is that they do not seem to be brought before the House upon any definite principle, and that they are brought down with a very considerable lack of the information which the minister should supply. We could get along a great deal better in committee if the minister would give the House all the information which we eventually do elicit by asking a great number of questions. The minister will recognize that in these supplementary estimates, he is asking for an enormous number of appropriations for harbours and rivers in the different provinces, and when such appropriations are brought down in the closing days of the session, it is the duty of the opposition to try to get some information about each item, in order that they may understand how that item can be justified in the public interest. So far as our fishing industry is concerned, I doubt very much whether even all the members from the maritime provinces realize the very great importance of our fisheries to the people, not only of the maritime provinces, but to the people of all Canada. So far as my limited research has gone, it would lead me to believe that we have perhaps not kept pace with modern methods in the development of the fishing industry, such as obtain in other countries. We pursue, to a certain extent, the methods of fifty or sixty years ago, and those who have made themselves acquainted with the latest appliances for catching and curing fish have assured me that our methods might be very much improved with great advantage, not only to the fishermen of the maritime provinces, but to the people of Ontario and Quebec, who at present are not supplied as they might be with the splendid fish which swarm around our eastern coasts. Let my hon. friends from Ontario and Quebec realize that it is within the bounds of possibility that in a very few years they can have a daily supply of the very best fish in the world from the maritime provinces.

There is no reason why they should not have it. But let them also remember that in order to ensure that supply, we must have in the first place better means of communication between the upper provinces and the maritime provinces. We must bring the fish along more expeditiously. In the next place, let them remember that in order to build up a trade of that kind, it is absolutely necessary that there should be a constant, regular and abundant supply of fish to the merchants who engage in that trade. That is an absolute requisite. Nobody can undertake to supply the needs of a great city like Montreal or Toronto, unless there are fishermen around the coasts on whom he can depend for a regular and abundant supply of fish every day in the week. And in order that there should be that regular supply, there should be a large number of fishermen engaged in the industry, and these in turn must be afforded the necessary facilities for sheltering their boats. In that way this expenditure can be justified, if it is justified at all. It should be made, however, upon some principle, some plan or some system. But, granting all that, granting that it is not made for political purposes, granting that it is not made in the interest of a political party in one district or another, I do not think we should object to it, although I concur in the view that on all occasions of this kind we should have the very fullest information from the hon. gentleman who is presenting these estimates to the House. Around the shores of Nova Scotia there are not only abundant supplies of the fish with which we are all familiar, but by adopting modern methods of fishing, I believe we may find there many other varieties of fish which are used for food in other countries, and which, if they could be supplied abundantly, regularly and constantly, could be sent from Nova Scotia and the other maritime provinces to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and even to the west. We have done a good deal in this country to encourage

other industries. We have provided bounties for manufacturing industries; we have regulated our tariff so that these industries should be developed; we have done a good deal for the farming community in the way of providing experimental farms and bringing experts into the country to teach the farmers how to make butter and cheese and how to utilize their dairy products. But it seems to me that up to this time we have not devoted the attention to the fishing industry which the importance of that great industry demands; and for my part I am prepared to support the government in dealing with this matter on a fair, comprehensive, systematic basis not only by providing the fishermen with adequate accommodation but by giving them assistance in improving their methods of catching and curing fish, and especially by improving the means of transportation by which the magnificent products of the sea, which are swarming around all the coasts of the maritime provinces, could be brought into the homes of the people of Ontario and Quebec. I assure my hon. friends from Ontario and Quebec—I need not assure the members from the maritime provinces—that in seeking to develop this great fishing industry, we would not be spending public money unwisely. I believe that we have in the fishing industry of Canada, referring more especially to the fishing industry of the maritime provinces, one of the greatest sources of wealth which are the heritage of Canadians at the present time. I do not underrate the magnificent wheat lands of the west or the agricultural resources of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec; but the fishing industry of the maritime provinces will, I believe, in the future, if properly developed and sustained, yield in importance to none of these. Therefore, I think it is wise for my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works to make such of these provisions as are necessary. At the same time, in presenting them to the House, I think it is very desirable that he should show the members from Ontario and Quebec and the west who are not as familiar as some of us from the maritime provinces, with the importance of this great industry, that it is absolutely necessary, in order that the fishermen may furnish a constant, regular and abundant supply, that they should have suitable shelter for their boats not only during the summer season, but also during the winter season ; because I believe the fishing industry can be prosecuted up to a much later date than it is at present. These men who pursue their labours around the coasts often in tempestuous weather, have sometimes almost at a moment's notice to seek refuge in some harbour. I am sure that what I have said here to-day with regard to the importance of this industry is the view of all my friends from the maritime provinces; and I know that some of them, who have made this matter much more of a study than I have and who are much more familiar with the conditions, would be ready and glad to say a word in support of the views I have endeavoured thus briefly to present to the House.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sure that the House must be well pleased with the remarks of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition with regard to the importance of this industry to the Dominion of Canada. I am free to admit that I find in this House and out of it a considerable want of knowledge as to the importance of this industry—an industry which is now bringing to the Dominion treasury a revenue of over $20,000,000 a year; and I am satisfied, from my experience of a year ago, and from the opportunity I have had of looking into the matter, that, with a little assistance and encouragement, the trade could be increased to bringing a revenue to the Dominion of over $40,000,000. I do not make that statement without having given the matter considerable attention. I am pleased that my hon. friend has to-day drawn the attention of the members of this House and the people of the country to the importance of this great industry. As to the point at issue, I will submit to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition whether I have not given satisfactory information in a general way as to the necessity for this work to the fishing industry. My hon. friend has made a very good point, which is not generally understood, namely, that fishermen cannot catch fish wherever they choose to go; but that the fish are to be found only at certain points along the coast, which may be unimportant, so far as population and the presence of other industries are concerned, but which may be important places for the fishermen to land their fish. I am sure the hon. gentleman would not expect me, as the minister in charge of this work to give information as to whether it will change the relations between the municipality and the Dominion in regard to the highway. I could not be expected to give the capital invested by the people who established a factory or any details of that kind. In a general way I would be supposed to give information, as for instance the population to be served and the public facilities to be afforded. In that connection the work will be judged on its merits.

Mr. CLANCY. How are we to tell its merits unless we know what is the nature and magnitude of the business to be served, the amount of capital to be invested, and why it should not be done by the municipality ?

Mr. COCHRANE. As one having considerable experience in municipal work, I do not see why this government should build roads to public wharfs. If the government expropriate the land and build the road they will be responsible for damages should any occur.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not if we hand it over to the municipality.

Mr. COCHRANE. But you are taking it out of the hands of the municipality. When a private company expropriates land and builds a road, it is not the municipality, but the private company which is responsible for damages. If the government were to build the wharf in the constituency I represent for the fishermen, the municipality would be only too glad to build a road leading to it from the highway.

At one o'clock, committee took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). Before recess I was about to remark that it was a great pity that the observations of my colleague for the city of Halifax (Mr. Borden) were not made at an earlier stage of the discussion, as it would have saved some gentlemen opposite from the great province of Ontario, from the disagreeable necessity of either supporting the remarks they made or retiring from them, which they cannot do gracefully. The reason why gentlemen from Ontario have objected to these small votes for the maritime provinces, and especially for Nova Scotia, is that they do not understand the conditions there and that they are so enamoured of their splendid and beautiful province of Ontario that they think that all of the expenditure of this country should be devoted to that province. We cannot judge small expenditures of the kind we are now discussing by analogy with the agricultural provinces and those that enjoy other resources. Let us take for example my own constituency, which is typical of other counties, such as Guysborough, Lunenburg, Shelburne and Yarmouth. It is on the Atlantic sea-board, and these harbours are along the ocean shore. Every ten or fifteen miles there is a deep inlet which may run into the land ten or fifteen miles. On each side of these inlets are the fishing villages and the coast outside of them is surrounded by reefs through which these fishermen navigate their craft in pursuit of their fishing operations. Up the side of these harbours are the roads that have been spoken of, which meet the municipal roads at the head of the harbour, perhaps ten or fifteen or twenty miles distant from the place where the fishermen operate. Therefore it is easy to understand the difference between these roads and the connecting roads in Ontario, Quebec or any of the other provinces. These fishermen are very poor and it is all they can do to maintain these municipal roads. They receive very little money and their life is a precarious one. They may not have a school of fish this year and have to live on what credit they can obtain from the merchants in anticipation of the fish they may catch next year. But next year again the fish may not strike in to the shore. Between the dog fish and the Ontario members, the fishermen are living a most precarious life indeed. It is necessary that the fish should be transferred from the boats to the shore as quickly as possible and without these wharfs they have to be carried to the shore in small boats, a condition that ought not to exist. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) wanted to have some principle laid down on which these grants were made. It may be said that as these fishermen contribute to the public revenue and receive no other benefit whatever, they have a right to have a portion of the public revenue dispensed in their interest in order that they may conduct the business on which they are dependent for a living. I would suggest that these gentlemen from Ontario should visit one of these fishing districts. The Americans come down these and revel in the beauties of the scenery and of the ocean, in the primitive people and in the customs and habits of those who dwell there. If these gentlemen could see the precarious and hardy life which is lived by these fishermen we would not hear another word in criticism of these votes. It is essential that the fishermen should be able to reach the great highway of the ocean both to ship their produce and to receive the goods which they consume. It is becoming necessary year by year for the fishermen to go farther out to sea in pursuit of fish. They are equipping themselves with larger boats and better nets and gear and will soon be in communication with the fast steamers which are being subsidized to ply along the shore in order to bring the fish from the fishing grounds to points from which they may be shipped. The government is to some extent aiding in this work but in the main the people are conducting their own industries and are entirely dependent on their own efforts. During the past year or two the government have been aiding the fishing settlements by constructing small local lights. It may be supposed that the fishermen have an immediate interest in the large expenditures that have been made for the great lighthouses. That is not, however, the case; these larger expenditures are mainly for the general interest of commerce and for international purposes, but these small lights which are being erected in the neighbourhood of the fishing harbours are for their benefit and they are proving of great advantage to the fishermen. If the Ontario members who criticise these expenditures could see the change that takes place in the Atlantic ocean during a storm and could realize how important it is that the fishermen should reach a place of safety, I am sure that we would hear no further criticisms of these votes. Unless they can make a harbour at the first attempt they must either put out to sea again in the face of the storm or be dashed to pieces on that rock-bound coast. Sometimes almost the entire male population of a village is lost in this way, and the

visitor to the shore sees the bodies of the drowned men and hears the wails of their kindred. An understanding of the conditions is essential and it must be understood that these roads connecting the wharf with the highways are exactly what is required to give the people the facilities they need and to aid them in successfully carrying on their business. I hope we will hear no more criticisms from the gentlemen from Ontario whose opposition I am sure results from imperfect knowledge of the conditions.

Mr. FRASER. I wish to say in this connection that I think perhaps we are only beginning to do what must eventually be done. I know there is good reason why the fishing business in Nova Scotia has not been better aided than it ought to be, and that is because we were expending large sums upon the training of the farmers of this country. That was all right. I was at an exhibition not long ago in the town of Orillia, and I was delighted to find there that at given times all the farmers were called to certain points and there they were taught how to pack apples. A man went through the packing process and gave full explanations. After a little while the wives and daughters were called to another place, and there they were all taught how to make butter by some one who went through the whole process. At another point the farmers' sons and daughters were called together and were taught how to feed poultry, even so small a matter as the best way of killing poultry was not overlooked. Now that was teaching the farmers, and that was all right. Now there are two or three things that must be done in the lower provinces, and everywhere else in Canada where people are fishing, they must be taught the best way of conducting their business. Speaking particularly of Nova Scotia, it is a hard thing for example for men living in a small district to change their methods of putting up fish. The salt fish business particularly is not as well attended to as it ought to be, and I would suggest to the government that one of the best investments they could make would be to have various stations, just as they have in the great province of Ontario, wherever fish packing is carried on, centres where the fishermen could be brought together, and taught the best method of curing salt fish, the amount of salt that ought to be used, and all that ought to be done to put fish up in the best method. We suffer in our fish business particularly when we come in competition with fish that is put up in the old country. There is no people in the world that know how to put up salt fish better than the Scotch. That goes without saying, because they know how to do everything better than any one else. But when our fish come in contact with the fish put up by people who have been taught with great care the best methods of curing fish, our fish suffer from the comparison. They are fairly well put up, our fishermen are as intelligent as any fishermen in the world. But if the intelligent farmers of Ontario need assistance and training to conduct their business, it will not be surprising when I say that the fishermen living along the coast, and who follow largely the methods pursued by their fathers and grandfathers, are not able to put up fish as well as they ought. That is one thing. Now training of that kind would be an excellent thing for them, and I am sure there would be no better investment on the part of the government, because every body knows how much fish are put up each year in Nova Scotia. We are now changing our methods somewhat, and we can sell all the fresh fish, if it is properly put up, that we can catch. I make bold to say that from Halifax down to Louisburg there is the best fishing in the world. Taking Canso as a centre, I think that is the best fishing district in the whole world.

The second thing the government ought to do is this: The Intercolonial has been a little slow in giving facilities for shipment. Now there is one firm in Canso in my own county that pay the Intercolonial nearly $30,000 a year in freight. Well, they cannot get their fish sent off promptly. I have been talking to the department about it, but it takes a long while, as in every department, to get them fully interested. They will furnish a car or two, but if the fish could be got off immediately after they are caught, there is an unlimited market for them in Canada and the United States. The market cannot be too large for the ability of the lower provinces to supply the demand. The ocean is full of fish, they are not decreasing. It takes about thirty-five hours to transport fish from Canso to Ottawa, and we ought to have it carried on express trains, and in that way there is no reason why the whole of Canada could not be supplied with fresh fish within three or four days after they are taken out of the ocean. Now that business can be extended to any extent.

The third thing I would recommend is just what other people are doing. It has been brought to my attention that even in South Africa they have voted quite a large sum to bring a trawler from the old country. That is a thing this government should do. The wonderful thing about the operations of that trawler in South Africa was this, that they discovered fish there that were never caught before, excellent fish were caught in the deep sea that were before unknown. You must remember that at our present rate and mode of fishing we are only skimming the surface. Of course, when you go out to the banks you get all these, but I am speaking of inshore fishing. Now this government has done a great deal in supplying freezers for the inshore fisheries, and they are now projecting—and I want to thank the government for that—

one or more stations for the bank fishing. The members from Ontario will understand that within the three-mile limit the inshore fisheries are conducted altogether by people who live on the land near by. But the people are becoming wealthier every day, and they are now able to send out schooners 15, 20 or up to 100 miles. In this respect the county represented by my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) takes the lead. They build schooners and send these out on the banks. This year, for example, the people lose between two and three months because they could not get sufficient bait anywhere, and the idea of the government now is to build a large freezer so that vessels from the bank can go in at any time and get their bait. Enough bait can be put up to supply the six or seven hundred vessels in Nova Scotia that are fishing on that bank, a sufficient amount of bait to last the season. Now that is the next move that the government of this country should undertake so far as fishing is concerned. They should undertake to train the fishermen, as they have been doing the farmers, in the best methods of putting up fish; secondly, they should provide every facility of transportation and of cold-storage, so that immediately the fish are caught they can be put aboard steamers to be taken to the railway stations and carried off in cold-storage. Thirdly, they should find out more about the fish that are in the ocean. I join with my hon. friend from Halifax in saying that after voting this money we have only taken the first step. I speak so far as these estimates are concerned, because the county I represent is not largely interested in the fisheries. We have done a fair share, and I am not complaining. But considering what could be done with this investment in one of our districts; I know a district where we have now a breakwater, and where men could not get in at all with their boats if there was a storm, they would have to go nine miles to another harbour and stay there all night. My hon. friends from Ontario will understand how pathetic must be the situation of the wives and mothers and sisters of those men who are out all night, and they do not know what has become of them. You will understand the difficulty. The fishermen of Nova Scotia are not coming to this parliament in forma pauperis. It must not be forgotten that the fishermen, man for man, pay more revenue into the treasury than any other class in the Dominion of Canada, for this reason, that they purchase everything that they require, so far as food is concerned, except fish. There they have small pieces of land. I know district after district in which there are men who would be very glad to have as much good land on which to raise vegetables as the space of the floor of this House. Then, it is with very great toil that they take away the stones. I would appeal to the fair-minded men of Ontario to remember that things have changed and that just as the Nova Scotia fisherman is not able to form an intelligent idea or perhaps give an intelligent vote as to the wants, demands and conditions of the people of the great province of Ontario it takes a long time for a member from Ontario to understand the circumstances of the Nova Scotia fisherman. I know very well how it strikes a gentleman from Ontario in this House. He says: There are $4,000 or $5,000 to be expended in Nova Scotia. The first question naturally is: What are we going to get out of it? What are going to be the receipts? Why should we make this investment? I say, as the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) said, that there is more than the simple return. There is the betterment of the whole fishing community, which is made up of a trained and stable population, a population that has a great future. and more than ever from the fact that it possesses the elements of forming a naval contingent such as no part of the world can produce. All these things I am sure will lead hon. gentleman, if they think over the matter a little to come to the conclusion that although the numbers are large the sum total is not. This is not done for political purposes at all. It is done by all governments. It must be under the condition of things and I know that my generous friends from Ontario look upon it in that light. After enforcing as strongly as I can that view upon the government I would say that the next move should be along the lines that I have indicated. I have no hesitation in saying that the municiaplities should keep up the roads when they are built, perhaps not to the extent that hon. gentlemen propose, but I think I would not find very much fault with the government if they made it a condition precedent that they should do that. But after all, it has been done and I was glad that the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) gave an instance of what had occurred in Ontario. He said that because the government built a road and the municipality were asked to look after it the municipality insisted that they should get a large sum from the government for doing it. The fishing business is of such a character that it requires even more care than has been given to the agriculturists. The farmer is ten times wealthier than the fisherman. He can see what his neighbour is doing, and he can go to fairs and see what the farmers in other counties are doing. He has a better opportunity than the fisherman for becoming acquainted with the methods of others. If he receives assistance as he should, and I will vote for all reasonable assistance for the agriculturist, the fisherman should get an equal measure if not more assistance from the government. The best way after all is to put the fisherman in a position to produce an article of the highest char-

acter and to put it on the market in the best condition and if that is done it will be found that that money is well expended.

Mr. OSLER. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) and the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Roche) made an attack upon Ontario as objecting to these expenditures in Nova Scotia. I entirely deny that we are doing so. I say that Ontario has never objected and will never object to an expenditure that is good for any particular part of this country and good for the whole country.

Mr. FRASER. I did not attack Ontario. I said that no man coming from Ontario could understand Nova Scotia any more than the man from Nova Scotia could understand the conditions in Ontario.

Mr. OSLER. What I gathered from the remarks of these hon. gentlemen, and I think I was right, was that the Ontario members did not understand the position of Nova Scotia and that they were not just to Nova Scotia or to the fishermen. I resent that assertion or insinuation entirely. I say Ontario will always be and has always been just to Nova Scotia and has never begrudged any expenditure in connection with the fisheries. What we object to is that there is a constant frittering away of money without any definite object in view. I entirely agree with what my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden) stated that these fisheries should be developed and developed upon a system. I have no knowledge of Nova Scotia, but I have a knowledge of the conditions down the St. Lawrence river. For many years I have fished there, and there are no men in this country for whom I have greater respect than the fishermen who live along those shores. They are a fine class of men possessing virtues for which they are to be envied by the people of Ontario or any other part of the country. My own observations from driving along those shores as far down as Ste. Anne des Monts is that as much as 50 per cent of the money which is spent on wharfs is wasted. There has been no system adopted for the proper development of the fishing industry. There has been no systematic endeavour to find out where the wharfs should be placed or how facilities can best be given to the fishermen along the shore. I am quite sure that the same thing holds good in Nova Scotia, and I say that the government in reason cannot spend too much money in developing the fisheries on such lines that the money spent will be productive. It is not as productive as it ought to be now because of the manner in which it is spent. The fishery industry is a valuable one and may be rendered ten times more valuable than it is to-day if it is properly developed. One illustration is better perhaps than a lot of theories. I was last year at Matane, which is on the St. Lawrence thirty miles from the Intercolonial Railway. I was with a party on Friday morning and we caught salmon. We left on Friday, driving to Metis, and we were in Toronto at a quarter past four by the Grand Trunk Railway day express on Saturday, having the fish with us, which were cooked for dinner on Saturday evening, having been caught at Matane on Friday. If that could be done by an ordinary passenger, I claim that with a reasonable amount of investigation, care and judgment by the government, they could give a market for the fish that are caught there that would produce to the fishermen, two, three or four times the return which they get for their fish to-day. What I do complain of is that there is no systematic investigation as to how to spend the money in order to promote the interests of these fishermen and how best to develop the fishing industry, and I claim that as long as we continue to pass item after item for building wharfs here, there and everywhere, without following any systematic plan laid down by men who know their business and who know what is wanted, we are wasting the money of the country and not developing the fishing industry or doing the good to these men that can and should be done.

Mr. HOLMES. I was one of those who, like the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler), at one time thought that expenditures for Nova Scotia wharfs that were built were apparently made for party purposes pure and simple, but I want to say that I endorse all that my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) has said, and that I believe that a great many of the wharfs that are built in the lower provinces are built from necessity.

I can easily understand the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) or any of the members from the lower provinces, advocating the building of a large number of wharfs. I am satisfied that if more members from Ontario had an opportunity of visiting the lower provinces, they would be willing to admit that these items of expenditure are perfectly justifiable. I do not know that it is possible to follow out the suggestion made by the hon. member from Toronto (Mr. Osler), but, as the result of limited observation, my own conviction is that you cannot follow any definite system in the development of the fishing industries of these provinces. It seems to me that the whole province of Nova Scotia is one vast fishing area, and that you have to provide accommodation simply as the immediate necessities of a particular place require at the time being. Personally I endorse these votes for the province of Nova Scotia, believing as I do that they tend to promote the welfare of the great fishing industry of that province.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) seems to

know all about Nova Scotia, and I would like to ask him if the legislature of the province has taken any steps to assist the fishing industry ? Of course, I believe it is the duty of this government to afford harbours of refuge and other accommodation for the fishermen, but the legislature of Nova Scotia has been remiss in its duty if it has not given some aid to its fishermen, and the member for Guysborough has been remiss in his duty if he has not insisted on the local government giving that aid.

Mr. BENNETT. He never dug a fish-worm in his life.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Oh, well, I believe he is a fisherman, but that is not to the point just now. I have some knowledge of the farmers of Ontario, and I know that they are willing at all times to assist their fellow-countrymen in Nova Scotia, or in any other part of the Dominion. But the farmers of Ontario have been trying to help themselves. They have taxed themselves havily to establish agricultural schools and farmers' institutes, so that the people may better know the science of farming. The people of Nova Scotia should make an effort to help themselves, as the farmers of Ontario have done. I am sure that we in the upper provinces would be only too glad to get this cheap fish from Nova Scotia, and if the member for Guysborough has not advocated the running of a fish train, he has not done his duty. It would be far better for him to have a market for Nova Scotia fish in Ontario than to go begging for a market in the United States.

Mr. FRASER. I do not want to be misunderstood. I did not accuse anybody of not helping the fishermen of Nova Scotia. I would like the hon. gentleman (Mr. Robinson) to get more fish from Nova Scotia, because it is productive of very much that he has not got. What I did say was that this government has done a great deal to educate the farmers of Ontario, and I only suggested that they should do a little to educate the fishermen of Nova Scotia. I think that both the Dominion government and the provincial government should combine to make the lot of the fishermen as comfortable as possible. That is all I have advocated.

Mr. BLAIN. We who come from Ontario would not object to any legitimate expenditure for the fishermen of Nova Scotia, or of any other part of Canada. I am surprised that the government supporter from Halifax (Mr. Roche) should venture to assert that the representatives of Ontario are opposed to this expenditure. No one on this side of the House has objected to one dollar of expenditure for the fishermen of that province. But we do think that the government should be able to give us some idea as to the policy they are pursuing with regard to the expenditure of this money. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) has told us that the county of Lunenburg is the chief fishing centre in Nova Scotia, but I am surprised in looking over these 103 items that not a dollar is to be expended in that county.

Mr. FRASER. They are engaged in the deep-sea fishing, which is entirely a different thing. They go 500 miles away from home.

Mr. BENNETT. But they have to come back to port again.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it any wonder that the representatives in this committee would object to this kind of expenditure, which leaves that important fishing county, represented by a gentleman on this side of the House, out in the cold ?

Mr. FRASER. It was well looked after when his friends were in power.

Mr. BLAIN. Why, last session the hon. member (Mr. Fraser) condemned the hon. member from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) for not getting some money for his county when the Conservatives were in power. Here is a list of 103 votes for Nova Scotia, and the county of Victoria, represented by a government supporter, gets seven of these expenditures to my knowledge, and probably if I knew the topography of the district intimately, I would find that many more of these votes were for that county. I believe that it is a legitimate thing for this parliament to look after the fishermen, but how does it come that so little of this large amount is to be expended in counties represented by Liberal-Conservatives ?

Mr. FRASER. The leader of the opposition does not say so.

Mr. BLAIN. The fishermen of Nova Scotia will be grateful to the leader of the opposition for bringing the Liberal members of this House to their feet in defence of their interests. These gentlemen opposite sat quietly by, without uttering a syllable, until the leader of the opposition drew the attention of the House to the facts.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no foundation for the statement that these appropriations have been made with any regard to the political allegiance of members who represent these counties. It is true that every county in Nova Scotia is not interested in the fishing industry to the same extent, but the hon. gentleman will find appropriations for works whenever they have been asked for ; I do not know of any appropriation which has been asked for, and which was recommended by the officials of the department, that was not granted. Of course, a great many have had to be overlooked for the present, but the appropriations appear in the estimates irrespective of who represents a particular county.

Mr. BLAIN. I will accept the statement of the minister, but I will remind him that last session and the session before the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) appealed from his place in this House for an expenditure in his county.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That was in connection with dredging, and not in connection with the fishing industry.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) drew attention to the needs of his county in the matter of dredging, but that class of work is not covered by these items. To the best of my knowledge, the people of Lunenburg have not asked for any appropriation, except in respect to dredging, which the hon. member (Mr. Kaulbach) has earnestly pressed here.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the county of Lunenburg been taken care of with respect to dredging ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The vote for dredging is a general vote and does not apply to particular counties. We are at liberty to employ a dredge in any part of Canada where work is needed, and when we can get the dredge. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) laid down the general principle that these votes were for counties represented by friends of the government. I point out to him that there are votes here for the county of Halifax, which is represented by the leader of the opposition.

Mr. BENNETT. And also by a government supporter.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a vote for the county of Colchester, where there is no government supporter. There are votes respecting the county of Pictou, from which there is no government member. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works calls my attention to the fact that we made a special appropriation for dredging in the county of Lunenburg, and the only reason the work has not been done is that we have not been able to get the dredges. When my hon. friend states that these votes are only given to counties which support the government, he is entirely mistaken. If there are only a few counties in Nova Scotia which send gentlemen to the other side of the House to represent them, that is not our fault ; but these moneys have been distributed irrespective of politics ; and, apart from dredging in the harbour of Lunenburg, there was no application for any public work in the county of Lunenburg before these estimates were prepared.

Mr. KAULBACH. It is very natural that I should offer an expression on a matter of such vast importance as the fishing industry, in which I am very largely interested, coming as I do from the largest fishing county in the Dominion, and being the representative of a class of men who, for bravery and skill, have no superiors. For that reason I am here, and for that reason I am on my feet now to advocate the claims of the fishermen. As last expressions leave the most vivid impressions, I may refer first to the remark which has just fallen from the lips of the hon. gentleman opposite with regard to the county of Lunenburg. I consider that it is right, it is just, it is honest on the part of any government not to discriminate in regard to the distribution of public moneys in the interest of the fishermen ; yet it is a remarkable fact that not one solitary item, so far as I am aware, appears in these estimates for the county of Lunenburg. I must refute the statement that has been made that I have not asked for public benefits for the fishermen. I have asked at every opportunity this session, and have urged their necessity in strong terms. I have asked for a breakwater or pier at Mill Cove, St. Margaret's bay. The Minister of Public Works can find my remarks on that subject, both this session and last session. I earnestly advocated the claims of the fishermen in that district. They live on an exposed portion of St. Margaret's bay, and are entirely dependent upon the fishing industry for a living. They possess no land from which to gather any portion of their daily bread, and if their employment or occupation is in any way disturbed, or their rights, uncared for, they must necessarily suffer. I asked for that breakwater in order that they might have their little property, which has cost them many days' toil, protected in the event of storms. Very often these poor men are compelled to leave their homes in the morning before dawn, and perhaps by night they are compelled to take up their anchor and run for shore in, or fearing, a gale. There is perhaps no chance possible of their getting back to their homes till the gale subsides, and as a consequence they are compelled to seek refuge in some other harbour ; whereas a small expenditure would give them a harbour of refuge and protection for their property in the neighbourhood of their own homes. I therefore make the appeal now, and it is not too late this session to place a sum of money in the supplementary estimates for that purpose. I also asked for the repair of the breakwater at Petite Rivière in my county. This work was started some years ago as a stone structure, which was to have been of lasting benefit ; but it was only partly built when it was allowed to suffer serious injury by the action of the sea in consequence of the laxity of the government in continuing the work, so that a large amount of money has gone to waste. These people depend very largely upon the industry of fishing for their living, and although I made appeals from

time to time on their behalf, I received no favourable response. I say that the fishermen of the county I represent, more than those of any other county in the Dominion, are entitled to redress, because they contribute more largely than any other county to the revenue. Our fishermen contribute more largely to the revenue of the country than any other class of men, because every article which they require for their daily food, (except a little fish) and their clothing, has to be purchased. When you consider that the fishing industry contributes $20,000,000 yearly to the revenues of the country, I think the county of Lunenburg is certainly entitled to a portion of that revenue. I am here for the purpose of demanding it, and I will never refrain from speaking for the rights of the fishermen, feeling satisfied that in so doing I am doing a God's service. I say that the expenditure should be made indiscriminately in the interest of all the fishermen. If these fishermen, with pride and an intelligent purpose, have returned me as their representative in the interest of the country, is it fair on the part of the government to treat them in the manner in which they are doing? I answer for them without any hesitation, certainly not. I say it is not only wrong, but it is unfair and unjust. Now, I respect the farmers as much as I do any other class of people. We have a bureau of agriculture, which is a sort of school to educate the farmers in the prosecution of their vocation. Why not also have a bureau of fisheries for the benefit of the fishermen, so that they may be taught how to pursue their industry in the most profitable manner? Fishing has become a science, and there is no reason why the fisheries on the Atlantic coast should not be developed as well as those in any other part of the world. A few years ago I complained that the farmer was in need of certain redress for wrongs done through the neglect of the government, in not making special inquiry as to the cause of the disappearance of kelp or sea weed.

This product of the sea, the kelp, has not been cared for in a proper manner. Experience had taught the most of our fishermen that the product kelp was destroyed—a sea vegetable matter—in consequence of the over catch of lobsters. I asked on a former occasion that a commission should be sent to the shores of the Atlantic—to my county if the government desired—to ascertain from the fishermen themselves the best method of protecting this sea fertilizer or weed from being completely destroyed. There is a sort of egg or shell fish found on our shores which lobsters feed upon, but in consequence of the depletion of these waters, of lobsters, those egg or shell fish have become more numerous and a sort of calcareous substance or excrescence or salvia covers the whole bottom of the shores and causes it to be unproductive of this weed. As a natural result there is no manure of this kind to be found for use as a fertilizer for the farmer. Such results might have been lessened had the government appointed a commission. The farmers are suffering to this day for want of this weed. If we had a bureau of information for fishermen, and a system of correspondence held between the fishermen and the department we would have gained a certain amount of valuable knowledge which would have enabled us to add to the welfare of both the fishermen and the farmers to a great extent. We want a certain distribution of benefits for the deep sea fishermen. We have along the shores at present—although my county has not availed itself of the privilege of shore freezers for freezing bait in small quantities to supply the shore fishermen. We want as well a supply of bait for the deep sea fishermen. We want the same conditions and the same privileges extended to the deep sea fishermen as are enjoyed by the shore fishermen, which gives them fifty per cent of the entire cost of the construction of freezers, and I think a bonus of $5 for every ton of bait for three years, which is placed in those freezers. If that same benefit were extended to the deep sea fishermen, we would contribute in return a certain amount of benefit to the revenue which otherwise is lost. No doubt the revenue of the country would be greatly benefited this year by the fishermen had they had the benefit of freezers for bait, but the want of that commodify has caused almost a total failure this year of the fisheries in the deep sea. I find that it was not only the fishermen in my own province who have suffered but also the fishermen in Newfoundland. This year in all probability they shall have to come to the rescue of some of the fishermen in order to give them relief. I would not be at all surprised if an appeal should be made to the government, or by others on behalf of these fishermen to enable them to support their families this coming winter. Why should the government be so obdurate, why should they turn a deaf ear to the appeal I am making now on behalf of the fishermen. I am anxious also that the system of fishing should be improved, and if the government would establish a bureau for the fishermen, there would be no difficulty in reaching the desired end, and every one would be benefited. We can have incubators all along our shores for the reproduction of fish. At present a very large amount of the ova or fish egg goes to waste. Why? Because of the lack of care shown by the government. Those incubators, as far as lobsters are concerned, could be placed wherever there are packing establishments or canneries, but I would advocate more strongly that we should use natural ponds where they can be found where the seed lobsters could be placed and where they could deposit their eggs and undergo the natural

process instead of a method that is absolutely artificial.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Is the hon. gentleman not aware that that is being done ?

Mr. KAULBACH. In one county, Cape Breton; but that is no reason why we should not have one in Lunenburg and other counties. I do not think my hon. friend has gained much comfort by his inquiry. I also would advocate the freezing system for the reason that we could utilize those places for the storage of fish and for shipments to the west. That would benefit the fishermen all along our shores from Shelburne to Halifax in the east, and from Cape North to Halifax in the west. By that system they would be able to ship direct by the Intercolonial at Halifax without any interruption to the centre of this Dominion and get in return the products of the west. The farmers in the west and the fishermen in the east would have thereby the benefit of a larger and more profitable trade. At present we are deprived of that opportunity because we have not the facilities for transportation. Would it not be infinitely better for us to have an amount included in the estimates to enable the fishermen to market their products so that after they have spent their hours, their days, their weeks, their years, their lives in the employment of fishing, they would have a better market for their product than they now have. I would also advocate—although in this perhaps I am in advance of my rights—the granting of a bonus by the government to a specially constructed steamer in order that it might convey bait from these freezers to the banks where the fishermen frequently rendevous and there distribute the bait to those who wish to take it, and also receive the catch of fish and convey them to the freezers. This would be a general benefit. I offer this to the Minister of Public Works merely as a suggestion.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would suggest that this discussion might be more in order when the estimates of the Marine and Fisheries Department are under discussion.

Mr. KAULBACH. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works will remember that I am only commenting on what has been stated by the gentleman who preceded me.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would not have raised the point except that I think the remarks of the hon. leader of the opposition and the gentleman who followed him were more in reference to the facilities for the transportation and landing of fish.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I was loath to interrupt and was waiting patiently until the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kaulbach) had finished, but then we shall have to adhere more closely to the matter under discussion.

Mr. KAULBACH. Mr. Chairman, I am much obliged for your kind consideration, but I think it is in the interests of the general public as well as of the fishermen that a public wharf be built on the shores of this Mill Cove harbour. What would be the use of the wharf, if the fishermen had no fish to land and if no boats came to it ? I am dealing with the matter in that way. Not a dollar is included in the estimates for Petite Rivière or for Mill Cove, although these places are deserving of a very great deal of consideration and would have had it long ago had it not been for interference. I have asked for a buoy off the eastern entrance to our habour, Lunenburg. This is necessary in the interests of the fishermen as well as for shipping generally, and also for the protection of life and property. Two steamers went ashore at this point within a very short time of each other, and several sailing vessels have been wrecked for want of a buoy; but I have not been able to obtain this necessary article. The constituency I represent pays into the treasury a large amount of money and to be told that we shall not receive one dollar is almost enough to set the people in revolt. I feel that we have not received justice, and it would have been better for the government themselves if they had not discriminated so conspicuously between my constituency and other constituencies, one of which, the constituency of Victoria, has nine votes in the estimates, but where is Lunenburg ? I feel I would be recreant to the trust imposed in me if I remained silent and did not give expression in the most earnest manner to this protest on behalf of the fishermen. I still trust that the government will come to the rescue of Lunenburg ; it is not too late for them to include items for these purposes in the supplementary estimates that are yet to come down.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman will excuse me, but I certainly was perfectly in earnest when I said that I did not know that there was an urgent application for the works he has asked. If the hon. gentleman will let me have a memorandum of the particular one to which he referred, I will have a report on it made at once.

Mr. KAULBACH. And an amount placed in the supplementary estimates for this year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say that.

Mr. MATHESON. It is unfortunate that some of our friends opposite do not know more about Nova Scotia. One gentleman asked if the local government are doing anything for the people. He also said that

they have a school in Ontario. I am sorry that school does not teach more than it does; if it did he would know that the government of Nova Scotia is doing all that it should do for that province and is appropriating about as much for school purposes as any government in the world. That government also gives the people of Nova Scotia roads and bridges, good iron structures, and before the Dominion of Canada took their revenue they also gave to the people wharfs and piers. It will not do that to-day because the people of Nova Scotia are paying another government to do it. To hear some members talking in this House about the poor fishermen of Nova Scotia you would almost think that they were the recipients of something that did not belong to them. I venture to say that one fisherman in Nova Scotia will contribute to the general revenue of the country as much as half a dozen of your farmers, for the very reason that the fishermen import and buy more of the goods which they consume. I presume that a farmer in Ontario can live largely out of his farm. Our fishermen have to send their fish abroad and get cash in order to buy the produce of Ontario. You will not buy it, and it is a great pity that the people of Ontario will not buy fish—they need it.

Now, what we want from this government is harbours; let them improve our harbours, improve our piers; in other words, do for us what we were doing for ourselves before the Dominion government took away our revenue. I think that is very reasonable. When the hon. gentleman across the way was talking of the injustice that was done to his county, I was reminded how often we were told, in the old days, that we could not expect anything from the government, because we were not sending a supporter of the government. That is what we were always told in the past, and in fact we learned not to look for anything. We did not look for anything during eighteen years, because we were taught that we had no right to expect government favours, that this heaven-born right belonged only to those who were supporting the government of that day. Let our friends understand that the fishermen of Nova Scotia are not entirely dependent on the paltry help they may get from this government. The great trouble with our fishermen is that they have not received the attention that the farmers of Ontario have received. They are scattered over the face of the Atlantic, and they do not often meet together to concoct plans and to send resolutions to the government asking for assistance. It would be well for them perhaps if they did. At the same time, I hope that the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) will travel a little more. He will find that there are schools in Nova Scotia as well as in Ontario. He told us there were schools in Ontario for farming. Well, they might teach their children a little of something else, so that they might know that there are other places in the world besides Ontario.

Mr. BLAIN. The Hon. Finance Minister made the statement that one of the reasons why Lunenburg county was neglected was that the member for that county had failed to put in his requisition for help. I wish to read from the 'Hansard' of last year a few words of the hon. member for Lunenburg. He said:

> I observe quite a number of estimates for different counties in Nova Scotia. Annapolis appears not to have been overlooked. Neither have Richmond, Guysborough, Victoria, Inverness and other counties. The two counties west and adjoining Lunenburg, not excepted, or in other words, all are included in the roll for benefits. But I am afraid that the Minister of Public Works has forgotten the most important part of the entire coast. He says he is very desirous of forwarding the interests of the fishermen. . . . I may tell him that there is a long stretch of coast in St. Margaret's bay where, for twelve or fifteen miles, there is almost a continuous town, house almost against house for that entire distance, with an immense population. I have been asking for a number of years for a breakwater for Mill Cove, St. Margaret's bay. The property of the fishermen there is in jeopardy every time there is a storm. They have to fish in large boats; smaller boats would not do because they are exposed to the open ocean.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I submit whether that is not an open request to the government for some aid to be given to the fishermen in the county of Lunenburg. I may say for the information of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) that when an item was up for discussion last year in connection with the same county, my hon. friend from Lunenburg asked this:

> I hope the minister will expend that sum this year.

And the hon. member for Guysborough said, 'Strike it out.'

An hon. MEMBER. It ought to be struck out.

Mr. BLAIN. Well, I am not here to say whether it ought to be struck out or not. I am only pointing out that the hon. member for Guysborough, who is so anxious about the counties in the province he represents, when an item was up in the estimates for the county represented by an hon. gentleman on this side of the House, the hon. member for Guysborough so far forgot his interest in the fishermen for that county as to say 'Strike it out.' I might ask the hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) why he wants it struck out?

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. member is mistaken, I made no interruption.

Mr. BLAIN. I am just pointing out to the Finance Minister that my hon. friend from Lunenburg has not forgotten his duty. And perhaps the Minister of Finance will say why it is that that county has been overlooked?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not make any charge of neglect against the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach). I stated that I was not aware, except as respects dredging, of any application that my hon. friend had made from his county. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) now calls attention to something my hon. friend said a year ago. Well, I can only say that when these estimates were being prepared I sent to the Public Works Department and asked if there were any applications from Lunenburg, and I was informed there were none. I do not want to find fault with the hon. member for Lunenburg; he has been here for seven months, and I think that if this matter was of such vital importance, he might have taken the trouble to place it before the department. However, I am not making any accusation against the member for Lunenburg, far from it. Since I am speaking on the subject, let me say that there is a great difference between the county of Lunenburg and some other counties, notably the county of Victoria, in respect to fishing. Lunenburg is a county in which the great mass of the fishermen are deep-sea fishermen, who go away in fine vessels. They are not so much concerned as the boat fishermen in the matter of small breakwaters and works of that character, and it might follow that the member for Lunenburg would not want works of this character at all, though there is one particular place the hon. gentleman now speaks of. But there is that important difference. There is another difference. The county of Victoria has no railway, not a mile of railway, and no prospect of any. This county, thus isolated, is exposed to the ocean and there is no other county in the province which is at such disadvantage in regard to the facilities for travel and the means of communication. It is only by such aids as these that have been granted that the people of that county can really carry on their business as boat fishermen. There is a very important difference, and nobody knows it better than the hon. gentleman from Lunenburg. The fishermen of his county are of a different class, as respects the majority. There are some boat fishermen, but the great majority of the fishing population in the county of Lunenburg, and the most prosperous fishermen in Nova Scotia, are the deep-sea fishermen, whose condition is not exactly the same as that of the boat fishermen.

Mr. KAULBACH. I beg slightly to differ from the Minister of Finance in one particular. From the border of the county of Queen's, which he represents, to the county of Halifax, there is one continuous line of habitations of fishermen who are dependent very largely upon shore fishing for their living. There is another class of fishermen, known as deep-sea fishermen, most of whom live along the shore, and a large number of whom depend entirely upon that kind of fishing in the summer time. But as soon as spring and autumn come they are then dependent upon the shore fishing, and look to that largely for their living. This year they are compelled to look to it entirely in consequence of the failure of the deep-sea fishing. Now, with regard to the appeal for assistance, the Minister of Finance must know that it was only two months ago I said to him, when meeting him: 'You will not forget me in the estimates.' Well, I will not say a great deal about that. I do not want to make an appeal from day to day, and make myself appear ridiculous, and get an answer by way of a refusal, but I certainly, from the friendly remark that was made at that time, expected that I would see something in the estimates for the county of Lunenburg.

Mr. HACKETT. I would like to refer to the statement made by the hon. Minister of Finance in regard to the county of Victoria. I think he said that it extended from the gulf on one side to the Atlantic on the other. Is that correct?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I said that Victoria had the sea on two sides of it. Cape North is in the county of Victoria and part of it in Inverness. The county of Victoria is one of the most isolated counties in Nova Scotia, having no railways whatever. That was the point of my observation.

Mr. HACKETT. I would like to ask the hon. minister what kind of a structure he is going to have at Briton Cove for oats to land at?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is proposed to construct a wharf 200 feet long by 16 feet wide. It is to be built of both faced and round timber and to have ballasted cribwork.

Mr. HACKETT. What depth of water will there be at the end of the wharf?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Four and a-half feet at low water.

Mr. HACKETT. What is the rise of the tide there?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About four feet.

Mr. HACKETT. Is it intended specially for the accommodation of the lobster-packing industry which has been erected there lately?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, there is the lobster factory, but there is quite a large number of people interested besides those engaged in the lobster factory.

Mr. KAULBACH. You will pardon me, Mr. Chairman, if I refer to a matter which

is of very material importance to the interests of the shore fishermen as well as the deep-sea fishermen, and it is the menace offered by the dog-fish frequenting the waters of Nova Scotia in certain seasons of the year. This is a matter that should be looked into very carefully. I know that petitions have been circulated through the various counties in Nova Scotia—I am not sure about the adjoining provinces—and forwarded to the Department of Marine and Fisheries in the early part of this year. I am sorry that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) is not present. I would like to know what has been done in that respect. Something ought to be done, because, during the past two years the dog-fish have been in such numbers that they have driven every other description of edible fish out of the water. I think the government might take the matter up and view it carefully in the interest of the country generally.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Does my hon. friend mean that they will take this wharf ?

Mr. KAULBACH. No, I do not mean that, but if the hon. minister gives me the hint and says that I should bring it up later, I shall do so.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All right.

Mr. HACKETT. Is it intended that the boats shall go and land their lobsters or other fish on the pier and then seek shelter elsewhere ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not understand my hon. friend's question.

Mr. HACKETT. In Prince Edward Island where we carry on such an industry I know gentlemen who built their factories on headlands 100 feet high, built their own accommodation, and did not come to the government and ask them for any assistance. These gentlemen found that by building their factories on these headlands, as high as this building, and placing their gear there to hoist the lobsters from the fishermen's boats, canning the lobsters and placing them on the market, that they could make money. Now, in this case, hon. gentlemen opposite are asking that an establishment having ten boats, which has been opened at Briton Cove, shall have the assistance of this government to the extent of expending $4,000 for the building of this wharf. This is only the commencement of this expenditure. I protest against this because I am aware that a fisherman in Prince Edward Island has to carry on his business through his enterprise and energy with whatever little capital he can put into it himself without receiving any government assistance. The gentlemen to whom I have referred and who have without any assistance established a business there, have found it to be very remunerative. They have carried it on for years without any assistance of this kind. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) spoke particularly of fish. I am not going to speak altogether of fish. He spoke of the great fishing industry of Nova Scotia. It is a great industry, and we are all proud of it. But it is not all fish there. If the hon. gentleman will look at the reports of a few days ago he will find that that province is about exporting to the old world one thousand barrels of apples, worth $4 per barrel. So that, when we arise here to speak of fishing matters, we are not speaking altogether of the resources of that great country from which we come. It is true that there may be some sectionalism. Our hon. friends opposite want to make it appear that the province of Ontario is directly opposed to the interests of the maritime provinces. I claim that is not correct. I have found that in all my intercourse with my friends from Ontario and Quebec on this side of the House they have always been willing to do what is right and fair by the people of the maritime provinces without distinction, whether it was New Brunswick, Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island. I think it is a very bad policy for our hon. friends opposite to endeavour to place that particular province against the lower provinces in this respect. We are one people from the west to the east. We are endeavouring, as far as possible, to carry out the great object of confederation. There should be no rivalry between one part of the country and the other, and the man who raises that question—I do not care whether it is on this side of the House or the other—is an enemy to his country and not deserving of any praise from any person.

Cow Bay Run—breakwater to protect outlet of harbour, $4,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the hon. gentleman explain this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a vote of $4,000 to make provision for the construction of a breakwater at the outlet of Cow Bay Run, situated at the mouth of Halifax harbour. The outlet has for some years been a source of trouble to the people of that district who have been blocked on several occasions from getting into the shore of the lake, causing much inconvenience to the fishermen who use the outlet as an entrance to the lake which forms their harbour of refuge, and which affords safe anchorage during rough seas.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This will complete the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The report of the engineer says it will.

Cheticamp wharf, $11,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This will complete the work; the total cost is $15,000.

Cariboo Island causeway, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to form a harbour of refuge for fishermen in Pictou county. The estimated cost is $2,000.

Chegoggin pier, $1,400.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work is in Yarmouth county. It is for a training pier to confine the water to the channel.

Mr. BLAIN. Will it be done by contract?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer tells me that it can be better done under the supervision of our local engineer. This vote will complete the work.

Drum Head breakwater, $1,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete payment on the contract. The total expenditure has been $5,500.

Donald's Head—repairs to breakwater, $3,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Shelburne and Queen's. The estimated cost of the work is $3,000.

Duncan's Cove approach to wharf, $200.

Mr. HACKETT. Is this to be expended on a highway?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. HACKETT. I suppose it is between the wharf and the highway.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

East Jeddore wharf, $1,800.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This in Halifax county?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it a new wharf?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, the total cost is estimated at $1,800.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the work be done by contract?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer thinks that the work will be done more satisfactorily under the supervision of the local engineer.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the minister keeping in mind whether there is any appropriation in the main estimates for any of these?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

East end Cape Sable island—entrance to boat harbour, $2,200.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Shelburne and Queen's county. It is a harbour for the fishermen.

East Berlin breakwater—to complete, $700.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Queen's county.

East Bay wharf—to complete repairs, $300.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Cape Breton county.

Frudes Point wharf, $1,500.

Mr. BLAIN. Was there a petition from the people of the county for this expenditure?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is in Shelburne, and I am pretty certain there was.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the minister could get the information from the department.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am pretty sure there was a request for it, because I see here that it has been referred to Mr. Locke, the local engineer, to make a report. That is the way we deal with these petitions as a rule.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is possible that representations may have been made to me by the people there, and I may have asked the department to inquire into it.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to know the form of these petitions, because we on this side of the House, are not familiar with the necessary form to reach the government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no special form.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A great many of these small works are petitioned for either to the department direct or to the members. We ask for a report from the engineer, and it is on that report, as a rule, that these estimates are made up.

Five Islands wharf—repairs, $700.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to raise the government wharf two feet and renew covering. It has been asked for by the people of Colchester county.

Mr. GOURLEY. It is a very proper expenditure. There is a good wharf there, and it ought to be repaired. Have you had a report from the engineer?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Dodwell made a report.

Mr. GOURLEY. Did he say $700 would be enough?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is his estimate.

Mr. GOURLEY. The people themselves thought it would cost about that.

Finlay Point wharf, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Inverness county.

Fort Lawrence landing pier, $11,400.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total cost of the work is $16,400, and this is to pay for the balance of the work under contract. It is in Cumberland county.

Mr. BLAIN. When was this work commenced ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contract was let during the present calendar year ; a vote was taken in the main estimates and this is to complete it.

Mr. HACKETT. What will be the depth of the water at the end of the pier ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know what the average depth of the water is. It is said at the spring of the year to be 45 feet. I do not know what it is at low-water.

Mr. HACKETT. It is in the Straits of Northumberland.

Mr. LOGAN. This work is not on the Straits of Northumberland, but is at the head of the Bay of Fundy. At high tide the depth of the water is sometimes 50 feet, and at low tide it is probably 12 or 15 feet. This landing pier is for the accommodation not only of Fort Lawrence, but of the town of Amherst as well. It is 2½ miles from that town. The manufacturers there have complained for many years that they have not had facilities for unloading materials brought from the United States, particularly southern pine. Then, there are shipments of apples from the lower part of the Bay of Fundy and other things brought to Amherst, for which there is at present no landing place.

Mr. BENNETT. Did the town of Amherst make any contribution towards the cost, or give a site ?

Mr. LOGAN. If I may be allowed to answer the question, I may say that the town of Amherst has contributed nothing. I do not think the site will cost anything, because it is to be built where the land is not valuable. I may say that the town of Amherst is a leading manufacturing town, and contributes largely to the revenue.

Mr. BLAIN. Has any work been done on the wharf so far ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I expect so, as the contract was let in June.

Mr. BLAIN. What was the amount ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Fourteen thousand, eight hundred and ninety-five dollars. It is estimated that this will complete the work.

Freeport—landing pier, $3,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Digby county. It is to provide for the construction of a landing pier at Freeport, on the east side of the Grand Passage between Long island and Brier island. It will reach a depth of 10 feet at low water in ordinary spring tide.

Granite village—mooring pier, $1,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Shelburne county. The vote is expected to cover the total cost of the work.

Gabarouse—extension of breakwater, &c., $6,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Is that for the completion or the commencement of the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for a continuation of a work that was under way. It is to be 80 feet long and 27 feet wide. This is the amount which the chief engineer estimates will complete the work now undertaken.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This is in the county of Cape Breton is it not ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is this being done by day's work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why are these works being done by day's work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They ar not all being done by day's work. It is to be done by tender and contract, except works which the chief engineer reports, for reasons given, can be better and more economically done by our own engineers buying materials and employing men, such as repairs and improvements, for which specifications cannot be made and which, if done by contract, would cost a great deal more.

Mr. COCHRANE. I can understand how the repairing of a wharf would be better done by day's work ; but where there is $6,000 for the extension of a pier——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I find that I was mistaken in regard to this work. It will be done by contract.

Mr. BLAIN. There was $3,500 voted for this work last year. Is it the policy of the department to have an engineer's report for a work before any money is voted for it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In almost every case.

Mr. BLAIN. What was the vote of $3,500 for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was an expenditure of $4,800 on this same breakwater, and $3,900 was spent on dredging at that point.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the call for this very great expenditure on this breakwater ?

Mr. KENDALL. I may say Gabarouse is the largest fishing district in the county of Cape Breton. For twenty-five or thirty years the inhabitants of that place have requested successive governments to construct a breakwater. I have myself seen six large vessels smashed on the shore for want of this protection. Three or four years ago the Minister of Public Works visited the place and became impressed with the necessity of a beakwater. The representatives of Cape Breton county for the present and the future will not be satisfied unless larger appropriations are made for the work. This amount of $6,000 will perhaps be little more than sufficient to buy the creosoted timber which is necessary, and next year I shall ask the government to make a further vote to complete the work. It is an important work, and as long as I represent the county, I shall urge the government to make a sufficient appropriation to afford the necessary protection.

Mr. BLAIN. Might I ask the hon. genleman if there was a petition presented to the government for this work ?

Mr. KENDALL. I may tell the hon. gentleman that petitions were presented to the late government again and again, but they turned a deaf ear to them. Petitions were made for this extension to my colleague and myself on several occasions and to the government, and we were determined to have this work constructed.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to know how the ear of the government is to be reached in connection with works of this kind. My hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) has tried to get the attention of the government on behalf of his county but without avail. The Finance Minister has told us that petitions have been sent in from time to time for this work, how did these get to the ear of the government ? Of course, my hon. friend (Mr. Kendall) made a little threat about next year. Here is an amount of $3,500 for last year, and $6,000 for this year, and the hon. gentleman representing the county (Mr. Kendall) has given notice that that is not nearly enough and that next year they shall come for a further amount. When will this cease ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am asking for a piece of work 80 feet long by 27 feet wide. If any further extension is required, it will be for the House to judge whether that will be granted.

Mr. BLAIN. What about the $3,500 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was a contract for $8,500, and $3,500 is for the approach.

Mr. BLAIN. $3,500 was asked last year to vote a breakwater there. What became of the money ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That was for a part of the breakwater, 190 feet long, which was under contract. It was to complete the contract under way.

Mr. BLAIN. There is a further expenditure.

Mr. KENDALL. Yes, and it does not go far enough.

Mr. TAYLOR. Has the hon. minister experimented in putting down some of these piers with cement instead of with timber as I suggested last year. By using cement, we would not have to spend so much money on repairs.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In some of the larger works, I have decided to use cement instead of timber. In some of the smaller works, I have asked the engineer to change from wood to cement when there is not too much difference in the cost.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Cement would last longer without repairs, would it not ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If cement is well done, it lasts almost for ever.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And where you use creosote timber, you have to import it, whereas you can get the cement in our own country.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. HACKETT. Is this work intended to concentrate the water of the river in the main channel or is it built into the ocean ?

Mr. KENDALL. It is in the ocean.

Mr. HACKETT. What will be the depth of water inside the breakwater ?

Mr. KENDALL. Ten to fifteen feet.

Mr. HACKETT. That would give protection in local shipping.

Mr. KENDALL. Yes.

Glace Bay, N.S.—wharf, $15,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was a prolonged discussion on this subject last session. I am asking $15,000, and the money will not be spent unless an agreement, such as was then discussed in a general way, be entered into by the company.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think the point made was that the bay, once this wharf was constructed, should be the property of the Crown and that some arrange-

ment should be made with the coal company to that effect.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. Were any moneys collected at this wharf ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The property is vested in the Dominion Coal Company, and the people have been asking for improvements which would cost a great deal of money. It was thought that some arrangement might be come to between the private owners and the department, which will be satisfactory and save a large expenditure.

Mr. INGRAM. Were no moneys collected at this wharf ?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). The Dominion Coal Company are owners at present, and will collect the wharfage. The government have nothing to do with the wharfage.

Mr. INGRAM. But this company is asking for $25,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, it is the people of Glace Bay, and not the company, who are asking for this money. The company are indifferent. Glace Bay used to be a shipping point but the company constructed a line of railway and shipped their coal elsewhere and the harbour fell into disuse. In the meantime it has become the centre of a mining district, with a population of some 20,000 within a radius of three miles, and the people desire communication by water as well as by rail. The idea is that if the government will give something, the company will be induced to co-operate and the harbour may be opened and a public wharf established there.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the wharf belong to the public ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That will have to be a matter of negotiation between the company and the government.

Mr. INGRAM. Then it is not a public wharf and will not be until some future arrangement is made.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It will have to be a public wharf, but the company might have some privileges over it in return for its contribution. The opening of a harbour and general improvements will cost a good deal more than $15,000. It will be a wharf in the general sense. But there will have to be an arrangement with the company.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The contention of the company was that they owned this harbour. That is to say, it is not a harbour at all until made so by the company.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The old Glace Bay Mining Company.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Originally it was not a harbour, but it was made so by one of these companies whose rights are now vested in the Dominion Coal Company. A company could not interfere with a navigable water but it might be possible that this company having itself created a navigable water would have absolute control of it. When this vote came up before us, the point was taken by myself that before the government expended a large sum of money for the benefit of the public in Glace Bay they should see to it that the public would actually have rights in the harbour. It would therefore be necessary to procure from that company some assignment or conveyance of it rights so that when the harbour should be once established and the wharf built, the public would have the same rights as if the harbour had been a navigable water in the first instance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is quite right.

Mr. INGRAM. I have here the Sydney 'Daily Post' and in it I find an article in which it is stated that this matter has been the subject of negotiations carried on by a civic committee of which Mr. D. M. Burchell and Henry McDonald, of Glace Bay, were members. The item reads :

> The supplementary estimates brought down in parliament contain an item of $15,000 for improvements of Glace Bay harbour. This with the $10,000 previously voted makes up the amount asked for by the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, lessees of the Dominion Coal Company.

That would be $25,000 altogether, including the $10,000 in the original and the $15,000 now asked for. A letter is published in this paper from Mr. C. Shields, late manager of the company, to the committee above named, in which he says :

> Sydney, C.B., March 9, 1903.
>
> Gentlemen,—Replying to your favour of the 4th instant regarding Glace Bay harbour :—
>
> As stated by me to your committee the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, lessees of the Dominion Coal Company, will build and repair its piers and wharfs at Glace Bay harbour, and also erect a coal shipping pier for the purpose of loading coal vessels coming to the port with produce or other freight and which desire a cargo of coal. It being understood, however, that we will not undertake to sell coal in order to find loading for such vessels, but will use them to move coal that we have sold as suits our convenience, or to sell them cargoes of coal if they desire it.
>
> The above offer is made providing the government will grant the sum of $25,000 towards the repairs, and rebuilding the piers and wharfs——

That would sound as if the government were rebuilding the piers and wharf.

—and also that they will dredge and keep dredged the entrance to the harbour.

Now what the company propose to do is :

The company will keep the harbour dredged inside of the piers, the rate of wharfage to remain as at present.

Trusting that this will cover your requirements and that the arrangements may be brought speedily to a satisfactory conclusion.

I remain, yours very truly,

C. SHIELDS.

This article goes on to say that through the work done by this committee the company is prepared to do this, provided the government carries out its proposition slated in the letter.

That would show that while the total vote at present is $25,000 the government are pledging themselves to keep this harbour properly dredged for this company for all future time. What the citizens of that section of the country would require is that they should not be deprived of the use of that harbour or that they would not be asked to pay unreasonably for privileges which they as citizens would require in connection with it. Therefore, I think this parliament should carefully protect the interests of the public and not allow any company, whether a coal company or a steel company, to monopolize that harbour to the detriment of the people residing in that locality.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). The opening of the harbour at Glace Bay has been an issue for at least four or five years. As has been stated, this harbour is the property of the Dominion Coal Company. A number of years ago the Dominion Coal Company abandoned that harbour as a port for shipping coal and the people of Glace Bay and the surrounding district have felt for many years that it would be to their interest to have this harbour reopened and to have the Dominion Coal Company induced to resume the shipment of coal from it. Negotiations were carried on for a number of years between the Dominion Coal Company and the town council of Glace Bay. The letter which the hon. gentleman has read was written by the late manager of the Dominion Coal Company to a committee of the town council of Glace Bay, who were conducting negotiations between the town and the company. In order that the harbour might become the property of the government it would be necessary in the first instance to purchase the harbour. I myself approached the Dominion Coal Company three or four years ago and conducted some correspondence with them ; at that time they stated that they would not sell the harbour. It was felt then by the committee, consisting of the mayor of Glace Bay, who is familiar with the interests and requirements of the people of that neighbourhood, and other gentlemen equally interested in the welfare of the town, that the best solution of this question was that which is set forth in the letter from the general manager of the coal company to the committee. That delegation was in Ottawa at one time. The gentlemen present being the mayor of Glace Bay, Mr. Henry Macdonald, who was a member of the council, and Mr. N. J. Gillis, one of the members of the local legislature and a resident of Glace Bay. They discussed this matter with the members of the government and with my colleague and myself and we all concluded that the interests of Glace Bay would be very well served by the government contributing this $25,000 towards the reopening of the harbour. The company estimate that in order to open the harbour and make it a fit place for the shipment of coal an expenditure of at least $75,000 would be required. For my part I feel that the mayor of Glace Bay and those who were associated with him in these negotiations will take good care that the rights of the people of Glace Bay are fully protected. Personally I will see, so far as I am able to see, that all possible rights are secured to the people of Glace Bay on these wharfs proposed to be rebuilt by the Dominion Coal Company. They have gone into this matter and have represented to my colleague and myself that if the Dominion Coal Company undertake to reopen the harbour and resume shipping coal it will be decidedly in the interests of the people at Glace Bay and at the surrounding collieries. Those who are acquainted with the situation know very well that this is a most important work and feel that the plan proposed and agreed upon between the committee of the town council of Glace Bay and the Dominion Coal Company, if carried into effect, would be perfectly satisfactory and I am satisfied that it would be perfectly satisfactory to the government.

Mr. INGRAM. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to mean that the people of this district prefer the arrangement as he has stated.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). I state without any hesitation whatever that the general opinion in the district as represented by the mayor and members of the delegation is overwhelmingly in favour of such an arrangement as I have indicated.

Mr. INGRAM. Is the entrance to this harbour on the property of the company, or is it public property ?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). The entrance to the harbour is public property of course. It is on the shores of the Atlantic.

Mr. INGRAM. And is it properly protected so that the company could not monopolize the entrance to the harbour ?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). There is no danger in the world of the company monopolizing the entrance, even if they wished to. The more trade comes to the harbour the better it is for the company.

Mr. BLAIN. Might I ask the hon. gentleman who represents the county why it was abandoned, why the original harbour was abandoned ?

Mr JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). It was abandoned when the property of the Glace Bay Mining Company, who were originally conducting the mining operations there, became the property of the Dominion Coal Company. In 1893 the coal properties in that region were consolidated, and as a result the Glace Bay Mining Company shipped its coal there. But the Dominion Coal Company constructed lines of railway between Louisburg and Sydney and concentrated as much as possible the shipping of its coal to Louisburg and Sydney.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there plenty of water ?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. When this matter was up last year the acting minister stated they had abandoned it for lack of water.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). It is not correct that they abandoned it for the sole reason that there was not sufficient water. They abandoned it for the reason I have stated.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There may have been a lack of water for the larger class of vessels which were engaged in the coal trade. The Glace Bay Company conducted its operations on a modest scale, and their coal was handled with small vessels. The new enterprise undertook to employ heavier vessels, and for that reason they could not send their larger vessels into Glace Bay harbour. So, in a sense, it was due to lack of water for the larger vessels engaged in the coal trade.

Mr. BLAIN. The Minister of Finance said last year there was formerly a coal mine at Glace Bay, and after it was purchased by the new company they ceased shipping there, owing to lack of water.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That would mean lack of water for the larger vessels.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would like to know if the government has received any offer from the Dominion Coal Company as to the deepening of this harbour and the dredging and repairing of the wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No definite conclusion has been come to. As the member for Cape Breton Mr. Johnston) has said, negotiattions have been going on, and it is assumed that a satisfactory arrangement could be made from a public standpoint if we had a vote of $25,000. The matter has been gone into fully and discussed on the floors of the House. The local people have offered to make arrangements for the improvements. Of course it is for the government to say whether these arrangements are satisfactory before they will agree to them.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I understand that the Dominion Coal Company own practically the whole harbour front there, and that there is a good deal of dissatisfaction among the residents of Glace Bay and vicinity as to the handling of these properties by the Dominion Coal Company. I also understand that the late general manager of the company, Mr. Shields, agreed or proposed that the company should dredge the harbour and fix up the wharfs if the government would give them $25,000 as a bonus. Now, Mr. Shields has left the company, and we have no guarantee that the Dominion Coal Company will dredge the harbour and repair the wharfs.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. member will see that we submit this estimate provisionally. No part of this money will be spent unless a satisfactory arrangement is made.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Nothing should be done until some arrangement is made satisfactory to the people of that vicinity. I think, as I have said, that the proper way to deal with this question is to appropriate part of the harbour front for the people of Glace Bay. There is a population of 25,000 or 30,000 in that territory who want to use this harbour, and I do not think that a monopoly of it should be held by one large corporation, or that we should give them $25,000 to keep up that monopoly. I understand that when the harbour front was prepared they changed the road and took away part of the public highway in order to take in these rights.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Let me say one word more. I would like to say to my hon. friend that his informant is not up to date.

Mr. LEFURGEY. My informant comes from Glace Bay, and possibly knows as much about it as the hon. gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). I know exactly where the hon. gentleman's information comes from. However, I want to say to the hon. gentleman that the successor of Mr. Shields, Mr. Duggan, has stated that he is prepared to carry out the arrangement entered into by his predecessor in the office as manager of the Dominion Coal Company. Only a short time ago he was waited upon by the mayor, Mr. Burchell, and Mr. Macdonald, and others, in connection with this very matter, and Mayor Burchell and his associates received the assurance of Mr. Duggan that he was prepared to carry out every proposition submitted on behalf of his own company by Mr. Shields.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I do not think that this government should spend $25,000 upon the faith of any verbal statements by the manager of the Dominion Coal Company, however respectable he may be.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would like the minister to tell the committee what he considers would be a proper arrangement to make with this company. We have had

some explanations, but still the affair appears to me mysterious. I would like to know from the minister what arrangements he thinks should be made with this company, so that the interests of the public might be protected, and that we might feel sure in voting this money that it was going for the benefit of the community and not of a corporation.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The matter is somewhat complicated. These people put a high value upon their property. On a previous occasion the House seemed to be favourable to making a contribution, provided it could be done on terms that would be in the public interest.

Mr. INGRAM. Do we understand the minister to say that the negotiations that have taken place were of a verbal character ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There have been representations between the municipality and the company as I understand, and representations have been made to the government with regard to what the company were willing to do. I may say to the committee that the company's interests there are very large. It will cost the Dominion an immense amount of money to provide the same facilities that the company offer to provide. If an arrangement can be come to between the company and the department by which the public interest will be secured, we will carry it out, if not this money will not be used.

Mr. INGRAM. That is not very satisfactory to this committee. The hon. gentleman is asking for $25,000 for an entirely new work. Now, we are asking if this is a verbal arrangement entered into between Glace Bay and the government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have already said that there is no arrangement.

Mr. INGRAM. Then what is the object of the government in putting $25,000 into the estimates ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. So that if we can make a satisfactory arrangement we will have this money to carry out this work. If not, it will not be spent.

Mr. INGRAM. The minister is not frank with the committee. Surely these people came to the government in order to induce them to put this $25,000 in the estimates. If they had a proposition to make to the government, either verbally or in writing, it should have been communicated to this committee. It is only fair we should know what the proposition is.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I could not state it half as well as the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has stated it to-day. I am sure he grasped it thoroughly. My hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) has explained in a general way the arrangement that is proposed to be made.

Mr. INGRAM. I may be thick headed enough not to understand it, and I do not believe that any hon. member on this side of the House can understand what the government anticipates in the shape of an expenditure for the dredging of this harbour. What obligation does the government undertake if we vote this $25,000, and what expenditure does the hon. minister anticipate that the government will be liable to make if this arrangement is carried out ? The hon. member for Cape Breton says that an arrangement has been entered into between these parties.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) has misunderstood me. I did not say there was an arrangement entered into between the Dominion Coal Company and the government. What I did say was that the Dominion Coal Company had submitted a proposition to the town council of Glace Bay. That proposition, as embodied in a letter written by the general manager of the Dominion Coal Company, the hon. gentleman himself read a few moments ago. The hon. gentleman will find that the substance of the proposition is that the Dominion Coal Company propose to do certain work, provided the Dominion government make a grant of $25,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Is that an answer to the question I asked, if these people were satisfied with what the government were doing?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). They are perfectly satisfied. I have no hesitation in saying that if the Dominion government carry out the proposal embodied in the letter of the Dominion Coal Company, the overwhelming majority of the people interested would be perfectly satisfied that the government had done their duty. As far as I am concerned, I feel that I can speak for the mayor of Glace Bay and for others in the council, when I say that they will take every possible means in their power to have secured to the people of Glace Bay the same rights in respect to this harbour as if the property were entirely theirs. That is my own position, it is the position of my colleagues and the position of the mayor of Glace Bay and those associated with him in this matter.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not understand that the company have an exclusive right to the harbour at all.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). They own it. They constructed it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. They cannot own it. Even if it were an artificial harbour, the moment they construct it it is dedicated to the public. The public have a right to pay for the user of it a fair remuneration.

No company can erect a harbour on the sea coast and have it exclusively for their own purposes. They could no more do that than they could have a navigable river exclusively for their own purposes.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that they procured these rights before confederation, but whether it was before or since, they could have procured these rights from the Crown at the time, whether by provincial or Dominion legislation. That is the position of affairs.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It could only be by Act of parliament. I do not understand how the provincial government would have the power to give over a harbour and the exclusive rights to it to an individual.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) is quite right as far as navigable waters are concerned. There has been a decision that the Crown cannot grant any right that will interfere with navigation without the authority of an Act of parliament. It may be that there was in this instance such an Act of Nova Scotia, perhaps, before confederation. I do not know anything about that, but I understand that the company claims to have exclusive rights in that harbour, because they have practically made the harbour themselves. What I was insisting upon when an item in connection with this work was up for discussion was that the government, after spending $25,000, should be the owner of the wharf. Further than that, I say that absolute rights should be conceded to the public in respect to this harbour.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was in view of the discussion between my hon. friend the leader of the opposition and my hon. friend the Minister of Finance that I undertook to bring down this vote, and it was with the intention of carrying out the arrangement based upon the remarks made at that time.

Mr. INGRAM. This is a question that must have been considered for some time, and yet we are now in the position that we have this supplementary estimate brought down asking for this increased sum of money. I have complained all along that one of the abuses that has been permitted in this House is that the government come down and ask for a sum to be placed in the estimates without informing parliament what the proposition is and what obligation the expenditure of the money will impose upon the government. The time of this House has been taken up session after session with the consideration of such votes as this. I had hoped at the early part of the session, when the hon. minister assured us that if any new work was to be undertaken, for which a large sum of money was to be asked, he would have full and ample information laid before the House showing the purpose to which the money was to be devoted. We are now told that unless there is a satisfactory arrangement entered into the money will not be spent. Lest this work should turn out a sink-hole for the expenditure of public money, it is time that we should pause before we proceed with it any further. Let us have the information, let us know what the probable cost of dredging this harbour is going to be. The government must agree to the arrangement before they can meet the views of the coal company, because the coal company say that the government must dredge out the harbour. They say that they are willing to dredge out between the piers inside the harbour. Before entering into an arrangement of that kind, we should know how much it would cost. It may require that a sum of money shall be expended every year upon the dredging of that harbour, or it may be that it will only be necessary to dredge the harbour once in two or five years. But if it is necessary that the dredging shall be done year after year, the money of the country will be wasted.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the hon. minister if any of the $10,000 vote of last year has been spent?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. BLAIN. And this vote is for $15,000 more, making a total of $25,000. I understand the hon. gentleman who represents the county to say that a certain letter was written by this coal company to the municipal authorities of the district. May I ask him if a similar letter was addressed to the government?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). This communication, addressed by the Dominion Coal Company to the authorities of Glace Bay, was forwarded to me accompanied by a resolution of the town council, endorsing the proposition; and these communications I sent to the Department of Public Works.

Mr. BLAIN. Do we understand that this $25,000 will not be expended unless the coal company carries out what is contained in that letter.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Certainly.

Mr. BLAIN. It seems to me that there should be a direct communication from the company to the government, and that the minister should submit to us that communication, so that the committee might have a fair understanding of what agreement was likely to be entered into. This expenditure may be in the interests of the people, but it is an unbusinesslike proposition for a private member to state to the committee that he received the correspondence on which this vote is based. Are we to understand that whenever a private company wants an expenditure by the government, whether it be

legitimate or not, it is to communicate with the representative of the county and not with the government direct? Surely that is not going to be the policy of the government.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The great majority of these resolutions and representations made by municipal bodies throughout the Dominion come through the member of parliament, no matter on what side of the House he is. I think it is well that such should be the case. I do not see anything wrong about it.

Mr. BLAIN. I can understand that if a municipal body asks for an expenditure in the public interest, it should send that representation through the member, but when a private company asks for an appropriation, it is a different thing.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The company is not asking for any appropriation here, or any favours. It is the people of the locality who want this done.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not understand it that way, and the committee does not either.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). The committee does.

Mr. BLAIN. The committee does not. The hon. gentleman may have it in his mind, but if so he has not been able to express it to the committee.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think the leader of the opposition made it clear to every gentleman in this House what was the object of this expenditure.

Mr. INGRAM. The Minister of Public Works says that it is the usual custom for a private member to hand these documents to the government?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say that. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) criticised the municipality for sending this communication to the member for the county, and I said that in my experience that was the usual custom.

Mr. INGRAM. What does the member do with the communication?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I should think it would be his duty to forward it to the department, as my hon. friend did in this case. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) has often done so himself.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the minister state what reply was made to this communication? I suppose that as a matter of courtesy, some reply would be made.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The substance of the reply was that the matter would receive consideration.

Mr. INGRAM. And that is all the information that the department has to justify it in placing this $25,000 in the estimates. Are we to understand that this is a new-found practice with the minister? I can foresee that there is going to be a large sum of money expended on this harbour, rightly or wrongly, and I protest against the meagre information given to the House. It has been like pulling teeth to get the little information we have got. There seems to be something to conceal. If this is to be the course pursued, I can tell the government that they will not shorten the session in getting through these estimates. We have our rights and duties on this side of the House and we intend to perform them. We are not like some gentlemen on the other side who are ready to swallow everything holus-bolus. We are criticising in a much more gentlemanly fashion than did the Liberals when they sat in opposition, and I know that we have been found fault with because we are too mild in our criticism of the various expenditures that are submitted to parliament. I had great hopes of the present Minister of Public Works, and I trust that he will not persist in following the course he has pursued in regard to this item, but that he will retrieve his position and be more frank in giving us information. Surely an engineer was sent to examine this place as to the probable cost, before this item for $25,000 was inserted. If the Minister of Public Works thinks it wise to treat the House in this fashion, I would like to hear him say so.

Mr. KENDALL. If the hon. gentleman is anxious to know about the dredging of Glace Bay harbour, I may tell him that there is a good sound bottom right out to sea, but sand and gravel and sea-weed accumulates, and that harbour has to be dredged perhaps once in three years, or perhaps once in 15 or 20 years. The outside cost would be from $1,000 to $3,000 whenever the operation has to be repeated.

Mr. INGRAM. Was that the information the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kendall) gave to the government to induce them to put this $25,000 in the estimates?

Mr. KENDAL. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. I presume it met with the approval of the engineer of the department, who, I suppose, knows this particular harbour?

Mr. KENDALL. Even if the repairs to the harbour and the additional equipment which we expect to have made were not asked for and were not provided, in all probability my colleague and myself would have asked the government to send a dredge there, in order to make ample provision for the small schooners that now frequent the harbour.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that this $25,000 is to be expended for dredging?

Mr. KENDALL. None of it.

Mr. BLAIN. Then it seems a little difficult to understand. The Finance Minister last year said that Glace Bay had been abandoned, for the reason that there was insufficient water to carry on the trade. The hon. gentleman who represents the county says no portion of this money is to be expended for dredging.

Mr. KENDALL. I presume so. I am not the responsible minister.

Mr. BLAIN. Whether that be true or not, how does the hon. minister expect vessels to get in now when they could not get in last year ?

Mr. KENDALL. Large vessels cannot get in now, but small ones can.

Mr. BLAIN. When the $10,000 was asked for last year, the Minister of Public Works said :

We will build about 250 feet of breakwater for this amount.

Mr. KENDALL. That should be breastwork, not breakwater.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the difference ? Does the minister propose to use any portion of the $25,000 to construct this 250 feet of breakwater, or is there a change of policy now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think there is any intention of using any part of this money, except in accordance with the explanation which I have given to the committee.

Mr. BLAIN. Mr. Chairman, you cannot but feel that the opposition have some duties here. The Minister of Public Works, last year, comes forward and says : Here is an important work, for which we want you to appropriate $10,000. The money was voted but not expended, and the present Minister of Public Works comes forward and says : We want that $10,000 and $15,000 more, and he says : We do not propose to construct the 250 feet of breakwater at all. There is a change of policy. This is one of the reasons why the opposition are compelled to criticise these items a little more fully than would otherwise be necessary—because the government come forward hastily asking for appropriations of this kind without sufficient information.

Mr. INGRAM. You had better let this item stand, and perhaps at eight o'clock the minister can have the information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have answered as far as I can every possible question, and have brought down all the information it is possible to obtain. That has been acknowledged and endorsed by the hon. leader of the opposition. If there is anything that the hon. gentleman will ask me to bring down, I will be only too glad to bring it ; but the item must be considered and disposed of some time.

Mr. INGRAM. If there is a breakwater there, surely the government will do something ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What is the use of the hon. gentleman making statements which he knows are not correct ? That may have been a policy thought of at the time.

Mr. KENDALL. No, it is a printer's mistake. The word should be ' breastwork,' not ' breakwater.'

Mr. INGRAM. Are they not the same thing ?

Mr. KENDALL. No, no. A breastwork is to keep back the land.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand that the government are going to abandon the work that was spoken of last year. Hon. gentlemen do not feel inclined to answer the question.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have already told the hon. gentleman that if there was any such proposition, it has been abandoned.

Mr. INGRAM. I did not so understand the hon. gentleman. That is definite.

Grand Narrows—extension to wharf, $3,100.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to make provision for extending the government wharf a further distance of 57 feet. This is the total amount intended to be expended on this work.

Mr. BENNETT. Are there any buildings or storehouses on these docks ? If so, are they rented, and what is the amount of the rent ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are no buildings on this wharf.

Georgeville wharf—extension, $2,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to make provision for the extension of the wharf 50 feet in length and 25 feet in width. The total cost of the work is estimated at $4,000. It is in the county of Antigonish.

Mr. GOURLEY. I want to ask if the work at Five Islands has been c mmenced yet, or do you propose to do it this fall ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The intention was to have the work started immediately after the passing of the estimates.

Mr. GOURLEY. It should be done this fall, because in the spring it would not be possible to get at it early enough.

Hall's harbour—improvements, $2,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in King's county. The total cost is $4,600. It is for a breakwater.

Indian harbour—wharf, $1,200.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for the construction of a small wharf.

Mr. BENNETT. Will there be any revenue ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, it is a small landing for the fishermen.

Mr. INGRAM. Is there any wharfinger there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I find that on these small landings there is no wharfinger and no charges. They are kept in the Department of Public Works and not transferred to the Marine department. There are no expenses except for repairs.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Inverness (Broad Cove) Mines harbour—repairs to harbour works, $10,000.

Mr. McLENNAN. This harbour is in the county I represent. During the past two years three large mining properties have been in course of development in the county of Inverness. One of these is situated near this harbour and for several years the company developing this coal property made use of this harbour as a shipping point. Subsequently, however, the harbour having an insufficient depth of water, the company decided that it was not suitable for large shipments and decided to build a railway from the mines at Inverness, formerly called Broad Cove, to the Strait of Canso, where they now have an excellent shipping pier. Owing to the construction of this railway Broad Cove harbour has been in a measure abandoned. Although the company have discontinued shipping their coal from this port the people along the shore of Prince Edward Island and the northern parts of Cape Breton, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick who find it convenient to carry any coal they require in small schooners find that this harbour comes in very convenient. Thus the public are more interested in the reopening and improvement of this harbour than the company and hence it is that I asked the government to place in the estimates an amount sufficient to render this harbour adequate for the accommodation of this local trade. I may say that there are points of resemblance between this harbour and the harbour of Glace Bay. It, like the harbour of Glace Bay, was opened up by a company, but in this case the company which opened the harbour are agreeing with the government to throw this harbour open to the public upon condition that the government improve the harbour for public purposes.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Mr. HACKETT. What is the depth of the harbour ?

Mr. McLENNAN. In some parts of it there is a depth of from 25 to 30 feet. Originally it was a very large pond and this company which was opening the mines there dredged it out. They secured a dredge themselves, dredged the pond to a considerable depth, had the neck of land separating this pond from the waters of the gulf cut out and built breastworks on both sides of this opening so that the harbour is rather a commodious one now, except that these breastworks must be extended by adding piers to them in order to prevent the entrance to the harbour from filling in owing to the shifting of the sand.

Mr. HACKETT. How far is it from Broad Cove to Canso ?

Mr. McLENNAN. About fifty miles.

Iona—extension to harbour, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This $5,000 is to make provision for the extension of the wharf at Iona, adding at the outer end of the wharf an extension 157½ feet long. The total cost is estimated by the chief engineer of the department at $16,000.

Mr. BLAIN. A contract was let for this last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think a contract was let. I think this is the first vote and this appropriation of $5,000 is taken now so that the contract might be let and the timber and stone taken out during the winter.

Mr. BLAIN. There was something voted for this last year. The minister then said that a contract was let at $7,840. Was that contract abandoned ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer tells me that I was under a wrong impression. I thought the Dominion had spent no money on that property before, that there was simply the wharf which was built there by the government of Nova Scotia before confederation. The chief engineer now tells me that $6,000 was voted by the Dominion and that is the vote to which my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) refers.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the hon. gentleman say whether that contract was completed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, that contract was completed last year. There has been expended on this work, including $3,000 in the main estimates, $15,925.60. The estimated cost of the completion of the work is $3,065.

Livingstone's Cove—repairs to breakwater, $1,800.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in the county of Antigonish. This breakwater sustained considerable damage

by storm. The wharf there cost $14,000 or $15,000.

Mr. HACKETT. Is this breakwater built for the purpose of deepening the channel in the harbour, or is it on the outside beach?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This was originally built, I think, only as a harbour of refuge.

L'Ardoise—extension of breakwater up to shore (revote, $6,000), $18,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Richmond county, and the work is undertaken in accordance with the report of the engineer. It is proposed to build an extension 1,190 feet in length.

Mr. HACKETT. What is the meaning of the words 'up to shore'?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was an isolated breakwater, and we are making a connection to the shore from the old block. This is in Richmond county. It will be let by contract.

Mr. BENNETT. What has been spent, approximately?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About $30,000 previous to this. The chief engineer expects this vote will complete the work.

McKay's Point—wharf, $6,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Is this a new work, and will this amount complete it?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is the estimated cost to complete. It is in Victoria county.

Mr. BENNETT. Is there any town there?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sorry the member for this county (Hon. Mr. Ross) is not able to be with us. There must be a place of some importance there, because I find that a steamer makes two trips a day to this place, with passengers and mail.

McNutt's Island beach protection—extension of, and repairs to work, $500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for an extension, and for filling up the cribwork and making repairs. It is in the county of Shelburne and Queen's. It will be done by day work under the supervision of the local engineer.

Malignant Cove harbour—repairs to works, $600.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Antigonish county. The original cost was $13,266.

Main à Dieu—breakwater on west side of harbour (revote), $2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Cape Breton county. The extension will be 320 feet long. This is a work on which nearly $150,000 has been spent in the past. The chief engineer informs me that he has no doubt this $2,000 will complete the repairs.

Margaretville—general repairs to breakwater, $500.

Mr. BLAIN. Then the proposition is to extend it further?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, 157½ feet.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the population in this section increasing?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is an increasing trade there, in general merchandise.

Mr. HACKETT. Is this in Cape Breton county?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, in Victoria county where the bridge crosses.

Ketch harbour—dredging entrance channel, $1,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This harbour is in Halifax county. The vote is for the removal of sand in order to allow boats to get in.

Kingsport—reconstruction of pier, $3,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in King's county, Nova Scotia, and is to supplement a vote of $3,000 in the main estimates.

Mr. HACKETT. Will the hon. minister kindly explain the vote for Margaretville?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Annapolis county. This is for miscellaneous repairs to the pier. This pier cost over $38,000.

Middle river—Shear dam, $2,400.

Mr. BENNETT. What county is this in?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In Victoria county. This is to make provision for the construction of a pile brush and shear dam on Middle river, 518 feet in length by 15 feet in width.

Mr. BLAIN. Is this a new work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A new work. The total cost is estimated at $2,400.

Mr. HACKETT. What is the purpose of this shear-dam?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to keep accumulations from going into the mouth of the river.

Mr. BLAIN. Was there any petition from this section of the country asking for this work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The engineer's report does not say that there was a petition but he says that representations were made by the inhabitants.

Malagawatch—improvements of boat channel, $300.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Inverness county.

Musquodoboit harbour—to complete approach to wharf, $300.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Halifax county and it is to complete the work that is going on there. The total estimated cost is $5,800.

Melbourne wharf—improvements, $900.

Mr. GOURLEY. Where is Melbourne wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is in Yarmouth county.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the engineer's report on this Melbourne wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is on the east side of the estuary of the river. A wharf is to be built 100 feet long and 20 feet wide with a return 20 x 20 feet so as to give a length of 40 feet to the outer edge. The depth of water at spring tide is 9 feet. This is being done on the representations of the people of Melbourne.

Mr. BLAIN. Was there a petition from that county ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, a petition was received on February 28th from the residents of Melbourne.

Necum Teuch—(revote, $1,200), $2,000.

Mr. GOURLEY. Where is that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In Halifax county. This is to complete a work which will cost $5,800.

North Gut, St. Ann's—wharf at Morrison's point, $2,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Is this a new work and what will be the total cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, this is a new work and the total cost is estimated at $2,800.

Mr. BENNETT. What county ?

THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Victoria county.

Mr. BLAIN. Is this by petition or through the member ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A petition was received from Mr. J. L. Bethune who was at one time a member of this House and others.

North river, St. Ann—repairs to wharf, $900.

Mr. BLAIN. What county is that in ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Victoria county.

Mr. BLAIN. Did all these wharfs give out at once ?

THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These are repairs.

Mr. BENNETT. Are all these docks given to Victoria in compensation for losing a member ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think so.

Mr. BENNETT. There seems to be a kind of squaring away.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The great majority of these small votes are simply made on the report of the local engineer that these improvements and repairs are necessary.

Mr. HACKETT. Will the hon. minister explain the difference between the item for North Gut, St. Ann's, and North river, St. Ann's ?

Mr. KENDALL. These works are eight or ten miles apart.

Noel wharf—repairs, $1,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Are we still in Victoria county ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, we have struck Hants county. This is to complete this work costing altogther $3,345.

Mr. BLAIN. Is this work being done by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, this was done under the supervision of the local engineer. This work cost originally $27,000 and the repairs and improvements which have been put upon it require an expenditure of $3,345. This is to complete the work.

Mr. BLAIN. This work has been completed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work is going on now and it requires this $1,000 to complete it.

Ogden's pond—to complete channel, protection works, &c., additional amount, $800.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Antigonish.

Mr. HACKETT. What is being done there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a crib work forming a harbour at this place.

Oyster pond—beach protection, spur at outer end, $450.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Guysboro county.

Mr. HACKETT. What is the meaning of the words 'spur at outer end' ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They mean that this is an extension at the outer end of this protection work.

Poirierville (lower D'Ecousse) wharf—revote), $1,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete a work under contract.

Mr. BLAIN. What was the contract price ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contract was $4,388 and its contingencies $612, making $5,000.

Prospect wharf, $1,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Where is this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Halifax county. It seems to be a race now between Halifax county and Victoria county, and some one might calculate which is ahead. This vote, like others we have passed, is to complete a work that had been under contract.

Pleasant Bay—boat harbour, $1,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Is this Pleasant Bay any where near Prospect wharf ?

Mr. McLENNAN. This is for a boat harbour for the fishermen of Pleasant Bay. There are thirty-five of forty families in that settlement, and it is separated from the rest of the community by twenty-five miles of dense forest. There is no landing place except what will be afforded them by this wharf.

Mr. HACKETT. How many boats and men are employed in the fishery at Pleasant bay ?

Mr. McLENNAN. They are all fishermen, and almost each family has a boat. They fish in small boats and dories because they could not pull large boats upon the beach. They fish salmon and lobsters, and mackerel in the fall.

Parrsborough—landing pier, $750.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Cumberland county.

Pugwash wharf, repairs, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Cumberland county.

Picketts pier, $3,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in King's county.

Pictou light beach, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Pictou county ; this is the total estimated cost.

Pembroke breakwater, $8,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for the construction of a breakwater to provide shelter for the fishermen's boats and vessels.

Mr. CLARKE. In what county ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Hants county.

Porter's channel, to finish, $2,500.

Mr. BLAIN. Where is this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Halifax county.

Mr. BLAIN. What was expended last year for this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total expenditure up to June, 1903, was $17,480. This $2,500 is to complete the work.

Mr. BLAIN. Last year there was a vote of $2,500 to complete the outlet, and the Minister of Public Works then stated as reported in 'Hansard.'

This work is going on for the last two years, and this is to complete it.

Is this a new story, or is it the same old story as last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know anything about the story of last year, but I am advised by the engineer that this will complete the work.

Mr. BLAIN. What about the engineer's report last year ? Do I understand the minister to say that this vote will complete the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The engineer informs me that this will complete the work. The total expenditure will be $20,000.

Port Hood—repairs, $1,500.

Port Hood harbour—closing of northern entrance with brush and stonework, $20,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total expenditure on the Port Hood pier has been $61,855, and this $1,500 is asked by the local engineer for repairs. This is a large wharf which was taken over by the Dominion government from the provincial government.

Mr. CLARKE. There are two items for Port Hood and we had better consider them together.

Mr. KAULBACH. Is this large vote for the closing of the northern entrance to connect the island with the mainland ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is the proposition.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the object of all this expenditure ?

Mr. McLENNAN. The $1,500 is for the repairs of the government wharf inside the harbour. The harbour of Port Hood, some 50 or 60 years ago, was one of the best harbours in eastern Nova Scotia, and was the home of the American fishing fleet, when there was a treaty of reciprocity between the United States and Canada. On many occasions about 300 sail would take shelter in Port Hood harbour, coming in from the storms of the gulf of St. Lawrence. About

sixty or seventy years ago Smith's Island which is about a mile from the coast, was connected with the mainland by a narrow sandy beach, including a sheet of water about two miles long and a mile wide, constituting the harbour of Port Hood. At that time it was an excellent harbour of refuge. But this narrow beach was at first broken up slightly by the waves, and a small channel was formed through it, which has continued from that day to this, though the waters of the gulf of St. Lawrence beating in through it every year since have made it considerably wider. During that time the government of Nova Scotia had this wharf, upon which repairs are now to be made, built inside the harbour. At the time of confederation the Dominion government took over the wharf and made repairs and extensions to it. But owing to the breach in the beach to which I have referred, the sand began to pour in along the coast and right up against the government wharf, rendering a great portion of the harbour useless. I may say that where about sixty years ago the admiralty chart showed forty or forty-five feet of water in Port Hood harbour, there is not to-day over six or seven feet. That portion of the harbour which is exposed to the northwest wind is especially filling up badly with sand. Some years ago a coal mining company took hold of the coal areas just at the entrance to this harbour, within 300 or 400 yards of the water's edge. For about twenty years very little was done in developing this property. But about six or seven years ago, certain gentlemen from the cities of Toronto, Montreal and Halifax, took hold of this coal property, and built a shipping pier along the southern portion of this harbour, at an expense to the company of about $60,000. But it was found by experience that year after year, the northern entrance being open, the sand was pouring in and was not only injuring the shipping facilities around the government wharf, but was also reaching the company's pier at the southern entrance to the harbour. This company, then, in common with the public, are pressing upon the government the importance of having this northern entrance closed, if not altogether, at least partially in the meantime, and a sufficiently long pier built from the shore to keep out the sand, for a number of years at least. It is supposed by the local engineer, and it is also the opinion of the chief engineer, that as the pier is extended out the sand will bank up against it, and thus make it perfectly safe to have this entrance closed with work composed of brushwood and stone. I may say that the importance of this harbour was considered to be so great in the year 1878 that Sir Charles Tupper spoke of it in this House in the following words :

Mr. Tupper said he would like to ask the hon. the Minister of Public Works if the government had arrived at any conclusion with reference to a work of considerable importance in Nova Scotia, which had been under the consideration of the late government, and which had been brought to the notice of this government from time to time. He referred to the closing of the Port Hood harbour, Cape Breton.

Mr. CLARKE. Is this $20,000 all that will be required to make the obstruction to which the hon. gentleman has referred ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. To close this gap would be a very expensive work. As my hon. friend has said, this has grown to be a very important point. I will read a short extract from a report of the collector of customs there :

During the month of July, 1902, sixty-six sailing vessels reported inwards at this port. Forty-one of them subsequently reported outwards laden with coal from the Port Hood colliery. In August, sixty sailing vessels reported inwards, fifty-five of which took coal outwards. In September, sixty-one sailing vessels reported inwards, forty-eight taking coal outwards, and in October, all of the same year, thirty-five reported inwards, twenty-eight taking coal outwards. During the same months of 1902, eighty-two steamers reported inwards. During the present month the following large steamers loaded coal here and reported outwards : Greetlands, for Three Rivers, Que., 1,400 tons coal ; Congal, for Portland, Me., U.S.A., 2,000 tons coal ; Polino, for Quebec, 900 tons coal ; Eros, for Halifax, 1,450 tons coal ; also fourteen sailing vessels taking coal.

So that my hon. friend will see that a very large trade is being done there. But I may say that the engineers have looked into this subject very carefully, and they recommend this work, costing some $20,000, which they feel will afford great protection and relief to the harbour. A permanent dam would cost some $300,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Is this intended as the first vote towards a permanent work ; or is it merely a temporary expedient, as the hon. member for Inverness suggests ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot speak for the future, but the present intention is to do exactly what we are proposing. It may be more or less of an experiment, but the local engineers and the chief engineer think this work may obviate the necessity of the larger work. Of course, if the large work should have to be under taken, it will be necessary to ask for an appropriation for it, and to give full information with regard to it.

Mr. McLENNAN. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) is certainly mistaken if he thought I referred to this as a temporary work. I meant nothing of that kind. I meant that the work would be carried out piecemeal, and this would be a very fair beginning.

Mr. CLARKE. We are getting at the bottom of it now. What will a work of the

character proposed cost as compared with the more substantial work ?

Mr. McLENNAN. If I remember rightly, the estimate of the engineer was $150,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Is this the first vote towards the $150,000 for this brush and timber work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think the engineers consider that this work can be carried across the deep water, but they think it will afford great relief to the harbour.

Mr. CLARKE. I would prefer to assume my share of the responsibility of making a permanent work there at a cost of $300,000 rather than embark upon an expenditure that will run up to $150,000 and be only temporary in its character, requiring to be renewed perhaps in two or three years.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The experiment, if it is to be called such, is to cost $20,000. I stated most emphatically that in the future the work would have to be dealt with on its merits.

Mr. GOURLEY. Port Hood is going to be a very important shipping port, and if the government are going to spend money there it ought to be spent intelligently. The best means should be taken to formulate a plan and then spend the money according to it. Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann have opened up large coal seams, from which they will ship enormous quantities of coal, and the work should be done thoroughly.

Mr. McLENNAN. The engineer reported that the work could be easily carried out with brush and stone.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand that the engineer reported that the work would cost $150,000 ?

Mr. McLENNAN. The local engineer reported upon the various plans by which this work could be carried out. The cheapest was by brush and stone. Another plan was by crib-work and there was a third plan more expensive than either.

Mr. BLAIN. This $20,000 is to be expended in the manner recommended by the engineer, as a part of the $150,000 ?

Mr. McLENNAN. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. What are the prospects of trade at this point ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend was not here when I read from the report of the collector of customs, showing the very large trade. In the month of May there were shipped in steamers 5,650 tons of coal and fourteen sailing vessels besides were loaded at that port. A year ago in the month of August sixty vessels came into that port and fifty-five went out.

Mr. McLENNAN. I may say that one of the directors of that company is the Hon. George E. Foster, of Toronto, and if he did not consider it a prosperous concern, he would not have invested in it.

Mr. CLARKE. We will have to foster that industry.

Port Greville—extension of breakwater and repairs, $12,750.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to make provision for repairs on account of damage done by storms. The work will have to be let by contract. This harbour is in the county of Cumberland.

Port Howe—wharf, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to be a reconstruction by raising the old pier thirty feet. The total cost will be $2,000. This port is in Cumberland county. The work will be done under the direction of the local engineer. It consists of adding thirty feet to the old pier.

Port Latour—breakwater, $4,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Shelburne county.

Port George—repairs to main breakwater, &c., $2,100.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Annapolis county.

Mr. BLAIN. Was any money expended there last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, I have not the amount.

Mr. BLAIN. By contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Under the supervision of the engineer. It is just urgent repairs. These repairs were so necessary that I gave instruction to go on with them at once to prevent the whole work being destroyed.

Mr. BLAIN. There was an item last year of $2,300.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That was expended.

Port au Pique—wharf, $2,500.

Mr. GOURLEY. This work should be proceeded with promptly, because unless done in the fall it will be too late. You cannot get the work done in time in the spring to make it available at the season of the year when the people want it. I am very glad this item is in the estimates. I have been urging on the minister ever since I came here, to give us this work. We have forty or fifty miles of coast without a harbour, so that our people are compelled, in treacherous weather, to make for land without the slightest protection from being cast on the rocks. We want from ten to fifteen wharfs along that shore in the county of Colchester, and I hope the government will regard this

simply as a beginning. This work should be proceeded with at once in order that it may be completed in the winter in time for the spring navigation.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say that this item would not have been placed in the estimates had it not been that it was necessary that instructions should be given for the work to go on at once.

Port Maitland—extension of buttress on seaward side western breakwater shorewards, $1,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Yarmouth county; we are building 21,600 cubic feet of cribwork towards the shore.

Scott's Bay—extension of breakwater, &c., $2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in King's county, and is for the carrying out of desirable improvements in the harbour of Scott's Bay, in accordance with the estimates of the engineer. There is to be an extension of the south breakwater, 50 feet, $1,300; raising south breakwater 3 feet, $200; extension of north breakwater, $400; and contingencies, $100, making altogether $2,000, the total cost of the improvement.

Swim's Point wharf—extension of, &c., $1,600.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is the extension of some works in Shelburne county.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why is it necessary to extend the wharf?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. To afford accommodation for the south shore steamships. This is a new service that has been established there, and the department is doing this so that these steamships can land at this wharf.

Mr. BLAIN. Is any of this money being expended on private property, or is the property generally owned by the government?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. So far as the information I received from the chief engineer of the department goes, none of these appropriations are being spent on private property. In any case where such property was not vested in the Crown, I have given instructions that it should be acquired before any appropriation was made. As I have said, the number of items is very large, but a great many of these are for urgent repairs to protect our own property. With a very few exceptions, no new works are being undertaken that are not completed by the amount here appropriated. Thus, although the amount is something like $300,000, we are not committing the country to any large undertaking, except two or three works that cannot be completed this year, as I have already explained.

Mr. GOURLEY. My complaint is that all your votes are trifling. I want you to know that we in Nova Scotia are not going to put up with these little trifling votes of $300. You are not dealing with the public service of Nova Scotia in a liberal and decent way, especially in regard to harbours. The whole of Nova Scotia is practically a harbour; the people are scattered around on the coasts in little villages, and the only means of communication with Halifax and other cities in summer is by boat, and therefore these small harbours are necessary. Otherwise, the fishermen would run the risk of having their boats thrown on the rocks without any protection. My charge is that you do not grasp the situation at all. The country in the early days got into the way of dealing with little dribblets in the maritime provinces, but henceforth we are not going to put up with that treatment, but will demand liberal and just expenditures. There are a number of items, but they aggregate only $300,000 when they should be nearer $3,000,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. Address your remarks to the opposition.

Mr. GOURLEY. I am addressing the government. They should find out that every item is for some beneficial purpose. I am charging them, as the government of the country, responsible for dealing with this whole service, with doing so in a niggardly manner. I want to enter my protest against the niggardly way in which the whole public service in respect to wharfs in Nova Scotia is being dealt with.

Mr. BLAIN. Did I understand the minister to say that the money is not being expended on private property in any of these cases?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is my information. Some cases of that kind came under my notice, and before I recommended an appropriation I asked that the proper steps be taken by the Justice Department to vest the property in the Crown.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In any cases where money was being expended on property which was not the property of the Crown, would it not be the duty of the minister to inform the House of that fact?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I fully agree with that statement, and, as I have said, in the one or two cases of the kind that has occurred I insisted that the property should be vested in the Crown.

Mr. BLAIN. What cases were these?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. One is the case where $25,000 were spent on property which was vested in the Dominion Coal Company, and the other case, which has slipped my memory, was dealt with yesterday.

Skinner's Cove—boat channel and protective works, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Digby county, and the total cost of the work is estimated at $10,500.

Sydney quarantine station—extension of, and repairs to wharf, $3,050.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is done at the request of the Quarantine Branch of the Agriculture Department.

Summerville wharf—addition, $1,600.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why is it necessary to make the addition ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Hants county. The wharf is now 300 feet long and 9 feet wide. The engineer reports that by adding a block we will render it safe for the steamer which calls regularly at this wharf. The water at present is not deep enough.

Spry Bay—wharf, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Halifax county and is a new work.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister say how much the property cost, and when it was transferred to the Crown ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We do not anticipate that we will have to pay anything for the site.

Tenecape—breakwater, $7,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Hants county.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman explain that ? It is a pretty large item.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is called for by the engineer in a report of January 9, 1902. It is at the mouth of the Tenecape river. It will reach a depth of twenty-four and a half feet at high water in ordinary spring tide. The proposed structure is to be 200 feet in length. The nearest railway station is thirteen miles away. Most of the trading is done by water, the nearest wharf being six miles distant. The proposed breakwater will give ample protection to shipping, and afford suitable facilities for landing. It serves the purpose of a wharf as well as a breakwater. The work will be let by contract.

Victoria beach—wharf, $25,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a somewhat expensive work. The engineer reports that it is to construct a deep water pier on the north side of the Annapolis basin, two miles across Digby Gut. It extends from the shore in a southerly direction, a distance of 734 feet. It is primarily intended to serve the purpose of a railway terminal and shipping pier, and also for schooners and small craft. I do not think the railway is altogether completed, but it will be completed during the present season. The total cost of the work is estimated to be $74,000.

Mr. COPP. I would ask the minister if this work is to be commenced before the completion of the railway. I am very doubtful if the railway will ever be built, and if built, I am still more doubtful whether it will ever be operated. I think it would be wise for the government to wait until the road is built. The road has not been commenced yet from Bridgetown to Victoria Beach, a distance of 30 miles.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am somewhat of the opinion of my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Copp). I doubt very much if the railway will ever be built, and I think the Minister of Public Works would be acting unwisely were he to expend this immense amount of money in the construction of a public pier before he is very certain that the railway will be built beyond this point.

Mr. LOGAN. I am sorry that I cannot agree with either my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Copp) or my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach). This pier will be built at the terminus, not of a road 30 miles long, but at the terminus of a system of railways operated by the firm of Mackenzie & Mann in the province of Nova Scotia. They are building a road from Yarmouth to Halifax along the south shore, and have purchased what is known as the Nova Scotia Central Railway. They have also purchased this property known as the Victoria Beach Railway, so when this road is built to Victoria Beach, it will be one of the termini of their system of railways in the province of Nova Scotia. I do not think myself there is any question but that this road will be built, and if built it will be necessary to build this wharf and pier, not only for the purpose of the railway but for the purpose of the general public.

Mr. KAULBACH. I do not wish to speak disparagingly of the road, but I have an opinion, judging from the geography of that portion of the province, that a road may be built from Middleton down to Granville, opposite the town of Annapolis. When they reach that, I think they will hesitate before they go down along the basin to Victoria Beach. For that reason I think it would be wisdom on the part of the government not to build the pier until they decide definitely whether that railway will ever be built.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Representations were made to me that there was no doubt about this railway being completed almost immediately. I have no reason to think that there ever was any doubt about the parties being able to complete that work. I understand the member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) states now the road is in the hands of a very strong company who are building several hundred miles of railway, and that it is their in-

tention to complete this work at once. But having these statements before me I shall certainly be careful before spending the money. Representations have been made to me that the road is necessary for the development of the country and for the shipping, and I have put this allowance in the estimates, but the money will not be spent before I am satisfied beyond doubt that this road will be completed.

Mr. KAULBACH. I have no doubt in regard to the ability of Messrs. Mackenzie and Mann to build the road, but I have doubt as to whether they will build the road from Granville opposite Annapolis to Victoria beach.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Victoria beach was the objective point of the original western railway construction in Nova Scotia. The original construction was proposed from Halifax to Victoria beach. Later the road was diverted in another direction, but I think Victoria beach has always been in the minds of the people in that region as the objective point, so that it is really taking up what is a very old project. The road was in the hands of some gentlemen in Montreal of good standing and there is no reason to doubt that they would have carried it out but I was advised recently that they had made an arrangement for the sale of the road to Messrs. Mackenzie and Mann by means of which arrangement the road runs down through Lunenburg.

Mr. COPP. The road is already built from Lunenburg to Middleton, and this is an extension from Middleton to Victoria beach. I do not want to be understood as opposing this grant, but I have a doubt whether the road will ever be built from Bridgetown to Victoria beach, and I think it would be wise for the hon. minister to satisfy himself as to whether the road will be built before this breakwater is commenced.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How far is Victoria beach from Annapolis ?

Mr. COPP. Seventeen miles down the Granville shore.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is on the Annapolis basin.

Mr. KAULBACH. I remember the history of Victoria beach. There was no railway down to Digby. Since then the railway has been built from Annapolis to Digby and this road is a parallel one on the opposite side of the river. I have no objection to the road on that account at all. I did not express myself as opposed in any way to the grant, but it would only be wisdom on the part of the government to ascertain if this road is going to be extended beyond the town of Annapolis before undertaking this expenditure.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the intention in regard to the wharf when it is constructed ? Is it to be used simply in connection with the railway or for other purposes ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is to be a government wharf under the direction of the Department of Marine and Fisheries and will be for shipping and for the use of the general public.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will you have trains running down on it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is the intention.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Trains run on the wharf at Digby now, but it is still a government wharf.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that if the road is not constructed the hon. minister will not go on with the wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have said most distinctly that unless I was perfectly satisfied of the representations made to me that I would not feel warranted in going on with that work. I will inquire and be satisfied beyond doubt as to that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the road in course of construction ?

Mr. COPP. Not from Bridgetown down. It is between Bridgetown and Middleton only.

Wallace harbour—improvements and repairs, $4,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Cumberland county. These are two extensions of the ferry landings at Wallace harbour, to cost $4,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose this work will be done under the supervision of the engineer ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Wentworth—wharf, $3,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Hants county. This is to make provision for the construction of a crib-work wharfing 120 feet long by 20 feet wide. The total cost is estimated to be $3,500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this a new work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it to be constructed by tender or how ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a new work and I would be in favour of letting it by tender.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are you so strongly in favour of it that you will do it in that way ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am so strongly in favour of it that I will do it in that way unless the engineer reports to me any reason why it should not be done in that way. If it were merely repair work there might be some justification for not doing it by contract, but where it is a new work it is very much more satisfactory to me at all events to do it by contract.

Mr. KAULBACH. While referring to this item, I would ask the hon. minister if he is aware that the Tancook breakwater, which was repaired some two years ago, but which was very imperfectly repaired, requires attention ? I do not see any vote for it. It is sadly in need of repair in consequence of the work being imperfectly done. The piles placed there were too short and the ice and tide have lifted the breakwater up and destroyed it to such an extent that it is all but useless. I want to know why there has been no vote in the estimates for this breakwater.

THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The matter was not brought to my notice and the chief engineer says he has had no report from the local engineer. He has taken a memorandum and will make inquiry to-morrow.

Mr. KAULBACH. Representations were made, I am sure of that.

West Bay—wharf (revote, $2,000), $3,300.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total estimated cost of this work is $3,300.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What county is this in ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Richmond county.

West Arichat—breakwater, $700.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Richmond county, and it is for general repairs.

Wedge Point—extension of breakwater, $4,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Yarmouth county. The estimated cost is $4,500.

Wolfville—wharf repairs, $2,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in King's county.

White's Cove—improvements to breakwater, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Digby county.

West Chezzetcook—breakwater, repairs, $3,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Halifax county.

Mr. BLAIN. Will this complete the work ?

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). The present breakwater is ineffective, and this is to extend it in order that the harbour may not be stopped up by sand which accumulates there at present. This work will give more force to the current.

Yarmouth bar—repairs, &c., $1,500.

Mr. KAULBACH. Has the minister any idea of what the harbour of Yarmouth has cost for dredging and so forth.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total expenditure according to the memo. of the chief engineer is $117,476.

Mr. KAULBACH. It must be more than that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That would not include the dredging. As I did not expect the question to be asked. I cannot speak with certainty.

Mr. KAULBACH. The dredging has been going on from year to year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I know that there are a great many demands for dredging. It is hoped that we may be able to get a dredge which will not only do the work in Yarmouth, but in other places in Nova Scotia.

Mr. KAULBACH. Lunenburg, I suppose.

Beach Point, P.E.I.—widening boat channel through bar, $900.

Mr. HACKETT. What is the explanation of this item ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is to be applied to widening and deepening the channel. There is a good basin inside, affording a shelter for boats, but it cannot be reached at low water without inconvenience and loss of time. The total cost of the work is nine hundred dollars odd.

Mr. HACKETT. What depth of water will there be when this is completed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Five feet at low water.

Mr. HACKETT. How wide will the channel be ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Twenty-eight feet.

Canoe Cove—breakwater, repairs, &c., $500.

Mr. HACKETT. How does it come that this breakwater, which was only completed last year, requires repairs now ?

Mr. LEFURGEY. There were $3,000 spent on it last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is very hard for me to explain why these breakwaters require so much repairs to keep them up. These are examined by the engineer and on the report that he makes, the department prepares these estimates. Probably it would be on account of the heavy weather and storms.

Mr. HACKETT. What part requires repairs ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The first section of 100 feet has been badly damaged.

Mr. HACKETT. Carried away by the storms ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think it has all been carried away.

Cape Traverse or Carleton Head—survey, $3,000.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Would the minister explain what has been done in regard to this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In the House and out of it, many representations have been made to the department in regard to the winter service there, and I thought it would be wise to take a small vote to have a survey made. The report of that survey must be of service to the country. I ask for this vote in order to have a survey made by some competent officer.

Mr. LEFURGEY. There was a survey made there last winter.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Who made that survey ?

Mr. LEFURGEY. Mr. Egan, the resident engineer, and he had several assistants. It is about time that report was before the House.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A report was made, but the chief engineer of the department was not altogether satisfied with the information furnished, and he thought there should be some further evidence from an expert with regard to this matter, before any expenditure was undertaken. The expenditure will be very large and the hon. gentleman representing the province will admit that it is important that we should have all the information that can be obtained with regard to this matter. I am personally in favour of doing something in the direction of meeting the wishes of the people of Prince Edward Island for a better service but with the difference of opinion that exists, the minister is at a loss to know what to recommend. I am sure the committee will agree, that it would be money well spent to gather whatever information can be obtained by an expert.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I am pleased to hear the remarks of the minister, but I would remind him that a survey was made there in 1894. The then chief engineer of the department resident at St. John made a very satisfactory report on a pier for Carleton Point. The report is a lengthy one, and the engineer recommends in the strongest language possible the establishment of a pier at Carleton Point for the winter service.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Does my hon. friend remember what the estimated cost of that work would be ?

Mr. LEFURGEY. It was somewhat in the neighbourhood of a million dollars I believe. It is not the cost we are talking about now, but the desirability of fulfilling the terms of union by giving us a pier at Carleton Point for the winter service. I do not want to go into the history of Prince Edward Island navigation just now, but I may say that it has been demonstrated, that Carleton Point is the best place to which the boats can ply during the winter. It is now ten years since the first survey was made when the engineer of the government recommended that a pier should be built there, and it is too bad that we should have to wait so long for that report to be carried out. The minister says that the survey of last year was not suitable, and now we are to have a third survey.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say the survey was not suitable, but I do say that a difference of opinion exists, and the department wishes further information.

Mr. LEFURGEY. At all events we have had to wait nine years for the government to fulfil the terms of union by establishing a pier at this point, and now we do not know how much longer we shall have to wait. I trust that the hon. Minister of Public Works who I know is desirous of giving the island the best facilities for winter transportation, will take this matter thoroughly in hand and not let it drop until he finds that this is the proper place, and has the work pushed forward with speed.

Mr. HACKETT. I simply desire to emphasize the remarks made by the hon. member for East Prince. The hon. Minister of Public Works will remember that in the early part of this session, some five or six months ago, we waited upon him in his office and presented him with a petition signed by a large number of the people in all parts of Prince Edward Island, asking for the construction of a pier at Carleton Point, in order that the terms of confederation might be carried out, and that communication might be maintained between the island and the mainland during the winter season. The hon. minister received us very kindly, as he always does, and assured us that he would give the matter his best consideration. Now, the only consideration he gave us is to place $3,000 in the supplementary estimates to pay the cost of the survey carried on during last winter.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, my hon. friend is mistaken. It is all very well to blame the minister, but my hon. friend knows that I gave this matter a good deal of attention. There was so much difference of opinion between the engi-

neers and the people of the locality that I am taking this vote in order to try to get information which we have not now in the department.

Mr. HACKETT. I remember that when I crossed from Cape Traverse to Cape Tormentine in the month of March last, Mr. Higgins was on the ice with two or three assistants making a survey. Has his report reached the department, and if so, what is the result of it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, the report has been received.

Mr. HACKETT. And what does he estimate the cost of this work at ? The very life of the province depends on its means of communication with the outside world, and we want to be frank and plain with each other in this connection.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The cost estimated by Mr. Higgins is something like $1,300,000 for building a pier at Carleton Head.

Mr. HACKETT. I would ask the minister why he does not place an amount in the estimates for the construction of this pier ? Does he think that too large an amount to expend for the purpose of maintaining communication with the province of Prince Edward Island ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know that I do. If I had as much trouble proportionately to put it through as I have to put through a total of $300,000 for the maritime provinces, somebody else would probably think it too much. However, speaking seriously, my hon. friend will admit that if a better plan can be got at less cost, there is no reason why I should not get it; and if the engineer tells me that this work can be done on a different plan at less cost, I think I am justified in spending a little money to make inquiry into it.

Mr. HACKETT. The hon. gentleman speaks about $300,000 for the maritime provinces. What is he doing for Prince Edward Island ? Simply giving $31,000 for harbours and rivers. The total is $66,800, with revotes amounting to $35,000, making in all a new vote of $31,800 for the province of Prince Edward Island. He surely cannot say that we are delaying the committee very much when we insist on having more done than this. He is spending large sums of money in other provinces, and we must insist, as long as we are here representing the people of Prince Edward Island, on our rights being carried out. I trust that the hon. minister will see his way clear to bring down another supplementary estimate, in which we shall find the sum of $1,300,000 to build this pier at Carleton Point.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Did the engineer recommend Carleton Point for the construction of this pier and breakwater ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Instead of answering that question, I would prefer giving my hon. friend a copy of the engineer's report.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would be very much obliged if the minister would give us a copy of the report.

Mr. HACKETT. Will the minister kindly bring down the report and lay it on the Table of the House ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, I shall be pleased to do so.

Cove Head harbour—improvement of entrance channel, $1,900.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work is under contract, and this vote is to pay the balance due.

Higgin's shore—repairs to pier, $1,000.

Mr. HACKETT. This is in the riding which I have the honour to represent, and on a previous occasion I showed the hon. minister that these repairs to the shore pier are no good. Is it his intention to make further repairs, or to build a new pier at that place ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I dare say that the construction of a new pier might be more satisfactory; but our engineer reports that these repairs will make the pier very satisfactory.

Mr. HACKETT. We have already voted $1,000 in the main estimates for repairs to this pier, and I represented to the hon. minister on that occasion that they would be of no service at all. In the month of March last, previous to coming to Ottawa, I attended a meeting of the electors of that section, who agreed, almost unanimously, Liberals and Conservatives alike, that there would be no benefit whatever from spending money in repairs to the old pier, but that a new pier should be constructed about 100 yards east of the old one; and they forwarded a petition to the department to that effect. With the $1,000 voted in the main estimates and the $1,000 in the supplementary estimates, you could make a good start on a new pier, instead of throwing away money on the old pier.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think the hon. gentlemen brought this matter to my attention before, and I asked for a report from the engineer, and that report is the basis for this vote. I think my hon. friend had better allow the item to pass, and I will reconsider the matter and ask for a further report.

Mr. HACKETT. At the meeting I attended, Senator Yeo was present and he agreed with me. The Hon. James Richards, who is a member of the local executive, also attended that meeting and all agreed that there should be a new pier, and that

it would be a waste of money to spend anything more on the old pier.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will have a further examination made.

Lewis Point pier, P.E.I.—repairs, $1,100.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in King's county.

New London harbour—improvement to entrance to Clifton and French river, $4,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. According to the report of Mr. Simpson, engineer, the channel is obstructed by a bar, and since the dredging done in 1900, quite a change has taken place. The construction of a break-water dam will give sufficient depth of water.

North Cardigan—extension, $4,000.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What is wrong with the present pier ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The object of this is to get greater depth of water and furnish better shipping facilities.

Point Prim—wharf, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to be applied to the construction of a wharf 1,000 feet long and 20 feet wide, 6 feet deep at low water and 15 feet at high water. The cost will be $15,000.

Richmond Bay—reconstruction of wharf near Grand river ferry, $1,500.

Mr. HACKETT. Has this wharf fallen into decay or been neglected by the government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for general repairs. The engineer reports that the works are required.

Mr. HACKETT. I would suggest that instead of reconstructing the wharf at Grand River ferry, the government should build a bridge across the Grand river. We have this afternoon passed a vote for the purpose of opening up a highway in the province of Nova Scotia between the main road and the pier. It is only a short distance between the Grand river and the wharf on the one side, and the pier on the other side, about one-eighth of a mile. I think that the government, instead of going on repairing the wharf in this way should build a bridge across the Grand river, and allow the people living in lots 12, 13 and 14 an opportunity of crossing over and doing their business in summer time instead of going around eight or ten miles by the upper bridge.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will have that suggestion brought to the attention of the engineer, and a report made with regard to it.

Summerside—breakwater (revote), $35,000.

Mr. LEFURGEY. We have had this matter up quite a number of years and it is getting to be an old story. I find in the votes in 1898, $30,000 for Summerside break-water ; in 1899, $3,000 ; in 1900, $20,000 ; in 1901, $20,000 ; in 1902, $35,000 ; and now we have another $35,000. In votes and revotes, we have had $108,000 voted for Summerside breakwater. I would like to ask how much money has been expended on it, and how much work done.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I would say that $3,388 have been paid out on account of this contract, and about 250 feet of the breakwater built. In 1900 a contract was let, but for some reason the contractor has not been going on for some time with the work. I have not had time personally to take this matter up, and I am asking for a revote until I have had an opportunity of investigating and considering it. The intention is to go on with the work, but if the circumstances are as represented, it would be better to cancel the contract, and call for new tenders.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I think there has been ample time to do that. The work has been suspended over a year. Have the government taken steps to investigate whether this contract will be carried out or not ? The department has had correspondence from the contractors claiming that from the nature of the contract the plans submitted were not practicable, and they could not carry them out in ten years, with continuous work during workable days. It is claimed that the contract was stopped because the stones were not suitable, but I find that some of the correspondence between the engineer on the island and the engineer in Ottawa is conflicting on that point. The contract calls for a stone that is sound and of good durable quality, suited to resist the effects of the exposure and subject at all times to the approval or rejection of the engineer. The engineer did not reject the stone on the breakwater and the work went on for some time until an engineer came from Ottawa and condemned the stone. Then the contractors refused to go on with the contract, because the stones that had been passed by the engineer in charge of the work had been condemned by the engineer from Ottawa. It seems improper to me that a work which the government found desirable in 1898 should on every occasion be used for election purposes. In 1898, when I was running a by-election they published this big poster, and distributed it around the town :

HURRAH FOR BETTER TIMES.

Work ! Work !

And plenty of it this winter for the working men of Summerside and Outsiders as well.

The work at the breakwater goes on and the 'Stanley' is guaranteed to come to Summerside to test the feasibility of the Summerside and Cape Tormentine route.

An Outlay of $5,000 in cash Monthly.

Hurrah again for good times for Summerside.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is the manner in which the public works which the government apparently found necessary are being exploited for party purposes, and I would say to the hon. minister that if it is the intention of the government to go on with this work, if it is found necessary or advisable to get the sand out of the harbour and to give a good deep channel and also to create a current through the passage in order to break up the ice and make the harbour an outlet for a longer time each year, I cannot see why it should be subjected to all of this waiting and foolery, and why it should be brought up on the eve of each election to be used for political purposes.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Does the hon. gentleman say that he does not approve of this work ?

Mr. LEFURGEY. I do not think that the hon. minister caught that from my words.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understood you to say : If it is thought to be advisable to go on with it.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I am not the engineer; I am not supposed to dictate to the engineers whether a work is advisable and should be carried on.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understood that this work is being pressed for in the public interest and not for political purposes and I was asking the hon. gentleman if he thought it is a work that should be gone on with.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I am simply stating that if the work is found necessary by the government it should not be used as a humbug for political purposes but should be pressed forward with all possible vigour. This matter has been up since 1898 and if it is a necessary work—and I presume it must have been or the government would not have undertaken to spend $50,000 or $100,000 on it—the contract should be gone on with and if it is not it should be condemned by the engineer and a new contract made.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot offer much explanation of the conduct of this work from 1898 up to within a few months of the present date. The matter has been brought to my attention by the chief engineer. The parties interested live a long way off and I have not had time to go into this case fully. I had an idea the work was one of necessity and of advantage to this district, and it was my intention at the earliest possible moment to have this work renewed and pressed forward.

Mr. LEFURGEY. In answer to the hon. minister's question as to whether I consider it necessary I may say that if a proper breakwater was constructed across from Indian Head to the lighthouse at Summerside harbour you would possibly obtain a greater flow of current and not only keep the sand from choking the harbour, but also would be able to keep the harbour open for a longer time without its being blocked with ice. I may say that I have a letter from the contractors written in March about the time they abandoned the work in which they say :

Ottawa, March 18, 1902.

Hon. J. I. Tarte,
Minister of Public Works,
Ottawa.

Re Indian Head breakwater—Summerside harbour, P.E.I.

Sir,—We commenced the construction of this work in June last and completed but 250 feet by the end of the season, the length of the breakwater when completed will be 3,150 feet, the progress has been as we could reasonably do; we employed thirty men and had two steam tugs, a steam pile driver with steam derricks and four large lighters, besides two schooners carrying stone ; we met with this difficulty, that we could place the brush and stone only when wind was off the shore, and at low tide ; this prevented the completion of this work as rapidly as expected, in many instances the lighters loaded with stone remained for four or five days at a time in the harbour waiting for suitable weather and very low tide.

We could only work three hours some days and not more than five hours a day, this was because the tide interfered.

We have an expensive plant, and keeping the men employed but four or five hours a day and some days idle, it will take a considerable time to complete.

If there is any remedy that you can allow, such as a change, by substituting a timber core for the brush and piling in the interior without additional cost the difficulty would be overcome, and we could proceed with the work rapidly.

Awaiting your reply,

Yours respectfully,
(Sgd.) HUGH McDONALD.

That was in March 1902, and I think the department has had ample opportunity to investigate the case in time for the people to have had a definite reply and to have knowledge as to whether they would go on with the work at the opening of operations in the spring. I trust, now that the Minister of Public Works has the case in hand, that he will see that it is pushed forward thoroughly.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will endeavour to straighten it out.

Mr. HACKETT. How much has been expended on this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Between $3,000 and $4,000.

Mr. HACKETT. And we have had votes in this parliament for $108,000 for this work. This is simply deception on the part of the government. I hold in my hand the issue of the Charlottetown 'Patriot' of October, the 2nd, and it has here :

Summerside harbour, $35,000.

It gives the greatest praise to the government and to the government's supporters from the Island because of the great work they are doing. Here too we have pictures of Mr. MacKinnon who has not been here for a long time and whom we have almost forgotten and also of Mr. Hughes the hon. member for King's whom we are pleased to see here with us all the time. These pictures are placed in the paper for the purpose of deceiving the people with regard to this work. These are both excellent young men; I have no objection to their appearance in the papers, and apart from their being young and fine looking they are jolly good fellows as well. But it is a serious matter and I find here in that very paper the proposition that a revote of $35,000 is to be taken in connection with the Summerside breakwater. I remember very well, as my hon. friend from East Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) has said, when he was running his election in 1898, that his opponents, on scores of platforms, said that Summerside harbour would be made one of the finest harbours in Prince Edward Island, and that the government were going to make a large grant for that purpose.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Is that what beat him, because he advocated this breakwater ?

Mr. HACKETT. There is no doubt it elected his opponent on that occasion. But I can tell you that afterwards at a local election, when Mr. Desroches was running against Angus McMillan in Summerside, Mr. McMillan was elected by two votes, simply because he told the people of Summerside and that section of the country that if they supported him there would be a tremendous boom at Summerside and great works would be carried out. Yet for five years nothing has been done, and now we find that, on the eve of another election, for the purpose of deceiving the people again, this amount is put in the estimates below the pictures of the two hon. gentlemen who care not one snap about Summerside.

Mr. HUGHES (King's). If our hon. friends opposite are not in favour of this item, I would suggest that it be struck out. There are many places in the county I represent which would be glad to get this money, and where it could be usefully employed.

Mr. HENDERSON. If this item is struck out, then the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Hughes) must take the responsibility of it.

New Brunswick—Black Brook — additional wharf accommodation, $5,000.

Mr. GANONG. Perhaps the minister will give us some information with regard to this work.

Mr. HACKETT.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is asked for to afford wharf accommodation, which is urgently needed in the interest of a rapidly growing trade. A government wharf had been built, and an effort was made to acquire the land. The department and the owner of the property were widely apart as to the price. After some negotiations, a few months ago we came to a satisfactory arrangement, the papers have passed the Department of Justice, and the land is now the property of the Crown. This $5,000 is asked to make the settlement, and to make some addition to the wharf that has been acquired.

Mr. GANONG. Are we to understand that the government built a wharf there on somebody else's property without acquiring it, and now they are paying the forfeit by asking this parliament to vote $5,000 to settle up for some of their mistakes ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am afraid that is about the state of affairs.

Cape Tormentine—improvements, $10,000.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What improvements is it proposed to make at Cape Tormentine ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a large and important place, as my hon. friend knows. This vote is asked principally for stone work. I understand that the structure is in a bad state of repair, and unless something is done immediately great damage is likely to be done to this important work.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Is a new pier to be built outside ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for a terrace alongside the present work.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Are they going to extend the wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not under this vote. This is only for protection to the present work.

Campobello—breakwater at Wilson's beach (revote), $3,000.

Mr. GANONG. Perhaps the minister would tell us how much this work has already cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In round figures $30,000.

Mr. GANONG. Is this $3,000 presumed to finish it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. GANONG. How far has the work proceeded already ? Can any one get near it with a vessel ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work at present is 207 feet long, and

when the additional work is done it will be 455 feet long. I do not see that I have any reference to the depth of the water.

Mr. GANONG. This is one of the votes that we had some talk of before. Some hon. members might think that it is unwise in me to criticise it because it refers to my county. But, I will criticise it very freely because I think if this system were followed throughout the country instead of having a vote of $67,000,000 we would require a vote of $367,000,000 to meet the requirements of the country. Instead of letting this work by tender so as to give the fishermen of that district value for every dollar that is expended the government have undertaken to do the work themselves and we have got about $20,000 worth of work for an expenditure of $30,000. Nineteen tiers have been put where there is a 30 foot rise and fall of the tide and yet after two year's work a vessel cannot approach the work. The total excess expenditure there of $10,000 has been used simply to furnish some work for good supporters of the present government.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no information except what I have read from the report of the engineer. My hon. friend is a very shrewd business man. I am informed that the department have advertised for tenders and that they have not received one either from the hon. gentleman or any of his constituents offering to do this work. Therefore, I suppose they would have to do it under the supervision of the engineer.

Mr. GANONG. There was not much effort made in that direction. However, as we have discussed it before it is useless to waste the time of the committee.

Campbellton—wharf extension, repairs, &c., $10,000.

Mr. GANONG. Was there not some grant made in the main estimates for this same purpose ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, we have $15,000 in the main estimates. This is to extend the present wharf at Campbellton a distance of 300 feet. This additional vote includes the payment, when the sum is known, to Mr. Shive, for the property which was purchased from him.

Mr. GANONG. Is this another instance in which the government are building a wharf without obtaining the property from Mr. Shive ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I do not think this is a similar case. It was not necessary to purchase the whole property. Expropriation proceedings were taken, the property has been taken over and vested in the crown but the settlement has not been made. The amount in the estimates will pay for the property when the award is made and it will carry out the improvements proposed.

Mr. GANONG. Is this all a new work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total probable cost of this work is $35,000.

Mr. GANONG. That is not just the point I was after. This appears to be an extension simply of the wharf. There must have been an original wharf to be able to extend it. Was the title to the original wharf vested in the government ? Do they own the property ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that the crown do own the property upon which the new wharf has been built. They had not a title to the adjoining property which has since been taken over by expropriation.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why do the government want this additional property if they had the property on which to build the wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that there is quite a large amount of shipping done at this point. It was necessary to acquire this in the public interest and it was very much cheaper than to have extended our own property.

Mr. COCHRANE. What I understand by the extension of a new work is that you extend it out into the ocean. Why do you want more land ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not so in this case, and we are not requiring any more land at all. There was a wharf built alongside the government wharf but it was found insufficient for the trade of the place. Being alongside of the government wharf it was purchased and united with the government wharf so as to make one large wharf to furnish the necessary facilities for this port.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why does the wharf want to be so wide that you should buy more land ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are not buying more land.

Mr. COCHRANE. If you are expropriating what are you expropriating ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Part of this wharf may be on a water lot. The wharf was acquired and the land with it.

Mr. COCHRANE. You have bought a wharf and then you have extended it.

Mr. EMMERSON. It was built years ago.

Mr. COCHRANE. We don't want to go back into ancient history. We are talking about what we are doing now.

Chatham—slip for lightship, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work was undertaken on the representations of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. It was represented that it would effect a large saving to the country if lightships could be taken in there, repaired and then taken out early in the spring.

Cocagne—wharf, compensation to Captain Antoine Arsenault of the schooner 'Morning Star' for damages to his vessel resulting from the failure of a defective mooring post, $250.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the explanation of this item ?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Who owns the schooner ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for damage done to a schooner owned by Captain Antoine Arsenault. This vote is asked for on the report of the officials of the department. I have no doubt it is a fair settlement of the damage.

Mr. GANONG. Do the government take the position that they are liable for all these troubles ? They might become liable for a buoy getting displaced ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not lawyer enough to tell my hon. friend how he will collect any claim against the government, but I always have taken the stand that if the government representing the country is responsible for anything it should be in very much the same position as any honest man would be. It should settle any claim that is a proper one ?

Mr. COCHRANE. How could the captain of this vessel have any claim against the government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He claimed that on account of some negligence in connection with the government works this schooner was damaged. The claim was for $500 but it was compromised at $250 by the officials.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where was the mooring post ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At Cocagne.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Occasionally vessels have got into trouble in the locks and mooring posts have given way but in every case the government have claimed this was the fault of the vessel because of too heavy a strain being put on the post. This now forms a precedent for other vessels in the case of accidents of this kind happening in the canals. This establishes a very serious precedent for the future.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think so.

Mr. COCHRANE.

Mr. GANONG. This has the appearance of having a friend at court, and the country will view it in that light.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The precedent now established by the minister renders the government liable to this sort of damages for all time to come.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is an exaggeration to say that it will be a precedent. I do not see why the government should not be liable for damages the same as any one else. I have no personal knowledge of this ; it was referred to the officials and they reported in favour of paying it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I agree with the minister that when the government causes damage they should be responsible, but as I understand it, such a case as this should be referred to the Exchequer Court. Has this matter been referred to the Department of Justice for an opinion, or why did it not go to the Exchequer Court ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a small matter, and the hon. gentleman knows that it would be cold justice to ask the claimant to go to the courts. I do not think he would have much left by the time he got his $250 damages. I have confidence in the officers of the department to which this matter was referred, and I believe they must have been satisfied that there was a just claim for this amount.

Mr. COCHRANE. If a private individual owned a wharf and if a vessel came up to it to load or unload, does the minister think that if a storm came and the vessel sustained damage, the private individual would be liable ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not a lawyer, but if the hon. gentleman asks me what would be fair between man and man, I would say that if the owner of the boat paid his fee—and I have heard complaints that the wharfage fees are pretty high on the lakes—and if the mooring posts were not sufficient, I imagine that the owner of the wharf would be liable. However, I do not care to offer an opinion on that.

Mr. GANONG. What revenue is derived from this wharf or is it a free wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand it is a free wharf.

Mr. GANONG. Then we give this man the use of the wharf, free, and pay him for tearing it to pieces.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I am not objecting to the amount of this vote, but I object to paying this amount when you compel other people to go to the Exchequer Court for claims just as small. If there is a dispute about expropriation it has to go to the Exchequer Court.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is in a case where the officers will not recommend payment.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I object to this because it forms a precedent to which the government is bound for all time.

THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, no.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I certainly think it will.

Mr. GANONG. Here is a case in which the wharf is given free of charge, and if a man ties his vessel up to it, and takes all the advantages of that wharf free of charge, you pay him if he sustains any damage.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There are many cases of this kind in which the government has not paid damages. Suppose a vessel is loaded with a valuable cargo, and that the cargo is damaged, would not the government on the same principle be liable for a large amount to compensate for the cargo? I am afraid that the government has done an unwise thing in establishing this precedent.

Dalhousie harbour—improvements, $10,000.

THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to make improvements at this wharf so that ships may receive cargoes of lumber direct, without the necessity of using lighters.

Mr. CLARKE. What will be the total cost of this work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The probable total cost is estimated by the engineer at $40,000.

Mr. GANONG. Is this the first amount that has been voted?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Dipper harbour—breakwater, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is asked by the chief engineer to make provision for the construction of a protection breakwater 235 feet long, 44 feet wide on top, and reaching to a depth of 32¾ feet high water in spring tide. The new work is to be built on the site occupied by the old pier on the western side of the harbour. The foundation of the new breakwater has already been partly prepared, and the work is to be done by contract. Its total cost is estimated to be $25,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Was any money expended at this point last year?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am informed that there was not.

Hopewell Cape wharf—repairs, &c., $5,800.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete the work under contract. The amount of the contract is $19,998.

Mr. BLAIN. When was this contract let?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On the 8th of October, 1900, to be completed on the 8th of October, 1901.

Mr. BLAIN. Was it completed?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, it has only been completed recently.

Miscou harbour—wharf, $5,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Is this a new wharf, and will this complete?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a new work, and this vote is to commence it. The total estimated cost is $11,850.

Mr. BENNETT. What county is it in?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Gloucester county.

Mr. BENNETT. Is there any village at the place, and what object is to be served by the construction of the dock?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is an island on which there are about seventy houses and eleven lobster factories. The population is estimated at about 500. The occupation of the people is mostly fishing. Farming is carried on to some extent.

Mr. BENNETT. And is the government going to build a $11,000 dock on an island where there are only 500 people? Does anybody contribute anything towards the cost of the dock?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As there are eleven lobster factories, there must be considerable commerce.

Mr. BENNETT. If the trade is sufficient to warrant the construction of a dock, why do not the people in the business construct it?

North Head breakwater wharf, Grand Manan, $10,000.

Mr. GANONG. Perhaps the minister will advise us as to how large a work he purposes at Grand Manan?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a pretty extensive work. The total cost, as estimated by the engineer of the department is about $91,000.

Petit Rocher—breakwater, $6,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Is this a new work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, this is a new work. This vote is to make provision for the construction of a breakwater 350 feet long. The total cost is estimated at $27,400.

Mr. BLAIN. What county is this in?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Gloucester county.

Pointe du Chêne—repairs to breakwaters, $4,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote is to make good damage done to the works caused by a storm last January, and to protect other breakwaters with stone ballasting.

Richibucto harbour—extension of north pier (revote), $3,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to pay the balance of the contract, which completes the work.

Mr. GANONG. May I ask if any report has been made as to the cost of dredging at St. Andrews ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say that a report has been asked for, but has not yet reached the department.

Amherstburg, Ont.—dredging, $15,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is rather an expensive and important work. It has been under discussion for some time. It is estimated that it can be carried out for $45,000, and I am asking for a vote of $15,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What is the general traffic at Amherstburg ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a very large amount of shipping there, and considerable amount of difficulty is found on the Canadian side in competing with the Americans, who have spent a good deal on improvements on their harbours.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the government dredge been working there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, this is for next season, and we intend trying to improve the facilities of the harbour.

Mr. BLAIN. There was an item voted last year, was it not expended ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, there were many difficulties about carrying on the work. We have adopted a plan by which I think we can, for the amount I have stated, do some good work for the harbour.

Blind river wharf—addition of head block, $3,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Is there any revenue at all from this dock? It is in the district of Algoma, I believe. What was the original cost of the dock ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $9,310. The wharf has not been completed and handed over to the Marine Department yet, so that there is no revenue. I understand that the country is developing fast.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Where is this river ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is eighty miles east of Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. BLAIN. Was there not money expended there last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contract was completed and the total cost was some $9,000.

Barry's Bay, Madawaska river—wharf, $1,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to provide for a small wharf there. There is a great increase in mining going on there and quite a settlement. After looking into the matter carefully, I found that a small wharf would be a great accommodation for that section and a great convenience for the shipping and mining industries.

Mr. BLAIN. What representations were made to the department by the citizens ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A very important deputation, including the head of the mines there, waited on me; and on their representation, I looked into the matter and am satisfied that this is a very proper work.

Mr. BLAIN. Will this complete the work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. How will this be expended?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. By contract. I am letting the construction of all these small new works by contract.

Bracebridge—wharf, $5,800.

Mr. BENNETT. Will that complete that work, and does it include the purchase of a site, and is the town contributing anything?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in new Muskoka. I do not see any estimate made for the site, so I take it for granted that it is not costing anything.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the $5,800 complete the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It is a very necessary work. Bracebridge is an arm from Lake Muskoka. There is a great deal of summer traffic there. The wharf was one of the promises given in the recent election, but for all that it is a very necessary work.

Bronte harbour—improvements, $6,300.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete the work going on.

Mr. BLAIN. Is that private property or do the government own it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Bronte harbour is in Halton county. I have not the information here, but it never oc-

curred to me that it was not public property. A very considerable amount of money has been spent there. Probably my hon. friend knows. I will look into the matter. It never occurred to me that it is not public property.

Burlington channel piers—to complete works of renewal and repairs under contract (revote) $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is on account of work going on.

Mr. GOURLEY. Are these places to be found in the geography ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It connects with Burlington Bay, and is the entrance to Hamilton at the bar.

Mr. GOURLEY. We regard ourselves as the maritime part of the country, and we only get $313,000 for expenditure on harbours and rivers. But when we come to an inland country like Ontario, we find an expenditure of $142,000 more. I do not want to complain, because if every dollar is rightly asked, it is my duty to vote for the expenditure, whether it be in Ontario or Nova Scotia; but after hearing from the other side, during the past ten or twenty years, constant abuse for the voting of money to harbours in a really maritime province like Nova Scotia, it seems a want of politeness for Ontario to get a half a million dollars for wharfs and harbours in a purely inland country. I merely want to bring that to the notice of gentlemen opposite from Ontario who spoke so vigorously about Nova Scotia votes. If these items are necessary, I will be glad to vote for them, but I hope that this talking about Nova Scotia or British Columbia votes, simply because these provinces are at the extremities of the Dominion, will cease. If they do not we will have to criticise items in Ontario. There must be absolute reciprocity in this matter. The only inquiry that should be made by members of this House is : Is it necessary and in the interests of Canada as a whole.

Mr. INGRAM. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Gourley) but I wish to call his attention to the fact that we want to have the same rule applied to all the provinces. We have fishermen in Ontario. They are not along side the sea it is true, but they are beside waters that are as important to us as the waters of any other province are to it. When we find fishermen in other districts of Canada having harbours provided for them out of public funds we think it is hardly fair that our fishermen, who have paid their license fees to this government and are now paying them to the Ontario government should be refused a small sum like $1,000 or $1,500 to make their harbours safe. We have then reason to complain and I do complain. The hon. gentleman states that in Nova Scotia they have harbour votes of $314,000. Let me remind him that one of our large counties in Ontario is nearly as large as Nova Scotia. I think that Nova Scotia is getting its share of harbour votes.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). How many harbours have you ?

Mr. INGRAM. I suppose as many as you have in Nova Scotia. If Nova Scotia is getting this money and it is properly expended there I am glad to hear it and I trust that it will be properly expended, but when we look at that expenditure we in Ontario are justified in pointing out that many ports, such as are helped in Nova Scotia, are not helped in Ontario.

Mr. HENDERSON. In connection with the vote for Burlington channel I wish to say a few words in answer to the hon. member for Nova Scotia who seems to think Ontario is getting more than its fair share. This is a work of great importance. Although it is called Burlington channel it is not in my county but it is very close to it ; it is the entrance to Hamilton from Lake Ontario. Vessels from Lake Ontario going into Hamilton harbour must pass through this Burlington channel. In the early days this channel was nearer to the south shore, but perhaps seventy-five years ago the government closed up the old channel and made this new channel. I believe the work was first constructed about 1825. It has, however, become very much out of repair ; in fact I think the government is making a sad mistake in not appropriating somewhere about $250,000 and making one complete job of the whole thing. By spending $10,000 this year and $25,000 next year I am afraid that this work will never be put in proper shape.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work was under contract just in the way that my hon. friend suggests and this extra amount of $10,000 is taken in the supplementary estimates in addition to $50,000 in that main estimate. This $10,000 is to be paid on account of the contract this year. The work is being carried on just in the way my hon. friend advises and I hope it will be completed early next season.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am quite sure that the money that has been appropriated during the last two or three years is not sufficient for the requirements and it will be necessary for the government to spend very considerably more to keep that channel open. It is an absolute necessity not only for the city of Hamilton but for the entire country around there that has its shipping interests bound up with the important city of Hamilton, that the channel should be kept open.

Cumberland wharf, $5,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is on the Ottawa river in Russell coun-

ty ; it is a new work and this is the estimate which the chief engineer thinks will complete the work.

Mr. BENNETT. How much has the municipality contributed to this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They have not contributed anything to it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What is the population ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I believe this is the only county on this river that has not one or more wharfs. The reeve called on me and I was perhaps a little weak, but I gave way. They have a large trade there. The place is about twenty miles from the city of Ottawa.

Mr. BLAIN. Has a site been procured ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The site will be given free.

Collingwood—improvements to harbour, $60,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In a general way this is to continue work that has been going on there in winding the channel from 110 to 220 feet principally by dredging.

Mr. BENNETT. To what width is it intended to widen the channel with this vote and will this complete the work ? The chief engineer tells me that this vote will go a long way towards completing work. It will make a bell shaped entrance of 300 feet long for the whole channel, 20 feet at low water.

Mr. BENNETT. $60,000 will make it a width of 200 feet all the way down ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is the estimate of the engineer.

Depot Harbour—breakwater, $20,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I see by the main estimates there were $75,000 and $25,000 more in subsequent estimates. Will the minister say what the total cost is likely to be, and how much has been spent already ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total cost is estimated in round figures at $195,000. In round figures about $60,000 has been spent, and $40,000 will complete the work.

Grand Bend—breakwater pier, &c., $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in the county of Lambton. A large deputation came to the department representing that this work was required, and that it would be a great convenience to a large population.

Mr. SHERRITT. What amount does the hon. minister propose to expend there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If we carry out the plan as formed by the engineer, the total work, bridge and all, will cost about $22,000.

Mr. SHERRITT. What will be the depth of water ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Twelve feet at low water. As soon as this vote is passed and the contract is let, the work will be commenced.

Goderich—breakwater off entrance to harbour, $20,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Representations have been made by the shipping interests that if a breakwater were built at Goderich that would become a first-class harbour. At present all the boats going up and down Lake Huron are forced to go to the American side when there is a storm, for want of a refuge. At present boats in a heavy sea have great difficulty in entering Goderich harbour. I was waited on personally by representatives of the shipping trade, who told me that if a breakwater was placed there it would be a great convenience and benefit to shipping. After consultation with the engineers, I came to the conclusion to make at first 200 feet as a trial, to see whether it would prove effectual and yield the benefits claimed by the representations made to me. This will only cost some $53,000. If it proves successful, we might extend the work. They asked for 1,700 feet, which would cost in the neighbourhood of $200,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What would be the depth of that 1,700 feet ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Twenty-five or thirty feet.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Would it not be cheaper to dig into the shore for your harbour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This matter has been taken up, not alone by the Goderich people, but by the large business and commercial interests of Ontario, especially from Toronto west, who represent in the strongest manner the importance of this work. I am asking for this vote of $20,000 for the purpose of making a trial of 200 feet of this breakwater. If it proves as successful as these gentlemen have represented, I am sure it will be a work much in the interest of Canada.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the total expenditure on Goderich harbour up to date ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This has nothing to do with the previous works. I know that a great deal of public money has been spent in Goderich on public works, but much of it, I fear has not been very useful for the want of this breakwater protection. I cannot at this moment give my hon. friend the amount expended by the Department of Public Works on the Goderich harbour. But this proposed work has nothing to do, except in an indirect way,

with any expenditure that has already been made on that harbour.

Mr. INGRAM. This is a serious question for the shipping interests in the town of Goderich. They have had breakwaters built there. I do not know whether they have been successful or not. Perhaps the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Holmes) could tell us where this breakwater is intended to be built.

Mr. HOLMES. I may supplement the information given by the Minister of Public Works. The chief object in making this breakwater is to make Goderich a harbour of refuge. There is no harbour of refuge on the shores of Lake Huron within 150 miles. It was originally intended that Goderich should be a harbour of refuge, but that idea has never been carried out. A number of lives have been lost during storms, simply because the vessels were unable to get in during a heavy sea. The purpose is to build a breakwater out into the lake 700 or 800 feet from the entrance of the harbour, whereby vessels could safely enter during a storm. No breakwater has ever been built in that direction, but only at the side of the river. Originally the piers ran in a south-westerly direction, but twenty-five or thirty years ago, at a very great cost, the engineer ran the piers out straight, which was a mistake, because they allowed the full force of the waves to come in. I may say also that the deputation which waited upon the hon. minister did not happen to be headed by the 'admiral,' as the hon. gentleman calls him. It happened to be headed by the mayor of Goderich, who is not a political supporter of my own. In addition to that, representations have been made to the government by the shipping men from all sections of the province of Ontario. A large quantity of grain has been handled at Goderich during the past year. They have ample water in the harbour for the largest lake-going vessels, and I believe that many vessels which find their way to Detroit and Buffalo would, if a suitable breakwater were provided, discharge their cargoes at Goderich. The depth of water is greater at Goderich than it is at the Lime Kiln crossing.

Mr. GOURLEY. What is the depth ?

Mr. HOLMES. In the neighbourhood of 21 feet.

Mr. GOURLEY. Is that a natural harbour ?

Mr. HOLMES. Yes, certainly. Strong representations have been made to the government in the interest of this breakwater. As a matter of fact the delegation asked for a much larger breakwater than is being provided, but it is expected that this one, built as an experiment, will demonstrate its utility and warrant its extension later on.

Mr. GOURLEY. How is this breakwater to be built—on solid masonry?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My intention was, if found practicable, to advise the building of this breakwater with concrete.

Mr. CLARKE. I have a very kindly feeling for the town of Goderich, and if the hon. minister is acting on the advice of his engineers I think it will be money well spent. There has been a great deal of difficulty in the past in regard to the piers constructed there, but as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Holmes) says, perhaps, they were not constructed in the right way. They did not run at the right angle out into the lake. If the hon. minister has reliable information as to the practicability of making a harbour there, I believe it ought to be a good harbour of refuge and if it is found that vessels can make that harbour in any weather it will bring a great deal of business to that part of the province.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. minister says he is going to make the breakwater of concrete. How deep below water level is he going to put the concrete ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As a rule we just put it below the extreme water level.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If the breakwater is not put deep enough below the low water-level the waves will lift it. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) speaks of this being a great shipping port and says that grain is going this way. He evidently has given up his view in favour of the transcontinental railway and has gone in for the water route.

Mr. HOLMES. I think this will be part of the transcontinental route because that line of railway already runs to Goderich.

Mr. MACLAREN (Perth). I have had a lot of correspondence in reference to this work with people in Stratford, Mitchell and other places along the line and they are strongly in favour of something being done at Goderich. I am very strongly in favour of this vote.

Mr. SHERRITT. I also have a very kindly feeling for the old town of Goderich, because of the service that harbour renders to the country in the early days when we had no railways. I was born within a short distance of the place and know something about it. I think it is a very wise expenditure of money which has for its object the making of Goderich a harbour of refuge. It is important that this work should be proceeded with when we consider the distance that vessels have to go up Lake Huron before finding a harbour of refuge. I may also say in reference to this grant of $5,000 to Grand Bend, that I am pleased to see that the hon. minister has placed in the estimates a sum for the construction of a breakwater at that place. I was up there

a few days ago and there are some people who are very sceptical about this item being spent. I hope the hon. minister will not disappoint them this time. An item was placed in the estimates upon a former occasion and just before the general election an engineer was sent up to make some surveys. I am not going to say that the surveys were so effective that they brought about the state of affairs that existed at the last election, but I will say that in the end of the township in which the work was proposed to be undertaken, every vote was polled for the government candidate against the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Simmons). Even some of the hon. gentleman's own friends are very sceptical to-day about that work. I am very pleased to find this estimate here, and I hope the hon. minister will not disappoint them and will let the contract for the work at once. This place is very much in need of a breakwater. We have heard a good deal to-night of the fishermen of different parts of the country but I think this is one of the best fishing poihts, if not the best fishing point, on the Lake Huron shore. The fishermen have no place to land their boats and there have been great complaints in the past from them. In addition Grand Bend is becoming very popular as a summer resort. Many people from different parts of Ontario go there to camp. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McEwan) knows something about this as do other hon. members. I think the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. McLaren) and the hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) will bear me out in what I say. A great many people come from London and spend the summer in cottages there. We have spent about $20,000 at this place. While I was in the municipal council we had some dredging work done at the mouth of the Au Sable river and it does seem to be a natural harbour. I think $22,000 would be a sufficient expenditure to construct a work that would be a credit to the government and a relief to the people of Grand Bend.

Mr. GOURLEY. I want to suggest to the hon. Minister of Public Works that if money is expended well everybody is gratified and if it is lost everybody is discouraged. We had some experience in building a bridge over the Shubenacadie river some two or three years ago. Some American engineers came up there who were not acquainted with the Bay of Fundy tide. They said it was folly to go down to bedrock and they put their piers on the hard-pan without reaching the rock. The tides came in and every one of the piers were moved. They had to go down and reach bedrock and the work was then made permanent. If you are going to make a good wharf you should go down to bedrock and if you do anything else you will find that it will be a failure.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are all interested in this work on account of the representations that have been made by the shipping and commercial interests of the province. As to the work itself it is probably to some extent an experiment as to what the results will be. I am confident from the representations made to me by practical men, captains of the large boats and others, that it will certainly bring many millions of bushels of grain to the Huron shore that now go to the American side. The trade of the whole Dominion will be very large if we are successful in establishing a good harbour of refuge at Goderich.

Gore's landing—wharf, $3,000.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the hon. minister, if, in regard to this item and also in regard to the next item of $4,000 for the Honora wharf, these amounts will complete the works ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total cost of the first one is estimated by the chief engineer to be $3,000. The Honora wharf work will cost $7,000 to complete.

Mr. BENNETT. Since the Liberals came into power these docks have been strung out all along the shore of the Algoma district. There were private wharfs there before, built by the enterprise of individuals, and fees were charged on the shipping, but the government entered into the business, and rendered useless the expenditure by private citizens on these wharfs. Is it proposed to charge rent for the use of these docks ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. You built a dock at Bruce Mines which cost $12,000, and last year you realized the paltry sum of $16.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a growing business in that district.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, and there is a growing business in the city of Toronto, and vessels have to pay for the use of the docks there. It is all on a par with the building of docks at Hawkestone in East Simcoe, against which I protested. This government practically threw $3,000 into the lake for the purpose of getting a little political advantage, but it did not help them a bit, and that dock is rotting to-day.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not anxious to build any work without necessity.

Kingsville—filling superstructure of extension of breakwater with stone ballast, $4,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The estimated cost of this is $3,840. This work originally cost $15,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Is this for the west pier or the east pier ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The west pier.

Mr. INGRAM. Was there not something the matter with one of these piers ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer tells me that some damage was reported, but he does not consider it very dangerous.

Little Bear creek—dredging, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Kent county, and it is a very necessary work.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it between Chatham and the lake ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The creek enters into the channel at the eastern side of St. Anne's island, Lake St. Clair, and is about ten miles from Chatham and seven from Wallaceburg.

Little Current—improvement of northern steamboat channel in Georgian bay, $15,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is proposed to have a channel 200 feet wide and 21 feet deep at lowest water. If that work were carried out for the whole distance, it would cost between $150,000 and $200,000. Large shipowners, the Messrs. Long, among others, have reported that some considerable improvement can be made by a reasonable appropriation from time to time.

Mr. CLARKE. How much has already been expended on that channel.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total expenditure up to January, 1903, was $83,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Is that channel at Little Current the only place between Manitoulin and the north shore where there is not 20 feet of water ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is the only place, so far as my information goes.

Mr. CLARKE. I should say that on the Canadian side of the St. Mary's river, there are not 20 feet of water in some places, and even if you do this work, you would still be obliged to use Hay lake channel for freighters.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman is correct. I am informed by the chief engineer that in some places there is only 18 or 19 feet of water.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not think there are 16 feet in some parts of the old channel of the St. Mary's river, and we would have to complete all that work to make us independent of our neighbours.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no doubt that my hon. friend is right, but we will make this expenditure in the meantime.

Leamington—wharf, $3,800.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Essex county, and the work is undertaken under the report of the engineer.

Midland harbour—improvements, $12,000.

Mr. BENNETT. I saw last week in the town of Midland a plan of a proposed dock there. Is that the plan that is to be followed—the one that was sent to the town clerk ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer informs me that that is the plan on which tenders are being called for.

Mr. BENNETT. By way of explanation, let me state the position. Owing to the fact that docks were being built at a great many places, the town of Midland made this offer to the government of Canada. They said, we will purchase this water frontage for $10,000 and hand it over to the government on condition that the government will build a dock on it. That was agreed to, and on that understanding the town voted the $10,000, purchased the site, and handed it over to the government. By the plan which the department have sent to the town council it appears they have actually given a portion of this frontage to some party friends. I would ask the minister what consideration has been received by the government for this portion, on which these people have built a dock ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If there is any foundation for the hon. gentleman's statement that the government have given away to party friends or to anybody else any portion of the property which the town conveyed to the government, it would be a matter for inquiry.

Mr. BENNETT. I asked whether it was given for nothing, or whether it was paid for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was not given at all. It was not either sold or given. The facts are not as the hon. gentleman states.

Mr. BENNETT. The plan shows that a part of this property which was purchased by the town and handed over to the department has to-day a dock built upon it by party friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. I can tell the minister that the effect of this action is such that had the question to buy the site and hand it over to the government to be put again before the town of Midland, it would be voted down almost unanimously. I do not know who is to blame for it, but I suppose the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The little spur of dock which the town is getting to-day for the $10,000 which they gave is so trifling that I am sure if they had known what they were going to get they would never have

voted the money. May I ask what rent is being received by the department for the use of the storehouses which are on this property that the government acquired from the town ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say that I have not looked into this matter personally, but either my hon. friend is greatly mistaken or the officials of my department are deceived. As the matter came up before, I asked them to look carefully into it, and they say that there is no foundation whatever for the statement, but that we have all the property that was handed over to us by the town. No rents have been received, and no action has been taken with regard to this property. The transfer was only completed a short time ago, and the plans have been prepared.

Mr. BENNETT. Do any of these parties who are in occupation of this government property pay any rent to the department ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The deputy minister informs me no.

Mr. BENNETT. Was not an application received by the minister from a firm in the town of Midland inquiring what rent was being asked by the department for this dock, and making an overture for renting ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will ask the deputy minister to make a memorandum of that. He says he has no recollection.

Mr. BENNETT. I can tell the minister that I saw the letter from his own department to those parties, acknowledging the receipt of their letter, and saying that the matter would be considered; but they heard nothing further.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Will the hon. gentleman give the name of the party ?

Mr. BENNETT. Stafford & Company—the Midland Mercantile Company. They wanted to rent the warehouse, and were willing to pay $500 a year for it; but one of the hon. minister's party friends has it, presumably for nothing.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not to my knowledge. My hon. friend knows that it is not in the plan or policy of the department to remove the old buildings.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman will interfere with them. In fact, there is no room on the new docks to put any buildings. I can tell the minister that the handling of that dock has not been such as to win any friends to the government. One of their own party friends, Mr. Playfair, has possession of that dock without paying any rental. This is like some other actions of the government there. For instance the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, at my solicitation, decided to put up two range lights. The department had the lights sent to the town, and what do you suppose they did ? Instead of placing them where they should have been placed, they decide, because Mr. Playfair had a couple of electric lights, to send them back to Ottawa or somewhere else; and in the meantime the marine trade has had to depend on two little lights which the people there supposed were fire-flies among the trees. I suppose the government think that Mr. Playfair can help them. All I can say is that I court his opposition, and I court the opposition of the government if they conduct other matters at Midland as they have done this. When parties were willing to pay a decent rent for the property if they had a chance at competition for it, these parties have had the use of the dock and the warehouses without paying a cent of remuneration. It will be news for the people, and from that they will judge how the general business of the country is carried on.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think my hon. friend is mistaken, but I will have a further report made in regard to this matter.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It ought to be a simple matter to ascertain whether or not the land conveyed by the town of Midland to the crown is in part occupied by other persons, and I should think it would be advisable for my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works to bring the plan here and have some explanation of the matter placed before the House. I should think my hon. friend might bring the plan down to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We will have a copy of the plan brought down to-morrow. I will have a report made on the other point, and if such a state of affairs exists as my hon. friend described, it is wholly without my knowledge. I am not aware, nor do I think that my deputy is, that any such state of affairs existed.

Pembroke—wharf, $10,000.

Mr. CLANCY. Permit me to ask the hon. minister if he intends to go on with the work at Little Bear Creek ? That has been in the estimates four or five years in succession and nothing done.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a dredge working in that locality, and I have given instructions to have it sent there at once.

Parry Sound—wharf, $8,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Where is that wharf to be located ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is to be built by the Parry Sound Lumber Company.

Mr. BENNETT. How much is the hon. minister giving the company for that dock ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Nothing; the site is free.

Mr. BENNETT. You have a very favourable proposition from the town of Parry Sound.

Point Edward—dredging, $6,000.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the extent of the work there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work at that place is very important. Large boats could not get up to the wharf, and we are consequently having this work done. I think that $6,000 will finish the work under contemplation at present.

Port Burwell—improvement of harbour (revote, $5,000), $34,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This will complete the work under contract there. This is for all the improvements going on there under the Department of Public Works, and the chief engineer informs me that it will complete it.

Port Stanley—dredging, $4,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Does this involve the replacing of the gentleman who died a short time ago and who superintended the works there ? Is it necessary to re-appoint another man to look after the dredges?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I do not think it is.

Mr. INGRAM. Then, there will be no appointment made ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. None.

Port Perry—dredging harbour, $2,200.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is anything being done in connection with dredging the river leading up to Port Perry ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Perhaps if we had a dredge there we might do it out of the general votes.

Port Perry—dredging harbour, $2,200.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). This breakwater was built a number of years ago and badly wrecked. It should be lengthened very materially. In fact, a new one should be built further out.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am making an effort to improve the one we have.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the dredging which was going on last year been finished, and what are the results ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not finished, but the work done this season has given great satisfaction.

Rosedale—wharf, $1,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). This is a very necessary work, and I might point out in connection with that water-way now in the control of the Dominion government that there is a number of logs towed and brought through the locks from time to time, occasionally some fall out of the boom or crib and become water-logged and are a perfect nuisance. From time to time we expend money to clear these out of the channel. Logs 12 to 16 feet are sunk in ten feet of water, boats strike them, the screws and paddle wheels become broken and other injuries and accidents occur. The province has control of these logs, but inasmuch as the government has taken over these waterways, it should look into the matter and see if the Department of Public Works or the Department of Railways and Canals has not authority to have those logs taken away. That is to give any one finding a log in the water a right to take it as his own property. I can assure the minister that in that way the government would save a good deal of money, many accidents would be avoided and the channels and water courses would be cleared of logs. Another point is that the locks of all the systems operate very slowly. The gates should be changed and should be made to operate much more rapidly than they do. Then, too, a great deal of country in the northern half of Victoria and Haliburton, near the Trent river, could be thrown open to traffic by the construction of four locks opening from the water north of Balsam lake into Haliburton. This would throw open a tract of country over 100 miles in length, containing much valuable birch and maple, which cannot now be hauled out to the railways owing to the conformation of the country. But I have previously entered into this detail and the plans and data are always in the departments.

THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will be pleased to have this matter looked into.

River Sydenham—improvement of, $5,800.

Mr. CLANCY. How is that money being expended ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Principally in dredging. It is to improve the navigable channels of the Sydenham river. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) is familiar with these places. This is a work on which we made some representations. It is in the county of Bothwell, and this work is along the lines of representations made by a deputation introduced by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CLANCY. I suppose this money is to be expended in the east branch of the river.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not sufficiently familiar with the river to say.

Mr. CLANCY. I call the attention of the hon. minister to this matter, because the River Sydenham includes the north and east branches. Wallaceburg is at the junction of the north and east branches, and I sup-

pose this is to be expended between Wallaceburg and Dresden.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to carry out the work asked for by the deputation introduced by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CLANCY. As that is a very pressing work, particularly at this time of the year, I would ask if it would not be possible to send a dredge in there at once ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will give instruction to the engineer to have it taken up at once.

Mr. CLANCY. There is a good dredge at his disposal, it is a very important work, and if some portion of it could be done during the present season it would be of great advantage to the people there.

Mr. BLAIN. During the last two sessions I drew the attention of the government to some work that was very necessary in the harbour of Port Credit, on Lake Ontario. Will the hon. minister state what is going to be done about that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman brought it to my attention, and I sent for a report. One of the great difficulties is that the harbour there is private property, and whatever may have been the policy of the department in the past, it is not now the policy of the department, except under exceptional circumstances, to spend public money on property which is not the property of the Crown. I intended to write my hon. friend about that in order that he might take it up.

Mr. BLAIN. Although that is the policy of the government, I do not think it has always been adhered to. There are other instances in Ontario where harbours are in exactly the same position. This is very close to Toronto, where the hon. gentleman has a dredge working all the time, and perhaps the hon. minister could allow that dredge to go to Port Credit and dredge out some of the sand that is continually drifting in there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think no one would object to that, and I will see that it is attended to, if there is a dredge in that locality.

Ottawa river—improvement of narrows at Petewawa above Pembroke—to pay G. C. Poupore in full for work done previous to July 1, 1903 (revote of lapsed amount), $7,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is an amount of $7,000 that has been voted for several years. The contractor filed claims for a larger amount. This was in the main estimates, and I had it struck out, in order to look into it. After discussion of the matter the contractor has agreed to accept this, and I am asking this in order to make the settlement.

Mr. CLANCY.

River St. Lawrence—dredging steamboat channel through shoal at foot of Wolfe Island, $5,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not see anything in the main estimates for the Canadian channel through the Thousand Islands.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Is not this a part of it ?

Mr. REID (Grenville). I understand a survey was made with a view to running a channel there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend knows that we must have our new Ontario dredge before we can do that.

Mr. AVERY. This work at the foot of Wolfe island is very useful.

Regulation of waters at Lake Simcoe and Couchiching—repairs to works at Washago, &c., $2,000.

THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A great deal of damage is done at this place from the overflow of the water in consequence of the government works. I find that $7,652 have been spent there in time past, and representations have been made to me that this $2,000 will renew this work in such a way as to protect the people of that locality from further loss.

Mr. BENNETT. At certain times in the past there was an overflow by the water of Lake Simcoe backing up on the south side. But since the stop-logs have been put in a few years ago, I understand no further trouble has been felt. I do not know what this $2,000 is needed for, unless it is to make a more perfect arrangement.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for repairs to those works, to those stop-logs.

Mr. BENNETT. I have always understood that the people of Orillia township were satisfied with the arrangement.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There is a report in the Department of Railways and Canals showing that in certain seasons of the year the water rises on all these lakes, but there is no more overflow in this locality than anywhere else. But on account of the blasting that was done years ago, these stop-logs were put in. If the minister means that this money is to repair those stop-logs, that is all right ; but if it means that it is to reduce the present level of Lake Couchiching and Lake Simcoe, he will find the country will not tolerate it.

Sault Ste. Marie—harbour improvements, including dredging of approaches (revote), $18,300.

Mr. LENNOX. I would like to have some explanation from the minister of what is proposed to be done here. I was up at Sault Ste. Marie recently, and it appears to

me a good deal of work needs to be done there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Representations have been made to me that a good deal of work was required there, but I have had no money to do it with. With this money it may be possible to do some dredging this fall.

Mr. LENNOX. That is a place where I think the government will be wise in taking a comprehensive view of the matter, and in proceeding deliberately upon some careful system by which that river will be utilized, and by which we may have a channel that will compare with the American channel. At present docks are being built through private enterprise. A dock was put up recently by a private company, who claim that they have spent a large amount of money. I do not speak with any technical knowledge, but it appears to me that that dock is carried out into the river too far. I think the government would meet the wishes of the country if they proceeded in some comprehensive manner with their work on the water front, which is to serve as a dock along the Canadian Soo. There is no one who visits the American side and then comes across to the Canadian side, but must feel, if he is a patriotic Canadian, ashamed of the appearance of our own country, as compared with the American side. That remark applies particularly to the lack of dockage accommodation and to the slovenly condition in which the Canadian side generally appears. There is evidently an immense amount of shipping done there, and I should think that some such system as has been adopted at Montreal would be a proper system at the Soo, that is to say, that instead of running out these docks or piers into the river, we should have a dock extending along the line of the river parallel to the shore, to serve as a means of anchorage for all the vessels coming from the Canadian locks. There is another matter that deserves attention, and that is the condition of the land round about the Canadian locks. On the American side everything is in beautiful condition, there is a lawn and a park, but on the Canadian side everything is rough and unfinished. It is important that we should make our side compare favourably with the other side. Although I do not often advocate the expenditure of money, I think it is important that the Canadian side of the Soo should be considerably improved. The Canadian Soo has a great future before it, the trade through that channel is rapidly increasing, and the percentage of increase is now in favour of our locks. I think we would be justified in expending money on a well-considered plan, both as regards the dredging of the river and improving the land round about the locks. I might remind the hon. Minister of Public Works that the Americans are spending a very large sum of money almost every year, and there is a very large contemplated expenditure at the present time in improving their channel. When we are coming into direct competition with them, as we are at that point and at some other points on the lakes, I would be somewhat generous in the expenditure of money. Of course, I would advocate a very well-considered plan for the whole scheme before the expenditure is engaged in.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think on this matter we are almost unanimous and the only reason I did not take it up sooner was that I wanted to have a plan prepared before I asked for my vote.

Thessalon—breakwater, $5,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What is that for? You have a government dock there already that produces almost nothing in revenue.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to make provision towards the construction of a breakwater 420 feet long at Thessalon for the protection of all classes of vessels on the great lakes. Very strong representations have been made to me by people engaged in the vessel trade and by fishermen and others upon the subject and it has been pointed out to me that the wharf under present conditions is of very little use to them. It will be a great advantage to the district to have another harbour of refuge there and I have brought down a vote for this purpose.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What depth of water is there?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. From twelve to fifteen feet of water.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not know whether the hon. minister has been at Thessalon, but he must know that this has been a town for fifteen years. It has done business for the last fifteen years and there is a very expensive government dock at that point now and as there is little or no revenue why this large expenditure should be gone into now seems incredible. I am sorry that the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dyment) is not here because I would like to compliment him personally on being able to get more money expended in his riding than the most sanguine well-wisher for the distribution of public funds with the view of political advantage coming from it.

Toronto harbour—works at eastern entrance, close piling, channel face of east pier and levelling up pier, $20,000.

Mr. CLARKE. I observe there is nothing in the estimates for the dredging out of Toronto harbour. This work has been necessitated because of the persistent refusal of the government of Canada for the last sixty years to take steps to protect what was once a peninsula inclosing the harbour of Toronto. I have the documents in my desk now but I do not want to weary the commit-

tee about it at this time. It is really incredible when we look over the official documents in connection with the preservation of Toronto harbour for the last sixty years to see how impossible it has been, because of changing governments and changing opinions, to have anything permanent done in respect to the preservation of the harbour. These eastern works have been made necessary because all the recommendations made again and again looking towards the protection of the peninsula have been entirely ignored. The force of the waves of Lake Ontario destroyed the peninsula and formed the present island. Since 1833, Capt. Bonnycastle, who was then the harbour master, and his various successors have been recommending that something should be done for the preservation of the harbour. Capt. Bonnycastle's statement were prophetic, and unless the government do something at an early day in regard to the diversion of the channel of the Don, and in the way of dredging, there will be good grounds for complaint.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think we can take up the discussion at the present time of the improvements of the Don. Representations were made to me as to dredging at the eastern entrance. I was unable to get a dredge to do this work. It was only last week that I was able to get a dredge, the one that had been working for the city of Toronto and I gave the owners a contract. We happened to procure a dredge up the lakes but they got into some trouble and they were not able to fulfil their contract. As to the other work that will have to be taken up again.

Toronto harbour—works at eastern entrance—to pay Magann and Phin in full and final settlement of all claims in connection with their contract of February 10, 1900, for the extension of the western pier, $9,100.51.

Mr. CLARKE. How has this adjustment been arrived at ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This settlement was made with the officials of the department and on the report of our own officials.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the hon. minister bring the papers down in connection with this matter ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. I will be very glad to. I have not looked into them myself.

Victoria harbour—dredging, $4,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Will that money be spent this year and if so will it complete the dredging at that point ? This is an important point. This year 75,000,000 feet of lumber will be cut there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This money will be all spent. There have been applications for about $3,000 or $4,000 more to complete this work, but I do not think we can take it up this year.

Wiarton—wharf, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for a new wharf at Wiarton.

Mr. BENNETT. What will be the total cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total cost will be about $11,000. My hon. friend is familiar with the conditions there. Owing to the establishment of new factories at that place strong representations have been made as to the necessity for this work.

Mr. BENNETT. Who furnishes the site ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The site does not cost us anything, but the chief engineer tells me that he expects that will be given. I do not know whether it will be furnished by the provincial government or by the town, but at any rate it will be furnished.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourns, I wish to refer to a matter that I understand was brought before the Committee of Supply last evening. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), I understand, intimated to the committee that I was an interested party in a company at Newmarket which was in receipt of government work. I wish to say that the statement is wholly without foundation. I know nothing about the company's financial arrangements and I have never had any interest in it. I do not know whether it has shareholders or whether it has not. It is quite true that I have felt it to be my duty from time to time to endeavour to promote the interests of this company. It is carrying on business in a town I am interested in and for many reasons I wish that town well. I am pleased to be able to be of service to that town in promoting the welfare of a great industry like the Office Specialty Company. Further than taking a public interest in the matter, I know nothing in respect to it. I think it would have been fairer if the hon. gentleman had reserved his remarks till I could have been in the House so that my denial might have immediately followed his insinuation.

Mr. BENNETT. I happened to be in the town of Newmarket during the by-election last spring, and I heard a wordy altercation between two electors. One was pretending that the Postmaster General was the backbone of the town of Newmarket, and in support of his contention he announced that

the Postmaster General was a stockholder in this company. The other contended that the Postmaster General was not interested in it, and that if the town had to depend on the Postmaster General, the office specialty works would not have been there. The Postmaster General's supporter repeated time and again that the Postmaster General was interested in this work, and the other gentleman, who was a Conservative, I need hardly say, asserted time and again that the town had not to thank the Postmaster General for this enterprising establishment. It now seems that this gentleman was right. This gentleman also asserted that the Postmaster General was never known to enter into any enterprise in the town. Be that as it may, since the Postmaster General says that he is not interested, I can only regret that he has not joined with other enterprising men in this concern, which is so creditable to the town of Newmarket. I hope the Postmaster General will follow at an early date, the example set by other gentlemen who have invested money in manufacturing concerns in that town.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The point of my observation was to deny the insinuation of the member for East Simcoe, that I had been—as he put it—sending grist to my mill, and using my position as a minister to enrich myself through the medium of this company. That was an unfair insinuation to make on the floor of this House. It is false in every respect.

Mr. BENNETT. It was the assertion of one of the Postmaster General's political friends, that his enterprise was so great, and that such was his admiration for the town of Newmarket, that he had been one of the gentlemen who had engaged in this enterprise. However, that appears to be untrue, and I join in wishing well to Newmarket.

ACCIDENT AT SPRINGHILL, N.S.

Mr. LOGAN. I regret to have to state that I received a telegram from Springhill this morning stating that a very serious explosion has occurred in the Dominion public building there, by which a gentleman named McDowell was killed, and a gentleman named Eaton and two boys seriously injured. I have received a later telegram saying that probably Mr. Eaton will die. I ask the Minister of Public Works to make an immediate investigation into the cause of this frightful accident, which has resulted in loss of life, and has wrecked the public building which has just been constructed in that town.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As soon as I heard of the accident, I saw the chief architect of the department, and I received from him the following report:

Re accident at the Springhill public building.

The Springhill building is a new one, having been completed and occupied in June, 1902. The caretaker had been in charge of the building since its occupation and had attended to the boilers and heating apparatus during the last firing season, in a satisfactory manner.

The furnaces put in this building were two No. 70 Robb furnaces manufactured by the Robb Engineering Company, of Amherst, N.S. The two furnaces were connected with headers by a gate valve so that only one or both furnaces could be used. The Robb furnaces have been used in quite a number of Dominion government buildings and they have always been found to work satisfactorily.

Mr. Cowan, our engineer who examined and tested the furnaces and heating apparatus at Springhill, and who also instructed the caretaker as to the working of the furnaces, &c., reported that the caretaker, Mr. McDowell, was an intelligent person.

From the information received we can form no idea of how this deplorable accident occurred.

Mr. Cowan, engineer, leaves here to-day for Springhill, with instructions to investigate the matter and make a report thereon.

(Sgd.) D. EWART,
Chief Engineer.

I regret to say that a telegram to the department confirmed what my hon. friend (Mr. Logan) has stated. The damage done to the building will, I am informed, amount to $5,000 or $6,000.

Mr. INGRAM. What fuel were they using?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Nova Scotia coal, I think.

REPORT OF TREADGOLD COMMISSION.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was told this morning that I would receive an answer later in the day as to the report of Treadgold Commission, and the printing of the evidence.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I spoke to the Premier and he intended to give an answer, but I may say that the report has not been received yet.

AUDIT ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would ask whether the Bill to amend the Audit Act is to be proceeded with, and if so, whether any date has been fixed for its consideration?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am unable to fix any date with regard to that Bill at present.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman does intend to proceed with it this session?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not given it consideration of late. I am not able to say anything more definite on that point than that the matter is still under consideration.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What business may we expect to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Continuation of supplies.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.40 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, October 7, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Mr. WILSON asked :

1. What amount of bonuses or subsidies have been voted by parliament each year to railways during the years 1900, 1901 and 1902 ?

2. How much of the said bonuses or subsidies has been paid during the said years, and up to 1st September, 1903 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). This question, and also questions 5, 6 and 8, which relate to either railways or finance, I would ask the hon. gentlemen to let them stand, and I will have the information on the next question day.

RURAL MAIL DELIVERY.

Mr. WILSON asked :

Is it the intention of the government to give any relief to the people living in the rural districts, by giving to them rural mail delivery ? If so, when may the people expect the said service to commence ? If not, why not ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). This question is engaging the consideration of the government.

MEMORIAL FROM NORTH-WEST POSTMASTERS' ASSOCIATION.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked :

1. Has the following memorial and supplement to the same, from the Manitoba and North-west Accounting Postmasters' Association been considered by the Honourable the Postmaster General ?

'Winnipeg, Man., February, 1903.

To the Right Hon. Sir William Mulock,
Postmaster General, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—We, the undersigned, accounting postmasters of Manitoba, beg to bring to your attention the following statement of facts regarding our work, which goes to show that the remuneration is most inadequate, in the hope that you may be able to grant us substantial and immediate relief. We do this the more hopefully in view of the stand you have taken on the question of hours of labour, &c., of the workingman.

1. The postmaster is responsible for the safe handling of many important letters and valuable parcels. In this country large amounts of money, formerly sent by express, are now sent by registered mail to wheat-buyers to enable them to carry on their business. In many places the branch banks remit to, or receive from, the head office large sums of money. This increases the postmaster's responsibility, and where help is employed, necessitates care in the selection. The money-order business necessitates the handling of large sums of money for the miserable pittance of 25 cents per $100. The amount of stamps kept on hand must always be large with the source of supply so far away. In no other line of work would persons be held responsible for the proper handling of such large amounts, with the same possibilities of irregularities and losses, without remuneration at least from five to ten times greater than the postmaster receives for his money-order work. In many cases there is added responsibility through the handling of customs parcels, for which there is practically no remuneration. The postmaster is expected to provide a roomy, centrally located office without any regard to the rental which that office would command if leased for other purposes. The necessity for the correct and prompt despatch of all mails, regardless of hours of arrival and departure, is in many instances a very grave responsability. Understanding that the present basis of remuneration has been in vogue for a quarter of a century or more, we would respectfully point out various increases in work which clearly show that, although it may have been sufficient then, it is utterly inadequate now.

Firstly.—In connection with newspapers and periodicals, we think it is a conservative estimate to assume that a family will now receive an average of six or eight times as many periodicals as a family would be receiving twenty-five or thirty years ago.

Secondly.—The use of the mails as a means of distributing advertising matter is a practice of recent years entirely, and the quantity handled is simply enormous and constantly increasing. These increases affect both local distribution and the sorting of matter for forwarding to outside offices.

Thirdly.—The recent reduction in the rate of letter postage necessitates (in the matter of Canadian and United States postage) an increase of fully fifty per cent in the number of letters handled before an increase of revenue can accrue, or an increase of salary be hoped for. In the case of British, and some other lines of foreign postage, the increase in the number of letters must be 150 per cent before we have established a basis for any possible increase in salary. A working out of the figures in this connection will establish that the postmasters are bearing from thirty to forty per cent of the expenses of the reduction so appreciated by the public. This appears to be an altogether undue proportion.

The introduction of the postal note system has increased the amount of labour out of proportion to the revenue attached. This method of remitting small amounts (chiefly to the city offices) has largely curtailed the sale of stamps, which were formerly used. At offices where customs parcels are handled and distributed by mail to smaller offices, stamps are usually sent in payment of duty, and cash is remitted to port of entry, again curtailing

the sale of stamps received from the department.

2. An examination into the method of handling customs parcels and the remuneration (even where any is allowed) will reveal the fact that the work actually required to be performed, which is considerable, is practically unpaid for. This is one of the points which we desire to bring to your attention, that unremunerative work of this sort is being multiplied, while the revenue of the office is being held down by reduced rates of postage.

3. In a number of the offices, besides keeping the office open throughout the regulation hours, the postmasters are compelled to await the arrival of a late evening train, and again in some instances have to get up at five or six o'clock in the morning to despatch a mail, thus imposing unduly long hours of service, without any allowances for any class of assistance, to say nothing of a competent assistant. In some offices, owing to the arrival of several different mails, the public is entitled to call and demand individual attention several times during the day, whereas the basis of remuneration makes no special provision for this. In places where tri-weekly trains carry the mails, the postmaster is compelled to remain (if he would give the public anything approaching satisfactory service), to provide, for a portion of three days a week, one or more duly qualified assistants. His allowance is inadequate for his own support at present cost of living, thus providing nothing for the payment of assistants.

4. In view of the amount of mail matter to be re-sorted and forwarded, the forwarding allowances do not begin to pay for the work done or the extra office room required. Another department with a deficit.

5. The allowance for rent, fuel and light is decidedly inadequate. In practically every town where the post office is kept in a separate compartment, the room occupied could be leased for a rental in excess of the full allowance for rent, for heating and for lighting. In the town of Morris, the postmaster is allowed $100 for rent, fuel and light. For less space in the same building he receives from the Merchants Bank $350 a year for rent alone. At Melita the postmaster cancelled a lease bringing him a net annual rental of $180 to use the building for post office purposes on an allowance of $125 for rent, fuel and light. Other similar examples could be cited. Fuel and light are costly here.

6. In the matter of securing proper assistants, we would point out that labour readily commands far larger remuneration in any market than it did a few years ago. To have experienced help available is a severe drain upon the limited exchequer of the postmaster who is unfortunate enough to require it, as nearly all do. Even where help is not regularly required, competent assistance must be had, if the postmaster is ever to seek recreation or relief from duty.

7. There is another matter which affects postmasters in the west more particularly, namely, the increased cost of living. This has frequently been brought to the attention of yourself and colleagues in various ways, and we note that already you have conceded the point, as in the case of the 20 per cent increase allowed the letter-carriers of Winnipeg. In our opinion, this does not represent the actual amount of difference, but is a recognition of that difference. In all lines the cost of living has advanced during the past few years, while the postmasters are receiving less pay for more work.

8. A comparison with salaries paid in other departments of the public service, and even in other departments of the postal service, give an idea of our disadvantages. For example: First-class railway mail clerks receive $960 and mileage; second-class clerks, $880 and mileage. In the city of Winnipeg, the assistant postmaster gets $2,000; first-class clerks, $1,500; second class, $1,320; third class, $880, and letter-carries, $720. We do not think these are too highly paid, but an office with a revenue of $2,000 not only absorbs all of one person's time, but requires an additional clerk at least a portion of the year. The postmaster of such an office receives for salary, commissions and allowances an average of less than $700, or less than half the amount received by a first-class city clerk, $100 less than a second-class railway mail clerk, and a trifle less than is paid to the city letter-carriers, and out of this modest income he must employ whatever additional help is required, and furnish a suitable office and office equipment. In most cases, his hours are longer and his responsibilities greater than those of any of the officials referred to. In one town, where the train arrived late and departed early, the postmaster until recently received $3.50 per month for overtime, while the railway agent received $19 a month extra.

In view of the conditions and facts set forth above, we would respectfully suggest the following changes, as tending to bring about a redress of our grievances :—1st. That the straight salary allowance be based on 50 per cent on the first $1,000 worth of stamps sold, and 40 per cent on all additional sales. This would barely offset the loss resulting from the reduction of letter postage. 2nd. That in Manitoba a special increase of at least 20 per cent be allowed to cover extra cost of living. 3rd. That the allowance for rent, fuel and light be doubled, so as to provide a reasonable rent for the office, and a provision for the cost of fuel and light in this country. 4th. That the money-order system be simplified, so as to lessen the amount of work to be performed for the small remuneration allowed, and also to increase its popularity with the business public, who now object to the restrictions hedging it round. 5th. In addition to the regular and general scale of allowances, we would request that a special allowance be granted for each extra mail which tends to bring the public again before the wicket for individual attention during the day; that the forward allowance be materially increased to distributing offices; that a special allowance be given to postmasters who are compelled to work before 8 a.m., or after 7 p.m. Among the mechanical industries the special allowance for overtime is very marked. That in the case of offices where mails are so infrequent as to have large quantities of mail matter delivered at the office at one time, so that the public convenience really requires the employment of one or more assistants, an allowance be given towards the payment of such assistant or assistants.

6th. In addition to the above, we feel that there are a number of cases of special minor grievances which we cannot enter into in detail, but in which we think that a little investigation would show that redress could be effected, so as to relieve the postmasters concerned, without in any way impairing the efficiency and safety of the public service, which grievances have probably continued to exist

because they have not been brought to your honourable attention.

And we would respectfully urge that the above matters be duly considered, and that a large measure of redress be granted in the very near future.

And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

MANITOBA AND NORTH-WEST ACCOUNTING POSTMASTERS' ASSOCIATION.

Supplementary suggestions passed by Executive.

1. That all accounting offices be given an allowance for rent, fuel and light.

2. That twine, mucilage, pens, ink, pencils, &c., for post office use be furnished by the department, and not at the expense of the postmaster, as at present.

3. That the department make it more clear to all publishers that newspapers must be suitably folded and that they must be addressed plainly. That where labels are used, they must be in large, clear type, and that if possible, uniformity of colour in labels be secured.

4. That a full list of 'Suggestions to the Public' be printed by the department and supplied to all postmasters for display in their offices, as tending to make it clear that certain regulations are found necessary by the department, and are not based on the caprice or convenience of the postmaster. For instance, that stamps and money-orders may be purchased during the distribution of a newly arrived mail, and that money-orders and postal notes are not available for purchase after the registered mail closes for an outgoing mail. Also, some suggestions as to the age of children who are to be considered as proper persons to receive mail from the wicket.

5. That when instructions are sent out for the weighing of all mails, that facilities for such weighing be afforded by the department.

6. That in view of the large sums of money at times in the mails in this country, and hence often stored in the post office, and in view of the value of the stamps and the importance of the books now to be kept, that safes be provided for accounting postmasters, or an allowance be granted to pay for use of same, when provided by the postmaster.

2. Is it the intention to accede to the request of the association ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). This memorial has been received, and when the supplementary estimates for the post office are under consideration I will be prepared to discuss this question.

MAIL CONTRACT—BALACLAVA TO OWEN SOUND.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey)—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Who has the contract for conveying the mails from Balaclava to Owen Sound ?

2. What is the contract price ?

3. Was it the lowest tender ? If not, why was not the lowest tender accepted ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). The answer to this question is prepared, but I do not find it in my desk. Speaking from memory, the contract for conveying the mails from Balaclava to Owen Sound was made with the old contractor at the contract price of $250 a year. The next tenderer, whose name I am not sure of——

Mr. TAYLOR. Better let the question stand.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think I am giving the whole information. The second tenderer and the lowest tenderer was, I think, a man named Hill, at $250. The next one above him was the old contractor at $270 odd. The department decided to accept the lowest tenderer, and in accordance with the usual practice the papers were handed to the officer to be completed. But on inquiry it was found that the lowest tenderer was a man advanced in years, about 73 years of age, and reported upon as decrepid and becoming too feeble properly to discharge the service. Accordingly the service was offered to the former contractor at the price of the lowest tenderer, and he accepted it. Therefore, the contract was made with him.

WEIGH MASTERS FOR GRAIN.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that to-morrow the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the General Inspection Act, and to provide for the appointment of weigh masters for the weighing of grain in any inspection district east of the inspection district of Manitoba, and for their remuneration by fees or otherwise.

Motion agreed to.

SATURDAY SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That when this House adjourns on Friday next, it stand adjourned to the following day (Saturday) at 11 a.m.; and that the order of proceedings will be the same as the order for Fridays. That this House will sit in the same manner on all subsequent Saturdays to the end of the session.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). As we are already sitting from eleven o'clock in the morning until one o'clock the next morning the addition of Saturday to these labours seems rather unusual. Could the right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) say what his proposition is in regard to the hours of sitting on Saturday ? Is it proposed to sit from eleven o'clock in the morning until twelve o'clock at night on the ensuing Saturdays ?

The PRIME MINISTER. We are now approaching the conclusion of the seventh month in the session, and I suppose the time has arrived when we might think of prorogation. Therefore, that is the end we

have in view in following the course of preceding sessions by sitting on Saturdays. To-morrow, probably, I shall be able to make a communication to the House as to the legislation that is still to be brought to the attention of the House, and the orders on the paper that may be dropped. In the meantime it is our intention to sit all day Saturday unless the sentiment of the House is overwhelmingly on the other side.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). A number of members, not anticipating that Saturdays would be taken inasmuch as we are sitting in the mornings, have made arrangements for leaving town next Saturday. If the right hon. Prime Minister would make it the following Saturday, I think it would better suit the convenience of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, I hope that hon. members of the House who have made arrangements to spend Saturday elsewhere will make arrangements to spend one Saturday in Ottawa.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—PETITIONS AGAINST NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT (Bellechasse). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I beg leave to rise to a question of privilege. On Wednesday last, Mr. Speaker, I drew your attention to the fact that I had serious doubts about the authenticity of the signatures of certain petitions which were presented in this House in opposition to the construction of a new transcontinental railway. You were kind enough to tell me and tell this House that the hon. members who presented these petitions assumed in so doing full responsibility for everything in connection with these petitions. I had them published in the newspapers of the district in order to make sure whether my doubts were founded or not. I am now in a position to prove to this House and to the country that a very grave abuse of the honour and dignity of this parliament has been committed, and——

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. TALBOT—the wholesale forgery——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot) has no right to read anything from newspapers reflecting upon the proceedings of this House or contradicting any statement made by any hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not understand that the hon. gentleman is reading from newspapers.

Mr. TALBOT. These are notes of my own written by my own hand—and the wholesale forgery has been committed by over zealous partisans urged by unscrupulous though important newspapers of Montreal. These petitions contain the names of mere boys, names of people who live in the United States, names of people who have been dead for years, names of people who are in lunatic asylums, names of people, who, owinig to their advanced age, are absolutely irresponsible, names of people who knew nothing of these petitions and names of people who when asked to sign positively refused. In view of these facts which I am in a position to prove, I beg, Mr. Speaker, to submit a motion to the consideration of the House. My reason for doing so is that I consider that the right of petition is sacred, and I do not question for a moment the right of the gentlemen who signed the petitions to present and emphasize their objections to the government policy on this transcontinental railway question in that way if they chose to do so, but for my part, and I feel sure that this honourable House will endorse me, I must enter my most solemn protest against this audacious and monstrous attempt to impose upon the good faith of parliament and the country, by seeking to create the utterly false and erroneous impression that the people in the province of Quebec at least are opposed to this great national undertaking, and I say that it is a screaming farce and a most shameful departure from all principles of honour and dignity due to this parliament to present such petitions.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to ask your ruling, Mr. Speaker, as to whether this is a question of privilege or not. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot) has a right to raise a question of privilege, but I do not understand it is a question of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER. If some documents had been brought before the House, which documents were supposed to be petitions, but which turned out to be forgeries, I suppose it would be within the privilege of the House to inquire whether these documents were genuine or not.

Mr. SPROULE. It is only an allegation that the hon. gentleman is making.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand the hon. gentleman is making a statement, and that he proposes that this statement shall be referred to some committee of the House.

Mr. TALBOT. I sincerely hope and trust that a thorough inquiry into this matter will be granted by hon. members on both sides of this House. I beg to move as follows :

Onésiphore Ernest Talbot, member of the House of Commons for the county of Bellechasse, having declared from his seat :—

1. That a petition of James V. Coté and others, of Cap St. Ignace, county of Montmagny, in the province of Quebec, has been

presented and deposited by Mr. Alcorn, M.P., in the House of Commons, on the 30th September, 1903, asking that a Bill, now before parliament, concerning the new Transcontinental Railway, shall not become law ;

2. That the said petition was read and received on the 2nd October, instant ;

3. That on the 29th September last a petition of Thomas Coulombe and others, of Berthier, in the county of Montmagny, in the province of Quebec, had also been presented and laid on the Table by Mr. Alcorn, M.P., to the same effect ;

4. That this latter petition was read and received on the 1st October instant ;

5. That these two petitions contain false signatures, that several persons, whose names appear on the said petitions, never signed them nor ever authorized any person to sign them and that the said petitions contain the names of persons who have been long since dead ;

6. That by reason of these facts the dignity of the House of Commons has been outrageously offended :

Mr. Talbot moves, seconded by Mr. Carbonneau, that these petitions be referred to the Committee of Privileges and Elections, for investigation into the validity of the signatures which they contain and the circumstances regarding the preparation, fabrication and presentation of the said petitions ; with power to the said committee to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses upon oath or affirmation, and that the committee do report in full the evidence taken before them, and all their proceedings on the reference and the truth of their inquiries.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). If any petitions have been presented to this House, purporting to be signed by persons who have not signed them, I at once agree that it is a matter which must be investigated. I cannot however congratulate the hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot) who has made the motion, on the judicial spirit in which he has presented the matter to the House. It seems to me that he has not acted as one who is desirous of upholding and maintaining the dignity of this House. His language did not impress me in that way. He has presented it apparently, in the belief that he could obtain some partisan advantage from proving certain facts in connection with these petitions, and he therefore seizes upon this occasion to indulge in very strong and violent language for party ends. With these observations, I desire to say that so far as this side of the House is concerned, we have not the slightest objection—in fact, I concur heartily in the proposal that this matter should go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am glad that the opposition have no objection to offer to this motion. Indeed I cannot see what objection could be offered, in the face of the statement made by my hon. friend (Mr. Talbot) that he has reason to believe that the dignity of the House has been seriously infringed on, and that an attempt has been made by false pretenses, to create a wrong impression. My hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) may perhaps have spoken warmly. He does not belong to the legal profession, and he is not perhaps trained to control his feelings as the members of that profession may be. But, as there is an impression growing very strong in the country, that in fact there has been an attempt at a conspiracy to impose upon this House, I am perfectly willing to excuse my hon. friend's language.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How many of these petitions have been referred to by the member from Bellechasse ?

The PRIME MINISTER. He has referred to only two, but I think he could refer to several, and perhaps to all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then I am perfectly willing to widen the motion and to enable an investigation to be made into every petition that has been presented. If the right hon. gentleman suggests that all these petitions are of a fraudulent character, let us by all means have an investigation into all of them. I am prepared to support a motion to that effect, if the right hon. gentleman moves it.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). It would be an insult to the intelligence and the honesty of the electors of Canada, to select a few of these petitions and examine them, and on the strength of that to allege that they are all of a fraudulent character. If any particular one so selected is to be regarded as typical of the whole, then it is a matter of the greatest importance that all of them should be scrutinized. I believe that a great many of these petitions can in no sense be characterized as having been obtained by any impropriety. If one petition goes before this committee then I suggest that all of them should be submitted.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). A few years ago in this House, there was presented the spectacle of hon. gentlemen from the province of Quebec, introducing affidavits and other proof to show, that there had been most gross frauds perpetrated in the taking of a census in that province. At the time, it seemed rather black, that if a fraud has been perpetrated, it should have remained for hon. gentlemen opposite to accuse their own compatriots of such frauds. This morning we have had a petition of that from an hon. gentleman opposite, who seems to be quite willing to be selected to make the charge; because nobody would blame the hon. gentleman for having moved of his own motion in the matter. The charge now made is : That in the province of Quebec, apparently it is a usual thing to commit forgery and to commit crimes of this nature.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. BENNETT. I congratulate the hon. gentleman from Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) that he thinks he is fitted to be selected for the performance of the duty of making such gross accusations against his compatriots. A little time ago, when that celebrated plebiscite vote was taken in the province of Quebec, I regret to say that there were frauds perpetrated, and the people of Ontario will now have the statement of one member at least from the province of Quebec, that frauds of this kind are perpetrated in that province. We had it that deliberate frauds and disgraceful frauds were perpetrated in the plebiscite vote and that charge will go before the people of Ontario, backed up by this evidence of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot). I congratulate the hon. gentleman on having been selected to assail, as he has assailed, his own compatriots in the province of Quebec. I can tell him furthermore, that in the constituency I have the honour to represent, there is a large French Canadian vote, and I invite him most cheerfully to come up there and assail his French compatriots in that riding as he has done in this matter.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). The French Canadians of the province of Quebec will be able, I thoroughly believe, to appreciate the attack that has been made upon them, and they will be able to distinguish between the responsibility of my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) and that of my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) has just referred to the plebiscite vote in the province of Quebec——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Have they stopped voting yet ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Does my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) refer to an affidavit presented by a man named Parent from Rimouski ?

Mr. BENNETT. I refer more particularly to the fact that more votes were cast in certain polling places than there were names on the voters' lists.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is not the case in the province of Quebec.

An hon. MEMBER. He is talking about Ontario.

Mr. BENNETT. And some of them in the city of Quebec.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I would like my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) to particularize, because if my memory serves me he must base his statement on an alleged affidavit of one (Parent) of Rimouski. That was the only affidavit we had referring to such a matter that I can recall, and the result of the making of that affidavit has deprived this country of one citizen who has become a necessary resident of the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT. I relied on the returns which show that in many polling places more votes were cast than there were names on the lists.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. E. HACKETT (West Prince). I presented a number of these petitions and I challenge the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) or any other hon. member to say, that I am not responsible for the names on these petitions. I endorse these petitions. Has it come to this, that in this free counry of ours, the right to petition parliament and our King, the highest right of the people is to be assailed in this way, and that we are to be draggged before a committee of parliament to be held responsible for the names on these petitions. Have things come to this pass in this free country ?

Mr. COWAN. Yes. You presented some very low class matter.

Mr. HACKETT. That individual over there is of a very low class himself. Sir, I stand here as an old resident of this country, I stand here as one who has represented the people for some twenty-five or thirty years, and I have never seen before such an exhibition; that the government of this country are endeavouring to prevent the people of this country from the right to petition parliament. It is a most disgraceful thing. and I would ask the hon. member from Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) to withdraw his motion and to have nothing more to do with this matter.

M. GEO. TAYLOR (South Leeds). I had the honour of presenting several of these petitions from my county. I scanned them carefully and I am certain that every name on them was genuine. I believe that these petitions should be included in the motion of the hon. member from Bellechasse. He has selected just a couple of these petitions and if any signatures on these are found not to be genuine, then an effort will be made to create the idea that all the petitions are of the same kind. That is not fair. Now, I want this motion to be broadened so as to include all the petitions that have been presented. Those from Quebec which were handed to my hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) were presented by him in the belief that they were genuine. It is possible that my hon. friend from Bellechasse sent some gentleman down there with one of these blank forms, knowing that this country from one end to the other——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has no right to say that a member might have been guilty of forgery.

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not say anything of the kind. I said that it might be possible that my hon. friend from Bellechasse might have procured these blank petitions and sent them to some friend down there.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has no right to make such a statement against a member of this House.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I take it back; but I must say that in view of his having risen in his place and singled out two of these petitions from among those that have been presented here, it at least looks a little fishy, and as if there might be a job at the bottom of it; and unless he will broaden his motion sufficiently to include in it all the petitions that have been presented here, there can be no other inference taken. Therefore I suggest that all the petitions which have been presented be referred to that committee—and I am anxious to have those from my own constituency referred—because I know that the country from one end to the other is alarmed at the enormity of the scheme proposed by the government, and the people rose in their might and sent in genuine petitions, asking the governement to stay their hand until they investigated he matter.

Mr. D. HENDERSON (Halton). When the hon. member for Bellechasse read his statement in the House, I did not give very much attention to it. Evidently the hon. gentleman was selected by some pre-arranged plan to do something that possibly no other member would have done. But when the right hon. the First Minister enlarged the charge made by the hon. member for Bellechasse. and said that the same insinuation applied to all the petitions that had been presented, I began to consider the matter as very much more serious. I may tell the right hon. the First Minister that the imputation he has thrown out against many of my constituents who have sent in petitions will not be very kindly received by them; and I may say that amongst those petitioners are warm political friends of his own.

An hon. MEMBER. Not one.

Mr. HENDERSON. An hon. gentleman says not one. He is making a statement which he has no right to make, which is not in accordance with the truth; because I saw the right hon. gentleman's own political friends signing the petition. I think the right hon. gentleman has gone too far in making this broad statement, and I think it is his duty to have this investigation enlarged so as to make it apply to all petitions which have been presented, or else to withdraw the statement he has made.

Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). My hon. friend who has just taken his seat has anticipated what I intended to say; but in order to give the right hon. gentleman, who is the guardian of the honour and the integrity and the privileges of this House, an opportunity of making good the insinuations which he threw out in replying to the hon. leader of the opposition, I propose to move, in amendment, seconded by Mr. Hughes (North Victoria):

That the words 'these petitions' be struck out and the following words be substituted therefor: 'All petitions presented during the present session relating to the National Transcontinental Railway.'

If the right hon. gentleman is so jealous of the honour of parliament, and if he is possessed of any knowledge or information that any attempt has been made other than that alleged by his follower from Bellechasse, to impose on the privileges of the House, he will surely accept this amendment, and give an opportunity to those who presented petitions to demonstrate their bona fides.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Carried.

Mr. CLARKE. If the hon. gentleman who says 'carried' is the fountain of justice, I wonder that he did not move in this matter himself.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Because when a specific charge of forgery is made, I like to deal with that specific charge. My hon. friend will find that there are others.

Mr. CLARKE. I hope the hon. minister will make good that statement.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I will. I refer to the case of petitions from Bagot.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (North Victoria). I second the amendment with the greatest of pleasure. I had the honour of presenting some petitions from friends in my own riding, and I want to tell the Prime Minister that a number of Liberals signed those petitions. I never asked one of them to sign, but the signatures are genuine.

Mr. BELCOURT. That is not the charge. Nobody disputes that.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The statement was made in the House that no Liberal had signed one of these petitions. The hon. member for Bellechasse stated that the petition presented to the House to-day contained the names of idiots and lunatics. If that is so, I venture to say that friends of hon. gentlemen opposite were instrumental in having those petitions signed in that way in order that they might be presented to this House and be exposed. If that is the case, individuals will prove that the men who had that done were instigated by friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. I wish to say that a very prominent man in the province of Ontario, who had the offer of a Liberal

nomination in the election for the last parliament, signed one of these petitions, and the name of a gentleman who has the refusal of a Liberal nomination to-day will also be found in one of them, signed not by another hand, but by his own strong right arm.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I consider this a much more serious matter than it at first appeared to be. The allegations made by the hon. member for Bellechasse were so sweeping in their character and so specific in their nature as to demand prompt action to either establish or refute these charges against the petitioners, and the first minister alleged that the bulk of these petitions presented were of the same character, make this his charge a very important one for this House to consider. Following him, the right hon. the First Minister insinuates that all the petitions against the railway were of a similar character. Under these circumstances, it becomes a matter of the gravest importance that the inquiry should be of the very widest and most general character. From what I know of the signers of some of these petitions, I believe them to be men of high integrity and of sterling character, and so far as I know the petitions are truthfully and honestly signed. But the stigma cast upon these petitions by the right hon. First Minister applies to every petition which has been presented to this House, and therefore it involves the necessity of bringing the individual signers before the committee; and I demand, in the interest of justice and fairplay, and for the vindication of the character of the Reformers as well as the Conservatives who signed these petitions, that they be brought before that committee to give their testimony. It is too important to allow it to pass in that way, after the specific allegations of the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) that the signatures to these petitions were forgeries or signed by lunatics or aged people or people who were dead, especially we have the statement of the right hon. the First Minister, immediately following, that the petitions generally were of the same character. Such statements call for a most searching inquiry. The signers of these petitions should be brought from every part of the country, so that they may have an opportunity of vindicating their character.

Mr. R. BLAIN (Peel). I have had the honour of presenting a few petitions from the province of Ontario and I have some others which I have not yet presented. The right hon. the Prime Minister has insinuated that a very large number of the petitions have been falsely signed. I wish to say that I would like to have an investigation into the petitions which I presented from the electors of my county, and I would insist that the scope of this investigation be sufficiently wide to allow every man who signed one of these petitions to come here and make a declaration. I did not go closely into every petition which I presented, nor was it my duty to do so, but I have sufficient confidence in the electors of my county to feel assured that no signature is other than genuine. That is the way we do business in Ontario. Hon. gentlemen opposite laugh. They do not seem to care how long the session may last and I suppose we need not worry very much about it. I wish to say that I am in favour of the motion moved by the other side in so far as it goes. I am in favour of a complete investigation into this whole matter, but I am still more in favour of the resolution introduced by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), that every petition presented to this House shall go before this committee and there shall be a complete investigation, so that the people will understand whether or not any of these signatures are false. I regard this as a most important question. Even at this late stage of the session, whether it should take several months or not, it is in the interest of the public that we should have an honest and complete investigation into the signatures to the petitions against this government project of a transcontinental railway.

Mr. M. K. RICHARDSON (South Grey). I had the honour, Mr. Speaker, of presenting several petitions. The first petition which I presented was accompanied with a letter stating that I would find on examination that it had been signed by Reformers and Conservatives alike. On glancing over the names, I found that statement correct, and I believe the same remark would apply to all the petitions I presented to this House.

Mr. G. O. ALCORN (Prince Edward). As it is concerning some petitions which I presented that controversy has arisen, I wish to state, Mr. Speaker, that I presented these petitions in the utmost good faith and belief that they were perfectly regular. And, Mr. Speaker, apart from the utterly unsupported statement of the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) we have no evidence whatever that there is anything irregular about them. In presenting these petitions I submit that I was certainly more warranted in assuming that the signatures were bona fide and genuine than the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) was in making use of the outrageously extreme language he has. After a reference which had been made by that hon. gentleman to these petitions in this House on a former occasion, I had a conversation with him, in which I called his attention to the fact that if some of the signatures were apparently written by the same hand, that gave no one any right to assume that they were not written in good faith at the request of the people who were not able to write their own names. In the rural parts of our provinces, it is not unusual to find electors who can-

not sign their names, and we are entitled to assume that the signatures of such electors to these petitions were written by people who were authorized to sign for them. Hon. gentlemen know that the most solemn document a man signs in the course of his life (his will) is not necessarily signed by his own hand. He has a perfect right to ask his friend or neighbour to sign it for him. The excuse made by the hon. member for Bellechasse was that in each such case there should have been a witness who should have made a statutory declaration affirming that he was present and saw the signature made by the person who was requested to make it. Well, Sir, I am not aware that there is any procedure laid down in the rules of this House requiring any such thing to be done, and the House will well understand that it would not be practicable. It seems to me that, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, this House is bound to assume that the signatures were genuine. Until some direct evidence is produced showing some fraud in the affixing of signatures, no one has the right to challenge their authenticity. Until evidence is produced before the committee of investigation, under oath, establishing fraud, we are bound to assume that everything is absolutely regular. I do not propose to make any statement with regard to these petitions now if they are to go before a committee and be investigated; but so far as I am concerned, I take this opportunity of cordially inviting any investigation into any connection I have had with these matters. Every hon. gentleman on this side is most anxious that all the facts and proceedings should be investigated in the fullest manner. If the hon. member for Bellechasse means to insinuate that I had reason to suspect or believe that there was anything appearing on the face of either of the petitions I presented which should have led me to investigate into their genuineness, then I throw that insinuation back to the hon. gentleman with the scorn it deserves. So far as I am concerned, I repeat, I invite the fullest investigation.

Mr. ALFRED A. LEFURGEY (East Prince). I had the honour to present a number of the petitions——

Mr. COWAN. Apologize now.

Mr. LEFURGEY. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) will keep quiet for a moment, he can have his turn when I get through. I was saying that I had the honour to present a number of petitions from my own constituency, and among the names appended to those petitions, especially those from my town of Summerside, quite a number were those of leading Liberals of that town, men who have been leading Liberals for years. I know the signatures of these gentlemen, and I can say that the best business men in the town signed these petitions. I was astounded at the language of the hon. leader of the House insinuating that the petitions presented to this parliament with regard to the Transcontinental Railway Bill were forgeries or that the signatures were those of people acting from ulterior motives. In the interest of the country and out of deference for the high standing of a great many of the men whose names are on the petitions I presented, I desire that the fullest investigation should be held, so that the stigma cast upon the reputations of these men by the leader of the House may be removed.

Mr. BENNETT. When, a little while ago, I mentioned that certain frauds had been perpetrated in the province of Quebec in connection with the plebiscite vote, I was rather challenged by the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick). That hon. gentleman, as I understood, alleged that the only evidence in support of these charges of fraud was to be found in the statements of a man who, in consequence of those statements, was placed in such a position that he had to flee the country. I said I did not rely on the evidence of any man who made affidavits, but on something more tangible—the returns of the plebiscite vote. Under whose auspices was that plebiscite taken? Every man appointed to a position in the taking of that plebiscite——

Mr. SPEAKER. I would draw the attention of the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) to the fact that, a few minutes ago, when he referred to this question of the plebiscite, I understood that he merely wished to illustrate his argument before the Chair; but I am afraid he is discussing——

Mr. BENNETT. I would have finished with my illustration.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would recall the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the question of the plebiscite or of the census is not germane to the question before the Chair.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It is used illustratively.

Mr. SPEAKER. I thought the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) wished simply to make an explanation of what he had said previously.

Mr. BENNETT. That is what I mean.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would invite the hon. gentleman not to make an argument.

Mr. BENNETT. I say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not rely for evidence of fraud in the plebiscite vote in the province of Quebec, upon the statement of any person, but upon the returns themselves. These returns prove that frauds of the grossest kind were perpetrated. Why, what happened in the city of Quebec itself? In one polling division, in which there were only 115 names on the voters' list, no less than 114 votes were

recorded. No man is so idiotic as to believe that, in such a polling division, 114 electors actually presented themselves and voted. In another division of the city of Quebec, I find that 111 votes were polled out of 114 names on the list. And, with a zeal worthy of their masters in the province of Quebec, where they were trying to get a negative vote on the plebiscite, in Quebec Centre, they did the magnificent work against the cause of temperance of polling 105 votes where there were only 101 names on the list. And you can take the province of Quebec county by county, and find evidences of such frauds as are exposed by the figures I have just read.

Mr. JOHN D. REID (South Grenville). I am much surprised at the right hon. Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) backing up so strongly the resolution of the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot). When these petitions were being presented to the House day by day, signed by men of both parties throughout the Dominion, the Liberal papers all over the country tried to create the impression that the petitions were only from members of the Conservative party. They tried to make the petitions fall flat. Now, when this Grand Trunk Pacific Bill was being put through this House, we on this side felt it our duty to do everything we possibly could to prevent it becoming law without an opportunity being afforded of discussing it before the people, so that they might be educated on the question and understand what was before them. If the right hon. Prime Minister will actually carry through this investigation that has been proposed—I for one do not believe that he has any intention whatever of doing so—he will find that this Grand Trunk Pacific Bill is being opposed by leading Liberals from one end of the country to the other. If that investigation is properly held, I am satisfied that leading Liberals from every constituency of this Dominion will declare themselves opposed to the Prime Minister's policy, and in this way he will gain some idea of the effect that this Grand Trunk Pacific Bill will have upon his party at the next general election. I feel, for one, that this is the opportunity of our life to show to the people the folly of having the Grand Trunk Bill pressed through the House during the present session. I hope, therefore, that the right hon. Prime Minister has not had this motion proposed as a sham, but that he will give us the very fullest investigation, even if we take another six months to carry it out.

Mr. T. I. THOMSON (North Grey). It is quite clear that the government are at sea, perfectly at sea, as regards public opinion in the province of Ontario on the subject of this proposed transcontinental railway. I may say that one of the petitions sent to me was accompanied with a letter from the sender stating that every man he asked to sign it had signed it cheerfully, and there were as many Liberals as Conservatives on the petition. I am satisfied that every name on the petition is right. And I ask you, Mr. Speaker, why should not any man, no matter what his politics, be glad to sign such a petition? The most important request in that petition is that the construction of this road should not be proceeded with until proper surveys had been prepared. Why, the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair), whom I am glad to see in his place, stated that one of the chief reasons why he broke with his colleagues on this question was this very reason. And if that hon. gentleman thought this of sufficient importance to be one of his chief reasons for leaving the government, why should any Liberal in Ontario or any other province, object to signing these petitions. I think the government have not realized their position in this matter, but an appeal to the people which I hope they will soon grant, will convince them of the opinion of the country.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). As one of those who had the honour of presenting some of the petitions referred to, I desire, in the strongest possible manner, to resent the imputation cast upon the signatures of these petitions as not being genuine, by no less a personage than the right hon. Prime Minister of this country. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) presented a petition signed by 800 residents of the province of Manitoba against the railway rates on cream and other products. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McCreary) assumes responsibility for the genuineness of that petition. He has faith, as I have, that the signatures are genuine. We who are representatives are only doing our duty in presenting these petitions to parliament, and we cannot be responsible for every single individual name that is on them. We cannot answer for the genuineness of all these names, but at any rate, we in the province of Manitoba feel such confidence in the integrity and in the honesty of our inhabitants that we know well that they would resort to no such despicable methods as those which the member for Bellechasse states were resorted to in connection with the signing of those petitions in the province of Quebec. Now, I do not know so much about the inhabitants of that gentleman's province as he knows himself, but certainly, coming as I do from the west, I believe it to be beneath my dignity to cast such aspersions upon the inhabitants of Quebec as have emanated from that hon. gentleman himself. The most amusing thing, Mr. Speaker, in connection with this whole affair, is to see the dignity of parliament being looked after by the hon. member for Bellechasse, who now constitutes himself a champion of the dignity of parliament. I would say, to use a vulgarism,

that it was enough to make a horse laugh, if it were not so serious a matter. I think that no other gentleman on that side of the House could be found who would use such violent language and make such a serious charge against the gentlemen who have attached their signatures to these petitions. But I am not so much surprised at that hon. gentleman as I was at the Prime Minister, when he actually stated that no doubt these two petitions were samples of what prevailed throughout the whole Dominion. I say that it is my duty to rise and resent on the part of the people of Manitoba, such an aspersion upon those who have attached their signatures to these petitions, and who, in sending them in, distinctly stated that they would have been much more numerously signed had they had time to circulate them a while longer. Now, Sir, like hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, we are in favour of an investigation, and we insist on a full investigation, and are quite willing to stay here the balance of the year to get that investigation. The right hon. gentleman need not think that he can confine his investiation to two or three of these petitions, and then go through the country and raise a doubt of their genuineness, and proclaim that they are a sample of what took place in almost every province of the Dominion. It is, I say, an aspersion cast upon the inhabitants of our country who, though Conservatives in their politics, were they to-morrow to go over and give their support to the government on this transcontinental road or on their general policy, the Prime Minister would say that 'nothing would be too good for them,' as he said in regard to some of his colleagues in the past; but when his colleagues left the administration and refused to support him on this railway question, now nothing is too bad for them. I say the mere fact of a man being a Conservative does not change his character to that extent that he becomes a forger immediately, and then as soon as he joins the Liberal party he becomes one of the best citizens of the country. I think we will find that this is a mere device on the part of the hon. member for Bellechasse, who no doubt, acting under instructions from the government, wanted to break the force of public opinion that has expressed itself against this Trans-Canada road and its prosecution under its present auspices. But I think the Prime Minister will find that he has mistaken public opinion when he attempts to gag and to stifle the opinion of this country by asserting that these signatures were not genuine, when as a matter of fact they would have been far more numerous had time and opportunity been given.

Mr. W. F. McCREARY (Selkirk). As representing a portion of the west, I think we should concur in this investigation and make it as wide as possible. I looked over some of those signatures obtained in the city of Winnipeg and I must say I do not think some of the signers have been long resident in that city. Looking at the two petitions that came from Winnipeg, I would say that they were signed in a certain bar-room on a certain street, and I am sure that many of the people who signed that petition have not been residents of Winnipeg for more than a month, and that the price of signing it was about a glass of beer and a cigar. Why, the spurious character of the signatures is evident on the face of those petitions, because several signed their names as residing in Michigan, Kansas City, South Dakota. Now, I submit that though they may not be forgeries, those petitions should have very little weight with this House, for after a residence of about twenty-five years in the city of Winnipeg, I venture the assertion that not fifteen per cent of those names belong to people who have votes, or who are known in the city of Winnipeg as labouring men or business men. I have not had time to scrutinize the petitions coming from other parts of the province, but certainly they are representative of only a very small minority of the people of the province of Manitoba. To show the absolute ignorance of the parties who sent up that petition, I may mention for instance that one of those presented by the hon. member for Marquette as coming from the county of Selkirk, was as a matter of fact signed at Baldur and Melita, a hundred miles west of the county of Selkirk—absolutely ignorant of the geography of the country.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I do not think the member for Marquette presented any at all for Selkirk.

Mr. McCREARY. Then it was some other gentleman, I don't know. I know they were presented, and the county of Selkirk was marked on the petition. I said to the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd): 'These cannot come from the county of Selkirk,' because when I examined the petitions I found that they were alleged to be signed at places a hundred miles beyond the old county of Selkirk, and beyond the present county. So, I think the investigation should be as wide as possible.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). Was it the same petition that was signed in Quebec?

Mr. McCREARY. Yes, and some of the men who signed in Winnipeg were men who had merely dropped into Winnipeg. There are a large number of speculative people there at the present time buying land, and no doubt a good percentage of those people who signed in Winnipeg were picked up in the hotels and around the markets.

Mr. EDWARD COCHRANE (East Northumberland) I had the honour of presenting petitions to this House, and I want to say that those coming from the county of East Northumberland were

genuine. For my part, I care very little what the member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) may say in reference to the electors of the county that I have the honour to represent, and if they all knew him as well as I do, the electors would care very little about him, but they don't. Therefore, I want to protect them from any misleading influence that the hon. gentleman's assertions may have in this House or elsewhere. I want this question to be thoroughly investigated, and not balked as other questions have been by the right hon. gentleman and his friends. I was surprised to find that the leader of this House, the Premier of the Dominion of Canada, would lower himself in the estimation of the electors of this country by pinning his faith to the statements that were made by a gentleman who, I think, was put up by the government to make these assertions, and to asperse the good name of the electors of the province of Ontario as well as of the rest of this Dominion. I tell the right hon. gentleman that there is many a Reformer in the riding I have the honour to represent who signed these petitions and who won't thank him for the insinuations he made about them. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) says he has lived in the city of Winnipeg for twenty-five years. Well, he has improved his time. He knows just where these iniquities are perpetrated. I think he must have got some of the petitions signed, for he says that all the signers wanted was a glass of beer and a cigar. I compliment the hon. gentleman on knowing where the dignified positions are in the city of Winnipeg. I am sure the electors of his constituency will be very proud of the man that represents them in this House, when they learn that he is so familiar with the places where they can get a glass of beer and cigars. I would like his constituents and the people generally of that noble west of ours to know that they have got a representative in this House who would so lower the dignity of the men who sent him here as to say that he is thoroughly acquainted with the city of Winnipeg, and knows all the dives and just where to get petitions signed at the price of a glass of beer and a cigar. I think if the hon. gentleman reads his speech in 'Hansard' he will be very much ashamed——

Mr. McCREARY. I will not take it back. I know all about it.

Mr. COCHRANE—to see that he has heralded it to the world that he knows all about the dens of iniquity in the city of Winnipeg.

Mr. R. A. PRINGLE (Cornwall and Stormont). Mr. Speaker, I had not the honour to present any petitions in reference to this Transcontinental Railway. However, I listened attentively to the statement made by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot), and, if I understood him rightly, he stated that these petitions were signed by dead people, that they contained false signatures and that they were signed by insane people. If the remarks had ended with the hon. member for Bellechasse I do not think I would have been called upon to say anything, but when the right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) practically insinuated that the statements made by the hon. member for Bellechasse in regard to these two petitions were also true in regard to all the petitions filed, I feel that it is my duty to say something in regard to that statement. Now, is it to be said that the people are insane because they have signed a petition, the second clause of which states that:

> Your petitioners are of the opinion that it would be unwise and imprudent to take definite action until the government and parliament are fully possessed of the information essential to a proper decision of the question?

The hon. member for Bellechasse says that insane people have signed that petition in which that statement is embodied. He might as well have said that the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) was insane when he made this statement:

> But I am not in favour of impetuously rushing into the construction of a transcontinental line from Quebec, through an unknown country to Winnipeg and west until we know something about it—until we have the fullest information about it. The project is one of very great magnitude and it should be dealt with only after the maturest deliberation.

The hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals has put it in very much stronger terms than the language of this petition. I think the amendment moved by my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) is a proper amendment, and now that the right hon. Prime Minister has intimated or insinuated that all these petitions have false signatures, that they have been signed by dead men and have been signed by insane people, we have the right to have all these petitions thoroughly investigated, no matter how long it may take us.

Mr. S. E. GOURLEY (Colchester). Mr. Speaker, I had the honour of presenting some of these petitions, and when the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) attacked two of them, I thought it was very proper to do so if he had reasonable grounds. But of the hundreds of petitions that have been presented there is not the slightest charge that there is any informality or incorrectness in them, with the exception of these two. For the right hon. Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to arise when only two petitions were attacked, and these two in reference to some three or four names, and make the wholesale charge which he heralded against the hundreds of men who had signed all of the other petitions without a scintilla of evidence, is one of the most extraordinary things that I ever heard of. I think the right hon. gen-

tleman should be a man of more discretion and judgment than to be carried away by a momentary impulse to make a statement of such a startling character. The right of petition is one of the most sacred rights that we have. Everybody has the right to come to this parliament and present a petition. It is one of the most cherished rights that we have, and a right to secure which wars have been waged in England. I agree that a member of parliament must be responsible for his petitions, but I say that he must be responsible in a reasonable and intelligent manner. If a petition is sent from my county professing to be signed by the electors of the county, I would present it in the utmost good faith, believing that everything was correct and honourable. The hon. member for Bellechasse has made the most extraordinary charge against this government that has ever been made since I have been in parliament. According to his own story, so unpopular and hated has this government become in the province of Quebec that men leave their graves and walk abroad to sign petitions against it. Even the asylums have been invaded by the awful terror of the existence of this government, because the crazy men in the province of Quebec have been frightened by the intolerable methods of this government into moments of sanity and lucidity, when they apparently petition this House to save them from the recklessness of this government. It strikes me that the hon. member for Bellechasse has levelled the most deadly blow against this government that has been levelled against it, when he says that men who have left the cares of life and sought quiet in the grave rise up to enter their protest against the infamy of this government. Why, Sir, the right hon. Prime Minister, if he had been an astute man, would have at once repudiated the language of the hon. member for Bellechasse, and asked him to desist, because he was pointing to a state of affairs which showed that petitions ought to be levelled by every live man against this measure when the dead have risen from their graves to protest against it. Now, gentlemen——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. GOURLEY. Now, Mr. Speaker—hon. gentlemen opposite are so extremely polite and courteous that an hon. gentleman cannot be permitted the slightest deviation from the rule, even if he does happen to be a young member—this method of attacking petitions should have the reprobation of this House. The charge should have been levelled against one, or two, or three names; the charge should have been specific; because, when you attack the general right of petition, you strike at one of the most sacred rights and privileges of the country, and while I agree that no man should offer to insult this parliament by pretending to petition it when he does not really sign his name or agree to somebody else signing it, while I concur that it was a most serious matter for any man to present a petition containing a single name that he does not know to be genuine, I think when petitions are presented here they should be assumed to be regularly and honestly signed, because it would be a serious attack upon the reputation and decency of the people and upon their intelligence to fancy that anybody in the country could be wild and bad enough to obtain the signatures of men improperly; and, secondly, when obtained that they should be presented to this parliament. Therefore, when the hon. member for Bellechasse attacks these petitions he charges, first, that there was some man in this country bad enough to go round and ask men to sign their names to petitions, and when they would not do so to sit down deliberately and commit forgery. That is a charge against the honour and honesty of the people of this country that does not apply, I am glad to say, against the province of Nova Scotia. If it can be applied to any other province, I can tell the House that there is not a man in the province of Nova Scotia bad enough to do that kind of thing, and when an hon. member makes such a charge in regard to the province of Quebec, I say that he insults the province of Quebec. I repudiate it on behalf of the province of Quebec. I do not believe there is any man who would be bad enough in the province of Quebec to go around and forge the signature of his neighbours to a petition and to send it to this parliament to have it presented. For my part, on behalf of the province of Quebec, I refuse to believe that a single name to these petitions was signed improperly. Therefore, when the hon. member, knowing the sacredness of the right of petition, made his charges, he should have particularized what names he believed to be bad, so that the whole character of all the petitioners should not have been assailed. It is an extraordinary and an incredible position for the government to take. The Prime Minister should have been the first to denounce this attack upon the honour of thousands and thousands of the electorate of this country. It is impossible to believe that thousands of our citizens are tainted with forgery, fraud and criminality. I refuse to believe it, and the Prime Minister should have been the first to refuse to believe it. The member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) has a perfect right to make the charge, but he ought to make it with the utmost gravity, the utmost care, the utmost particularity, and he should not have cast a slur on the whole body of the citizens of Canada who signed these petitions.

Mr. TALBOT. In one petition, out of twenty-four names, there are seventeen bad.

Mr. GOURLEY. And what is seventeen out of thousands? There are three or four

hundred criminals in our penitentiaries, but does that asperse the high moral character of all the citizens of Canada ?

Mr. LOGAN. Seventeen out of twenty-four.

Mr. GOURLEY. And supposing it is true that seventeen are bad, I will decline to believe that because that is the case all the citizens of Quebec, who signed these petitions, are guilty of fraud and forgery. The hon. member (Mr. Talbot) should have been most guarded to confine his charges simply to the names which he thinks are bad, and the Prime Minister should have himself guarded the reputation of the people of Canada by demanding that these charges should be particularized. Even if some names should be found to be bad, then we must assume that the person who had charge of the signatures for that petition was not careful in having it signed. That is all it would amount to. I support the amendment of the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) that all of these petitions be brought before this committee, in order that the fair name of the people of Canada may be safe from the serious charge made against them, and which charge has been endorsed by the Prime Minister.

Mr. R. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). I had the honour of presenting some of these petitions, and I desire to say that so far as I know, I believe the signatures to them are genuine in every respect. I do not wonder at an attempt being made by the Liberals in this House to discredit those who petitioned against the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, in view of the manner in which they have attempted to discredit a late minister of the government whom they supported, who had the courage to protest against the ridiculous idea of building this railway without plans, and without necessary information. These gentlemen opposite have endeavoured in every way to belittle the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair), and I have not the slightest doubt they would belittle him more if they were able to. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) is put up to this scheme to try to blackmail the petitioners all through this Dominion of Canada. It is no wonder, I repeat, that they try to blacken the character of the petitioners, just as they tried to blacken the ex-Minister of Railways, who they said was not fit to unloose the shoe-laces of the Prime Minister. Although I did not see the signatures upon the petitions which I had the honour to present, I believe that every name on them was legitimately put there with the knowledge of the persons who signed. I want all the men who signed this petition in the county of Dufferin, to be summoned down here, so as to give them an opportunity of stating before parliament, whether they signed these petitions or not. If there is any fair-play in the matter, the government will afford these petitioners this opportunity.

Mr. C. B. HEYD (Brant). We have not been treated this morning to a very edifying spectacle in connection with the charge which has been made by our friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot). Because he has stated that there was corruption and fraud in connection with these petitions, a general desire has been expressed by our friends on the other side, that every one of the petitioners should have a free ride down to Ottawa in order to say whether they signed these petitions or not.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HEYD. That would be a very nice thing for the constituents of our friends on the other side, but it is not necessary. A distinct charge has been made that fraud has been committed with regard to certain of these petitions, and I hope that it will be investigated. We have heard this morning about the sacred right of petition. We acknowledge the sacredness of the petition to parliament. We know that it has existed from time immemorial. It is because it is the right of the humblest of His Majesty's subjects that we so highly regard it, and therefore we say that when our friends on the other side, for political purposes, have prostituted that right of petition——

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HEYD—have caused petitions to be circulated throughout the length and breadth of this country——

Mr. BELL. I have risen to a point of order.

Mr. HEYD—not to express the grievances of the people, but in order to promote the political interests of their party——

Mr. BELL. I have risen to a point of order. I beg to call attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) has accused the gentlemen on this side of the House of prostituting their rights.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not catch the word.

Mr. BELL. He distinctly accused gentlemen on this side of the House of having prostituted their rights.

Mr. SPEAKER. I presume that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) will withdraw the word 'prostituting.'

Mr. BENNETT. Take it back now.

Mr. HEYD. His inference is entirely erroneous ; his mind and my mind are running in a different groove——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is in order in making a personal explanation.

Mr. HEYD. I do not know what hon. gentlemen opposite are driving at.

Mr. BELL. I say the hon. gentleman—I presume he would like to be considered

an hon. gentleman—has applied the word 'prostituting' to members of this House, and I think the dignity and honour of this House requires that that expression should be withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that the hon. gentleman was explaining what he intended to say, and was willing to withdraw the expression.

Mr. HEYD. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw any expression which our hon. friends on the other side think is offensive ; but I will go on to say that when the sacred right of petition is prostituted for political purposes—that is what I said, and that is what I say still. If certain disaffected people anywhere in this country have a grievance, they have a perfect right to petition this House to have that grievance removed. But when in a newspaper office, or in a gathering of politicians somewhere or somehow in the darkness of the night, a scheme is set on foot for petitions headed in a certain way to be sent throughout the length and breadth of this country, to create the idea that these petitioners have a grievance; and when these petitions are being hawked about from pillar to post; and when, as is represented here, they are fraudulently signed; when the dead, as our hon. friend says, are brought from their graves and others are brought from lunatic asylums, when all other conceivable methods are used to get these petitions signed—what is it for ? Not because these people have a grievance, but to give our hon. friends opposite a political card to play in the coming elections; because they want to trump up the idea that there is a great protest against this railway throughout the country. I excuse our hon. friends on the other side from knowingly presenting these fraudulent petitions. They could not possibly know who signed them or how they were obtained. I have not the slightest doubt that if one had reached me from my own constituency, I would have presented it in good faith. But do not let our hon. friends opposite run away with the impression that they are going to convince the public that there was no fraud in any particular instance.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). There is no doubt that our hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Heyd) maintains a very lofty view as to the character of the citizens of this country and the members of this House. He seems to have no higher opinion of them than to assume that the citizens of this country are on the lookout for a cheap ride to Ottawa. I congratulate the hon. gentleman on showing that he possesses those qualities of statesmanship which justify his presence in this House. I hope it will not be presumed that the members of this House generally are represented by the hon. gentleman. I would like to think that he represents himself alone in speaking in the way he has done. With that remark, I think I might let the opinion of the hon. gentleman go to the oblivion to which it properly belongs. I may say that several petitions in connection with this matter were presented to this House by myself in perfect good faith. I do not know that all the signatures attached to them were put there by the parties who purport to have signed them, and I do not know that the Prime Minister would ask any member of this House to give any such assurance in presenting a petition. But I do think that the right hon. gentleman, in making the charge which he has made in his place in this House, against the people of Canada generally, and against the citizens of his own province, spoke much too hastily and without much reflection as to the importance of the words he uttered. There was in the right hon. gentleman's remarks the implication that possibly a large proportion of the signatures on the petitions presented to this House were forgeries ; which implied such a charge against the people of this country as no Prime Minister of Canada should ever dare to make in the House of Commons. The right of petition belongs to us as British subjects ; and how are our petitions to be presented except through the representatives of the people who have seats in this House ? If it can be shown that in some cases that privilege has been abused, I am sure the right hon. gentleman will find that no men in this House are more anxious to discover the wrong and have it rectified than the gentlemen sitting on this side of the House. But we decline to allow the right hon. gentleman to put up one of his followers on the back benches, with a prepared case, to cast discredit on hundreds and thousands of these petitioners, and to decline to allow a more general investigation to be made. If the right hon. gentleman feels that he can accuse the people of Canada generally of this kind of wrong-doing, we will declare on our part that the people of Canada must have the right of rebutting that charge, and throwing it back in the right hon. gentleman's face. The intention of hon. gentlemen on the government side of the House is to cast doubt on the whole series of petitions.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BELL. May I ask the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Cowan), who says 'hear, hear,' who was the first man in Canada to attach his name, in a most effective fashion, by his speech in this House, to this petition against this gross outrage on the part of this government ? It was Andrew G. Blair, ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, recently a colleague of the right hon. gentleman, who not only, to all intents and purposes, signed his name to the petition, but enforced it in a powerful arraignment of the government, which I may say has not to this moment been replied to by any member of the government. Hon. gentlemen oppo-

site attempt to belittle the protest of the people of Canada against this outrage; but that attempt will fail, and fail most effectually. This attempt on the part of a government, which has sat here month after month without submitting to parliament in response to inquiries one reason or one shred of information on which a proper judgment of this contract could be based, is destined to lamentable, ignominious and complete failure. It is a very small trick on the part of the government to put up a gentleman who in the early part of the session——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman has no right to accuse members of this House of a trick.

Mr. BELL. Well, I am anxious to keep myself within the rules of order, and I will say that it was a very low proceeding to take a gentleman who early in the session was clamouring for a subsidy for the Trans-Canada Railway, and who is now, no doubt, in consequence of some settlement that has been arrived at between himself and the government——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman has no right to impute motives to any members of this House.

Mr. BELL. I am not imputing any motives. I presume that some arrangement has been made or something has transpired. If the Speaker rules that out of order, I have great pleasure in withdrawing it.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is no doubt that no member of this House has a right to impute any motive, or to cast any suspicion upon the motive of a member of this House.

Mr. BELL. I do not desire to cast any suspicion. I merely suggested what I thought was a very obvious fact—that something must have transpired. If my remark in that very mild form is objectionable, I am willing to withdraw it. But you find the government compelled to resort to these efforts to try to weaken the attack made upon them in the only way in which it can be made by means of petitions. I have a petition from the county of Cumberland, which I am assured by the gentleman who sent it to me, would have been signed by 80 per cent of the electors, if he could only have had sufficient time to present it for signature. There are petitions which as we will be only too happy to prove, have been signed by men who, in other respects, are supporting the present government, but who, so far as this most grotesque railway project is concerned, are opposed to the government. If the right hon. gentleman wants to weaken the force of these petitions, he is not going to do it by attacking one here and there, but he must treat the whole together. What was the course taken by hon. gentlemen opposite last session when they sought to throw discredit on the census returns of the province of Quebec? The right hon. gentleman laid on the Table a great mass of evidence intended to show that there was an improper computation of the population of the province of Quebec in the census of 1891. He was challenged by this side not to rely solely on such evidence as he could procure from his partisans throughout that province, but to submit the whole matter to the investigation of some competent authority. Did he do it? No, Sir, he did as he did in the case of the West Huron election frauds. He refused to have the matter investigated by a competent tribunal. Just as he does in every difficult situation in which he finds himself, he managed to make use of some subterfuge and creep out when challenged. But if now, after he is challenged to have a full inquiry, he prefers to shirk his duty, he can only do so in defiance of the protest of the opposition.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland). There can be no doubt, Mr. Speaker, about the fact that the opposition have lost their self-control.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LOGAN. They have made their last throw and lost. A few weeks ago, with the aid of a Canadian newspaper they determined to put forth a propaganda which they thought would sweep the whole country. They were going to submerge this House with a deluge of petitions and completely overpower the government. But what has been the result? After trying their utmost, after canvassing constituencies, after begging the people to sign, they have induced less than four per cent of the electorate to sign petitions against the government railway project; and among that four per cent are lunatics and dead men and men who are not living in the country at all. They have ignominiously failed to get the petitions signed, which they have been hawking around for weeks. My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) says that he could have had eighty per cent of the people in some districts of Cumberland to sign the petition which he presented. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that there are 40,000 people in that constituency, and that his friends who went through it from house to house got just 151 names out of these 40,000. Does that look like 80 per cent of the people? I was down in my constituency a few weeks ago, and during my stay I did not find one Liberal who did not approve of the government scheme, and I met many Conservatives who said they were ashamed of their party, once led by such men as Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper—a party which then had the instincts of government, but which now has sunk so low as to oppose our national development. I can tell my hon friend further that he might tramp the county of Cumberland from end to end, and he would not get one per cent of the people in the

Liberal ranks to sign any petition in favour of the alternative scheme of the leader of the opposition. These hon. gentlemen opposite have tried to use the ex-Minister of Railways to bolster up their case, but we know that that hon. gentleman has freely expressed his opinion that the alternative proposition of the leader of the opposition is absolutely ridiculous and would not be entertained by the people. Have any petitions been presented in favour of that alternative scheme? Not a single one. My hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) has presented specific charges regarding certain petitions and has been answered by a volume of abuse, and no doubt I shall be treated in like manner. These hon. gentlemen resort to the old dodge of abusing the opposing attorney in default of argument. In one of the petitions there are thirty out of thirty-four names written in the one handwriting. Let me tell the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) that although I do not believe that there was forgery in my constituency, these 151 names were not signed by 151 different hands. There are several in the same handwriting. What are the facts? These gentlemen opposite prepared these petitions in conjunction with a certain newspaper and sent them broadcast over the country. Did these petitions ask the people of Canada to declare that this road should not be built? No, Sir. I have in my hand a copy of two of them, one prepared to circulate in the east and one for circulation in the west, and the one differs from the other as black from white. Here is the petition from the east, which was presented for signature in the county of Cumberland. It sets forth:

That your petitioners are of opinion that it would be unwise and imprudent to take definite action until the government and parliament are fully possessed of the information essential to a proper decision of that question.

That a project of such magnitude should not be undertaken without the most complete and accurate surveys, under the direction and control of engineers of standing and repute.

But you will not find any such paragraph with western petitions.

That such surveys should be in the hands of the government and of parliament before the credit of the Dominion is committed to an enterprise which involves enormous obligations.

That, however, the most competent men are of opinion that the cost of the projected line between Winnipeg and Moncton will reach the enormous amount of upwards of $120,000,000.

That, on the contrary, it is to be greatly feared that by pledging the credit of the country to such a vast extent, the government will make it impossible to carry out works better calculated to meet the transportation needs of the country.

This is equivalent to saying that if the government go ahead with this project, there will be no public money available to build other railways. Then it proceeds to say:

That the government, parliament and the taxpayers should hanve an opportunity to learn the results of the investigation of the said commission; and to examine the evidence upon which such results were arrived at.

That is the eastern petition. Let us now look at the western petition. It starts out by stating that transportation facilities are necessary and then proceeds to say:

That the over capitalization of transportation companies is one of the most important conditions leading to unduly high rates, and should be prevented.

That a railway system designed to move the products of the west should not be burdened by the addition of costly and needless sections; that the proposed eastern section of the Grand Trunk Pacific would be of value chiefly for the purpose of colonizing the territory it traverses; and that western lines should not be obliged to impose rates fixed with a view of providing for the annual fixed charges upon such section, between one and two thousand miles long, built many years in advance of settlement in the James bay basin.

That the company should not be committed to the construction of the eastern section.

This is the petition presented to the west.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). The hon. gentleman accuses members on this side of circulating two petitions—one for the east and one for the west.

Mr. LOGAN. Yes.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I know and can tell more about those western petitions than the hon. member for Cumberland. I placed that petition on 'Hansard' the other day. There has not been one petition circulated in the west coming from hon. gentlemen on this side. They originated in the west and were circulated there by the people themselves and sent here to their representatives in parliament.

Mr. LOGAN. Will the hon. gentleman tell me that the heading of the petition, a copy of which I have in my hand, was not printed in Ontario or Quebec?

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). So far as I am aware——

Some hon. MEMBERS. You do not know.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I will undertake to say this, that not one single petition circulated in the west was printed in the east.

Mr. LOGAN. I asked the hon. gentleman if the headings to the petitions were not printed in the east.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I do not deny that, but there is no point in that.

Mr. LOGAN. That is all I have contended for. This petition goes on to say:

That the proposed western section of the Grand Trunk Pacific, from Winnipeg to Edmonton should be constructed as an additional line opening up new territory; and that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company should not be allowed to purchase the Canadian Northern

Railway line instead of constructing an additional line.

That is something new that they have imported into this proposition. Then it concludes :

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that the Transportation Bill now before parliament be not passed in its present form, but that it be altered to provide for the above-mentioned conditions, and that the commission on transportation should consider the whole question of the proposed eastern section and report, and that complete surveys and estimates should be made.

Mr. Speaker, the petition which was presented in the House from the eastern part of Canada, and which they failed to get signed by any material part of the population of that part of Canada was put upon this ground—the people were asked to sign it on the ground that $120,000,000 would have to be paid for the construction of this road, that this would be taken out of the treasury, and that the effect of its expenditure would be to prevent facilities being provided which were required in that part of the country. In the petitions presented in the western part of Canada this was not mentioned, but signatures were sought to the petition on the ground that the road would be too heavily bonded and would be compelled to charge too high rates. I charge that these petitions were prepared in Eastern Canada, either in the city of Montreal or in the city of Ottawa; that one form of petition was sent to the eastern part of Canada to be signed and the other sent to the western part of Canada to be signed; and not four per cent of the electorate of Canada signed either one petition or the other.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). Mr. Speaker, as I am one of the members of the House who presented petitions in regard to this much vexed and much discussed railway project of the government, I desire that this discussion shall not close without a word from me on the subject. I should not have troubled the House at all if the matter had ended with the remarks of the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot). But, when the Prime Minister, undertaking to represent the whole country and standing for the advisers of His Excellency the Governor General in all administrative matters carried the argument to the distance he did this morning in the few remarks with which he favoured the House, I feel that it is incumbent upon me not only on my own part, but out of respect and consideration for the electors whom I represent who have hitherto supported this government and voted against me in the last election, to say a few words. I say it is my duty, not speaking alone for members of the opposition, or even for those in my county who are in the habit of voting for the Liberal Conservative party, but speaking for those who have hitherto voted for the so-called Reform party and the government now in power, to say a word in refutation and repudiation of the insinuation thrown out by the right hon. Prime Minister. The hon. member for Bellechasse undertook, from information which he seemed to think satisfactory—and perhaps he is to be excused, for, as the Prime Minister said, the hon. gentleman is not a lawyer and does not know the value of evidence—to find fault with one or two petitions in regard to this matter which has come from certain places in the province in which he resides. The hon. member for Bellechasse attacks certain parts of that province in attacking the petitions which come from it. He undertook, as I say, on the strength of information which satisfies him that there is something wrong in these petitions to ask an investigation in regard to these two—I believe there were two—petitions to which he refers. It might well have stopped there, and I think it ought to have stopped there. The hon. member for Bellechasse might or might not have been entitled by the evidence which he presented to prolong the session of this House and have an investigation carried on. While I notice that the hon. member for Bellechasse was very anxious to have an investigation, he based his demand for it largely upon the fact that several signatures in the petitions were in the same handwriting. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot) is not a lawyer, I might be permitted to point out that this of itself is not a piece of fraud. His province, no doubt, is in the same position as others in this matter. There are men who cannot write, or men who do not put their own names to petitions, but request another person to sign for them. There are persons who cannot write their names legibly and, if they wish to petition parliament or petition a municipal body or any other authority must have their names written by others. It may be that the hon. member for Bellechasse will find that this is the mare's nest he has discovered. But that is not the most serious part of it, nor would the remarks of the hon. member for Bellechasse with regard to petitions from his own province have caused me to feel it my duty to speak. But I rise, as I have said, to repudiate the insinuations thrown out by the right hon. Prime Minister against all the petitions that have been presented against this measure. The petitions from the county of Lincoln were presented by me in good faith. They were signed by persons whom I know. I read every signature and I can assure the Prime Minister and every member of parliament that several names, in the petitioner's own handwriting, are the names of gentlemen who have never voted against the party of the present government, but who will not be the more inclined to vote for that party by the insult of the Prime Minister,

They have not said by this petition that they are going to vote against the government on this scheme, but simply that the opposition in this House have been doing their duty in calling for delay in regard to the scheme until we had information which would enable us to judge in a reasonable way whether the scheme was for the benefit of the country or the reverse. This is what the language of the petition says: There are many reasons why the delay should be granted; there are many reasons why the project which has been put through the House and is now before the House should not come into force, should not be binding upon the country until more information can be obtained. What else can the ordinary voter do than petition the House in this way. Is it unreasonable that he should ask for delay? Would it not occur to any one in the habit of supporting the government that a great mistake was being made in pledging the assets of the country to an enormous extent when the people have no means of judging why it should be done because they have not sufficient information? Is it not reasonable that they should ask the government to pause, to look before they leap, to get information before they commit the country irrevocably to this scheme? But that does not seem to please the right hon. Prime Minister. That right hon. gentleman seems to think it is not right that anybody should have the assurance, should have the cheek, so to speak, to ask this government not to go so fast. And the right hon. gentleman seems to think that because the hon. member for Bellechasse believes he has discovered an irregularity in one or two petitions presented here, he has the right to stand up and insinuate, as I understood him to do, that all the rest of the petitions were tainted in the same way. I want to tell the right hon. Prime Minister that if he comes to the county of Lincoln and says the same thing to the Reform party there he will be repudiated more than by the Conservative party. It is the Reformers of Lincoln whom I have the honour to represent who are disappointed. The majority of Lincoln showed that they did not have faith in the present government in the election of 1900, because they came to the conclusion that it was necessary to change their allegiance and send a member to the opposition, though the county had been in the habit for some time of sending a supporter of the party of hon. gentlemen opposite. It is not only the Conservatives of the county of Lincoln who are petitioning in this matter, they are not disappointed, because they were not expecting much from this government; but it is the Reformers of the county of Lincoln who signed these petitions for whom I specially speak, and whom I represent as much as I do the Conservatives. Reformers though they be, they have a right to expect me to stand up here on their behalf and on behalf of the honour of the county of Lincoln, and to repudiate the aspersions which the Prime Minister has cast upon their honesty and their good faith.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister carried this a good deal further than the member for Bellechasse. The member for Bellechasse only attacks the genuineness of two isolated petitions, which he wants investigated, but the Premier assumed that all the other petitions are in the same category and are open to suspicion. Therefore I am bound to say that I am in favour of the amendment moved by my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), that if any of these petitions are to be investigated, if it is insinuated that all these petitions are more or less tainted, then I say that every petition and every name on those petitions should be proved to be absolutely genuine. Now the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) seemed to think that the investigations of the committee should be restricted, because, as he chose to put it, it would involve a free ride of all those petitioners and their witnesses down to Ottawa. I do not think the hon. member for South Brant is justified in saying that. He has no right to suppose that the people of this country want free rides down to Ottawa. They are not so little occupied—in the rest of the country at all events, whether that may be so in the hon. gentleman's county or not—they are not so little occupied that they are anxious to take free rides down to Ottawa; perhaps they are not so anxious for these free rides as the hon. member and his constituents are. But I am speaking for the rest of the province that I know something about, and I think I am quite correct in saying that the ordinary electors of this country, those who exercise their right of petitioning this government, are justified in sending their petitions here without being accused of wanting a free ride down to Ottawa to back up their signatures. But whether they ride to Ottawa free or at the expense of the country, I venture to think that a great many of these petitioners from the county of Lincoln, notwithstanding the insinuation thrown out by the Premier, would be glad to come here at their own expense; and they will not only satisfy the Premier that their signatures are genuine, but they will tell him why they signed those petitions, and they will tell him why they think his government is making a mistake. I think the result will be that the Premier will regret that he ever threw out those insinuations. The people of the county of Lincoln who signed those petitions comprise a great many gentlemen who have heretofore voted for the Reform party. The gentlemen who signed those petitions ought to be allowed and must be allowed to come down here and say: We do not know what the member for Bellechasse meant, we do not know what the Prime Minister had in his mind, but all the same we desire to tell you that we did sign these petitions, and we

are here to back up our signatures. Let me give this word of warning to the hon. member for Bellechasse, at which I hope he will not take offence: I think he had better be very careful how he goes on with this sort of thing unless he has better evidence in proof of his charges than he appears to be able to present. It is true he says that there has been a wrong done in regard to these two counties, but I warn him how he tries to prove fraud in respect of any other counties, particularly in the province of Ontario. The whole object seems to be to make it appear to the world that notwithstanding that these petitions have been sent in here against this railway project of the government, they are not to be considered as having the weight that ordinarily attaches to such petitions. Now there are thousands and thousands of names on those petitions, there are undoubtedly the names of the most prominent men in every county in the Dominion on these petitions against this railway project. The hon. member for Bellechasse might well consider the trend of the general consensus of opinion throughout the Dominion before he undertakes this investigation.

I do not know how long the member for Bellechasse wants this session to last, but I can assure him, and I can assure the Premier, that just so long as it is necessary in the interests of the country for members of the opposition to sit here and investigate public matters, whether in regard to this railway or in regard to the petitions against it, or in regard to any other public question, he will find us perfectly willing to sit upon the job as long as we find it necessary, just so long as we think it is in the interests of the people of Canada to do so to discover what is true and what is untrue, and to rectify any wrongs that we may discover to exist. The investigation that has been asked for will necessarily involve a great many days of the time of the committee, and probably a great many days of the time of this House. I dare say the investigation will extend into months, and it looks to me as if we were not going to get out of here until the new year, because we must investigate every one of these petitions, every one of these signatures, in order to disprove the charges the Prime Minister has made against the people of Canada. Now it is all very well for the member for Bellechasse to say that he only wants to investigate these two petitions. He speaks of the whole of them as being of doubtful genuineness, and the Premier says the same thing in effect, that probably all the petitions are tainted. Now the question before the country is this, whether the people have a right to petition this parliament without being accused of fraud, and without each one being called upon to send half a dozen witnesses down here to prove upon oath that his signature is genuine. If this government means that they want to stop the people from petitioning against any of its acts, that they want to prevent them from exercising their constitutional rights to petition parliament whenever they see fit, then we have indeed before us a question of great magnitude to decide. It ought to be sufficient for the Premier to know that every hon. gentleman who presented these petitions in this House attached his signature to them to vouch for their bona fides. For instance, my name is attached to a petition from the county of Lincoln, and that ought to be prima facie evidence for the Premier that the signatures on that petition are genuine. The people of Lincoln expect that it should be so. Now the Prime Minister seems to think that because the petitioners do not approve of his policy, and because he finds that two petitions from somewhere in the province of Quebec presented in good faith by the hon. member for Prince Edward county, contained a number of signatures in the same handwriting, that therefore not only these petitions are to be suspected, but all the others that have been presented.

You must also take it for granted that several gentlemen who have hitherto supported the so-called Reform government are now calling upon this government to pause, and not go on with this scheme until they have made the surveys and procured the information which they ought to have, before the country is prejudiced irrevocably by its commital to this great project. These gentlemen are in good faith petitioning the party in power that they supported until today, and they are told by the right hon. Prime Minister: You may have the right to vote for us to put us in power, or you may have the right to vote against us, or against our policy when we go to the country but we will not allow you the right of petitioning us and assisting the opposition in stopping the government from doing a great wrong by committing the country irrevocably to this scheme. The right hon. gentleman tells these gentlemen that he doubts very much the evidence of the genuineness of the signatures that are attached to these petitions. The people have to fight upon this question and I say right now that the investigation that is to be held must cover all the petitions that have come in and every signature must be inquired into. The honour of every man who carried these petitions through a riding and of every man whose signature appears upon the petitions is at stake, because either these signatures are genuine or the man who sent that petition to me and asked me to present it to the House has been committing a fraud. We cannot assume that any signature is a forgery. The onus of proof would be on the person making the charge. The presumption is in favour of the man who says that his signature is genuine. Nevertheless, the honour of the supposed signer of the petition is involved, the honour of the man who

is supposed to have got his signature is involved, the honour of the man who sent the petition to me and asked me to present it to this House is involved and I say that these men must come down here, whether they have a free ride or not, as the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) states, and say where these petitions came from. Therefore, I say the investigation must be as wide as that which has been suggested by my hon. friend from West Toronto, and it is the right hon. gentleman's fault if it does take time and involves expense.

I have just a word to say in regard to the hon. member for South Brant. He had the temerity to stand up and say that the idea of presenting these petitions was conceived in the darkness of night. I wondered when he said that if he thought that the project which the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) had condemned and which had caused him to leave the cabinet was conceived in day-light. Was there so much of the noon-day sun that the people of the country understood it? Was it not because there was no light upon the subject that these petitions were presented here? In spite of all that the opposition could do, representing the best interests of the people of Canada, to get information upon the subject that Bill was railroaded through this House as fast as they could put it through. Notwithstanding the fact that the opposition used every means in their power to get the information to try and find out what obligation this was going to impose upon the country, they were unsuccessful, while at every step the evidence seemed to preponderate against the wisdom of the scheme. In spite of all that, in spite of the fact that Cox could not wait, in spite of the fact that the government were apparently bound to put it through, what did the people of Canada do? In each county, wherever they could within the short time at their disposal they prepared and sent petitions down here saying that: If the government do not think the members of the opposition were right in what they said, we ourselves petition as ordinary voters and ask you to delay until you get more information. The hon. member for South Brant should have reflected as to where and how this scheme originated. He ought to have asked himself whether he and other hon. gentlemen behind him had as much light upon the subject as they desired when the scheme was first announced? Does he not know that several hon. gentlemen who voted for the government were at the beginning utterly opposed to it? Does he not know that lots of the supporters of the present government in the country were waiting anxiously to have placed before them the merits of this question and that they have not yet received the light upon the subject that they ought to have received? Does he not know that the men signing these petitions have declared that there is not the day-light upon the question that there ought to be before the country was involved in the enormous expenditure that this scheme will entail?

The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) had a few words to say before one o'clock and he read a lecture to hon. members of the opposition as to what, from his standpoint, should be their duty in this House. He said that we on this side of the House, having no case, were abusing the members of the government. He said that having been disappointed in our last effort to impose our conclusions upon the government we were abusing the attorney representing the government on this question. I do not think that we have been abusing the members of the government in this matter, but, I think that the government have abused the people who have signed these petitions. I do not think they have been fairly treated in the measure which has been meted out to them in regard to these petitions. He says that this is the opposition's last resort. It may be the opposition's last resort at the present time but it is not the opposition's last resort because the opposition's last resort is the people's last resort. If the government have the courage to go before the country the hon. member for Cumberland will find that the opposition's last resort is to make the appeal that they shall make against the government, and he will find that the people's last resort will be the strongest condemnation of this project. The hon. member for Cumberland also said that the difference in the petitions which came from the east and from the west showed that there was something wrong about them. Does he not know that there were so many objections to this scheme that you could have fifteen or twenty petitions in opposition to it and if you were to put them down in ordinary sized print you would have a petition as long as from here down to Wellington street. Does the hon. gentleman suppose that three dozen petitions could in any ordinary sized print represent all the objections that there are to this scheme, and does it not strike him, that, when the people of the west enumerate certain objections to this scheme, although they are not the same as those which the people of the east have, nevertheless, they are good objections? Does it not also strike him that if there are so many different objections urged to this scheme by the people in the west and the people in the east there is an accumulation of evidence against it, and that there is an additional reason why the government should get more information instead of merely insulting the petitioners? I do not know that I shall trouble the House any longer with the matter. I have said as emphatically as I can, and I wish I had language in which to say it more emphatically, that I resent and I think the people of Lincoln will resent as an insult, the words used by the right hon. Prime Minister to the effect that these

petitions are not bona fide and that therefore the government should not pay any attention to them. The people have the right to appreciate the efforts of the opposition if they think that those efforts are well directed. What makes the government angry is that they find that not the hidebound supporters of the government but the independent Reformers so to speak as well as the Conservatives are unanimously saying that the contentions of the members of the opposition are contentions which they strongly endorse, and that they find that their party are losing strength in the country and are going to get into trouble. A few of the most important objections against this policy are set forth in these petitions. The signatories, in pursuance of their inherent right as British subjects, have petitioned the House of Commons, and asked the government to pause before the country is irrevocably committed to this scheme. Speaking as the representative of the county of Lincoln, and speaking generally of the duty of a member of this House, I say that the government should have accepted these petitions in good faith, and should have considered them in the proper spirit. If this investigation is to be made by the Privileges and Elections Committee, it must be of the widest character, and notwithstanding that the member for Brant (Mr. Heyd) has accused us of wanting free rides for our constituents to Ottawa, I say, Sir, that the petitioners must be allowed to come before parliament and to give their evidence that they have presented these petitions in proper form.

Mr. TAYLOR. A little before three o'clock this afternoon the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) went to the record room, where the petitions are supposed to be kept, and asked for the two petitions to which the member for Bellechasse referred this morning. The clerk in charge stated they were not there, and he said that the member for Bellechasse had taken them away. I want to know from the Minister of Justice or the Prime Minister, if it is proper that petitions supposed to be in charge of an officer of this House, may be peddled all over the country and left lying around on desks, and names added to them, and then have them referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections ? These petitions are not now in the custody of the proper officers, and the members who presented them have no opportunity of seeing them. These petitions are supposed to be under lock and key, in the custody of the Clerk of this House, so that any member of this House may have access to them, but we now find that they are out of the possession of the Clerk, and presumed to be in the possession of the hon. member (Mr. Talbot) who made the charges.

Mr. GOURLEY. The officer who allowed these original petitions out of his custody should be immediately brought to the bar of the House and punished, and some proceedings should be taken against the member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) for his conduct. These are original records of parliament, and any man who takes them from the custody of the proper officer infringes on the criminal law of the country. We should have the Clerk summoned before this House, and dismissed, and we should pass upon the conduct of the man who attempted to take them from the custody of the clerk. It is an outrage, that the records of parliament should be peddled about in that way.

Amendment (Mr. Clarke) agreed to, and main motion (Mr. Talbot), as amended, agreed to.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not necessary that there should be an Order of the House, to send these petitions before the committee ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the motion provides for that. All documents of the House are always at the disposal of the members of committees, and of the members of the House also.

Mr. SPROULE. I am of the opinion that they should be referred to the committee by Order of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that is provided for in the motion.

PAYMENT OF EMPLOYEES ON RIDEAU CANAL.

Mr. TAYLOR. I had a letter this morning from a merchant, stating that the employees on the Rideau canal, in my county, have not yet received their pay for the month of August. What is the reason for this ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I should think we would have to inquire from the Auditor General, why a credit has not been issued.

Mr. TAYLOR. These employees are suffering great inconvenience ; they have exhausted their credit in the country stores, and the government should explain why they are not paid.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will draw the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals to the matter, but I apprehend, it is because a letter of credit has not been issued.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now that the Minister of Finance has come into the House, I wish to ask the hon. gentleman why it is that the labourers on the Rideau canal in the north end of the constituency I represent, have not received their pay for August, nor any pay since then ? I have a letter from a merchant of the locality stating that their credit is about exhausted, and that some of the store-keepers will not supply them until their cheques come. Some of the men are really in need of money in order to get the necessaries of life.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A good many persons in Canada have been obliged to wait for their money because the Auditor General declines to facilitate the usual method of payment.

THE KING VS. CARVER.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have received a communication as to the commutation of sentence in the case of King vs. Carver. It would seem that the commutation of this sentence has provoked hostile criticism, and at the instance of my correspondent I would ask the Minister of Justice, if there is no objection, to lay upon the Table of the House the papers connected with this case. If there is any report of the judge, or any reasons assigned for commutation, or any petitions asking for commutation, it would be desirable, if there is to be a discussion, that these documents should be made public.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. A motion has been passed in the Senate asking for the production of these papers. I have hesitated up to the present to comply with that order, because it is contrary to the practice of this House. I have a memo. made by Sir John Thompson in which he refused to produce the papers in a capital case. I am, however, considering the matter with respect to this particular case, and I will let my hon. friend know in a day or two what the decision of the judge is.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the decision of Sir John Thompson cover all the documents in connection with such a case? It would not, I suppose, cover the Order in Council.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Perhaps not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Minister of Justice gave a memo. to the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) in connection with this subject, but I confess that I did not read it very carefully. I suppose there would be no objection to producing the documents which are not covered by any precedent. I think there was the same opinion on the part of my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) and myself, that these precedents did not go as far as seems to be indicated in the memo. which my hon. friend the Minister of Justice was good enough to send to us.

ST. JAMES DIVISION, MONTREAL.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the government whether any decision has been come to with regard to issuing the writ for St. James division, Montreal? The matter has been brought to the attention of the House on several occasions by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). Will the hon. gentleman repeat the question when the Premier is here?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Very good. When is it likely that there will be an opportunity of renewing the question?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman may do it by consent at any time.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

British Columbia—Columbia river above Golden—new hull for pile driver, &c., $4,500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why do you have the votes for dredging divided up in this way? This is not dredging?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the object of this pile driving?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The banks on these rivers have to be protected in many places, and we require the use of a pile driver.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that it would be better if you kept the estimates for your dredges, scows, pile drivers, and all other plant separate from the estimates for the actual work done.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think there might be an improvement in the classification. I may say that in going over these matters I found the same difficulty the hon. leader of the opposition did, and I think it would be well to have a reclassification in our estimates in that direction. It would be more convenient for this House, and still more convenient for the department.

Columbia river above Golden—opening channel from river to site of proposed warehouse at Wilmer, $1,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What warehouse is this?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mining developments are going on there, and the products of the mines are shipped by boat. An application from Mr. Hammond, of Osler & Hammond, who is largely interested, represents that a large amount of money has been invested in mining industries there. Therefore, I feel that this expenditure is warranted in the public interest for the purpose of improving the navigation in this river.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that dredging?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This will be hand dredging.

Columbia river—improvements between Upper and Lower Arrow lakes, $12,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say that a small dredge has been

built by the department and placed on this river, and this vote is for the maintenance of the dredge and its working expenses during the year.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the dredge doing ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is dredging the Columbia river. We do not require a separate item for dredging there. We own the dredge, and this is for its maintenance and operation.

Mr. SPROULE. Why do we vote $12,000 to maintain and operate a dredge in this place and $10,000 to maintain and operate a dredge somewhere else ? Would it not be better to have a general vote, out of which these dredges might be kept going, instead of having a separate vote for each place ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I agree that that would be better. In this particular case the dredge is built specially. It can get neither off nor on that river. $12,000 is the total cost of the work being done. But I agree with my hon. friend, and if I have anything more to do with preparing the estimates. they will be prepared in that way.

Columbia river between Arrow lakes—to pay balance due on dredge machinery, $4,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a dredge that was built by the department under contract. It will cost altogether $6,000 with the machinery.

Fraser river—improvements, $25,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work is done under the supervision of Mr. Keefer, the engineer of the department in the province of British Columbia.

Mr. SPROULE. Where is this work done?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At Nicopin island. It consists of mattrassing and pile-driving for the protection of the banks of the river.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Do they use the government pile-driver ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, we own all the plant there. It is all done by day labour.

Hardy Bay—wharf (revote), $2,100.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete the payment for this wharf, which was let by contract.

Quatsino city—wharf, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a new vote. It is proposed to provide wharf accommodation for steamers and other vessels. This is a city in the north of Vancouver island, and it is a mining district.

Mr. SPROULE. How much is this work expected to cost when completed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total cost is estimated at $5,000. The work will be let by contract.

Williams Head quarantine station—extension of wharf at eastern end, &c., $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have a government wharf there, and this is for small extensions and improvements.

Mr. SPROULE. Will this complete the improvements ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is the intention.

Victoria Harbour—additional amount for dredging and removal of rocks, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have both government dredges at work in that harbour, and the work was carried out very successfully. We desire to complete it, and I am informed by the engineer that this $10,000 will complete it this season.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is this for the inner or outer harbour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. For the inner harbour.

Public works—chargeable to income—Yukon Territory—Lewes and Yukon river improvements, $30,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote of $30,000 is proposed to apply as follows in connection with the Lewes and Yukon improvements, viz : (a) Maintaining the training piers, dams, &c., built at the head of Lake Laberge, the object of directing the whole discharge of Lewes river into one comparatively narrow channel on the south-east side of the river which can be used by steamboats of from four to five feet draught at the lowest stage of the water ; (b) Closing the gap of about 400 feet left in the centre of the brush and stone dam of which already 3,250 feet lineal have been built on the north-west side of the contracted artificial channel formed at the head of Lake Laberge. (c) Removing boulders from Thirty Mile river. (d) Completing some further blasting required on the rocky ledge which runs across the waterway at Five Finger rapids, in order to improve the navigable channel so as to permit of the easy and safe passage of steamboats of about four feet draught at the lowest stage of the water without having to use a cable. (e) Blasting some rock off dangerous points, &c., at the Rink rapids. (f) Improving the channel at Hellgate. (g) Increasing the depth of water over bars in the Yukon river below Selkirk and Ogilvie.

Mr. HACKETT. Have we a representative in this House from that section of the country ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, Mr. Chairman, we have.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Will this work be done by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work is being carried out under the advice of the local council at Dawson city.

Mr. CLARKE. Municipal council or the government council ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The government council.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I regret that, because we have an experience of that body already, as I understand. It will be remembered Mr. Chairman, that it cost $50,000 merely to plug a hole in that country. If this money is to be expended by the same people as had control of that work, I do not think the method is a good one. It seems to me it would be better and more satisfactory if the matter were under the control of the department.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We found it would cost more to maintain a staff of engineers in that country such as would be necessary for these works than to carry out the works under the advice of the council. That council are coming in contact with the representatives and the shipping interest, and so have the best means of learning how the money can be most advantageously spent in the public interest in improving navigation. My hon. friend (Mr. Thomson, Grey) will admit that there are none who know more of the situation than the representatives of the shipping interest, and none who are more anxious that the work should be properly done. Since the present system was adopted, we find we get much greater value for the money expended than before. Of course, we have an engineer representing the department, who reports on these works.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not hear the whole of the minister's explanation, and may have misunderstood. Did he say that this money was spent by the transportation companies ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I said the money was expended under the advice of the Yukon council.

Mr. SPROULE. This is in addition to the amount placed at the disposal of the council itself ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, with this feature—that they make a report to us, and the accounts are sent here and we pay them.

Mr. SPROULE. Who initials the accounts ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The accountant of the Yukon.

Mr. SPROULE. In keeping the accounts, would this amount be included in the expenditure of the territory ?

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is entirely under the charge of the Public Works Department here. The hon. gentleman will remember that I mentioned seven or eight points at which improvements were to be made, and I explained that the work could be done more efficiently and cheaply than by maintaining our own engineers in that country.

Mr. SPROULE. Can they carry out the work and charge what they like, or does the department's engineer there employ the men ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They make a report to the department and we scrutinize the accounts. But they employ the men to carry out the work.

Harbours and rivers generally, $3,500.

Mr. SPROULE. What is this for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is the usual vote.

Mr. SPROULE. What can be done with this small item ? What kind of improvements can be carried on with this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is for contingencies and different small accounts. It has been voted annually for a long time.

Mr. SPROULE. It always seemed to me that the voting of these small general amounts is absurd. We have accounts for each locality for dredging, and then a general account ; accounts for repairs to dredges, and a general account. And here we have another of these small items. I suppose this $35,000 applies to the whole Dominion, and can be used anywhere. But what can be done with an amount like this I cannot understand.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is because we take special votes for dredging here and there, instead of having one vote, which I think would be better, that a general item like this is needed. There are incidental expenses in connection with all the works—stationery and other contingencies—to be met out of this general item.

Mr. SPROULE. I could understand a vote of some size, but I cannot see what is the use of voting $3,500.

Mr. HACKETT. I desire to bring to the attention of the hon. minister the fact that in the year 1900 a public work was commenced in a place called Skinner's Pond, in West Prince, P.E.I.

Mr. CLARKE. Was it before or after the election ?

Mr. HACKETT. Immediately before the election. I would like to ask the minister if he intends to drop that work after having expended $2,000 on it, or does he intend to continue it ?

Mr. McCREARY. Will the hon. gentleman say where Skinner's Pond is?

Mr. HACKETT. It is just as good a name as Pile-o'-Bones creek, or any other. I would like to ask the minister if he intends to prosecute this work at Skinner's Pond, where $2,000 have already been expended.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no information with regard to this matter. I do not find anything in the estimates for any work there. What kind of work was commenced there, may I ask the hon. gentleman ?

Mr. HACKETT. The hon. gentleman ought to know, he has the facts before him. It was cutting a channel through the sandbar into the land near Skinner's Pond, in a region where there are many other points on the coast of Prince Edward Island. It was supposed to be a great advantage. Now the minister has the chief engineer at his elbow, who should be able to tell us what is going to be done now that the elections are coming on.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know that the chief engineer is intersted in elections. He tells me it was opening up a small channel, and was reported to give satisfaction.

Mr. CLARKE. Surely it is not the intention of the department, after commencing this work on the eve of the last election, to drop it immediately after the election. Is it the intention, now that another election is coming on, to go on and complete the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no knowledge whatever. The chief engineer says $2,000 was spent there.

Mr. HACKETT. Do I understand the minister to say that he will make further inquiries ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will be pleased to give instructions to have the local engineer make a report with regard to this work.

Mr. CLARKE. I think this item better stand until we get full information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, let it stand.

Item allowed to stand.

Dredging—including salaries of engineers, superintendents and clerks. Dredging—Maritime provinces—additional amount required, $28,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is an additional amount required for carrying on dredging operations in the maritime provinces.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). In the moneys provided for public works in the maritime provinces, I notice that there are no items under the head of dredging alone, but they are all for the construction or repair of dredges. It seems strange that this item should be in the former class.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is a general statement as to how the money is to be used.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I think it would be better to place it under the head of rivers and harbours generally than to place it where money is required for building and repairing dredges. It is not a proper classification. Every other item is for the construction of dredges, here it is for dredging, a different matter altogether.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know that the department is responsible for this classification.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). The amount of money that is appropriated for improvements in the maritime provinces is so large that a portion of it had better be under some other head.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We send the items over to the department, and when they are printed we find them in this way. I imagine that is being done with the items of the other departments. There is no intention to cover up anything. That money cannot be used for any other purpose than dredging in the maritime provinces.

Mr. HACKETT. Could the minister tell me what dredging has been done in the province of Prince Edward Island in connection with this vote ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the hon. member will wait till that item comes up in the estimates, I will give him a list of what is being done there, or I will give him the information now.

Mr. HACKETT. What has been done at Cape Tormentine and Pointe du Chêne in regard to dredging ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No dredging has been done at Cape Tormentine this year. The dredging at Pointe du Chêne was completed early this season and the dredge left there some months ago.

Mr. HACKETT. At about what time ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Some time in July the work was completed.

Mr. HACKETT. Where was the work done at that particular place ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Along the base of the pier.

Mr. HACKETT. What depth of water is there now and what space has been dredged ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About seventeen feet at low water.

Mr. HACKETT. What space ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot remember the figures sufficiently well to give my hon. friend correct information, but I will be very glad to bring down a report showing the hon. gentleman just what space has been dredged.

New dredging plant, British Columbia, to replace snag boat 'Samson' and dredge 'Mud Lark,' $10,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Are these out of service or what has become of them ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is the commencement of a somewhat important vote. The snag boat has become unfit for use, worn out and the 'Mud Lark' is in the same position. They have been doing some work but they have been reported as being unfit for work, and it is desirable that we should renew the plant. The new snag boat is estimated to cost $20,000 and the dredge to replace the 'Mud Lark' $30,000.

Mr. CLARKE. This is the first vote ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is the first vote in an expenditure of some $50,000.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Will a contract be let by tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Where is it proposed to build this new snag boat and dredge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are generally built on the coast. They have been built in the past by companies from Toronto or Montreal.

Mr. SPROULE. What about the 'Samson' and 'Mud Lark' ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are generally disposed of by public advertisement.

New tug for dredge 'Manitoba,' $10,500.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Is this for the province of Manitoba ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is the total cost of the new tug required.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Where is it to be placed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On Lake Manitoba. This is an entirely new tug, a strong one and more competent to do the work that is required of it.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Was there a vote last year for the construction or purchase of a new dredge for that province ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, the chief engineer informs me that there was a vote last year and that a dredge was purchased.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). There is no item for dredging at the mouth of Mossy river. I noticed that there was a vote last year. Has that work been finished ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I put the item in the main estimates.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Has any work been done there yet ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Is it going to be done this year ? There is a large sandbar which prevents boats coming in and going out at low water and this work is very necessary.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer informs me that it is difficult to get the dredge up. It was the intention to take it up during high water. It cannot be got up at all times. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will know that is the reason why the work was not carried out for which a sum was voted last year.

Hydraulic self-propelling dredge for maritime provinces, $40,000.

Mr. HACKETT. What is the name of this dredge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It has not been christened yet. This is a vote of $40,000 for the purpose of building a new self-propelling dredge for the maritime provinces.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the total cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think the hon. members of this committee will agree with me that we require some better plant for spending the money that we have voted. We have voted money for dredging at important points from year to year and no work has been done. We either should not vote the money or else we should have some good plant to carry out the work in a satisfactory manner. There are several important harbours in the maritime provinces where we have no plant to do the work. Some of the dredges that we have are small and could not do the work at these harbours. The intention is to build or purchase a new plant. The total cost will be about $120,000.

Mr. CLARKE. What will be the capacity of the dredge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a suction dredge with a capacity of about 1,000 yards an hour.

Mr. SPROULE. Who is the builder and how is it to be built ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We will have to advertise for tenders. It will be built by contract.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I entirely agree with the government's policy in construct-

ing these dredges. The only thing I regret is that there are not more public moneys appropriated for a similar purpose. I am satisfied that if the government owned more dredges and did the work themselves the work would be done for one-half what it costs now by letting it to outsiders who have dredges for this purpose. I am confident that it will meet with the approval of the country.

Mr. HACKETT. Might I ask the hon. minister where this new dredge will be constructed and what will be the total cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Specifications will be prepared in the department for the kind of dredge that we want and we will advertise for tenders.

New dredge for Prince Edward Island, $25,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The old dredge in Prince Edward Island is very unsatisfactory. The expectation is that we can have a dredge to do satisfactory work in Prince Edward Island at a total cost of $25,000.

Mr. HACKETT. It is quite impossible that you can get a dredge to do the work around Prince Edward Island for $25,000. The old dredge was taken over from the local government at confederation ; it is thirty years old, and it originally cost over $40,000. It is a small thing for the government of Canada to propose to replace her by a dredge that will only cost $25,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am informed by the engineer that you can build a better dredge now for $25,000 than you could for $40,000 when the old one was built. The engineer has some experience, and he knows that my instructions are to give the House full information so far as he can as to the cost of these things. I may say to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hackett) that the first cost of the old dredge was about $23,500.

Mr. HACKETT. She cost $40,000.

Mr. CLARKE. How will this work be done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Tenders will be advertised for.

Mr. CLARKE. May I ask the minister if any dredges are being built at Sorel ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am informed that they have more work on hand at Sorel than they can attend to.

Mr. CLARKE. What are they doing ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are building two or three large dredges and scows, &c.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I may say that $25,000 will build a splendid dredge, as good a dredge as we have on the upper lakes, and she is a very good one having a capacity of from 800 to 1,000 yards daily. In the main estimates, on page 55, there is a vote of $5,000 for harbours and rivers generally, and in the supplementaries there is a vote of $3,500 for the same purpose. That is additional to the amount in the main estimates ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). In the main estimates you have an item : 'New dredging plant, maritime provinces ; new hydraulic dredge, $200,000.'

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is a different kind of dredge altogether ; that is for the 'W. S. Fielding' that is being built at Sorel.

Mr. CLARKE. Is the material for these dredges obtained by public tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. So far as I know, yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Will this dredge be built in Prince Edward Island ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We will have to build her wherever the most satisfactory tender comes from. I dare say that the contract for the hull may be in Prince Edward Island, and the contract for the machinery might be separate, or the contractor for the hull might buy the machinery, according to specifications, from the different manufacturers.

Mr. BLAIN. How many dredges have you at the present time ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The deputy thinks we have 19.

Mr. BLAIN. How many under construction ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. One.

Mr. HACKETT. How long before this dredge for Prince Edward Island will be completed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We will advertise at once for tenders, and there is no reason why it should not be completed during the next season. There are urgent demands for dredging from different parts of the Dominion, and I believe that this dredging work is necessary for the improvement of our harbours and the development of the trade of the country. We wish to secure this plant at the earliest possible moment. We have made inquiries with regard to purchasing plant, but we have had no suitable offers, or I would be quite willing to accept them. We want a first-class, up-to-date plant that will give satisfaction. As soon as this vote is passed we will advertise for tenders for the Prince Edward Island dredge.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). When the minister says that he will advertise, he means in the public press of the country ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. KAULBACH. As there are so many dredges now under construction, I would ask the Minister of Public Works to make a red mark on the wall with respect to my appeal for dredging to be done in the county of Lunenburg.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say that the appeal of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kaulbach) is one of the principal reasons which has convinced me as to the necessity of getting more dredging plant. We have no dredge at the present time that can satisfactorily do that work.

Mr. KAULBACH. I will look forward with a very great deal of expectation and hope that this appeal of mine, which I have made so frequently, will be acceded to at the earliest possible moment. I hope it will be the first appeal attended to.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would not like to make any rash promise that it will be the first, but I will see how the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kaulbach) behaves himself. However, seriously speaking, that is the intention, and this is one of the most important works that we want this new plant for.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). From the amount of money voted for dredging in the maritime provinces, I do not see why our hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) should not have all the dredging he requires in his constituency. I find in the main estimates, at page 55, that $87,000 is voted for dredging in Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick, and in these supplementary estimates $28,500 more is voted. These amounts far exceed the amounts voted for the upper provinces, so that I think the hon. member for Lunenburg should have the dredging he wants done in his constituency to his entire satisfaction.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Thomson) looks more closely, he will find a special vote for dredging in the hon. gentleman's constituency; but, as I have explained, no matter how much money we vote, we have not any dredge to do the work.

Mr. KAULBACH. I may inform the hon. Minister of Public Works that I shall be satisfied with the dredge he has on hand at present until he can get a superior one, and then of course we shall expect to have the remainder of the work completed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am perfectly willing to make a bargain with my hon. friend; but the chief engineer of the department and the hon. gentleman between them decided that the dredge could not do the work, and therefore if I sent it there, it would not be very satisfactory.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria).

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). The harbours in the constituency of Halifax have not been dredged for three or four years, and we have been waiting with a good deal of patience until a dredge could be procured. There are a number of harbours in that county which are suffering because the dredges are occupied elsewhere. But I would point out to the hon. minister that before any promise is made to the outlying counties of Nova Scotia, he should remember that the promise has been made for some time that the harbours of Halifax county would be attended to, and the people of that county would be unwilling to see any outlying counties take precedence. I would like to have this impressed on the hon. Minister of Public Works.

Mr. HACKETT. I approve entirely of what has been said by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat; but I was surprised last evening to hear the hon. gentleman say that the fishermen of Nova Scotia lived on the outskirts of civilization, and I do not desire to allow that statement to pass without a word of protest. I would like to ask him now, if he thinks, in his cooler moments, that the fishermen of Nova Scotia live on the outskirts of civilization. I believe that the fishermen of Nova Scotia live in the very centre of civilization. That province is one of the first colonies of the empire. It was not only settled after the war of the revolution, but Champlain, Jacques Cartier, and all the other great explorers first discovered it on their way up the St. Lawrence. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he thinks now that the fishermen of Nova Scotia, after these hundreds of years, lived on the outskirts of civilization?

Mr. KAULBACH. I wish to emphasize the statement in regard to the fishermen which has just emanated from my hon. friend who has just taken his seat; because no better class can be found anywhere.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Is it a fact that the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Roche) has made the statement here that the fishermen live on the outskirts of civilization? Is that true?

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). About as true as a great many of the statements made on the other side of the House—made out of whole cloth. I never stated any such thing. I may have stated that they lived on the extreme verge of the country, that is, nearest the ocean, but if anybody thinks the fisherman is a greenhorn or is outside the limits of civilization, he makes a great mistake. Mistakes of that kind will arise in Ontario; that is where half truths emanate from; but they do not emanate from the member for Halifax. I wish the hon. gentleman to understand that I am not in the habit of making rash statements of that kind. What I do say I am quite willing to stand by on every occasion. I never disparge any one,

either friend or foe. I am not such an idiot as to do that.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Will my hon. friend tell us what he did say ?

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). It is in 'Hansard.'

Mr. HACKETT. I do not wish to make a statement which I can corroborate or support, and I have here the words of the hon. gentleman as he uttered them—that the fishermen of Nova Scotia——

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). What page ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must draw the attention of the hon. member to the fact that he cannot read from a former debate.

Mr. HACKETT. I am not reading. I am simply stating the words of the hon. gentleman as he uttered them, that the fishermen of Nova Scotia lived on the outskirts of civilization. I simply took down the words of the hon. gentleman as he uttered them, and I repudiate the statement.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). Is the hon. gentleman quoting from 'Hansard.' If so, from what page ?

Mr. HACKETT. The hon. gentleman is very desirous of having pages, but, I am quoting his words exactly as he uttered them. Now, I resent that on the part of the fishermen of Nova Scotia.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). I rise to a point of order. The hon. member for West Prince (Mr. Hackett) has attributed certain observations to the hon. junior member for Halifax, who has denied having uttered them. I submit that in view of the fact that the hon. gentleman is not prepared to state the authority from which he quotes, he has to accept the denial of the hon. member for Halifax.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The rule is quite clear. When a certain statement is attributed to an hon. member, and when the hon. member says he did not make any such statement, then the whole thing has to cease. The statement of the hon. member who has been charged must be accepted in good faith.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Will you permit me, Mr. Chairman, to repel any such insinuation with regard to the fishermen of the province from which I come. They are not living on the outskirts of civilization, but they are well-to-do citizens, who earn more money than the average merchant or professional man or farmer, and they are as respectable a class of people as we have in Ontario. To say that these people live on the outskirts of civilization, or that they are not as competent to do business as the rest of our people, is something that I must repudiate.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). If the hon. gentleman wishes to make remarks, he is at perfect liberty to do so ; he may put any interpretation he pleases upon his own remarks in regard to people in his own locality. There is no resemblance whatever between the fishermen in the hon. gentleman's constituency and the fishermen in my constituency.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must draw the attention of the hon. member to the fact that this discussion is out of order.

New dredging plant, British Columbia—one tug, steel hull, and two hopper scows, $36,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Here is another illustration of what I spoke about. Just a little above, you have another item for dredging plant at British Columbia, $10,000. Why not put all the dredging plant in one item in each province, so that we may know how much is spent in each province.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I agree with the hon. gentleman and I am sorry these items are entered in this way. It is inconvenient for me, and I would prefer to have them altogether.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the estimated cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The tug will cost $20,000 and the two steel hopper scows $8,000 each.

Mr. SPROULE. Will they be built in British Columbia ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If there are any firms in British Columbia able to do this class of work and I understand there are—they will be given an opportunity to tender.

New dredging plant, Ontario and Quebec—additional amount, $78,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In the main estimates we asked for a vote of $75,000 for new dredging plant for Ontario and Quebec. That is the way moneys have been voted since confederation for this dredging plant. We purchased the 'International' plant, a large steam dredge and scows belonging to Mr. Connolly the contractor. This plant cost originally, $180,000. There was a dispute between the Connollys and the government when this plant was offered for sale, and I asked Mr. Stevens, one of the most competent men in the service at Halifax, to examine and report on the plant. On his report and that of Mr. Howden of the department, we concluded that it was a good purchase and that by purchasing it we would save two years, which it would take us to procure a plant at all equal to this in order to carry on the works for which money was voted. The whole purchase price was $123,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What was included in the purchase ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not the particulars, but speaking generally it includes a dredge, a good tug,

four scows, all the duplicates, &c. I am satisfied that the department has now a first-class deep water dredging plant.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the capacity of the dredge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About 6,000 yards per day. It was built at Kingston, Ontario, in 1894. It has a steel hull.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Where is this dredge to be used ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At all the deep water points in the province of Quebec, down in the St. Lawrence. This plant may be used in salt water and will dredge anywhere from fifteen to sixty feet.

Mr. SPROULE. Was this dredge purchased after examination and estimate as to value ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The first thing I did was to get Mr. Stevens of the Marine Department, who was reported to me as the most competent man in the Dominion to examine machinery of that kind, to examine it. Then we have the report of the officers of our own department, especially Mr. Howden, who has been in the service some twenty-five or thirty years in connection with this work, and who is said to be a man of very high character and a very efficient judge. From the reports of these men we decided to make the purchase.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). Mr. Stevens, the government inspector of machinery in Nova Scotia, is one of the most competent men in Nova Scotia.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the minister bring down these reports ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, I will have them brought down and lay them on the Table.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, it is understood that we can discuss this item further.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly.

Mr. BELL. May I ask to go back to the item for the hydraulic dredge in the maritime provinces ? I would like to know what is the character and capacity of that dredge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The capacity will be about 1,000 yards per hour.

Mr. BELL. Will this $40,000 cover the cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, no. The chief engineer estimates the cost at $120,000.

Mr. BELL. Is anything included in that estimate besides the dredge proper ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. BELL. In what depth of water will this dredge be able to work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As deep as thirty or thirty-five feet.

Mr. BELL. In how shallow water can she work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. She is a suction dredge ; she will have a draught of about five feet, and can work in about eight feet of water.

Mr. BELL. If only $40,000 is voted and the total cost will be $120,000, I am afraid we can scarcely expect to see that dredge in operation next year. At what time is it expected to be available for use ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say definitely. Of course, I could not procure the plans until I had the authority of parliament. I am making all the speed I can, and, so far as the department is concerned, there will be no delay that can possibly be avoided.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I suppose there is no intention of proceeding next year with making the channel by the Canadian route between Gananoque and Brockville. I understand the government made a complete survey of that channel. There is not so much dredging to be done.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not intend to proceed this season. I have not taken any special vote for the improvement of that channel.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I might suggest to the hon. Minister of Public Works that some time, when he is taking a trip up the river St. Lawrence, he might take a look at a rock or shoal in the narrows at Brockville. I brought the matter to the attention of the minister two or three years ago, and a buoy was placed there but the channel is very narrow, and buoying does not obviate the difficulty. It is merely a large rock, I should say, lying there in eight or nine feet of water, and I think it would not take very much money to clear that obstruction and make a first-class channel through the narrows. The American government have removed all obstructions on their side of the channel, so that, on the route between Cape Vincent and Ogdensburg, this is the only real obstruction that might cause accident. It is only three or four years since a large steamer with her consort struck this rock, and very great loss resulted. I mention the matter so that the minister might kindly look at it and see if it would not be possible to have this obstruction removed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Some day, when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Reid, Grenville) has his yacht out, I shall be glad to accept his invitation and take this trip. But the survey has been made, and the engineer has the plans in the department, and an estimate is being made up which I

shall be prepared to submit to my hon. friend.

Roads and bridges 'Hull slide' union bridges and roadway approaches—repairs, alerations and additions, &c., $6,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to replace sidewalks, roadway and approaches destroyed in the great Hull and Ottawa fire. The total cost of the work is estimated at $12,800.

Ottawa city—Dufferin and Sappers bridges over the Rideau canal—repairs, alterations and additions, $10,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought this work was finished.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to cover the cost of road, sidewalk and approaches, granolithic or asphalt, including, if necessary, iron girders. This work is being done on the recommendation of the officers of the department and will cost $15,600.

Mr. SPROULE. There was a considerable expenditure on these bridges, and I thought we were done with them for a considerable length of time; but the work is hardly finished before we commence again.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is exactly how the matter struck me, but I am informed that the work done was merely temporary work. But the work is to be done now in a first-class and permanent manner.

Mr. BIRKETT. When it is considered that nearly all the traffic between west and east in the city of Ottawa passes over these two bridges, it will be seen that the work is necessary. But I question if the minister can carry out the necessary repairs and improvements for this amount.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is this an iron bridge?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Bryson bridge—reconstruction of piers and approaches, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is over the Ottawa river at Bryson.

Mr. HACKETT. Is this an interprovincial bridge?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, it is a wagon bridge across Calumet Island in the river. There are two bridges. I think, one from the Quebec side and one from the Ontario side.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Does the government build wagon bridges?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They must have built this one.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Then we are doing a work that belongs to the Quebec government. I think the minister had better look into this.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I know that the bridge is government property. Representations have been made to the department about it, and I inquired why the Dominion government had built the bridge. I have made arrangements with the county that they are to take possession of the bridge and relieve the Dominion of any further expense in regard to this matter, and this vote was given upon that condition. It is for renewing a bridge built there some years ago. The total cost of the bridge was $15,500. It is a steel bridge, but it was built on wooden piers that have become undermined.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I think that belongs to the province of Quebec; that island is entirely within that province.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think that probably it is a provincial work, legally. But the government did some years ago build this bridge, and are responsible for it. We are to put it into good shape, and the county is to maintain it hereafter.

Mr. SPROULE. This other bridge at Ottawa, the union bridge, is that an interprovincial bridge?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not very well posted. It is government property and we get considerable revenue.

Mr. SPROULE. I am speaking of the interprovincial bridge between Quebec and Ontario at Hull. Has it any connection with what is called the slides that are in the city of Hull and belong to the province of Quebec?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No the slides are Dominion property. There are two bridges over the slides that are Dominion works, and we maintain them.

Moisie Post road—improvement of, $700.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to keep up a road in connection with our Dominion telegraph lines along the north shore of the St. Lawrence, for a distance of about 300 miles. There have been improvements made from time to time in order to carry on the telegraphic work, to remove obstructions in order to enable material to be carried across a rough country.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It is the duty of the province to keep up that road. The government is not taking any grants to build a roadway along the Yukon telegraph line, and why do you build a road down there?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This line was built in 1886. It runs from the east shore of the Saguenay along the shore of the St. Lawrence river down to Belle Isle.

Mr. SPROULE. Then the item ought to be under the head of telegraph lines.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I agree with the hon. gentleman, so far as my judgment goes. It is ridiculous to say that this is for the Moisie road. It is a vote for the maintenance of telegraph lines. I beg to move that the words 'Moise post road' be struck out and that the words 'North Shore Telegraph Line' be inserted in lieu thereof.

Motion agreed to.

Edmonton bridge over the Saskatchewan river —renewal of flooring, $1,650.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Trains and teams have to cross over this bridge on the same level as it is both a railway and wagon bridge. It is not wide enough for the two, and I think that the traffic in the near future will require that an additional bridge shall be constructed or an enlargement of the present bridge at one side or the other for the use of teams shall be made. I took the liberty once before of pointing out to the hon. minister, that, wherever a railway bridge across a stream or river in the North-west Territories is constructed, beside or under the railway track there should be a wagon road. I am satisfied that it would be of incalculable benefit to settlers if that should be brought about. There should be a separate wagon road instead of having the wagon road and the railroad together.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The matter has been brought to the attention of the department and the engineer is looking into it.

To open a pack trail from Peace river to Pelly river $25,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At the request of the Department of the Interior it is proposed to open a pack trail 650 miles long from the Peace River landing to the head-waters of the Pelly river.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There was a good deal of money expended and of course it had to be expended in haste at the time of the Yukon excitement in building the Athabaska trail to Peace River landing. They took that trail over the worst possible route that could have been selected for a trail. It is not necessary as a matter of fact to have a trail into that part of the country as yet, because the water-ways are available and one can get to Peace River landing much more readily by water than by land, but in case the trail is constructed it should be kept more to the west than when the old Athabasca trail was constructed. In building the trail through the Peace River valley by the route proposed, it will be found to be a very difficult one. You would find it as easy to follow the Liard river route rather than the route which has been outlined. I think you will find it necessary to construct the old Athabasca Landing trail to Peace River over again, as it has all grown up and is almost impassable.

Mr. SPROULE. Who is going to do this work and how is it going to be done?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The former work was done by the officers of the North-west Territories. I dare say that probably the best way this money can be expended is to expend it under the direction of the officers of the government of the North-west Territories.

Mr. SPROULE. Under the officers of the government of the North-west Territories?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The district is far away and inaccessible and these people are interested in getting value out of the money.

Mr. SPROULE. You mean the North-west council?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I may say in regard to the last trail constructed that the money was very well expended. A young officer named Chalmers, who was afterwards shot in South Africa, had charge of the work on the trail. He gave very careful supervision to the work and did it excellently.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not objecting at all to the way in which the work was done, and I am not saying that it was inefficiently done, but we have been voting a great many items for the North-west Territories, and I would like at some time during the passage of these estimates if the hon. minister could give us the various items together with the aggregate amount that we have voted for this purpose.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is practically a grant to the North-west Territories.

Mr. SPROULE. We have passed several items of this kind already. Then, there is another thing. Do these gentlemen in the North-west Territories receive pay for doing this work? They get their salaries as they are under contract to do police work. Do they get extra for this work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, they receive no extra pay. The officers to whom I referred are the officers of the North-west council.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I think I may have misled my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule). This officer had been formerly in the police, but I do not think he was an officer of the police at the time he took charge of this work for the North-west council.

Mr. SPROULE. This will be done by the North-west Council?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a long way from Ottawa, and we have to consider the best way to get value

for the money. The North-west Council are extremely interested to satisfy the people that they should get the most value for this money, and they will do the work and send vouchers, properly certified, here. They have men of special experience for this kind of work.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not object to that. I heard a rumour that Mr. Charleson was to go out there to do this work, and I do not think that the country requires a second experience in the near future of the manner in which he expends money. I assume that the North-west Council will make every dollar go as far as it can, but if it were to be spent by some commission sent out, including Mr. Charleson, I certainly would object to it.

Assistance towards extension of telephone line from Chatham to Tracadie, N.B., $2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a grant we are giving to a private company to connect a line with the Lazaretto.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you get any return for this grant ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The deputy tells me that we have not made any contract, but I suppose there will be a condition as to certain government messages going free.

Mr. SPROULE. You ought to have that understood beforehand. If the money is voted, the company is likely to try and get out of any bargain of that kind.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I agree with my hon. friend, but this is a small matter, and I think we may leave it with the deputy minister to arrange proper terms.

Telegraphic connection between Deer Island and Eastport, Me., $3,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is an extension of our own line for 10 miles.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Doees it cost $350 a mile ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are two miles of cable which will cost $1,200, and the cost of the land line is $110 a mile.

Anticosti Island—renewal of line wire between Fox Bay and Bescie river, $7,360.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for a renewal of 60 miles of our present line.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What stations have the government on Anticosti ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are seven stations.

To pay for Marconi wireless telegraph apparatus at Chateau Bay and Belle Isle, $4,100.

Mr. SPROULE. What success has attended this Marconi system ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The report of the officer in charge is that since July this station has been working very satisfactorily. This line extends for 22 miles.

Mr. SPROULE. Have we not a station for ocean telegraphic purposes ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This station is not used for communicating with ships as yet, but it can be so used.

Mr. SPROULE. We voted $80,000 last year for the Marconi system.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That was for erecting a station at Glace Bay.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes ; and we see it announced in the press, from time to time, that the system has been a success and so on. Can the minister give us any information about that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The arrangements in that regard have been carried out by the Department of Finance, and my hon. friend will be able to get the information when the Minister of Finance comes into the Chamber.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Could not this station be made to work for outgoing or incoming vessels ? If we had had a station there somewhat similar to what they have in New York, it might possibly have prevented some of the accidents which have happened, and perhaps some of the large steamers now going to Montreal which have not the system on board would adopt it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have an expert in the department who is at the head of the telegraphic business, and I will endeavour to obtain any information which he may have on this subject.

Telegraph line—Murray Bay to St. Catherines Bay, second wire, $1,640.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for a second wire on our own line between these two points.

Mr. HACKETT. What is the distance between these points ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Forty-one miles.

Mr. HACKETT. Might I ask what the hon. gentleman is doing to establish a telegraphic service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland ? It is a matter that has been brought up frequently, and the minister said he would consider it ; and I trust that he will see his way clear to place an amount in the estimates to wipe away what is called a monopoly down there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend knows that some arrangement was made with the company which has the telegraphic system between the is-

land and the mainland, and the Dominion granted it a subsidy. Legal questions have arisen, however, and if the hon. gentleman would take my advice, he would ask us to cancel the subsidy until the company afforded a satisfactory service. With the improvements in wireless telegraphy, we may be able to establish a couple of Marconi stations on the island, and in that way do away with this monopoly.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the government control the rates ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I think the arrangement was made between the Island government and the company previous to confederation.

Mr. HACKETT. That is correct. I insist on having some answer from the government in this regard. Some years ago we were told by Sir Louis H. Davies, who was then a member of the government, that there was no monopoly, and since then nothing has been done. The people of Prince Edward Island are insisting on this accommodation every year, and I, as one of their representatives, stand here again to insist on having justice done to the island. We find in these estimates a vote of $3,500 for telegraphic communication between Deer island and Eastport, Maine, while nothing has been done for the people of Prince Edward Island. I would ask the minister seriously to consider the conditions that now exist, and to do something in the near future to relieve the people of that province from the incubus of this monopoly, which has weighed so heavily upon them for the last fifty years.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not going to express any opinion; but I shall be pleased to do anything I can to help my hon. friend. If the people of the island would take my advice, I think they would get better arrangements with the company. If not, I suppose parliament would have power to bring in legislation to remove the monopoly.

Mr. CLARKE. There is a great opportunity now, to meet the wishes of the hon. gentleman and the people of the island. We have just passed a grant to aid a press cable service, and I understood, when that matter was discussed, that the Minister of Finance promised to see that the papers on the island should have the benefit of the service as well as the papers on the mainland.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no doubt that there will be a discussion on this matter when the question of the cable service comes up.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Can the minister give any idea of what revenue he expects from these lines ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know that I can ; but the revenue is very small.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It is not equal to the amount spent annually in keeping them in repair ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, nothing like it ; but a large number of people are benefited by it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). About $40,000 is spent annually in keeping these lines in repair, and there appears to be less than $20,000 per annum of revenue ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Having made a little inquiry the other day, I am pleased to be able to tell my hon. friend that I find that our revenue in the North-west from these lines more than doubled last year ; so that in course of time it may be that with the development of the country, we shall obtain a revenue that will pay for the service.

Mr. HACKETT. Is the hon. Minister of Justice in his seat ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. HACKETT. I would like to have his opinion, and have it made public, whether the Anglo-American Company have a right to monopolize the telegraphic system between Prince Edward Island and the mainland ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There will be a vote on which this matter will come up for discussion, when the Minister of Justice will be present, and when he will be able to give my hon. friend more information than I can.

Mr. CLARKE. Would it cost much to establish some stations under the Marconi system on the island, to compete with this monopoly which my hon. friend speaks of ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think the wireless telegraphic system at the present time is somewhat expensive; but the result might be good in the end.

Mr. HACKETT. The great difficulty is that the government tell us from time to time that they are going to do better next time. If they cannot break up this monopoly, I would ask them to institute the Marconi system.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Would the governmen have any objection to placing a telephone service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland ? If this monopoly cannot be interfered with by the government, perhaps the hon. member would approve of a telephone service.

Mr. HACKETT. I would be only too pleased to vote for any competition, whether by telephone or by the Marconi system or by any other method, which would relieve our people from this monopoly. We are a small population, about 20,000 people, but we are up to date.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). You are not on the confines of civilization.

Mr. HACKETT. No, we are right in the centre of civilization, and I would ask the government to insist on a telegraph service being given us which would satisfy the people and do away with the necessity of our complaining every year to parliament. There is not an hon. gentleman in any of the other provinces who does not desire to see justice done to this small sister province, and I am certain that I will have the support of hon. gentlemen from the other provinces in insisting on proper telegraphic communication being afforded us.

Mr. SPROULE. It would seem a desirable place for testing the Marconi system. That system is being worked to the Magdalen islands, some twenty-three or twenty-five miles distance, and surely it could be worked easily to Prince Edward Island. It is not a very costly system to install and this will be a splendid place to try it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I am very much surprised that hon. members from Prince Edward Island sitting opposite have not raised their voice in favour of the island.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That matter is not before the House at present. If the hon. gentleman had been in parliament as long as I have, he would have heard this question discussed over and over again by hon. members on both sides. It is a legal question to a very great extent. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Thomson) made a very pertinent question with regard to the Marconi system, but to discuss the contract and the subsidy is now out of order.

Mr. REID (Grenville). But I am talking of a telephone service.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A discussion on the telegraphic system of the island is out of order.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I am appealing on behalf of the island to have a telephone system installed between it and the mainland.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS Will the hon. gentleman tell me whether or not under the contract between the island and this company, this government could install a telephone service between the island and the mainland ?

Mr. REID (Grenville). I say it can. At the time of confederation a telephone system was not thought of. If the hon. minister would bring in a vote to install a telephone system between the island and the mainland, I am satisfied that even hon. members in the opposition would support it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS All the lawyers put a different construction on the contract.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I would recommend the government to lay a cable across.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We are not discussing a contract between a certain company and Prince Edward Island or the advisability of establishing any line between the mainland and Prince Edward Island. I would ask the committee to come back to the point.

Mr. LANCASTER. Are not the committee in order in discussing this item and comparing the telegraphic facilities on the island with those in other parts of the country ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Supposing that could be brought under discussion, it would be far better to bring it up when the proper estimates are under consideration, and we have the proper officials here.

Mr. HACKETT. I desire to insist on the rights of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Any discussion with regard to the facilities which Prince Edward Island has now for telegraphic service is entirely out of order. This question will come up under the heading of the Finance Department and it will then be in order to discuss it.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILL.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 264) respecting the Ottawa Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Ethier.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Mr. HACKETT. May I ask the necessity for this second wire from Murray Bay to St. Catherine's Bay ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In 1902 the Great North-western Telegraph Company laid a special wire from Quebec to Murray Bay to afford better connection with the North Shore Line. The second wire of the government is provided with the same idea, and so supply local offices. Generally, I may say, it is to improve the telegraph communication between these two points.

Telegraph lines—Quebec—Island of Orleans, land line, extension to Ste. Famille, $1,150.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is an extension of seven miles, and the vote is estimated to cover the cost.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has any explanation been given on any previous item as to the working of the Marconi Telegraph System ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, there was considerable discussion on that point. I suggested that the general discussion on the Marconi System would be more in order when the estimates of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) are under consideration, and as he is more familiar with the matter, all communications with respect to it having taken place under his department.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As I pointed out last session, there is this observation to make, that if the system is capable of being worked at all it should be capable of being utilized for certain short distances around our own coasts. As we have granted some assistance, it seems to me the government should be in a position to give some definite information as to the prospects of making it successful along our own coast.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend was not present when we had a discussion on this item. I read a paragraph from the report of the engineer a short time ago showing that the line from the coast to Ste. Famille had been working very satisfactorily. That is about all the information I could give.

Land line—Ste. Anne du Saguenay, to Descente des Femmes, $1,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This line is 22 miles long. The total cost will be $2,640.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are these lines solely for the purpose of the government, or are they open for use by private individuals ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are used as a regular public line. The revenue in this district is about 50 per cent of the cost. That district is settling up very well in some parts, and the settlers require more means of communication.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the principle adopted by the government in the construction of these lines ? Do they construct them only in cases where the government require the service, or do they construct them in cases where the public may be served as well as the government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There have been some cases which covered both principles. I imagine some of these extensions have been made where the government had no particular use for them, and they were made chiefly for the public.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That means that we have in some portions of the country a government system of telegraphs, not more for the requirements of the government than for the people at large. Is the hon. gentleman in a position to say how many miles of telegraph lines of that kind we have ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think we have 5,720 miles under government control.

Mr. HACKETT. Before recess we were discussing the telegraph line connecting Prince Edward Island with the rest of the Dominion of Canada, and I asked the Minister of Justice if he would give his opinion regarding an alleged monopoly in connection with that telegraph line.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. A gentleman interested in the telegraph company recently prepared a statement which was submitted to the Prime Minister and by him forwarded to the Department of Justice, in which I understand they claim that they have got some monopoly or some privileges which are being interfered with by legislation passed during the present session of parliament. I have not had an opportunity of looking into the memorial, and do not intend to until after the session. But so far as this parliament is concerned, we have hitherto proceeded on the assumption that there is no monopoly.

Telegraph line on north shore of St. Lawrence—land line from Bersimis to Godbout, $12,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to make provision for substituting an all-land line, about 80 miles in length, for the present cable connection between these two points. The cable seems to be always out of order and is very unsatisfactory.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the hon. gentleman explain the necessity for this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The cable has been down about seventeen or eighteen years and is completely used up, and is now useless.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Bersimis and Godbout are two important stations on the north shore of the St. Lawrence below Tadousac. There are on that coast several indentations and deep bays. Instead of building the line originally around these bays, they extended it across through the water, laying cables for the purpose. I understand that these cables have been very much interfered with by ice in spring and by the tempests, and the proposal now is to lay a land line in substitution for these cables around the bays rather than across them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Have the cables ceased to be operated ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think they are spasmodically worked, but they are used very little. This is the line which connects Belle Isle with Quebec, and it is the line upon which the shipping of the St. Lawrence depends to communicate with Quebec.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They have what my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. Gourley) calls lucid intervals ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Lucid intervals.

Chicoutimi—St. Charles telegraph line, branch from Ste. Anne to Lac Clair, $1,800.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is proposed to construct a branch line fifteen miles in length from Ste. Anne to Lac Clair, at a cost of $1,800.

Mr. HACKETT. Before we conclude with this vote of $40,000 for Dominion telegraph lines, I would like to ask what is being done to relieve the people of Prince Edward Island from the telegraph monopoly under which they suffer ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As my hon. friend, who is an old parliamentarian, and a resident of Prince Edward Island, knows this matter has been under discussion for many years. It was brought to my attention this session, and I have taken it up in earnest. As the hon. Minister of Justice has just stated to the committee, legal questions have been raised, and they have been referred to the Justice Department for their opinion. The company have made a statement of their claims to the Department of Justice, and we will have their advice in regard to the matter. We are proceeding upon the assumption that there is no monopoly. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Hackett) will see that the discussion might more properly take place when the item for the subsidy is under consideration. It will be more proper and the information would be far more satisfactory, as I am not prepared at the present time, not having any item in reference to Prince Edward Island before me, to give the information that I would like to give to the hon. gentleman and to the committee. If my hon. friend would be kind enough to bring this question up when the question of the subsidy is under discussion, I am sure that he will find that the government will be ready to discuss it and to give him all the information.

Mr. HACKETT. That is quite correct, but I consider the remarks made by the hon. Minister of Justice as being very unsatisfactory in regard to Prince Edward Island. I would like to ask him as the legal adviser of the Crown if he thinks Prince Edward Island is subject to this monopoly ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This is a question that arose previous to confederation, and results from legislation that was enacted at that time. I understand that parliament has in recent years proceeded on the assumption that there is no monopoly, and as a result of legislation that was introduced this session, the company have thought it proper to make certain representations to the government which representations amount to the statement that they enjoy a monopoly under the legislation that they have. These statements have been referred to the Department of Justice, but I only received the memorandum from the company yesterday. My hon. friend will see that to give a matter of that importance the attention which it requires so as to enable me to give an opinion to the House that would be of any value would take much more time than it is possible at the present stage of the session for me to give to it. I have no desire whatever to make light of the pretensions of Prince Edward Island. If there is a monopoly it seems to me that it would be proper for the government to interfere and to endeavour in some way to get rid of it, but the hon. gentleman cannot expect me to make a statement as to the legal position of the case or as to the policy of the government without that knowledge which would enable me to make a statement that would be of any value.

Mr. HACKETT. I am very thankful for this explanation of the hon. Minister of Justice. I know that he is sincere and honest, and I trust that when he looks at the papers which he says only came into his hands yesterday, that he will give the benefit of any doubt that may arise to the province of Prince Edward Island.

Petite Rivière—St. Agnes telegraph line, $2,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a vote of $2,500 to provide, according to an estimate submitted by the general superintendent of government telegraph lines, for the construction of two lines of telegraph in Charlevoix county, so as to connect St. Agnes, St. Urbain and Petite Rivière.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are these new lines or are they in substitution for lines already existing ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These are new lines, but extensions of the present lines.

Mr. MORIN. Does the hon. Minister of Public Works know where Petite Rivière is ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. St. Urbain is about midway between Baie St. Paul and St. Agnes. Petite Rivière St. Francois is some distance west of Baie St. Paul.

Telephone line to Edmonton Indian agency, $1,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to connect Edmonton with the Indian agency, 14 miles distant.

Mr. CLARKE. Where is the agency ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is 14 miles from Edmonton.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the name of the place ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is the Indian reserve at which Mr. Gibbons is the Indian agent.

Telegraph line between Edmonton and Athabasca landing, $15,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to make provision in accordance with the estimate of the superintendent general of government telegraph lines for the Edmonton-Athabasca line, the distance between the two places being estimated at 100 miles. The total cost of the work for 100 miles is estimated at $150 a mile, making $15,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Are the mounted police at Athabasca Landing ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The mounted police are exercising authority at Athabasca with a number of isolated detachments, and they can only communicate with Edmonton by using the road. The line is principally for the mounted police, but, of course, my hon. friend knows that the country is settling up. There is no railway communication and there is a very considerable number of settlers going in. This has been urged very earnestly by the local authorities at Edmonton, and also by the mounted police. It will be constructed by tender and contract.

Mr. BROCK. What leads the minister to decide as to the necessity for such a work as this ? It looks to me that $15,000 is a small sum with which to build 100 miles of telegraph line in such a country. Has the minister the report of an expert ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My experience is that the superintendent there is a very competent and energetic officer, and this vote is based on his estimate. It is on his report that I ask for the sum, and I have no reason to believe from my past experience of him, and his general ability, but that this will complete the work.

Loop line from a point on the main line near Victoria Alta, to connect with Andrews, $600.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for the construction of four and a half miles of line, the residents agreeing to supply the poles. There is quite a settlement there.

Mr. BROCK. That costs more than $100 a mile.

Extension of telegraph line from Wood Mountain Post to Willow Bunch, $7,600.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for thirty-eight miles of land line. There is some difference in the cost in different localities, but that depends on the distance that they have to haul the supplies. This estimate would make it $200 a mile. I may say that our representative from the west was here a short time ago, and on looking into the matter I found that the receipts have increased fifty per cent last year, so that if they continue at that ratio of increase, the receipts would soon be equal to the expenditure and maintenance.

Mr. BLAIN. What rates are charged ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The rates average from twenty-five cents for ten words to forty-eight cents, according to the distance. They are not unreasonable rates at all.

Mr. TAYLOR. Are Mr. Charleson and Mr. Rochester up there superintending the construction of telegraph lines ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are not. They have not been in this part of the country at all. This work is done under the supervision of the department, and the officer in charge is Mr. McDonald. Mr. Rochester is still in the Yukon, and is in Vancouver at the present time, and Mr. Charleson has just returned to Ottawa.

Mr. BROCK. The cost of one of these lines is $100 a mile; of the other $150 a mile, and of this last one $200 a mile.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In one case the poles are being supplied by the settlers.

Mr. BROCK. That is where the cost is $150 a mile, and it makes the discrepancy all the greater.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I should point out that one of these is a loop line, a double line. The very fact that the officer in charge does vary his estimate according to the locality, shows that he knows what he is doing. It will be easily understood that where you have to cart poles a distance of a couple hundred miles, it might easily double the cost.

Mr. BROCK. Is this work let by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is let by contract as a rule.

Mr. BROCK. Have you any means of checking whether or not you are charged too much ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh yes; there are men accustomed to do that sort of work and I think we get a very low price. My difficulty is that the contractors are complaining that they have lost money in some cases. On the short lines, where the settlers find the poles, our own men string the wires.

Mr. MONK. Was the Canadian Pacific Railway Company asked for an offer to extend this line from their own line at Moosejaw ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In these sparsely settled districts on the

north shore of the St. Lawrence, and up in the west, we cannot get the companies to extend their lines. Where settlement is coming in a telegraph line is found to be a great convenience, as the settlers are a long way from the railway and other conveniences.

Mr. MONK. There is no doubt that telegraphic communication should be established, but I question whether the receipts are sufficient to indemnify the government for the expenditure. If the receipts are as considerable as my hon. friend says, it is probable that the Canadian Pacific Railway Telegraph Company would have been prepared to undertake to build this line without any expenditure whatever to the country. My hon. friend is aware that the telegraph line to the Yukon cost us a considerable sum. Indeed, there were rival companies competing for the privilege of building that line, and offering the most favourable conditions to the government, including the control of rates and free transmission to the government itself. Under these circumstances, it was a very questionable step.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend will see that this is not analogous to that. My hon. friend is perfectly right in saying that it would pay the company to extend a line here, but they will not do so. As I said before, owing to the increase of settlement in the country, the time appears to be arriving when the expenses will commence to be met by receipts.

Kamloops—Nicola telephone line, re-setting of poles and general repairs, $1,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote is called for by the general superintendent of telegraphs to provide for the resetting of poles and general repairs on this line, which is sixty-seven miles long.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is Mr. Charleson superintending this line ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, he has just returned to Ottawa from the Yukon.

Mr. TAYLOR. He is still in the employ of the government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Vancouver Island—Salt Spring Island telephone line—extension, $900.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote is to provide for estimates submitted by the general superintendent of telegraph lines to construct this line eight miles further on Salt Spring Island. He reports that if the line is extended as proposed, it will be so much utilized as to prove self-sustaining.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would like to know from the hon. minister if there is any idea on the government side of the House that the Anglo-American Telegraph Company hold a monopoly of the telegraphic communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice has stated that the government assume that the company have no monopoly, and have been acting accordingly during the present session of parliament, that the company have filed a statement with the government claiming under the contract that they have a monopoly, and that the matter is now under the consideration of the Department of Justice.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Does the government propose to take any action to redress the grievances of the people of Prince Edward Island to which we have been calling attention several times during this session, and for years past ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I made a statement in reference to this matter a few minutes ago, and perhaps it would be as well for my hon. friend to bring it up again in a day or two, when there will be an opportunity ; and in the interval I will look into the papers as far as possible, and if I can make a statement of any value to the House, I shall be glad to do so. I have not yet been able to look into the papers.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I might refer the hon. Minister of Justice to a speech delivered by the Hon. Senator Ferguson in the Senate a few days ago, in which he reviewed the situation from the beginning.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would draw the attention of the hon. member to the fact that the discussion on this question is quite irrelevant to this item. He cannot go into a discussion of the monopoly in Prince Edward Island under an item in reference to Vancouver Island.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I understood that we could discuss any system of government telegraphs under the question of government telegraphs, which is now before the House. I do not wish to go into a lengthy discussion of this Prince Edward Island telegraphic communication, as the Minister of Justice says he will look into the matter, and we shall have an opportunity to discuss it later on. But I wish to refer to the fact that Senator Ferguson took this matter up in the Senate a few days ago and dealt with it from the beginning, throwing a good deal of light on the contract and on the decision given in regard to the monopoly, on an appeal from a Bill which was passed in this House regulating marine telegraphs in 1874, when the English authorities discountenanced any idea of a monopoly between the island and the mainland. If the Minister of Justice will bring the matter up at a later date during this session, and will let us know what the intention of the govern-

ment is in regard to it, we will let it drop for the present.

Arbitrations and awards, including payments authorized, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to enable the department to pay the expenses of investigations and necessary arbitrations in connection with claims. We find that we can often settle these claims by having some of our own officials or outside experts to arbitrate between the parties, and in that way save a great deal of money.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the reason of this reference to the Civil Service Act ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Some of the officials of the government might be more competent to undertake this work than outsiders, and out of this money we will pay their expenses when they are sent away from headquarters.

Mr. LANCASTER. Extra pay besides their salaries ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Hardly extra pay. If these disputes can be settled by our own officials it will be very much cheaper to use them than to engage outsiders.

Mr. BLAIN. Are there any cases pending at the present time ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sorry to say there are some claims. These are often small matters, but they give a good deal of trouble. There are continually disputes between the architect, the engineers in charge and the contractors. I am sure that by having an item like this, we shall save a good deal to the country.

Mr. WILSON. Does this cover the commissions to investigate ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A small commission will be paid out of this.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the nature of the dispute ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Questions of constructions of contracts and specifications. My hon. friend will know from experience that difficulties are continually arising, and it saves a great deal of trouble and expense to have these matters amicably settled.

Mr. MONK. If this is not to be a gratuity to the civil service but merely to cover expenses, when they are employed on investigations, why do you insert the words 'notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act.'

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Very often the disputes are left to the decision of a man of experience in another department, and a small allowance would not be out of the way for the trouble and expense.

Mr. MONK. Will this amount of $5,000 be paid to nobody else but civil servants ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Occasionally we may go outside the service. The contractor might think that a government employee was biassed, but we find it less expensive to employ a civil servant, when the contractor will consent.

Mr. MONK. For my part, although this is a vague vote, I would not object to having it employed in remunerating the civil service if necessary.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have the same vote every year in the Railway Department, and we find that it has worked to advantage.

Chief engineer's office—salaries of engineers, draughtsmen, and clerks, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $14,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is an additional amount required for 1903-4. The reason the words 'notwithstanding anything to the contrary of the Civil Service Act' are inserted is because a great many of these civil servants are technical officers and do not come under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. COCHRANE. If they do not, why insert these words ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Because under the Civil Service Act we could not pay over $400 a year, and these technical officers have salaries averaging from $1,000 to $3,000 a year. Even the chief engineer of the department comes under this vote.

Mr. COCHRANE. I thought the hon. minister informed the committee that these were officers who did not come under the Civil Service Act.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They do come under the Act unless the vote is taken with this provision. The Auditor General would not pay them unless they had the vote taken in this way. The chief engineer could not draw his salary otherwise.

Surveys of headwaters of the Ottawa river and tributaries with a view of devising a scheme for the regulation of the water levels of the upper reaches of these streams so as to afford increased facilities for navigation purposes, the descent of timber, &c., $20,000.

Mr. CLARKE. On whose recommendation is this expenditure being made ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A large deputation of the parties interested waited upon the Premier and the government some time ago and made representations with regard to this matter. In this connection I may say that the Dominion

received very considerable revenue which would be increased if the works would be carried out as urged by this deputation. A survey was promised with the view of devising the scheme for the regulation of the water level on the upper reaches of the stream.

Mr. MONK. What is the estimated cost of the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is estimated by the chief engineer of the department that this is the lowest amount for which the work can be done. It is a very important question, and the information to be gained is such information as the public should have.

Mr. CLARKE. What is it estimated that the total cost will be ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is estimated that the cost will be covered by this vote.

Mr. HACKETT. Is this the first appropriation of this kind ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. So far as my information goes, this is the first appropriation for this purpose.

Mr. HACKETT. What is the need for it?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The country receives a very considerable revenue from these water-ways, and representations have been made to the government by the parties interested that very great improvements should be made. Qualified engineers will be sent out to see whether or not this is a practical proposition.

Mr. CLARKE. What counties is this in ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Principally, I think, in Wright, Pontiac and Renfrew.

Mr. MONK. It seems to me I heard that at the time the representatives of the lumbermen waited on the government they submitted a scheme which would render surveys unnecessary and merely call for the execution of certain works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer informs me that they did not submit any detailed scheme. In a general way they pointed out the advantages to be derived if a scheme could be devised to carry out the idea they proposed. The chief engineer reported to me that it was necessary to make the surveys, and this estimate is to defray the cost.

Mr. HACKETT. This seems a very large amount. Can the work not be done for less ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a good deal of territory to go over, and much time will be spent by a considerable staff of engineers. The chief engineer informs me that it will require at least four parties to do the work in one season, so my hon. friend (Mr. Hackett) will see that this is not a large estimate. I have no personal knowledge of the matter, but this is done on the recommendations of the officials of the department.

Mr. CLARKE. When did the deputations wait on the government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The last deputation was on the 30th of May.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the hon. minister any estimate of the probable cost of the undertaking contemplated ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. The object of the survey is to obtain the levels, because it would be a great mistake to go into any of these works until we have a fair knowledge whether it is practically as represented, and what advantage we shall derive, and what the cost is likely to be.

Mr. BLAIN. Will these surveys be conducted by officers of the department ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That was my intention, to send out the best officers we have in the department at the head of these parties. This I would do for two reasons. First, because they have some knowledge of the matter ; and, secondly, because we should have their services at a less cost than that of others.

Mr. BLAIN. May we expect the report of the surveyors at the next session ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, it will be a year from next session probably before we have the report.

Mr. OSLER. Have the government no knowledge on this subject now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No information. My hon. friend (Mr. Osler) knows that the districts to be surveyed are a long way from headquarters and in the unsettled parts of the country.

Mr. OSLER. How does the matter come up now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a great deal more use for the power than there was.

Mr. OSLER. This is to devise 'a scheme for the regulation of the water levels, so as to afford increased facilities for navigation purposes, the descent of timber, &c.'

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is aware that at certain seasons, when the water is low, the city of Ottawa, for instance, is very much interested in the question of this water-power. It is important to see that we have water enough for navigation and still use water to provide power.

Mr. OSLER. What stretch of country is it proposed to cover ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would not like to say off-hand, but, speaking under correction, about 175 or 200 miles.

Mr. CLARKE. Have any of these water privileges been disposed of by the government within the last twelve months ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. So far as I am aware, they were all disposed of years ago.

Mr. CLARKE. I speak of the privileges far up on the river. Have any of these been disposed of ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to get a little more light on the subject. Is it to aid the lumbermen that these expenditures are made ? Is it to develop and make more permanent the water-powers, the privilege of which has been secured by private parties ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is one of the——

Mr. CLARKE. Is it not an extraordinary thing for the House to be asked to vote $20,000 to improve these privileges that do not belong to the Crown ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They belong to the Crown, but have been leased to these parties.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the lessees pay an increased indemnity to the Crown because of the work contemplated ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If we went on with the work, certainly. If we did not receive an increased revenue, we would not go on with the work.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand the minister to say that this vote is asked for the purpose of making surveys and obtaining the levels of the river with a view to constructing works to give a more equable supply of water in the Ottawa river ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, for regulating the water.

Mr. CLARKE. If this is done primarily to advantage private persons, I think they ought to contribute some of the cost.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. For general navigation also. It is a proper work for the government to undertake when they are to receive a revenue from it. The discussion now going on would be in place if it was proposed to go on with any of these works.

Mr. CLARKE. Is this $20,000 to be expended entirely on surveys ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. I still think that if these powers have been leased, the expense of the survey ought to be paid partly by those who are to benefit by the construction of the work.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood the minister to say a moment ago that we derived large revenues from these works. I have looked carefully into the public accounts, and fail to find one of these works that produces any revenue. They appear to be like the canals, it costs two or three dollars to collect one dollar of revenue that you get from any of these timber slides and booms. I would like the minister to point out a few of these works that are producing a revenue over and above expenditure.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think we receive at the present time between $70,000 and $80,000 per annum from the works to be affected by these improvements.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I see by the Auditor General's Report, page W—51, that a sum of $700 has been paid to Henry A. F. MacLeod, civil engineer, for completing unfinished plans and profiles of the Ottawa river survey, made in the autumn of 1900 and the winter of 1901. That would lead us to believe that there had been a survey going on of the Ottawa river.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That has nothing at all to do with the object of this vote. That was in connection with the Georgian Bay canal.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I see also that we voted in main estimates, under the head of miscellaneous surveys and inspections, $50,000. Now, I understood at the time that that was to cover all surveys of any kind that would be made by the Department of Public Works. Now, that $50,000 is a very large amount. I understand that the department has a regular staff that does this work, and therefore I suppose that the minister would simply take a staff away from one work to another; or is it the intention to employ an outside staff independently of those that have been employed in the department for some time ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That survey as was explained at the time, was part of the ordinary work of the department. We could not apply any part of that money for special work of this kind. We would utilize the staff we have now in the department so far as we could. But to undertake a work of this kind requires some extra assistance.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If the hon. minister sent an engineer and a few men to make a survey of any work under his department, not only in the Ottawa river but in any other part of the country, I see no reason why they should not be paid out of that $50,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have work in the department that requires all that vote, we could not undertake this work under that item.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If he is going to employ an additional staff of engineers to do this work over and above the regular staff, I can quite understand that he requires a certain amount. But it did seem to me that $20,000 was a large amount for surveys.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot offer any opinion as to that. I have asked for this amount on the careful report of the engineer, endorsed by Mr. Gobeil, the chief of the department. There is no object in asking for a vote greater than is required.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Have there been any petitions presented asking for this to be done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, I have stated several times that a deputation waited upon the government on the 30th of May last, composed of certain of the largest business men in this district, men interested in the Ottawa Valley. I cannot give their names at present, but they are well known in this district. They made such representations about the importance of this work that the Premier asked me to make provision for this survey.

Mr. AVERY. Were these men on the deputation lumbermen ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Principally lumbermen, including Mr. Booth, Mr. Edwards, and others whose names I do not remember. I was present only for a few moments myself, on account of another meeting I had to attend. But it was certainly a very large and influential deputation and after hearing that deputation the right hon. Prime Minister asked me to make provision for having this work carried out.

Mr. COCHRANE. Would this scheme interfere with the Georgian bay canal ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It would not interfere, but it would afford very valuable information if it was thought necessary to undertake that scheme.

Mr. COCHRANE. I do not think it would hurt the Georgian bay canal scheme, but could this project of raising the levels of the upper Ottawa be carried out as well as the Georgian bay canal scheme ? Could you interfere with the levels of the Ottawa river if the Georgian bay canal were constructed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It could not possibly injuriously affect it. My hon. friend has asked if this scheme can be carried out if the Georgian bay canal should prove a practicable proposition. The chief engineer says, yes, that it will help it.

Mr. AVERY. How far up do you intend to survey the tributaries of the river so as to form basins to regulate the level of the water ?

Mr. BLAIN. Is there such a work as this constructed in any part of Canada or in any part of the United States ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a work on the Trent river, and there are works in the province of Quebec which they have found to be of great advantage in connection with some of the streams there. They are under the jurisdiction of the provincial government.

Mr. AVERY. Would it not interfere with some of the lumbermen above the Ottawa river where they have slides and booms made to bring their logs down, by raising the water, and thus causing it to back up so that they could not get a sufficient flow of water ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My object in getting this information is to know whether it would interfere with any one's rights. The question will have to be considered as to how it will affect any rights that may exist. It would not do to make improvements if they were going to injuriously affect interests upon other parts of the river.

Mr. BLAIN. What success has followed the investment of capital in similar works on the Trent river ? Have the parties been satisfied with the amount of money that has been received from the investment ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These works were erected on the Trent river some years ago and they are under another department. I was asked the question as to whether there were any similar works in existence, and I just recollected these on the Trent river.

Mr. OSLER. I am a great believer in having an investigation made before money is expended, and I am very glad to learn that in one small case at all events the government are of that opinion. It is a wise and proper thing to have a most thorough investigation made in connection with the waters of the upper Ottawa, but the hon. minister made the statement just now that a deputation composed largely of lumbermen had waited upon the government and that it was at the instigation practically of these gentlemen that this item had been put in the estimates.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I said that I understood it was as a result of the representations they had made.

Mr. OSLER. Yes. The Minister of Public Works also said that he thought that the government derived a revenue of $70,000 a year from the lease of these water-powers. I would like very much indeed to

know from what source the income is received ? I had no idea that the government were getting anything like that revenue from the Ottawa river water-powers.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I gave the information furnished by the deputy minister.

Mr. OSLER. I think it would be very interesting if we had the details of that. Perhaps the hon. minister could not give them now.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, but I would be very pleased to ask that a statement be made out, and I will bring it down probably in a couple of days.

Mr. OSLER. If the government make this investigation it would be very useful to the lumbermen and all those who are interested in the trade of the Ottawa river, although I hope the government are not going to give these lumbermen or any one else the use of the valuable privileges that may be ascertained to exist there as a result of this survey, without putting them up to public competition ; because, if they do, I think it will show that this is merely a scheme to enable some individual lumbermen to pay the expense of enabling them to acquire cheaply the valuable water-powers of the Ottawa river. The government should let these and other water-powers by tender, and only for a short time. These water-powers are going to be enormously valuable. I hope the government will not consider for a moment the alienating of any of the water-powers that exist on the upper Ottawa.

Mr. COCHRANE. Would the hon. minister tell us where those works on the Trent river are ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At the head-waters of the Trent. The matter came before me in connection with some claim of the Gilmour firm some time ago. In regard to what my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) has said I quite agree with the position he has taken. If as a result of this survey, it is found that a great improvement can be made, I think every consideration should be given to the question as to how these water-powers should be disposed of. I agree with the view of my hon. friend that the country is entitled to see that it gets the greatest possible revenue that is to be had from these water-powers in open competition.

Mr. REID (Grenville. I think it is necessary to have a survey of the river, and I am surprised to learn that an investigation of this kind has not been undertaken before now. I would like to ask the hon. minister if it is really a fact that we have not a chart of the Ottawa river for navigation purposes up to the head of the river. Suppose I went into the department to get a chart in order that a steamer might be run to the head waters of the Ottawa, would the department have to admit that there never had been a survey made, and that they could give no information whatever as to the depth of the water on the upper Ottawa?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have some information as to the stream itself, as far as navigation is concerned, but no regular chart. I am told by the deputy and by the chief engineer, who have been for many years in the department, that we have no information of that kind.

Mr. HACKETT. What does the minister mean by the 'head waters of the Ottawa river.'

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understood by looking at the maps that it might be somewhere around Mattawa. I do not know how much further north it goes.

Mr. HACKETT. The minister displays a good deal of ignorance about the head waters of the Ottawa river. Twenty years ago I travelled twenty miles beyond that, and did not reach the head waters. What scheme has the government in mind with regard to this matter ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot hear the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HACKETT. Then there is the peculiarity that I cannot hear the Minister of Public Works and he cannot hear me. What part of the upper Ottawa does he intend improving ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend from Nipissing (Mr. McCool), says that we can go 500 miles before we get to the head waters of the Ottawa.

Mr. HACKETT. It is above Mattawa then ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, a long way. I was speaking as the crow flies, but it is a very winding river, and anyhow I do not think that so far as this vote is concerned, that distance makes much difference. Requests have been made to the department for extensive improvements on the Ottawa river, and its tributaries for the purpose of navigation, and to maintain the water-power. I have asked for this vote on the advice altogether of the technical officers of the department. I submit that it would not be a business-like proceeding to ask parliament for any considerable amount of expenditure without having surveys made, and if possible the estimated cost.

Mr. BROCK. Why do you not apply that principle to the Grand Trunk Pacific ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. One at a time ; I am responsible for this.

Mr. BROCK. These surveys are to benefit the lumbermen, and these improvements would no doubt increase the value of the timber limits. As the timber belongs to the provinces, I contend that an expenditure which would increase the value of the limits should be made by the provinces. It is said that surveys for a railroad through a new country cost about five per cent of the value of work to be undertaken, which would make this expenditure $400,000. Of course it will take a much greater sum than that to carry out the improvements the minister has in view, because these are days of very large enterprises, which have to be rushed through, as we have been given to understand that even time does not wait, and, that we cannot say to-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow. It should be remembered that the government have appointed a transportation commission, and would it not be well that that commission might inquire into all these things? The Ottawa river runs some 500 or 600 miles beyond Ottawa, and I presume that the government are not going to get to its head waters with this survey. There is a vote lower down for a 'transportation commission' which, I take it for granted, is not the transportation commission which the government has announced with such a flourish of trumpets. I contend that before you go into this expenditure, this matter should be brought before the commission and it should be made one of these things that the government would deign to refer to it, so that in years hence when we come to improve the navigation of the Ottawa river we may have this information in the report of the commission. If the transportation commission is to have nothing to do with our large railways, and with expenditures on our harbours, surely something might be referred to it. I contend that this is one of the things which it would be well to leave in the hands of this transportation commission. I can assure the hon. minister that it will relieve him wonderfully. Instead of having to answer questions for an hour or an hour and a half, he can with one sweep of his hand say: There is the report of the transportation commission; read it. It will be of great benefit to the government this session, and to the government that will follow next session. I hope we shall be able to make good use of this transportation commission, which the government at present seem to be ignoring.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend has given another strong argument, which I had not thought of, in favour of gathering this information. It was intended to be in connection with the navigation of the river, but it is possible, as my hon. friend says, that in the near future the information may be of great service to the country in connection with a greater scheme of navigation.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have no doubt that this item was put in the estimates for the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. McCool) and the deputation he may have come with. No doubt he is acquainted with the district, and can give us some information as to the probable result of the survey, and as to whether navigation on these waters can be benefited.

Mr. McCOOL. I may say that I was not present with the deputation which the minister speaks of, but I know the object of the vote. It is not to build dams alone, but is for a general survey of the river. There is a large body of water at Lake Temiscaming, and it would be difficult to erect a dam there. Then there are Quinze and Expanse lakes, where a very short dam would control the water and give a basin of 100 square miles. At Lake Victoria there are about 200 square miles of water, and the outlet is very narrow. There are good high banks in both cases, so that a very small expenditure would control the water. The dam would hold the water during the spring freshets, and by means of gates its flow could be regulated, so that during the dry summer season there would be a good flow. The lumber industry would be benefited by having a fair flow of water at all seasons for driving purposes. Navigation would also be benefited, and a great deal of the expense that has to be borne at present for dredging would be done away with. There is a dredge on Lake Temiscaming at the present time which would not have been necessary if this scheme had been carried out. There is sufficient water at medium height; but in spring it is higher than is required, while during the dry summer season the water recedes so that it is impossible to get near the shore. I think this is a very wise and necessary expenditure. A survey of the Ottawa river from here to Mattawa was made about fifty years ago by Mr. Walter Shanley. That was the only survey, and it was very carefully made. I read the report of it in the library a short time ago. From Mattawa west there has not been a survey made at all. On Lake Temiscaming, which is really an expansion of the Ottawa river, there are eight or ten boats, which carry a very large quantity of freight.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not propose to offer an adverse criticism to this appropriation; but where large public works are contemplated, it is necessary that the fullest information should be given by the government. This grant for surveys evidently contemplates a possible outlay at no distant date of a very large amount of money for improvements on the Otttawa river, and I would like to know what is the net revenue derived from the various franchises that would be benefited by these public works?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At the present time I am informed the rev-

enue is between $70,000 and $80,000 per annum.

Mr. McCOOL. If the records are looked over, they will show that though there has been a considerable amount of money spent on building slides and dams on the Ottawa river and its tributaries, the expenditure has been repaid to the government twenty times over. They have been one of the greatest sources of revenue the government have had in the past, considering the amount of money expended.

Mr. RICHARDSON. What would be the probable increase in the revenue from the proposed expenditure ?

Mr. McCOOL. It is decreasing.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot give any opinion as to the probable increase. The expenditure on these improvements, I presume, would be very large. Before making that expenditure it was thought advisable to have a careful examination and report made by qualified engineers.

Mr. CLANCY. We have had a very rosy assurance from the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. McCool) that this is not only a good thing for the country, but a profitable investment. If I understood him correctly, the expenditure has paid its way over and over again. I have not taken the trouble to go over the Auditor General's Report for past years, but I presume that last year would be a fair sample.

Mr. McCOOL. No, last year would not be. I said the revenue had been falling off.

Mr. CLANCY. In the first place, we had the statement of the Minister of Public Works that the revenue last year was some $70,000 or $80,000. I find on page V—394 that the revenue for the Ottawa district was $37,923.23; for the St. Maurice district, $13,-565.48 ; and for the Newcastle district, $5,-847.22, or, instead of being $70,000 or $80,-000, it was $57,335. The expenditure on these services last year was : For the St. Maurice district, including staff and repairs, $51,727 ; for the Ottawa district, $42,182 ; and for the whole service, $201,958. It would seem that hon. gentlemen have been groping in the dark in regard to this question.

Mr. McCOOL. I did not include the St. Maurice river at all. It did not enter into my calculation. I know nothing about the St. Maurice and am speaking about the Ottawa river, and if you take the accounts that are to be found in the department for the last twenty-five years, you will find that my sstatement is absolutely correct.

Mr. CLANCY. If I take the Ottawa river, the hon. gentleman is in the same difficulty, because the expenditure largely exceeded the receipts last year in the Ottawa district alone.

Mr. McCOOL. One year would not be a fair test because they may have had large extra expenditure in rebuilding improvements, which I know to have been the case.

Mr. CLANCY. I am afraid my hon. friend has been speculating in that way very generally. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works to state just how this vote came to be in the estimates. Is there any portion of this work which should be properly done by private enterprise ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On the 30th of May last a very large and influential deputation waited upon the First Minister and represented that the public was very much interested in having some work done there. We felt in the department that we had not the necessary information to ask the House to grant a vote, and for that reason we have suggested that a survey be made and an examination by qualified engineers into the practicability of carrying on the work, and also as to its cost before spending a dollar in connection with it.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman seems to be more cautious in small matters than in large. We have had an expenditure involving some hundreds of millions of dollars undertaken, and the government did not think that the same precaution should be used in both cases. I would ask if the deputation made any financial representation regarding the cost of the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think that I might divide the representations made by those people under three headings. First, the regulation of navigation of the river; second, regulating the water so as to bring down the logs; third, regulating the water-powers which are of such great value to this district, supplying, as they do, this House and city with light and water.

Mr. CLANCY. Has there been any undertaking by those persons to pay higher rental and to recoup the treasury for its outlay ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, the representations made were solely in the public interest. It will be for us, having charge of the work, to say upon what terms any advantages should be given to parties outside of the general public.

Mr. OSLER. The demand of the deputation was not for surveys but for the expenditure of a large sum and it was the government which suggested that the survey should be first made.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. OSLER. What amount was it contemplated that the work would cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No one was in a position to make an estimate, but we all know that at that distance the cost would be very considerable.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understand from the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. McCool) that only a couple of dams are required, one at the foot of a lake 200 miles long, and another at the foot of another lake one hundred miles long. It would certainly not cost much to put in a couple of dams, but does not the hon. member know that if the water is raised at these outlets, great damage will be done to surrounding land ?

Mr. McCOOL. Not at this point, because there are no settlements there except a few lumber camps. I repeat that the expenditure will not be very much, though of course the cost of putting in a dam and bringing out supplies will be heavier than in the case of a dam built in this neighbourhood. But the expenditure would not be very large because the mouths at the outlet of those expansions are not very wide or very deep. Then, another point is the Kippewa lake. That, I presume, is another hundred miles. As I am on my feet, I might mention that I have a memorandum showing that the receipts of the Ottawa slides and booms for last year increased by $8,100 over the previous year. I was surprised to learn this as I thought the receipts were falling off year by year. Still another point is that this survey should include work with a view to using the power of the different falls along the Ottawa up to its head. Take, for instance, the Chats, Portage du Fort, Rocher Fendu, Des Joachim, Roches Capitaine, and other rapids and falls. I suppose that between here and Lake Temiskamingue, it would be possible to develop 300,000 or 400,000 horse-power.

Mr. MONK. I was inclined to look favourably on this vote, but since the explanation given by the hon. member for Nipissing, it occurs to me that it is utterly misapplied money. From what I saw when I was in the district of Nipissing a year ago, I think it would be far more useful to spend money in improving the roads for the settlers of that district than in such a work as this. There are other improvements far more needed in Nipissing, such as wharfs, railway facilities and others. If I understood my hon. friend (Mr. McCool) correctly, it is to dam the Ottawa river in such a way as to keep the level of the river higher, this being particularly for the advantage of the lumbermen. The wants of that district are not confined to the lumbermen, and I venture to say that far more useful employment could be found for this money, and the benefits of its expenditure much more generally extended among the inhabitants of the district. My hon. friend knows that the lumbermen are not a penurious class of people. They want improvements so as to ensure the better floating of their logs, and so they came to the government. If these gentlemen wish to make larger profits out of their business by having a more uniform water level, and wish to saddle the government with the construction of the dams, why should not they bear a certain share of the expenditure by having these surveys made themselves and a reasonable plan placed before the government of the improvements they require ? There is another point, and one to which I would ask my hon. friend's particular attention. If the object is merely to dam certain indicated portions of the Ottawa river, surely it does not require $20,000 for that ? If the minister will inquire in the city of Montreal or, no doubt, in the city of Toronto, he will find competent engineers who will make a report as to the work necessary for damming the river and the cost of that work for far less than $20,000. The survey is not going to be made this winter, and there will be plenty of time if the money is voted next session. I understand that we are going to have a session in the early part of the winter to repair some of the mistakes of hon. gentlemen opposite. Then we can vote the money with a better knowledge of what we are doing. But I say that for one-quarter of this sum the minister will find engineers to carry out the surveys for this work, as the hon. member for Nipissing has explained it. Under the circumstances, it seems to me that this is not only an expenditure for dams, but a damnable expenditure.

Mr. McCOOL. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) seems to be under the impression that I have some special interest in this vote. I tell him frankly that I did not know even that it was in the estimates until this evening. And, as to benefiting Nipissing particularly, that is not the case. Not one of the dams referred to would be built in Nipissing, but most of the work would be done in the hon. gentleman's own province, for nearly all the dams I have spoken of are in the province of Quebec. But this is a national work. The hon. gentleman need not imagine that I am advocating it because it is only going to benefit Nipissing or any friends of mine.

Mr. MONK. If the work is to be done in the province of Quebec, the river being between Quebec and Ontario, it must extend into Ontario also. But if the work is to be confined to the province of Quebec, I can tell my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works that we have engineers in the city of Montreal, qualified under the laws of the province of Quebec, who will be able to make a full and complete report on this subject for less than $5,000. So, what is the use of spending $20,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Had the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) been

present he would have heard me explain that this estimate was based on the report of the engineers of the department. It is a question for the Committee to decide whether to take the advice of my hon. friend, who knows practically nothing of the work to be done, the miles to be covered, or the time likely to be occupied, or that of the experienced officers of my department. The hon. gentleman may be right, but for my part, I would rather act on the report of the engineers of the Public Works Department.

Mr. GOURLEY. Is this money expended with a view to ultimately adopting the Ottawa and Georgian bay canal scheme?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The information gained might be used in connection with that scheme, as suggested by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock). But no such idea was in view at the time of preparing this estimate.

Mr. GOURLEY. The hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Murray) has on several occasions presented the claims of the Ottawa and Georgian bay canal in a way that enlisted my sympathies to a certain extent. And I have often wondered why the people in Ontario did not insist on opening up the Ottawa river with a view to determining its value in connection with the transportation routes of Canada. If this is a mere local expenditure made on behalf of the lumber interests in Ontario, I should be opposed to it. But if it is intended to bring information to this House to enable us to know whether the Georgian bay canal is feasible in the interests of the whole of Canada, the expenditure might be justified. The minister has said it will be useful in this connection only in an indirect way. In that case the expenditure ought not to be made, for it could not be made intelligently with a view to getting that information, unless the engineers were so instructed. To go up the Ottawa and build certain dams which will yield only a certain benefit to the lumber interest, is a thing, I think, we should not be called upon to do. But if, in the larger interests of Canada, it would help to solve the transportation problem, I would support the vote. I have on many occasions, in listening to the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Murray), while speaking of the Georgian bay canal, been struck with the importance of the Ottawa river as a means of communication. I think it should play a very important part in the transportation route from the Georgian bay to the seaports, and if the money were voted for that purpose, and engineers were instructed to develop that idea and give us the latest information, I would feel like incurring the vote. But if, on the other hand, it is merely in favour of a local interest, I think we ought not to make the expenditure.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly very valuable information will be given in connection with that project.

Mr. REID (Grenville). When I read this item I supposed it was to make a complete survey of the Ottawa river, and I asked the minister if that was the intention, and the minister replied that it was the intention to get a chart of the Ottawa river. Now the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. McCool) stands up and assures us that this is for building dams on the Ottawa river.

Mr. McCOOL. The hon. gentleman is ascribing words to me that I never uttered. I did not say that the money was for that purpose, I said that it was the intention of the lumbermen who urge this survey, to ascertain the best means of regulating the spring freshets. I gave my own opinion that that could only be accomplished by dams at the points I named.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then the member for Nipissing states that this money is to be expended merely for surveys in view of building dams, and not for the Ottawa river at all.

Mr. McCOOL. I did not say that at all.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Did he not state that this money was to be expended for surveys for dams?

Mr. McCOOL. No, I did not.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. gentleman has just stated that the lumbermen wanted it.

Mr. McCOOL. That was their intention.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That this money was to be used for surveys for dams.

Mr. McCOOL. I did not make any such statement. I said this money was appropriated for the purpose, as stated by the Minister of Public Works, of surveying the Ottawa river. The deputation asked for some improvements to regulate the flow of the water, and that is what induced the minister to put this amount in the estimates —to make a complete survey of the Ottawa river.

Mr. MONK. It looks to me worse and worse. It seems this money is required to get from experts a report as to the best places in the upper stretches of the Ottawa where the river may be dammed, and the only men who are going to get the benefit of this are the lumbermen, they are going to get all the benefit of these expert surveys upon which the government will be asked to make a large expenditure for dams. They will get the benefit of all these researches as to the best places where the river may be dammed. These people know exactly where the best water-powers will be, and so the whole of this expenditure is for the lumbermen on the upper Ottawa. Their

trade will be benefited and they will have water-ways of great value. This is not a proper application of public money.

Mr. HENDERSON. I confess I have had some difficulty in ascertaining the exact purpose for which this money is asked. However, from what I learn in this discussion, I take it for granted that the object of this vote is to devise some system of constructing dams, booms and slides on the river Ottawa and its tributaries, for the purpose of aiding the lumbermen who may go up there and purchase large tracts of timber and float it down the river. Now, if the timber that is to be floated down the Ottawa and its tributaries is still vested in the Crown, still belongs to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, I think these provinces should construct these improvements for the purpose of making an outlet for the timber which belongs to them. If the property has passed out of the hands of the provinces into the hands of private individuals, who bought it with all these obstructions in the way of navigation, all these difficulties in the way of getting out their timber, and consequently would buy this timber at a very much reduced price, I do not see that we are called upon at all to improve the river Ottawa and its tributaries for the sole advantage of the men who have purchased the timber at a low price when these facilities were not provided. Now, there is the larger question, to my mind, of provincial rights. We are told that these booms and slides are a profitable investment. If they are, very possibly we may find the provinces complaining that we are trespassing on their rights by constructing these slides and booms and taking away the revenue from them. The provinces are at the present time very jealous of this parliament. We noticed that in the chartering of a railway a short time ago between the cities of Hamilton and Toronto, when they thought their rights were invaded. I think we should be very watchful not to invade the rights of the provinces. In this instance I fear we would be invading their rights, more especially if they are going to obtain a revenue from these improvements, as I understand from the hon. member for Nipissing that they will be a profitable investment. I have some doubts about that. I have looked at the revenue derived from booms and slides that have been constructed. Reference has been made to the St. Maurice river and the amount of money that accrued to the government last year from the large expenditure on that river. But we forget that we are yearly expending large sums of money in order to get that small amount of revenue.

I think that during the present session we have voted $50,000 for improvements and boom works to facilitate the floating and storage of logs on the St. Maurice district. That is about four times as much as the revenue that was derived last year from that district. I very much fear that the prophesies of the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. McCool) will not be realized if the results are no more gratifying than they have been in the province of Quebec on that river. But, I think, first, that the whole question just depends upon what the object of this expenditure is. Who is to be benefited? If the province of Ontario and the province of Quebec are to be benefited, if their timber is to be increased in value by reason of these improvements, then let Ontario and Quebec construct these works for the purpose of giving increased value to the timber which they own. If we construct these public works at the expenditure of $400,000 or $500,000 it will practically be an additional subsidy given to the provinces, and we will get nothing at all for it. If the property has passed out of the hands of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and belongs to private individuals who bought it with all these obstructions in the way of getting it out, and bought it at probably one half of what it would have been worth if these improvements had been made, let these men pay for these improvements, and not ask us to spend the money of the people to benefit private individuals. The hon. Minister of Public Works told us that a large deputation had waited upon the government. I would like to know who composed that deputation. I think if we had the names of the gentlemen who composed that deputation we would find that it comprised the names of many gentlemen who are large holders of timber berths, who purchased these timber berths with these difficulties in the way, and who expect the government to use the money which belongs to the people of the whole Dominion simply to provide improvements to assist them in getting out the timber which they purchased at a low price by reason of those difficulties and that this proposed expenditure is to personally benefit themselves. I do not see the propriety of voting this appropriation at the present time. Although the sum was asked for the purpose of getting information, I think it would be well for the government to wait and see whether it is wise to go any farther. I think we had better consider whether there is any reasonableness in the inquiry which it is proposed to make.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These are Dominion works. These works were transferred to the Dominion at the time of confederation, and they are under its jurisdiction. The Dominion is charged with the maintenance of these works, and collects the revenue from them. My hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) knows very well that Ontario and Quebec do not collect the revenue. Could we undertake any great national work which is not for the benefit of the people of Canada? The people of

Ontario and Quebec form a part of this Dominion, and a great national work such as this, I think, would be for the general benefit of Canada. My hon. friend refers to those who may own the timber limits, and he says that they should pay for these improvements. They complain that the fees are too high now. How that may be I do not know, but certainly we do collect a very considerable revenue. My hon. friend instances the work at the St. Maurice river. Probably if the same care had been taken beforehand to make a survey such as we propose before the work was undertaken, we might have had better work for less money. I am not saying that is so, but it is always better to have information before undertaking a work of this description. I think, having removed the fears of my hon. friend as to who owns these works, and having pointed out the good results that will flow from such an expenditure as we propose to make, he should withdraw his opposition. I could understand the criticism if we were asking for a vote to carry out any of these improvements. Then it would be for each hon. member to express his opinion as to whether the improvements were of such a national character as to warrant us in going into them. But we are not doing that to-night. Here is a large question affecting the navigation of the Ottawa river. We hear the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) hour after hour declaiming about the great necessity for improving water navigation, yet, when the slightest effort is made in that direction, it is denounced as a damnable expenditure. It shows that we have hon. gentlemen in this House who have not given the matter very much consideration, and that there is on their part a great deal of talk with very little action. This is a work of great national importance, covering a vast area of territory, and I submit it to the committee, and if the majority think differently from me in regard to the question, they can refuse to pass the vote. This investigation should be made at the earliest possible moment, and it will depend on the report of the engineers as to whether in the opinion of parliament any expenditure should be undertaken upon the improvement of the river.

Mr. HENDERSON. If I thought the object of the vote was to improve the navigation of the upper Ottawa, I would think more kindly of it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would not come to parliament and ask for a vote without saying that it was for a specific purpose. If the report of the engineers is such that the amount involved is greater than the benefits to be derived, that will be a question for parliament to determine, but certainly it would be a great advantage to have that information, if we are asked to undertake any of that work in the future.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not object to that, but I understand that the object of the expenditure even if it is recommended by these engineers, will not be to improve the navigation of the upper Ottawa, or of its tributaries, but to obstruct it by the construction of dams across it, so that instead of the river——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is misinformed. The conclusion to be derived from the hon. gentleman's remarks is that we are asking for the money under false pretenses. The statement in the vote itself shows that the improvement of the facilities for navigation is one of the objects in view. The second object, the descent of timber, is incidental thereto, and surely the improvement of the river is in the interest of the country.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not insinuate that the hon. gentleman was asking for the money under false pretenses, but as the discussion has gone on, I have learned that it is not so much for the purpose of improving the navigation of the river as practically to obstruct the course of the river in such a way as to destroy it for the purposes of navigation, and that these obstructions will be used in the interests of private individuals. As I said before, in so far as I know, they have acquired large interests in that section of the country which will be vastly improved in value if this expenditure is made.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When application is made to the Department of Public Works, such as it is necessary to make under the law by private individuals or corporations, to make certain improvements on this river, how is the department to know whether they shall be allowed to do so or not if it has no knowledge as to the waters that are to be affected ? This is very important and very necessary information to be acquired by the Dominion of Canada looking to the protection and improvement of this great river.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not finding fault with the hon. gentleman taking this step, but what I do doubt is the propriety of doing anything even after he has obtained the information. I have very great doubt as to the propriety of the Dominion government expending public money there at all. In this matter we are invading provincial rights. We are interfering with works that ought to be undertaken by the provinces. If the property has passed out of the hands of the provinces, and has been acquired by private individuals at a time when no improvements were made on the river stretches, and at low prices on account of the difficulties of getting that timber out, then I do not see why we should be called upon to spend large sums of money for the

purpose of making valuable the property that was purchased at a very low price.

Mr. HACKETT. On which of the tributaries of the Ottawa are these improvements to be made ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not able to give that information. If my hon. friend is in earnest, he must know that there are a great many tributaries of the Ottawa that have never been surveyed, and I suppose not even named. The improvements will depend upon the report of surveyors. I do not say that any improvements will be made at all, but it is important that we should have information before we expend any money.

Mr. HACKETT. I have been asking for a survey from O'Leary station to the west shore of the island which would cost only $1,000, but I have always been refused. While you are spending this $20,000 to survey an unexplored country, you might make that survey in Prince Edward Island and build a wharf there too.

Mr. CLANCY. The Ottawa river and its tributaries have had improvements many years ago, and they have served the purpose since. What new conditions have arisen which call for further improvements ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Ottawa river works were started forty or fifty years ago and we have urgent applications for different works, and we want to get information. The new conditions are the general development of the country.

Mr. CLANCY. I understand that an interprovincial river, as the Ottawa is for some distance, would come within the jurisdiction of this parliament, but has the minister considered how far it devolves upon us to undertake work in any province ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We would not think of intruding on provincial territory without arranging with the province.

Mr. CLANCY. I have no doubt that the provinces would not object to an expenditure of money by the Dominion.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Has the hon. gentleman any doubt that the improvement of navigable rivers is under the jurisdiction of this parliament ?

Mr. CLANCY. As I understand it, this is not a navigable river, but it is proposed to make it so.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is navigable now.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the draft of the boats that ply on that river ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My information is, that the Ottawa is navigable for 40 miles above Ottawa where we have made improvements. Some of the boats draw from six to eight feet more or less.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister should take the advice of the hon. member from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and drop this vote for the present session, because he does not purpose sending surveyors out this time of the year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is just the time.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. McCool) and the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Murray) who are sitting beside the minister, know all about this region, and they can give the minister more information than he will get by sending out a band of surveyors, costing $20,000. Probably these gentlemen accompanied the deputation that went to the minister to ask for this vote.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman should accept the word of the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. McCool) that he did not accompany the deputation, and did not know the vote was in the estimates until to-night.

Mr. TAYLOR. I accept that, but perhaps the member for Pontiac cannot say so much. The hon. member (Mr. McCool) knows these waters very well, and he can give all the information that the minister wants. I would like to hear what the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Murray) has to say.

Mr. MURRAY. I may say, that like the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. McCool), I did not accompany any deputation. I am not specially interested in the vote before the House ; but I do know, from my experience as a business man, that the lumber industry is very much interested in these improvements on the upper Ottawa. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat knows as well as I do that the lumbermen have to go further back to the various tributaries to get out their lumber ; and they get it out late in the season, when the water is low. I do not think there should be any objection to the government expending the appropriation for the purpose named.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. McCool) says that the construction of two dams would do the whole business ; and $20,000 which the government are proposing to spend on surveys, if spent on the work itself, would probably construct those dams.

To provide for expenditure in connection with a transportation commission, $25,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There has been so much discussion with regard to this transportation commission that I do not know that there is any further information which I can give upon the subject. Perhaps the commission would have been organized before this but for the long delay in getting the vote before the House. Every member has a copy of the Order in

Council providing for the commission. I am of opinion that good results will come from the investigation.

Mr. SPROULE. The government, having dealt with the transportation problem before getting the information have done away entirely with the need of a commission, and now I do not know what it is required or expected to do.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand that this sum of $25,000 is not to pay the salaries of the commissioners, but only to provide for the expenditures in connection with the inquiry. How long is this supposed to last? Will it pay for a full year or only a portion of a year? I think we are entitled to some explanation as to when the commissioners are expected to begin their work, and what its scope will be.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would ask my hon. friend to read the Order in Council, which states better than I could at this time the scope of the inquiry. They will necessarily gather statistics and information at various points in the Dominion from the Atlantic ports to the ports on the lakes, and this vote is to cover the expenditure that they may find necessary for secretaries and for technical and statistical information.

Mr. HENDERSON. I read the Order in Council of the 19th May last, and I thought that one special object of the appointment of this commission was to deal with the question of transportation from the great west to the east. The question has now been settled by the government themselves, and we do not want a commission to deal with it. They have agreed to spend from $100,000,000 to $150,000,000 in constructing a transcontinental railway to dispose of the whole problem. Consequently if that was the object of appointing the commission, I do not see why $25,000 should be appropriated when the work of the commission has been actually taken out of their hands. I am not going to oppose this vote. I think it is very desirable that the work of this commission should go on. I think a great blunder was committed in not having the commission set to work months ago. If that had been done, possibly many millions of money would have been saved to the people of this country. So let us not hesitate now to appropriate the funds that are necessary to set the commission to work, trusting that good will come from it. I wish not to offer the slightest opposition, but only to express my regret that the government did not take action in this matter many months ago, so that they would have had the recommendations of the commissioners before they had entered on the construction of the transcontinental railway.

Mr. SPROULE. I regret that I cannot agree with the hon. member who has just spoken. In view of the action of this parliament on the transportation question during the present session and the fact that we have no scheme before us, I cannot see the need of this commission, nor what work there is for it to do. It seems to me that if there ever was a time when we needed a commission, it was before we took the step which we have taken this session; but that step having been taken, and the transportation problem having been dealt with, I venture to say that there will be very little change from what has been outlined. It is true, we shall be likely to go on and improve our canals, harbours and waterways to some extent; we shall have to do that of necessity; but what other great scheme is to be hatched out by this commission I cannot understand, and I think if we go on with it at present, it will be so much money thrown away.

Mr. LENNOX. I absolutely oppose, at the present time, the appropriation of one dollar towards this transportation commission. We were all of one mind some months ago as to the desirability of having a transportation commission for the purpose of solving the great transportation question which was then coming up. But after having committed ourselves to an enormous expenditure for the construction of a transcontinental line, after having taken out of the hands of the commission that pressing problem, it would be injudicious to expend this money. It may be quite true that we have many public works in the way of transportation which still require our attention, but there must be a halt called some time in the public expenditure, and in the face of the fact that we have committed ourselves to the construction of a railway which will cost anywhere from one to two hundred million dollars, I do not see why we should go on and spend money on a commission to inquire into the transportation problem which the government has determined to solve without the advice of any commission.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Like the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, I object to this item. Had the railway Bill not passed, I would not have objected to it, but now that the whole question is really settled——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am glad the hon. gentleman is so easy to satisfy with regard to the transportation question.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The government have settled that question in so far as the construction of a railway is concerned.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am glad that the hon. gentleman is pleased with our railway policy.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I did not say I was, but that the question has been settled and, so far as this item is concerned, I would move that it be struck out.

Mr. SPROULE. I am disposed to support that motion. Had this commission gone on and done the work intended that it should do when it was promised in the speech from the Throne, I would have said that we were doing the right thing in voting the money, but after the government have committed themselves to an expenditure of $125,000,000 to $150,000,000 for the purpose of effectively dealing with the transportation question, I can see no use for this commission. To vote this money would be locking the stable after the horse is stolen. When we add the salaries of the three commissioners and other expenses to this item, we will find that we will have to pay some $75,000 in the near future to keep these men going, and we will be doing that after the only object for which this commission was intended has been settled. We are practically appointing three men for no purpose whatever and at great expense.

Mr. MONK. What will be the salary to each of these commissioners ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not the intention to pay them any salary, but there will be some allowance paid for their services, depending on the time they will be at work. They will not be salaried men in any sense. The class of men we have appointed are not looking for salaries and never considered that a salary would be paid them.

Mr. MONK. No doubt something will be paid them for their services.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I suppose some honorarium or something of that kind, but no salary.

Mr. MONK. There will be a chairman and two commissioners. What is it intended to allow the commissioners as compensation for their services ? Have any arrangements been made with them ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, when they meet an arrangement will be made, but I have no idea of considering a salary or that they would ask for a salary —only some allowance to cover their expenses and for the value of the time they give.

Mr. MONK. I do not think my hon. friend should play on words. We are now voting an expenditure on this commission which will certainly cost $100,000, at the very least, if it sits one year. And, surely, before we vote that money we are entitled to know some details of the proposed expenditure. First and foremost, we are entitled to know what amount should be paid to the commissioners, whether you call it salary, solatium, indemnity for services, compensation for lost time, honorarium, or anything else.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it proposed to make a per diem allowance or to pay a lump sum ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As I stated, the commission have not met and organized. But some sum will be allowed. I do not expect that it will be paid, except as I have stated. This is to cover the expenses of the commission, and it is not my intention to incur a large expenditure in connection with it without further consulting parliament.

Mr. SPROULE. But the trouble is that we commence the expenditure. If, later on, we object, we shall be confronted with the argument, as we have been over and over again in other matters, that we should have objected before. That being the case, this is the time to endeavour to stop this expenditure. The minister says he does not intend to allow the commissioners any salary. To use a common expression, that is entirely too thin.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) misunderstood. I said that no doubt an allowance should be made in accordance with the services rendered. These men would gather certain information and prepare the report.

Mr. SPROULE. The country never employs men for such work without paying them handsomely, and no doubt these men will be remunerated on a scale commensurate with that given for similar work. We might as well recognize that at the beginning. But the question with me is as to the wisdom of paying out this money after having dealt with the transportation question as we have done. It is simply a vote of $25,000 as the beginning of an expenditure that will run up to $100,000. We might as well recognize that that is what we have to face.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not think that any member would object to this or a larger sum if it were necessary to have a commission on the transportation question. But we know that the government have been telling us for months that they have solved the whole transportation problem. If so, what is the use of this commission ? It cannot change the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Bill ; that is settled. I cannot, for the life of me, see what there will be for the commission to do. I believe that this item was put in to hood-wink the people and make them believe the government are carrying out the promise they made early this session to have a commission to solve the transportation question. They think that if they did not put this in they would not be able to defend their action on the Grand Trunk Pacific. Under the circumstances, I have no hesitation in moving that the item be struck out. The motion may not carry, but I believe that it is not fair to vote this item now that the Grand Trunk Pacific legislation has passed this House.

Mr. MURRAY. This is a preliminary provision for the transportation commission. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House laid great stress on this commission, and said that the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill should have been kept back until the report of the commission was received. Surely, these hon. gentlemen will not say that the only transportation question for the country is the Grand Trunk Pacific question? Is there not the question of transportation by the St. Lawrence water-way? Is there not the question of transportation by railways other than the Grand Trunk Pacific? Is there not the question of the Ottawa and Georgian bay canal, in itself sufficient to occupy the attention of a commission? For my part, I must say that I never took much stock in the idea of a commission, for it seems to me that the people's representatives should settle questions. But the strong opinion of the House seemed to be that there was a need for a commission. Good men have been selected, and this is a preliminary vote to pay for their services. It is not a large amount, considering the character of the work expected of them.

Amendment (Mr. Reid, Grenville) negatived; yeas 22, nays 40.

Government of the Yukon Territory—additional amount required for expenses in connection with the administration of the Territory, $15,000; amount required for the maintenance and construction of roads and bridges in the Territory, $113,490; grant to administration of Yukon Territory for construction and maintenance of public buildings for local purposes and settlement of claims in connection with the construction of roads, $113,500—$241,990.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The latter item of $113,000 is really that for which I am asking a vote here. The money of these three items is paid out through the local council of the Yukon.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the money been spent already?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. This is an allowance to the Yukon council for constructing the works set forth here. My hon. friend will remember that an arrangement was made by which we voted this money to the council, with the understanding that it would be administered better under the local authorities, since the council has become partly appointed and partly elected, than by the department here.

Pelly river bridge at Lethbridge—reconstruction of—to recoup the government of the North-west Territories, $55,000.

Old Man's river bridge at Macleod—reconstruction of—to recoup the government of the North-west Territories, $29,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Both these bridges were carried away by a freshet in May, 1902, and application was made to the department to rebuild them. An examination was made by the engineer, and it was thought better to erect more permanent structures than had previously existed. There was some correspondence between the local government and the Dominion as to how the money should be charged, and it was understood that the bridges were to be built by the Dominion.

Mr. SPROULE. The item says: 'To recoup the government of the North-west Territories.'

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The construction of these bridges was urged upon us by the local government as a matter of immediate necessity, and they agreed that we should expend the money out of their vote, to be recouped by this government.

Mr. SPROULE. On another item I asked a question this afternoon for a statement of the various items which appear in the different estimates of grants of money for the North-west Territories. We do not know what we are voting in the aggregate, and it is time that we should know that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman's request is a very proper one. The deputy made a memorandum, and to-morrow he will have this account made up.

Telegraph lines, British Columbia—working expenses—additional amount required, $2,500.

Mr. SPROULE. Are the telegraph lines self supporting? Excepting this amount for working expenses, what is the original amount? What are the telegraph lines costing to-day for maintenance over and above their earnings?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will give that information on the Yukon vote. Mr. Chairman, we have done a little work at any rate, and perhaps we had better rise.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MONK. Before the House adjourns I would like to state that when the House goes into committee, either to-morrow or on some future day before long, a motion will be made in regard to the expenditure in connection with the taking of the last census. What business does the minister intend to take up to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will continue in Supply, taking Public Works, and after we finish them, Militia.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There was an arrangement that the Militia estimates should come up to-morrow morning. There was an understanding to that effect with

the Minister of Militia and Defence. If the hon. Minister of Finance will be good enough to keep his rank and file in better control than they were this morning we will get on very much more expeditiously with the estimates than we have done to-day. I would like the arrangement to be carried out to take up the militia estimates to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Arrangement with whom ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). With the Minister of Militia.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am most willing and anxious to oblige hon. members. I think there was one item allowed to stand affecting the Yukon and there are some small votes for Quebec which I think we can easily dispose of in the morning and then go on with the militia estimates in the afternoon. If hon. gentlemen want any particular item to stand for discussion I shall be perfectly willing, but, unless there is some object I would like to proceed with my estimates because there have been a great many days during this session taken up with the Public Works estimates.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. Minister of Militia and Defence came over last night and said that he wanted to know if we started his estimates the first thing in the morning it would be possible to get through with them before six o'clock as we are going to adjourn in the evening. My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Hughes) said that he had a statement to make and although some other hon. gentlemen also desire to offer some observations, we thought that it would be possible to get through with these estimates in one day if we started early.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If it will oblige any hon. members, while it causes a great deal of inconvenience to myself, I will agree that the militia estimates shall be taken up.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. Minister of Militia and Defence mentioned to me that he desired to make such an arrangement and I left him to arrange with the hon. Minister of Public Works. Very good; let it be understood that the Militia estimates will be taken up to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, October 8, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Mr. WILSON—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. For how many miles of railway have bonuses or subsidies been voted by parliament during the years 1900, 1901 and 1902 ?

2. How much money would it amount to each year, figured at minimum rate of $3,200 per mile ?

3. What amounts of the said bonuses or subsidies have been paid for each of the above years, and up to September 1, 1903 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I think that questions No. 1 and No. 3 are practically the same. No. 3 is perhaps the more comprehensive of the two, and I will answer that :

1.—	New Vote	Revote.	Total. Miles.
1900..	855½	9½	865
1901..	586	517	1,103
1902..	Nil	Nil	Nil

2.—	
1900, 835 miles at $3,200..	$2,672,000 00
30 " 2,500..	75,000 00
	$2,747,000 00
1901, 1,103 miles at $3,200..	3,529,600 00
1902. Nil.	

3.—	
1900-1901..	$ 525,371 75
1901-1902..	218,800 00
1902-1903..	578,404 98
July 1, 1903 to September 1, 1903.. ..	Nil.
	$1,322,576 73

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE FOR 1903.

Mr. CLANCY asked :

1. What was the total amount of revenue collected for the fiscal year 1903, so far as has been ascertained ?

2. What was the total expenditure for the fiscal year 1903, so far as has been ascertained?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Mr. Speaker, the returns for the last fiscal year, though not exactly and finally closed, may be regarded as practically complete, because any figures that occur later are not likely to make any material change, and therefore I think the statement that I am able to give may be taken as a substantially correct statement of the operations of the year :

Fiscal Year 1902-3.

The returns to 30th September, 1903, show :

Revenue on Consolidated Fund..	$66,034,108 32
Expenditure on Consolidated Fund.	51,707,172 89
Surplus..	$14,326,935 43
Capital expenditure, including railway.	
Subsidies, bounty on metals..	$10,367,163 01
Sinking funds bought..	2,620,588 46
Decrease of net debt on the operations of the year....	$6,580,360 88
Further decrease of net debt through adjustment of provincial accounts....	3,305,450 24
Total decrease of net debt for the year..	$9,885,811 12

PAYMENT OF MILITIA FOR DUTY AT VALLEYFIELD STRIKE.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. Have the militia who were called out and sent to do duty at Valleyfield on the occasion of a strike in the fall of 1900, been paid for their services ? And if so, by whom and on what date ?

2. What was the total sum paid by the government on account of the calling out of the militia on the occasion of the Valleyfield strike above alluded to ?

3. Has an action been entered against the municipality of Valleyfield to compel that municipality to reimburse the government the amount expended for the militia services rendered on the occasion herein alluded to ?

4. When and by whom was the action commenced, and upon what date was the writ issued?

5. Has the case been set down for trial ; and when will it likely be tried ?

6. What is the present position of the suit ; and what instructions have been issued with reference to proceeding with it ?

7. Have the militia force called out on the occasion of the longshoremen's strike in Montreal, last spring, been paid for their services ? And if so, by whom, and what was the total sum paid out for such services ?

8. Has any request been made by the city of Montreal to be relieved of the payment of the militia for such services ?

9. What is the intention of the government with respect to enforcing payment from the city of Montreal of any sums advanced by the government for payment of the said militia force in respect of their services while so called out; and what action, if any, does the government propose to take for that purpose ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir F. W. Borden) :

1. Yes ; by the Dominion government, under section 34 (6) of the Militia Act, on 17th October, 1901.

2. $4,442.91.

3. Yes.

4. Instructions were sent by the general officer commanding to Lt.-Col. Roy, who, at the time of the strike, was in command of the district, on the 30th April, 1901, to take action against the municipality, 29th January, 1902, as prescribed by the law.

5 and 6. Yes ; it has been set down for trial on the 9th instant. No instructions were necessary.

7. Yes ; by the Dominion government, under section 34 (6), Militia and Defence Act ; $18,850.42.

8. The city council of Montreal passed a resolution requesting the Dominion government to pay the militia, copy of which was officially transmitted to this department.

9. Section 34 (6) of the Militia and Defence Act prescribes that in such a case the district officer commanding shall at once, in his own name, proceed against the municipality for the recovery of the amount advanced.

PAY OF PERMANENT FORCE.

Mr. GILMOUR asked :

Have any steps been taken toward increasing the pay of the permanent force ? If not, is it the intention of the government to do so ; and if so, when ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir F. W. Borden). No decision has been reached. The matter is under consideration.

CONTRACT WITH THE NORTH ATLANTIC TRADING COMPANY.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) asked :

1. What contract or contracts, if any, have been entered into since the year 1898 between the government of Canada, or any officer or person, acting on behalf of the government of Canada, or the Department of the Interior, of the first part, and the North Atlantic Trading Company, of the second part ?

2. What contract or contracts, if any, have been entered into since the year 1898 between the government of Canada, or any officer or person, acting for the Department of the Interior, or for the government of Canada, of the first part, and any trading company or trading companies carrying on business at Amsterdam, in Holland, or elsewhere in Holland, of the second part ?

3. What are the particulars of each of such contracts ?

4. Will the government lay on the Table of the House a copy of each of such contracts ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). A contract was entered into on the 1st November, 1899, between the Department of the Interior and the Trans-Atlantic Trading Company, the name of which was afterwards changed to the North Atlantic Trading Company. The object of the contract was to secure the conveyance of immigrants from Europe, especially northern Europe, to Canada. The contract will be placed upon the Table of the House.

MR. J. G. ANDERSON.

Mr. ALCORN asked :

1. Has J. G. Anderson been appointed a fruit inspector, or to any, and what official position relating to fruit or its inspection, in or for the county of Prince Edward, Ontario, or for any territory including that county, or any part of it ?

2. Where does he reside, and what is his post office address ?

3. What are his duties ?

4. What instructions, written or verbal, have been supplied to him ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). Mr. J. G. Anderson was appointed inspector under the Fruit Marks Act, 1901, to act temporarily from the 5th September last. There is no special district to which he is appointed. He works at present in the province of Ontario. At the moment of his appointment he was temporarily residing at Picton, Ontario, but his former residence, to which I understand he was about returning, was Lucknow, Ontario. His duties are to act as an inspector under the Fruit Marks Act, 1901. The general instructions furnished to inspectors are

set forth in a departmental circular, which contains a copy of the Act and the regulations made by Order in Council for its enforcement and operation. Those and the verbal explanations given to Mr. Anderson by the chief of the fruit division were the instructions that were given.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—SHIPPERS' CLAIM FOR DAMAGES.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. Hackett—asked :

1. Has the government received a memorial from the shippers of frozen fish and other perishable goods, in the province of Prince Edward Island, asking to be compensated for loss sustained owing to government boats not keeping up communication between that province and the mainland, during the past winter ?

2. If so, is it the intention of the government to place an amount in the estimates to meet the claims of said shippers ? If not, why not ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. R. Préfontaine) :

1. Yes.

2. The matter is under consideration.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Geological Survey Department for the calendar year ending 1902.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That order (No. 42) on the public Bills and Orders : 'House in Committee on Bill (No. 3) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900, as amended by Special Committee.—Mr. Charlton,' be transferred to the government orders.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. W. ROCHE (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I rise to a question of privilege. The other day, the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Hackett) said, apparently reading from 'Hansard,' that I had stated : The fishermen were on the outskirts of civilization ; and he interpreted these remarks as being a reflection upon fishermen generally, and on the fishermen of his own county in particular. I rise to deny that I made these remarks. I saw the reporter and I asked him if I had made these remarks and he said : No ; these remarks are not in 'Hansard.' I might have allowed the matter to remain there had not some other gentleman, the member for North Grey (Mr. Thomson) endeavoured to present me in an unfavourable light before this House, and before those whose opinions I value. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hackett) could not have read the remark in 'Hansard,' and therefore I stand in an invidious position, as it might appear that I had denied something which was affirmed to be true, and which was proved by being found in 'Hansard.' Now, I made no such observations, and they are not reported in 'Hansard,' and it remains for the member for Prince (Mr. Hackett) to make an explanation on that point. If the light were imperfect, or if his glasses were improperly adjusted——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I rise to a question of order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) has a right to make a personal explanation, but he has no right to rise and challenge somebody else to make a personal explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule is, that an hon. gentleman has the right to make a personal explanation on a question of privilege. The point taken is that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) has no right to ask another hon. gentleman to make an explanation, and I should think that the other hon. gentleman will have to decide for himself whether he wishes to make an explanation or not.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). I quite agree with you, Mr. Speaker, but you see that I am compelled, because of the attitude taken by that hon. gentleman (Mr. Hackett), to present the case in this way. The hon. gentleman left the impression that he quoted from 'Hansard,' but he could not have quoted from 'Hansard' when it is not in 'Hansard.' I do not think that the leader of the opposition should have interrupted me, because we are all interested in preserving the dignity of this House and in supporting the personal reputation of its members. If he were attacked I would be the first to believe that it was incumbent on him to make an explanation ; and to ask the member who attacked him for an explanation. I think that I should have an explanation from an hon. member who has placed me in a derogatory position, and I think the member should make the amends which one gentleman should make to another.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have not the slightest wish that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) should be prevented from making an explanation. It is his duty to put himself right if he thinks he is misrepresented in the House. But when he does so he has no right to lecture other gentlemen of the House, and that is what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) is doing. The House will listen to the hon. gentleman most respectfully, and no one more respectfully than I, when he makes such an explanation, but it is not necessary or desirable that he should indulge in a lecture.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). I was paving the way in the easiest manner possible for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hackett) to make an explanation which everybody should be glad to make.

Mr. E. HACKETT (West Prince). I have no wish to do any injustice whatever to the hon. member (Mr. Roche). When he spoke a few days ago he made this reference and I wrote it down immediately.

> The fishermen of Nova Scotia were living on the outskirts of civilization.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hackett) must accept the explanation made by the hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Roche.

Mr. S. HUGHES (Victoria). I rise to discuss that point of order. The rule, as I understand it is, that when a gentleman makes a statement which is not of his own knowledge, concerning another member. and the other member denies it, then the hon. gentleman who made the statement not of his own knowledge must accept the denial. But in this case, the hon. member (Mr. Hackett) says he heard the statement made in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) is mistaken. When a declaration is made by a member, that declaration must be accepted against the affirmation of anybody.

Mr. HACKETT. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) made a personal allusion to me, and he spoke about my eye-glasses. Well, I have to use eye-glasses.

Mr. BENNETT. What kind of glasses does he use.

Mr. HACKETT. I use eye-glasses, and I use them for the purpose of spying out hon. gentlemen on that side of the House and it is very unfair and very unjust for the hon. gentleman to make a personal reflection on me because I have to wear eye-glasses.

SPEECH OF THE RT. HON. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the government to a matter of some importance, and to put a question to the right hon. the Prime Minister. In the summary of the report of Mr. Chamberlain's speech which I find reported in all the newspapers—I have before me the report of the Ottawa 'Evening Journal' of the 7th instant—I find the following :

> Mr. Chamberlain said he believed that the colonies are prepared to meet us in return for a very moderate preference. They would reserve to us the trade we already enjoy ; would also arrange their tariffs in the future in order not to start industries in competition with those already in existence in the mother country ; and not only would they enable us to retain our trade with them, but they would give us preference on all trade done with them by our foreign competitors

I wish to ask the government, if at the colonial conference—as to which, as my right hon. friend knows, we have no verbatim report—or on any other occasion, the Canadian government has stated anything to the British government which would justify this statement of Mr. Chamberlain in regard to the starting of new industries in the future in this country ; or, in regard to the statement generally which I have just quoted from Mr. Chamberlain's speech ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I also read Mr. Chamberlain's speech, at all events the summary of it which has appeared in the press, and I must say that I do not draw from his words the inference which my hon. friend has just drawn. I understood Mr. Chamberlain to make an argument and not a statement. He argued that if the British public would give a preference to the colonies, it would be an appeal to the colonies to return a preference, not only in matters which had already been agreed to, but in what might be suggested. In regard to statements made at the conference or elsewhere, they are all contained in the papers which were submitted by the Canadian ministers at the conference, and which were conveyed by the government to the House some time ago.

SUPPLY—ST. JAMES' DIVISION MONTREAL.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I would like to call my right hon. friend's attention to the division of St. James, Montreal. My right hon. friend will remember that very nearly a month ago I called his attention to the fact that that division had not been represented at all during this long session of parliament. My right hon. friend stated at that time that he was under the impression that although his attention had been called to that matter some time previously by myself, still an agreement had been come to between us, or some statement had been made by myself, to the effect that the matter should rest there. This I denied at the time ; but my right hon. friend stated that the matter would be seen to at once. I would like to have from my right hon. friend an explanation of why the writ was not issued at that time.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I am bound to say, first of all, in justice to my hon. friend, that when he called my attention to the matter, I made the statement which he has just repeated as having come from me, and which I made in perfect good faith at the time ; but as I found no confirmation of it in 'Hansard' I have to admit that

so far as that goes I was mistaken, and I beg my hon. friend to accept my apology for that. With regard to the other question, the writ has not been issued for this reason. When our attention was called to the matter a few months ago—this session has been so long that it is almost impossible to keep track of time—we found that the lists in the city of Montreal were being prepared. My hon. friend knows that the disposition of the law is that the lists cannot come into force to be made use of in an election until sixty days have elapsed after they have been prepared. Therefore, it has been only within some few weeks at most that the writ could have been issued for the electoral division of St. James.

Mr. MONK. Will my right hon. friend allow me to state that the lists came into force on the 11th day of May. They were revised in March.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think the lists were prepared in May.

Mr. MONK. They were prepared in March, and came into force in May.

The PRIME MINISTER. At all events, that is the reason. We did not think it would be useful, nor do I think my hon. friend was particularly anxious to have the writ issued until the session was over, and until, without any inconvenience to anybody, we could dispose of the business in hand, so that we could go to the country, in that particular division, fresh from the questions we have been discussing.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). My right hon. friend is remarkably considerate. He changes his attitude with regard to the St. James division every time he mentions it in the House. Some six or eight weeks ago he distinctly took the ground that he was waiting for my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) to bring the matter up. It seems remarkable that a constituency should stand unrepresented in this House for months because some member of the opposition did not force the government to issue a writ. However, my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier pointed out that there was nothing in that, because he had brought this matter to the attention of the government as soon as the constituency had been declared vacant. That was not two or three months ago ; it was something like six months ago, if I am not mistaken. Months rolled on and no action was taken. During all that time it would have been perfectly competent for the government to bring on the election, as the lists were all ready. The lists in the province of Quebec, so far as I understand the law, were revised in March last, and sixty days afterwords they would be ready for an election. On the 11th of May, as my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier informs me, the lists were ready for an election in St. James' division, Montreal. The months of May, June, July, August and September elapsed, and we are now in the month of October ; and during all these weary months of this session that constituency has been unrepresented. I do not think the reasons which my right hon. friend has given for disfranchising the constituency during what amounts to an entire year are at all adequate. It would have been perfectly possible to have had a member for that constituency elected during the month of June last, and he would have been present in the House during the past four months to represent the people of that very important division. I am informed that not only were the lists ready, but they were printed in the Printing Bureau in May or June last, and that twenty copies were sent to the candidates who had last contested that division. Under these circumstances, we should surely have some better explanation than the right hon. gentleman has given us why that very important section of the city of Montreal has been unrepresented in parliament during so many months.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). I understand the right hon. gentleman to say that the reason why the writ was not issued was that the lists of this year for St. James' division were not completed. I am glad to hear him take that stand, because, in the face of that there cannot be much truth in the rumour which is going about that we are soon to have a general election. The lists in the province of Ontario in many cases are not completed until the last days of December, so that we could not have an election before some time in March. So that the statement of the right hon. gentleman will please the politicians throughout the Dominion, as it means that we cannot possibly have a general election before March next.

REPRESENTATION OF WEST QUEEN'S.

Mr. E. HACKETT (West Prince). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I desire to call your attention to the fact that the province of Prince Edward Island is entitled to five members. Of one of those gentlemen we all lament the death, which took place in the early part of the session. I refer to the Hon. Donald Farquharson. Since then the district of West Queen's has been unrepresented in this parliament. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman if he will have an election in that constituency without delay ?

The PRIME MINISTER. It is quite true that the county of West Queen's, P.E.I., has not been represented in this House, but it

is not my fault. I am ready to take my share of the blame, but it it also the fault of my hon. friend.

Mr. HACKETT. How is that ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Because he has not notified Mr. Speaker that there is a vacancy.

Mr. BELL. Might I ask the hon. the First Minister if it is intended that the House shall sit on Thanksgiving day ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The government in this matter will be in the hands of the House. We are very anxious to expedite business, but we have a good deal to thank Providence for, and I suppose it would be in order to do like the rest of our fellow-countrymen and not sit on Thursday, but attend to more important duties.

Mr. LOGAN. Is it the intention to adjourn for the Christmas holidays ?

Mr. HACKETT. I desire to call to your attention now, Mr. Speaker, that the west riding of Queen's has been vacant——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken.

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

Pay and allowance—further amount required for headquarters and district staff, $17,625.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden). Although, as you have been reminded by my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan), we have been here for something like seven months, still I think that the importance of the question of defence is so great and the estimates for that purpose which are being asked this year are so considerable, that it is proper we should take up a short time at least in discussing the present position of our militia force, and the intentions of the government with regard to it. The two items 29 and 30, more especially item 30 will cover the ground upon which I propose to speak. I think it will be more convenient that the general question should be discussed in a single statement rather than divide it up into the different heads suggested by the items in the estimates. The objects for which the militia force was established were first to aid the civil power, to maintain order, and in the second place to repel invasion or attack from without. The militia is the force of Canada upon which the government rely for assistance in maintaining order, in carrying out the laws of the country, and in maintaining the integrity of our Dominion, if attacked or threatened. These are the purposes for which the militia force was originally established. These are the purposes for which it should be chiefly maintained. Occasions may arise in the future, as they have in the past, when temporarily the militia may be used for other purposes ; but as I have said, these are the main objects for which the militia was organized. I think there is no need of any argument to satisfy this House that a militia force is necessary. I am sure there is not a single man in this House who will not agree that such a force is necessary, and that the force we have has done good service in the past. It is true that peace and contentment reign everywhere in Canada at present, but we cannot forget that we have been threatened in the past from without, and even on more than one occasion raids have been made on the soil of Canada, and also on more than one occasion the hand of the rebel has been raised up within our own country against its government. We have enjoyed during recent years great prosperity in Canada. There has been extraordinary development of our resources and of our wealth. In fact the development since confederation to the present has on the average been most satisfactory, but with that development and growth our responsibilities have increased also. I propose, in the first place, to call your attention to what has been done in the way of expenditure on the militia since confederation, and I might premise by saying that at the time of confederation there was an understanding—although not a written bond—between this government and the imperial authorities who gave us our constitution, that there should be an annual expenditure of something like a million dollars a year on our militia. At that time our revenue amounted to about $13,000,000. To-day it is five or six times that amount, so that if a million dollars were a proper sum at the beginning of the confederation to spend on our militia, we can see that a very much larger sum might properly be expended now. Of course I do not mean to say that pari passu with the increase of revenue, the expenditure on the militia should increase.

But I do say we have no excuse for not expending all the money that may be necessary to make that force efficient. I have here a table showing the expenditure upon the militia since confederation, beginning first with the period of four years from 1868 to 1871, inclusive, and then going on by decennial periods. As will be seen, the table shows not only the total expenditure, but the expenditure provided under main heads, and also a column showing the average expenditure per head of the population per year. I have had an actuarial calculation made for each year since confederation down to the present time, based upon the censuses that have been taken. I have included last year and the current year, ending 30th June, 1904, estimating the expenditure on the basis of the best information available :

Year.	Population.	Yearly Militia Expenditure.	Per capita.	Consolidated Revenue.				Capital.	Per capita.	Public Works Expenditure.	Grand Total.	Per capita.
				Ordinary.	Per capita	Special.	Per capita					
		$		$		$		$		$	$	
1868		761,008		601,385		159,623					761,008	20
1869		952,350		952,350							952,350	27
1870		1,426,598		978,840		447,758					1.426,598	40
1871	3,485,761	1,436,316	·32 ·412	811,471	·233	624,845	·179				1,436,316	·32 41
1872	3,569,666	1,754,012		1,576,694		177,318				25,000	1,779,012	·51
1873	3,653,571	1,412,041		1,264,573		147,368				10,493	1,422,534	·40
1874	3,737,476	1,347,763		1,138,594		209,169				15,009	1,362,772	·36
1875	3,821,381	1,162,775		1,029.548		133,227				47,036	1,209,811	·32
1876	3,905,286	1,124,987		1,043,070		81,917				75,629	1,200,616	·31
1877	3,989,190	644,328		614,359		29,969				46,123	690,451	·17
1878	4,073,095	692,499		573,523		18,976				99,535	792,034	·19
1879	4,157,000	826,272		809,675		16,597				112,558	938,830	·22
1880	4,240,905	731,895	·27	728,372		3,523				92,231	824,126	·19
1881	4,324,810	703,030	·162	703,030	·162					71,926	774,956	·29 ·18
1882	4,375,653	809,160		808,910		250				73,648	882,808	·20
1883	4,426,296	764,234		763,439		795				89,997	854,231	·19
1884	4,477,339	1,017,166		1,016,871		295				199,849	1,217,015	·27
1885	4,528,182	2,730,974		1.033,123		1,697,851				118,545	2,849,519	·63
1886	4,579,025	4,055,323		1,201,955		2,853,368				160,090	4,215,413	·92
1887	4,629,867	1,315,492		1,227,793		87,699				159,063	1,474,555	·32
1888	4,680,710	1,349,271		1,309,048		40,223				134,368	1,483,639	·32
1889	4,731,553	1,397,010		1,355,490		41,520				104,607	1,501,617	·32
1890	4,782,396	1,327,576	·32	1,317,779		9,797				44,946	1,372,522	·29
1891	4,833,239	1,287,550	·266	1,279,513	·264	8,037	·002			5,574	1,293,124	·37 ·27
1892	4,887,020	1,270,264		1,266,306		3,956				57,231	1,327,459	·27
1893	4,940,801	1,426,970		1,419,746		7,224				219,623	1,646,593	·33
1894	4,994,583	1,284,517		1,268,361				16,156		113,396	1,397,913	·28
1895	5,048,364	1,574,013		1,505,930				68,083		65,468	1,639,481	·32
1896	5,102,145	2,136,713		1,136,713				1,000,000		37,103	2,173,816	·43
1897	5.155,926	2,413,651		1,639,810		27,876		745,965		87,580	2,501,231	·49
1898	5,209,707	1,688,213		1,413,123		101,350		173,740		106,157	1,794,370	·34
1899	5,263,489	2,500,102		1,713,800		392,614		393,688		56,927	2,557,029	·49
1900	5,317,270	3,624,653		1,668,926		1,723,021		232,706		90,546	3,715,193	·70
1901	5,371,051	3,106,241	·41 ·576	2,040,531	·379	923,003	·172	135,885	·025	186,954	3,293,195	·43 ·61
1902	5,400,000	2,947,375		2,295,407		352,271		299,697		252,134	3,199,509	·59
1903	5,500,000	*2,713,003		*1,823,003		*315,000		*575,000		*138,000	*2,851,003	·52
1904	*5,600,000	*3,371,990	·55 ·60	*2,071,990	·37			*1,300,000	·23	*432,000	*3,803,990	·60 ·68

* Estimated.

It will be seen that during the first four years after confederation the expenditure varied from $761,000 in the first year to $1,400,000 in the last year, which was the year of the Fenian raid. During that period the expenditure per year per head of the population was 32 cents. For the next ten years, from 1872 to 1881 inclusive, the expenditure was something like $1,000,000 per year, and the per capita expenditure was 27 cents. The next decennial period included the North-west rebellion, but the expenditure amounted to about the same, 32 cents per head of the population. Of course, in the meantime the population had increased from about three and a half millions to about four and three-quarter millions. Then, for the next decade, from 1892 to 1901, inclusive, the expenditure reached 41 cents per head. For the last three years —1902, 1903 and 1904—the last estimated on the best information available—the average expenditure per capita is 55 cents per head of the population. These figures do not include the expenditure on account of public works devoted to militia purposes—drill halls, armouries and so on. But, including these amounts, I find that during the first four years there is practically no change, the expenditure still remains at 32 cents per head of the population; during the next ten years there is a slight increase from 27

cents per head to 29 cents per head; during the next decade, up to and including 1891, there is a further slight increase from 32 cents to 37 cents per head; during the next decade, up to and including 1901, there is an increase from 41 cents to 43 cents. But, during the last three years, the average expenditure per head of the population is brought up to 60 cents.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Does that include the cost of the South African war ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, this covers every dollar of expenditure, direct and ordinary, for the militia, including the expenditure on the Fenian raid, the North-west rebellion and the South African war. It also includes the expense of maintaining the garrison at Halifax. It will be seen that the estimated expenditure for this year, including expenditures upon public buildings for the militia, amount to 68 cents per head of the population of Canada.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. That includes an expenditure of $1,200,000 on capital account?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, for the current year. I find that the expenditure for this year, 68 cents per head, has been exceeded only twice since confederation, viz. :—In the year 1900, when it was 70 cents per head—this, of course, including the expense of the South African contingents—and in 1886, when it was 92 cents per head, this being the year during which nearly the whole of the expenditure in connection with the North-west rebellion was made, when the expenditure for the year on ordinary account, including the North-west rebellion, amounted to $4,055,000. I thought that these figures would be interesting, and would enable us, perhaps, to see exactly where we are with reference to the expenditure which this country is making in connection with military matters. From my point of view, it is very gratifying to find that we have made this increase, that we are getting nearer to what I believe, and what I think the best citizens of the country believe, is our duty with reference to military matters and questions of defence. How much further we may be prepared to go, I cannot say. But I feel sure of this, that this parliament and this country will be ready to support the government in expenditures of this kind, so long as those expenditures are wise, and the development of the militia is carried on under wise rules and proper directions.

Now, I propose to discuss for a moment the expenditures which are now before the committee. I shall not now speak of the expenditures on account of public works for militia purposes, because these matters have already been discussed in the committee, when the estimates of the Minister of Public Works were under consideration. The expenditures are divided into ordinary and capital, and that division, I think is obviously correct. The ordinary expenditure, of course, should be taken out of consolidated revenue, as it is the expenditure for the ordinary maintenance of the militia. The capital expenditure is special. It is chiefly for new armament, to some extent for rifle ranges, and, perhaps, the acquisition of lands for military purposes. This particular vote of $1,300,000 will be chiefly for the purpose of purchasing arms and ordnance and for purchasing equipment and clothing as a reserve. At the present moment we are inadequately armed. There are less than 40,000 rifles in this country whereas we need at least 100,000, and I believe we should have many more than that in reserve. Our field artillery is inadequately armed ; we should exchange the present guns for up-to-date weapons. Our garrison artillery is inadequately armed ; in many cases the armament is absolutely worthless and useless. That should be changed and we propose to change it.

I may be asked : Is $1,300,000 going to do all this ? Certainly not, but it is going to make a commencement. I may be asked —and it would be a fair question—what appropriations do you propose to ask in the future ; what is your policy with reference to expenditure on capital account ? I propose to anticipate this question. I have no hesitation in saying that I think this vote will have to be repeated four or five times in order to place the militia in a proper and safe position particularly with respect to armament. When we come to vote the various items I will be able to state to the committee, at least approximately, the disposition which it is proposed to make of the money.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Do I understand that this present estimate covers an additional arsenal ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, it does not. It includes an amount of $75,000 for reserve ammunition.

As I said a moment ago, I believe that the people of the country and this committee, while willing to give money freely for the benefit of the militia force, will be anxious as to its expenditure and will justify the granting of considerable sums such as we are asking only after being satisfied that the plan of expenditure is the wisest that could be adopted. This I think is the proper moment for explaining in a general way the scheme which we have in mind. One or two sessions ago I stated to the House that I looked forward to having in the near future a force of 100,000 men in Canada which might be called upon at any time and which would be ready within a brief period whenever its services might be required. I am happy to say that reflection and the experience of the last year or two lead me to believe more strongly than ever that such a force can be counted upon and

that it can be counted upon without very much increase in the expenditure on consolidated revenue account. The scheme briefly and roughly outlined is this: That we shall proceed as we are doing now with an enlistment of say 40,000 or 50,000 of this 100,000 men, this enlistment to be called a peace establishment. Of that 40,000 or 45,000 probably at least fifty per cent, that is twenty-five per cent of the whole 100,000 of the establishment, shall be asked to do annual drill; that all the officers and non-commissioned officers for the total force of 100,000 men shall be required to do annual drill, and that the twenty-five per cent or less of the 100,000 men, say, 22,000 men who will be required to do annual drill, shall be selected men, men who will represent—if I am not making use of a term that is objectionable to some of my friends—the skeleton of the force of 100,000 men.

In connection with a force of this kind it will be absolutely necessary that you should have all the departments of an army properly represented. You cannot put an army into the field unless you have the means of supplying them with food, clothing, arms, transportation and everything that is necessary for their comfort in the field, and in order to do that you must have permanently established in time of peace all the departments which you would require in time of war. This is an essential not only at headquarters but in every one of the whole twelve military districts of the Dominion. We now have too, in this country, I am happy to say, an efficient permanent force, perhaps not as efficient as it ought to be, but a force which has done, and is doing excellent work. This force was created for the purpose of educating the active militia; it supplies the teaching power from which the officers who will have charge of this force of 100,000 men and also the non-commissioned officers and the selected men will get their training. Every man who reflects will realize that the most important point in order to bring about an efficient military force is to have the leaders, whether they be officers, non-commissoned officers, or selected men, thoroughly trained and ready for action at any moment. This is an important and vital part of our scheme. Then the question would be asked: What are you going to do with the other 60 per cent? You have some 40 per cent enlisted for what you may call a peace footing, but where are the 60 per cent and where are you going to find them when you may require them for active service? Our proposal in regard to the 60 per cent is that they shall be enlisted for the requirements in time of war, but that in the meantime they shall not be required to drill unless they choose to do so, but that they shall be taught the use of the rifle and shall be given rifles and ammunition to use at their homes or at convenient points, that they shall be enrolled so that when an emergency arises they can be brought in and incorporated with this 25 per cent which I have referred to, and which shall be the flesh and blood, so to speak, to be put on the skeleton which will go to make up the army. That is roughly an outline of the scheme. I may say, in passing, that we have done a good deal already towards looking after the 60 per cent, the 60,000 upon whom we have to call to make up our army to 100,000. We have already inaugurated a system of rifle associations. We require the men who join these rifle associations to sign a bond or agreement to serve if required in war. We are at present doing this and we are giving them an opportunity to learn the use of the rifle by giving to each association of forty the use of ten rifles. We have established first-class rifle ranges all over the country, and I am glad to say that we have something like 20,000 men now enrolled in these rifle associations. During the last four or five years we have constructed rifle ranges in nearly all of the important centres of Canada. We have in this city the Rockliffe Rifle Range, which is one of the best rifle ranges in the world. We have rifle ranges at London, Hamilton, Niagara, Toronto, Kingston, Montreal, Three Rivers, Sherbrooke, Lévis, St. John, N.B., Fredericton, Campbellton, Moncton, Bedford near Halifax and in British Columbia, and so I might go on.

Mr. GOURLEY. Any in Nova Scotia?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. GOURLEY. Give us the points.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There is one at Bear river, one at Aldershot, and there are one or two in Cumberland county. I am not quite sure whether there is one at Truro or not.

Mr. GOURLEY. I was just wondering.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Well, we must have one there.

Mr. GOURLEY. I hope so.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We have also adopted the principle of issuing free ammunition. Six or seven years ago the annual consumption of ammunition was between 1,000,000 and 2,000,000 rounds, last year it was between six and seven million rounds, and I am happy to say in this connection, that we have increased the capacity of our cartridge factory from a million and a half rounds a year, to something like thirteen million rounds.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). How much miniature ammunition was issued free?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Between 1,000,000 and 2,000,000

rounds. In order to carry out the scheme of education and training which is the very groundwork of the efficiency of our militia force, it is proposed to establish a central camp at a convenient place in the interior, where all the officers of the force and certain representatives from every corps in Canada may be brought together, a ground large enough to enable military evolutions to be carried out to some extent as they would be in actual warfare, a camp ground which would probably embrace from 20,000 to 30,000 acres of land. To this central camp the permanent force would be brought, and there the plan of education which I have outlined and upon the importance of which I cannot too much insist, would be carried out in the best possible manner. It is not proposed to give up district camps. On the contrary, it is hoped that we shall be able to extend the ground for the camps in the different districts so that the officers and non-commissioned officers who have learned their work at this central school will be able to return to their own districts, and there have an opportunity of teaching the men with whom they are more immediately associated. It is intended I may say in this connection, to increase the number of mounted men. They should at least be trebled and probably quadrupled. There are certain districts of this country, the eastern townships, points along the frontier in different parts of Ontario, and in the North-west especially, where this force can be easily enlisted, and where you can get a class of men who will go into the cavalry who would not think of joining the infantry. It is proposed to utilize these men in this way.

Now, perhaps, this would be as convenient a moment as any to discuss the question of the pay of the militia. I have read some reports in the newspapers and I have heard some statements in this House as to the views of some of my hon. friends connected with the militia upon this question. This is not the first time it has been discussed. I have expressed my opinion in regard to it on more than one occasion, and I would say, while the pay may not be all that we would desire, that in view of the fact that our means are limited, and presuming a strong loyal feeling to exist among the young men of this country, it was not unfair to expect them to be prepared to accept what is only an indemnity, and was never intended to be anything more than an indemnity to go up to camp for twelve days, provided they are put in a position not to be subjected to a direct loss.

That is the idea upon which the pay of the force was established, and I think it is a sound idea, and I am bound to say it has worked fairly well up to the present moment. I have said, and I repeat it, that I think something in the way of an additional amount might be given to men who served well in camp, for the second and third years of their turning out, and so on up to five or six years of their service. I would be in favour of recognizing, by some such method as that, good conduct and zeal in acquiring military knowledge. At the present time, however, I may point out that we are not in a position to do this, because the militia law prescribes the pay, and we have no power to go beyond it I hope, when I have an opportunity of bringing down amendments to the Act, that some changes may be made in this regard. I wish to go a little further with regard to this question of pay. I have been at pains to examine the results of the training during the past year, under what is known as the skeleton system, the system of turning out only enough men to keep up the organization of the different companies and regiments. And while I find that only in one or two places was there a lamentable failure to respond to the call to camp, I find that upon the whole——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Nothing personal, I hope.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Oh, no, nothing. I speak of camps and not of individuals. I find that, taking the whole of the camps together, the result was about as good as the result, for instance, in the year 1900, when the whole of the militia was called out. I will go further, and I will be able to show that if the camp at Niagara is left out of the computation, then the average this year was very much above the average of the year 1900. Why it was that the battalions failed to turn out at the Niagara camp I do not know. I presume it was because labour was in such demand, and that people had so much to do at home that they could not take the time to go to camp. Just here let me make this observation. I am not at all sure, in fact, I doubt very much, if it is desirable that this parliament should vote money for the purpose of taking men away from the avocations which demand their attention. We know what a demand there has been for labour this last year, and how impossible it has been to get labourers. Would it be in the public interest that the government of Canada should enter the labour market as a rival to bid against the agricultural and other industries of the country. I doubt it very much, and I am not disposed to recommend such an extreme step. I go further, and I maintain that if the sum fixed by some of our friends as the proper amount of pay, namely, one dollar per day, had been offered this year in the province of Ontario, you would not have filled up your camp at Niagara much better than you did.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand). May I ask if the minister has the figures for London district, No. 1 ; he mentions specifically the camp at Niagara ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am going to mention them all. I am going into these details only for the purpose of trying to learn some lessons, if possible, and not at all for the purpose of making any reflections on the Niagara camp. But I wish to point out the extraordinary fact that in the camp at Niagara 44 per cent of the officers who were called into camp, did not materialize. If the officers are not interested enough to go to camp, how can you expect the men to go ? Is it very much wonder that 48 per cent of the men did not turn out at Niagara ? Was it because the officers were not getting enough pay that they did not go ? I have heard no complaint of that kind. You cannot make the argument apply to the men and not apply to the officers. I have taken a good deal of pains to have a tabulated statement prepared, showing, first, the number of officers, non-commissioned officers and men who were called out for duty last year ; secondly, the number who actually trained ; and thirdly, the number who failed to respond to the call.

STATEMENT showing approximate number of Officers, Warrant and N.C. Officers and Men called out for training, and trained, in Camps of Instruction, 1903.

MILITARY DISTRICT.	PLACE OF ENCAMPMENT.	CALLED OUT.			TRAINED.			DIFFERENCE BETWEEN NUMBERS CALLED OUT AND TRAINED.						
		Officers.	Warrant and N.C. O's.	Men.	Officers.	Warrant and N.C. O's.	Men.	Officers.	Per cent.	Warrant and N.C. O's.	Per cent.	Men.	Per cent.	Total all ranks.
1	London	228	440	1,311	150	423	951	78	34·0	17	4·0	360	26·0	455
2	Niagara	399	651	2,141	225	486	1,113	174	43·6	165	25·0	1,028	48·0	1,367
3 and 4	Barriefield	186	330	1,614	158	265	1,139	28	15·0	65	19·0	475	29·0	568
	Deseronto	51	178	574	51	178	570	....	....	....	....	4	....	4
5, 6 and 7	Three Rivers	451	820	2,718	336	820	2,398	115	25·0	....	....	320	11⅔·0	435
8	Sussex	150	318	1,070	121	318	610	29	19·0	....	....	460	43·0	489
9	Aldershot	188	356	1,351	177	305	955	11	5·0	51	14·0	396	29·0	458
10	Various	21	79	279	19	57	184	2	10·0	22	21·0	95	34·0	119
		1,674	3,172	11,058	1,237	2,852	7,920	437	26·0	320	10·0	3,138	28·0	3,895

I find that in the London camp, district No. 1, 34 per cent of the officers failed to turn out; 4 per cent only of the non-commissioned officers failed to respond, and 26 per cent—which is only a little under the average—of the men failed to turn out.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand). Does the hon. gentleman show any distinction between the infantry and the cavalry in these figures ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No. I have not been able to do that. In Niagara district, No. 2, 43⅔ per cent of of the officers failed to turn out ; 25 per cent of the non-commissioned officers failed to turn out ; and 48 per cent, or practically half, of the men failed to turn out.

At Barriefield, Kingston district, Nos. 3 and 4, 15 per cent of the officers failed to turn out ; 19 per cent of the non-commissioned officers failed to turn out, and 29 per cent of the men failed to turn out.

Now, I want to call the attention of the committee to the camp at Deseronto, an artillery camp. What happened at Deseronto ? Every officer turned out, every non-commissioned officer turned out, and all the men but four turned out. Out of 574 men called, 570 turned out.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Did they get any more than 50 cents a day ?

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand). They got pay for their horses.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Certainly they got pay for their horses, and nine-tenths of these men hired their horses and paid the full dollar, and some of them more than a dollar a day for the horses. There is an important lesson to be learned from this, and that lesson is, that the artillery is a technical branch of the service ; a branch of the service that requires education and application, or the men cannot get on in it. The officers are trained and educated men ; and the men, having been interested by their officers in their work, have turned out for precisely the same amount of pay that the 48 per cent of the Niagara camp would have got. There is no distinction as to the pay. While I do not wish to reflect on the infantry—because I know very well that both cavalry and artillery have greater attractions for officers, non-commissioned officers and men than has infantry—yet I wish to make this point, and I do it in all kindness and with

every appreciation of the trouble which infantry officers have. I believe it would be possible for them to make the work of their men more interesting than they do. I believe that the scheme which I indicated the other day, of having constructed for every single unit of the force throughout the Dominion a good home, at a convenient place, where the officers and men could meet, where the men could come in the evening without interfering with their work, and where the officers could deliver lectures to the men and promote good fellowship and interest among them, would do ten times more for the force than voting to them a dollar or a dollar and a half a day.

But to continue this comparison. I find that at Three Rivers 25 per cent of the officers failed to turn out, that every non-commissioned officer turned out, that only 11¾ per cent of the men failed to turn out. That is to say, while at Niagara 48 per cent of the men failed to appear, at Three Rivers they all appeared except about 12 per cent.

Mr. MONET. Do I understand from these figures that the attendance in the province of Quebec has been better than in the other provinces ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I believe it is. Coming to the maritime provinces. I find that at Sussex 19 per cent of the officers were absent, all the non-commissioned officers attended and 43 per cent of the men failed to turn out.

Mr. HENDERSON. What percentage of those expected to come out actually came ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is exactly what I am giving. In No. 9, Aldershot camp, a little less than 5 per cent of the officers, 14 per cent of the non-commissioned officers and 29 per cent of the men failed to turn out. In the other camps, lumping the small camps together, 10 per cent of the officers, 21 per cent of the non-commissioned officers and 34 per cent of the men failed to turn out.

Now, I wish to call your attention to the last full camp that was held. I mean by full camp the camp where the whole enrolled militia were called out. That was in 1900, and I propose to make a comparison of the results this year, under the system of skeleton drill, with the results in 1900, under the old system of calling out the full regiment. I find that in 1900, of the whole rural militia of Canada, 25 per cent of the officers failed to turn out, and that non-commissioned officers and men put together —I have no means of separating them in this return—show 21 per cent absent.

RETURN showing the number of Officers, N.C. Officers, Men and Horses, trained during the Year 1900 in District Camps.

MILITARY DISTRICT.	AUTHORIZED ESTABLISHMENT CALLED OUT.			RECEIVED 12 DAYS' TRAINING.			RECEIVED UNDER 12 DAYS' TRAINING.			UNTRAINED.		
	Officers.	N.C. Officers and Men.	Horses.	Officers.	N.C. Officers and Men.	Horses.	Officers.	N.C. Officers and Men.	Horses.	Officers.	N.C. Officers and Men.	Horses.
No. 1	309	3,211	345	209	2,727	310	...	...	...	91	484	35
No. 2	355	3,814	607	288	3,431	566	8	44	1	59	339	40
No. 3 and 4	267	2,720	444	188	2,160	377	...	...	...	79	560	67
No. 5	206	2,094	233	166	1,454	188	...	7	...	40	633	45
No. 6	135	1,391	272	103	817	236	...	7	...	32	567	36
No. 7	205	2,163	78	138	1,287	66	..	..	...	67	876	12
No. 8	160	1,796	439	113	1,415	351	...	...	...	47	379	88
No. 9	212	2,380	104	175	1,954	101	3	36	...	34	390	3
No. 10	6	78	80	6	79	80	...	...	...	...	...	...
No. 12	43	442	4	34	390	4	2	26	...	7	26	...
Total	1,889	20,088	2,606	1,420	15,714	2,279	13	120	1	456	4,254	326

Coming back to the return which I read a moment ago, I find that, taking these two together and making a general average, in these rural camps an average of twenty-six per cent of officers as compared with twenty-five per cent—only one per cent difference—failed to turn out. And taking the non-commissioned officers and men and adding them together, twenty-four per cent failed to turn out this year as compared with twenty-one per cent in 1900, only a difference of three per cent. If you omit from the calculation for this year the abnormal condition of things at Niagara, if you leave the Niagara camp out of the calculation altogether, you will find that only twenty per cent of the officers failed to attend and only nineteen per cent of the non-commissioned

officers and men, which is a better showing than that of 1900. The figures are there to speak for themselves and I think they are unanswerable.

Some comparisons have been made between the city and rural militia. The city militia have been charged with the expenditure on their magnificent drill halls and armouries and we have been told that the rural militia have nothing to place against these. This was done, I think, in a debate to justify the argument that we should pay the rural militia a dollar a day and keep the pay of the city militia at the same rate. It was pointed out by my hon. friend that it was true the city militia gave every cent of their pay into a common fund.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand). Most of them.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yet, notwithstanding that, it was argued that, in view of the splendid accommodation they got and of the fact that they had their drill at night, which did not interfere with their days work, we should discriminate by increasing the pay of the rural militia without increasing the pay of the city militia. I dissent from that view. I think we must treat all alike. While the city militia may have some advantages in the respects I have mentioned, they do give up their pay, they are always on hand, and are the first to be called upon in the case of any trouble.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand). Let me say one word of explanation. I urged very strongly that the pay of all the militia, including the city, should be increased, but that if the funds were not sufficient, then the increase should apply to the rural corps for the reasons I gave on that occasion.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I do not see how we could discriminate. I wish to point out further to my hon. friend that the rural battalions are provided with tents and transportation and are fed, and I do not think it is fair to charge against the city battalions some of the extravagant expenditures of which both the late and the present government have been guilty, in the erection of armouries, which are altogether more expensive than were necessary. I do not know that I should go any further into this question of pay except to say this, that I am looking carefully into the subject and feel disposed to go upon the lines to which I have referred. I feel disposed to ask that increased pay be granted for good conduct to men who turn out regularly and show an intelligent and earnest interest in the force. One of our great troubles—and I am sure it would be just as great if it were a dollar a day—is that a man will attend one annual drill and then get a good job and you will never see him again. I want to do something if possible that will foster military ardour and encourage our young men to join the militia and complete their term of service, and I propose that encouragement should be given in the shape of a reward to those who have done continuous and faithful service.

The question of the pay of our permanent force has been mentioned, and I was to day asked a question with reference to it. I can only say that the position of the permanent force has been enormously improved within the past three years. A pension law has been passed, under which every man who serves in the permanent force will be taken care of in his old age. Formerly men who had served until they had become too old, men who had done good work and had risen to the rank of sergeant or sergeant-major had to retire without any pension. I have a case this very year, in which I am asking parliament to give a gratuity to a sergeant-major, who served the best of his days in the permanent force, who had gone beyond the age limit, and had to retire without any allowance. Thank heaven that disgraceful state of things is at an end; and now our permanent force men will be getting something more than forty cents a day and their clothing, lodging, rations, &c. If they are faithful to their duty and remain in the corps, they are certain of being taken care of, in some sort at any rate, in their old age. I would also like to point this out to the men of the permanent force, if they are sufficiently interested to read what I am saying. It is open to any man in our permanent force to rise to the highest position in the militia. I am happy to say that we have to-day officers in the force who began their military career as privates in the permanent force of this country.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Can the hon. minister give us a few names ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I could give one or two, but I do not think it worth while.

Mr. THOMPSON (Halidmand). Lieutenant Butcher, recently appointed, is one of them. Each one of these men carries his marshal's baton in his knapsack.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). Are there a number of non-commissioned officers who have served in the regular army and are now employed in the permanent corps ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think there are. I would apply the principle in existence now in the North-west Mounted Police. Have a rate of pay for the first year and increase it every year of good service up to a proper point. That is the reform I would propose in connection with the permanent force. But, Sir, we have not only to consider the men, but we have to consider the non-commissioned officers and officers. I am prepared to admit at once that the pay of the non-commis-

sioned officers is insufficient and should be increased, and must be increased. And the same is true with regard to the officers. We should give the officers at least as good pay as is given in the British army. I think we should give them better pay. That is a matter to be considered. But here, again, let me point out what has been done for the officers as well as for the non-commissioned officers and privates of the permanent force. We have established a pension law. It is true, we call upon the officers to contribute. They contribute five per cent of their pay. But upon retiring they get a most generous pension. And not only this, but if anything happens to them, if they are killed or die, their widows and their children are taken care of. So our officers of the permanent force are very much better treated than they were before.

I am sorry to find I am occupying so much time—I thought I should finish in half an hour. But I wish to proceed upon the line I have just mentioned and devote a short time to pointing out what has been done in the way of improving the condition of the militia, and what is about to be done. I will only name some of the changes which have been made. I have already mentioned the pension law. Let me refer to the limitation of the term of commission. Let me refer to the establishment of the reserve of officers. That was being done, I think, by my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) my predecessor, about the time I came in. It had been arranged for, but I am happy to say that I have had the satisfaction of carrying it into force and insisting on its being done.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman is not now referring to the permanent force ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, but to the whole militia. The term of an officer in command of the militia to-day is limited to five years. When I came into office there were about fifty colonels who had been serving forty years more or less giving no opportunity whatever for a young man to rise, and taking away every inducement almost for a young man to enter the militia force at all. Now we have the enforcement of the age limit. We had colonels away beyond the age limit, we had captains away beyond the age limit, we had majors away beyond the age limit, and lieutenants—why I myself knew some lieutenants who were over sixty. It is now possible for us to get rid of these well-meaning gentlemen who, no doubt, have served their country very faithfully. The lieutenant who was sixty had no opportunity to rise, because his colonel, who was seventy, had been in command for thirty or forty years, and the major, who was sixty, had held his place for about as long. Of course, I am not finding fault, but simply pointing out the fact that this was the condition of things which actually existed and which, I am happy to say, has been absolutely changed, so that, to-day we have, as a result of these promotions, given the younger officers who enter the force the reasonable hope that, within eight or ten years they will be occupying high positions in their regiments if they deserve it.

Mr. SPROULE. Might I ask a question ? Is that change necessarily in the interest of the militia ? It is since that change was made that we find the complaints that we have only the skeleton of a militia turning out. May not this have been a detriment to the force ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I tried, in my opening remarks, to answer that question by pointing out the scheme. And I may say that this is a scheme which Lord Dundonald, who is a skilful soldier, absolutely approves, that we should reduce the nucleus down to the lowest possible point for the purposes of economy, perhaps, to some extent, to enable us to use the money for other purposes. Lord Dundonald maintains, and I agree with him, that it is absolutely possible to do the work necessary in order to provide the nucleus of a force of 100,000 with the skeleton system of sending out twenty-two or twenty-three men out of each company.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand that the term of office for a colonel is limited to five years ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, but there is a regulation by which, upon the recommendation of the district officer commanding and the further recommendation of the general, the tenure of office may be extended by one, two, or three years, the limit being three years. It may happen that there is no major—the second in command—qualified to take the colonel's place. And it may be in the interest of the force—and it must be shown to be in the interest of the force—to extend the term of command for not more than four years.

Mr. INGRAM. Military qualifications to be the only requisite ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The only requisite, so far as I know. Another reform effected under the present regime is to insist upon annual camps. We have had annual camps ever since 1896. In my opening remarks I spoke of the importance of an army having all the departments of a working force actually in existence in time of peace, and doing in time of peace the work that they would be required to do in time of war.

In this connection, we have inaugurated a system of medical service under the supervision first of Colonel Neil-

son, and now under Lieutenant-Colonel Fiset, who distinguished himself so greatly at Paardeburg. We have organized bearer companies. There was not one in Canada before. We have field hospitals. There was not one in Canada before. We have an army medical staff, which did not exist.

We have organized an intelligence branch of the service which did not exist before, for the purpose, as the committee knows, of collecting the information that might be necessary for the commanding officers to use in time of war. In connection with the intelligence branch, surveys are being made of the thickly-settled parts of the country, and I hope to be able to get the necessary funds to make an accurate military survey of the country, which will be most useful. This is a thing that is done in every other country. I hope to see maps prepared and placed on sale in the book-stores, which will be of immense benefit to the people of the country and to people visiting this country.

We have organized an army service corps which previously did not exist. This is under the supervision of Lieutenant Colonel Biggar, who had service in this connection in South Africa which has been of great advantage to him and who has taken a special course at Aldershot to fit him for the position. I believe he is a most efficient officer. In connection with the army service corps, instructions are being given in every military district, lectures are given before the camps and a small permanent staff has been established.

Then we have the ordnance branch, which is now being created for the first time in Canada. This is, of course, very largely the old stores' branch of the Militia Department, which has been under the direct control of the minister. For years and years, certainly for the last ten years, a change in this respect has been advocated. It was altogether an anomalous condition that the stores, rifles and articles of that kind should be under the control of the civil head of the department. I had not been very long in my position when I was impressed with the force of that statement. We have now adopted the English system; we are creating an ordnance branch, and have appointed Colonel Macdonald, the very able and worthy head of the old stores' branch, to the important post of head of the ordnance branch, placing him under the supervision of the general officer commanding. As under the British system, he is still under the control of the minister, but he is under the supervision of the general officer commanding.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Does that cover all the stores ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That covers everything.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. But he does not buy them ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood the minister to say that the ordnance branch is under the supervision of the general officer commanding as well as of the hon. minister himself.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We have adopted the phraseology of the English Order in Council, which says that certain departments shall be under the control of the general officer commanding and that certain others shall be under his supervision.

Mr. INGRAM. In case of a conflict with respect to the management of this department between the general officer commanding and the minister, what would occur ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is a case that would scarcely arise. The Order in Council provides that the minister, if he chooses, may consult the head of a great department such as the ordnance department, the administration of which involves great expenditures of money and important questions of policy. In the English service this applies to the quartermaster general as well, and to one or two other similar positions in the War Office. I think it is convenient to follow, as far as possible, the course of the War Office in this, because it is desirable that our organization here should be as nearly as possible like that of the War Office.

We have also established an engineering branch, and I have been able to secure as the chief of the branch Major Weatherbee, a graduate of the Royal Military College at Kingston. Mr. Weatherbee has just returned after having taken a long course in England to fit him for this position. He has as his assistant Captain Maunsell, whom I found in the service, who was appointed by the hon. ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Tisdale), and is one of the most efficient officers in the service.

At one o'clock, committee took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Mr. Chairman, before proceeding with my statement, I wish to make a short explanation as to the percentage of the 100,000 which I said would be turned out in camps annually. I think I said that it would be somewhere between 22 and 25 per cent. I meant that statement to refer to the rural militia. Of course I think there are in the cities from 12,000 to 15,000 men enlisted in the ordinary way, and the 43 per Company will all drill in the cities.

To resume the consideration of the changes and improvements that have, or are about to be made in the state of the militia : before recess I concluded my reference to the engineer branch. I come now to that of military secretary. We have never had in this

country a branch of that sort, although it has always existed in the war office in England. Lord Dundonald suggested to me some time ago that this would be advisable, and I found that we had what I believed to be a first-rate man here at Ottawa now at the head of the Medal Claims Board, whose employment as military secretary would not involve any additional charge upon the revenue, as he is already paid for doing the work as head of the Medal Claims Board, and is quite willing to take up the additional work involved in the discharge of the duties of military secretary. I simply mention this as a fact of some importance, and also as a departure not involving any additional charge upon the treasury. I refer to Lieutenant Colonel Smith, who was at one time district officer commanding No. 1 district, who has been here for some years, who has done very valuable work, and who is acknowledged on all hands to be a very able military man.

Mr. INGRAM. A first-class man.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The next thing I desire to mention is the establishment of a school of musketry, and I wish to give the credit for this to the general who preceded our present general, General O'Grady-Haly. It was at his suggestion that this school was started, and I can assure the committee that in my humble opinion it is one of the most valuable adjuncts to the militia of Canada that has ever been made. This school—I need not describe it—is going on here under the very shadow of this building. There have been this year two terms of the school already held at the ranges here, where there is every opportunity for the men and officers who are there to learn the art of rifle shoooting. These are the men brought together from all parts of the Dominion — officers, non-commissioned officers and men in each of the two schools—who are to be the teachers of the active militia force throughout Canada. You can easily understand how important a departure this is. I have already referred to the increase in the number of rifle ranges and to the large number of rifle associations which have been organized under the ægis or encouragement of this school, and under the direct superintendence of the commandant of the school, Lieutenant Colonel Cartwright, who has done, I am bound to say, magnificent work as the head of that school, and who deserves the highest consideration from the militia generally, and from the people of Canada.

Next I wish to refer to the establishment of a school of signalling. Signalling is something which has not been done to any extent worth mentioning in the militia of Canada. We have sent an officer to England who is to take a special course to fit him to take charge of the teaching of this school. Whether he will take command or not I do not know. I refer to Lieutenant Lister. I have a vote in the estimates which will come before the House shortly for the purpose of organizinig this most valuable school—the school of signalling—which I believe will be located here side by side with the school of musketry.

Before leaving this branch of the subject, I would like to refer to two important changes which have been made in the civil branch of my department. I refer to the establishment of a contract branch under the supervision of Major Benoit, an old officer of the department, one who has been private secretary to Sir Adolphe Caron, a man who has been in the department for 25 or 30 years, and who is a most valuable officer. He has been secretary of the department. He will be changed from that position to the position of head of the contract branch.

I wish to refer to another most important change, as I view it—the establishment of a central registry in the department. Hitherto we have had three or four or five different registries and confusion, as the business of the office has increased in magnitude, has continually arisen as the result of the great number of offices of registration. Those have all been done away with, and now we have one central registry where every document or letter or anything that comes into the department, whether on the military or civil side, is registered, and where, if any paper is wanted, it can be obtained at almost a moment's notice. This office is under the control of Mr. Jarvis, who has been for some time in the department, who is a most valuable officer, who, I think, was private secretary to my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tisdale), and whoever brought him here deserves well from the people of this country, because whoever brought him brought one of the very best men that could possibly be found, a man who has done most valuable work in the department.

There is one more thing to mention in this connection, and that is the establishment of a library. If we are to have educated men up to date officers, we must have books for them to read, and I have asked for a small vote—it is a very small one—as a beginning in a small way to provide for the establishment of a military library here in connection with the headquarters staff, and the department generally.

Now, I come to another branch of the subject, the permanent force, and I wish to point out a few changes, or rather additions, which are to be made in the force. I have already pointed out that we are transferring the stores branch of the militia to the military side, and changing it into an ordnance branch. All the storemen and officers connected with the stores department in the different districts throughout the country will become members of the

permanent force, will be enlisted and therefore will be directly under the control of the different officers of the department who are here at headquarters or in different districts.

We are to have two new depots in the permanent corps ; one in the city of Montreal where we will have one company of infantry and a section of garrison artillery ; probably 200 men in all. This is a most important departure, and I believe it will be of great use to the militia in that section of the country. Montreal is a great city ; perhaps it might be fairly called the commercial centre of the Dominion of Canada ; it has a very large population, and it is desirable that the military spirit should be cultivated in that city, and that we should establish there a branch of the permanent corps.

Another depot is to be established at Calgary, North-west Territories. The North-west Mounted Police is being moved gradually northward, and it is proposed that a mounted corps of the permanent force shall be established at Calgary to replace the North-west Mounted Police. This corps will be named after the Strathcona Horse, which distinguished itself in South Africa. We have at this moment in the permanent force in Canada, units representing all the different corps that served in South Africa, except the Strathcona Horse; and it is proposed now to do honour to the memory of the man who rendered that magnificent service for his country, in sending out at his own expense a regiment to South Africa, and to do honour to the memory of the corps itself by perpetuating their name and fame. Therefore, a depot of the permanent force, consisting of probably a hundred mounted men, will be located in the North-west Territories and will be called the Strathcona Horse.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I omitted to refer to the engineer branch of the permanent force. As we have made the ordnance a branch of the permanent force, and all the employees, soldiers of the permanent force and under military control ; so we propose to have in every military district, or rather as a part of every military depot of the permanent force, a small section of engineers. There is no engineer force to-day in the permanent militia force at all. We have a few scattered companies of engineers. It is a most important thing to have an up-to-date, educated and thoroughly trained engineer force, and we want a section of it in every one of the depots in the Dominion. The strength of this force will be about 100 ; so that we will have 100 ordnance corps, 100 engineer corps, 200 Montreal depot, and 100 Strathcona Horse, making in all 500. I cannot hope to have all of these established during the present year, but the ordnance corps and the engineer corps, and I hope the Strathcona Horse will be established within a very short time.

Now, Sir, I wish for a moment to speak of the state of the militia generally. Notwithstanding the criticisms which have been vouchsafed against the militia, and notwithstanding the failures, perhaps lamentable failures in some respects, I believe that as a whole, as a going concern, as a machine fit to do work if called upon ; the militia force is in fairly good condition to-day. I think that was pretty amply proven two or three years ago in the despatch of the contingents to South Africa ; in the preparation within a fortnight of a force of one thousand men scattered over 2,000 or 3,000 miles of territory ; and in the despatch later on, of artillery and cavalry within a space of perhaps three weeks. All this has shown that there is some vitality in the Canadian militia, and some power to do its work, notwithstanding that some of the camps have seemed to be lamentably small. I maintain that as a going concern the militia is in a far better shape than it was ever before, and is in a fairly satisfactory condition. But much more can be done ; much more must be done, and it must chiefly be done in the line of educating and training the leaders of this force. This is the direction in which I think we should chiefly expend our money. If we had an unlimited amount of money to train 100,000 men, I daresay it would be a better proposition to call them all out and spend our money, and have the force up to date in every particular. But we cannot do that. It is a question of doing the best we can with the money we have, and I think the amount of money we are asking from the people for the militia this year, is perhaps pretty near the top of what we should ask in the near future. If that be so, we must be content with perfecting the different departments of the militia ; we must be content with affording the very best possible means for the education of the officers, non-commissioned officers and selected men ; we must be content with supplying the sixty per cent whom we are not asking to turn out to drill, with rifles, with ammunition, with targets, with instructions in the art of shooting.

But I think that the idea which I have put forward—which is Lord Dundonald's idea, which is the idea his predecessor approved of—of having turned out annually to drill, all the officers and non-commissioned officers, and a skeleton of the men ; I believe that this means you will get a fairly effective skeleton upon which you can put the plastic material, the flesh and blood, out of which you could make an army. Some one has alluded to the shadow of a skeleton. Well, I beg to dissent from that view. It would have been more correct to have said a skeleton from which some of the smaller bones are absent—and a good many of the small bones seem to have been absent in one or two of the military districts in the western

part of Ontario. As to the flesh and blood, as to the plastic material, the 60 per cent that we propose to utilize to fill out this skeleton, and make it strong and stalwart and able to defend ; I can point with confidence to the evidence that has been given by the militia men of former days ; the men who engaged in repelling the Fenian invasion ; the men who engaged in putting down the two North-west rebellions ; the men who volunteered for South Africa and won glory for their country ; the men who were second to none in heroism; the men who never turned their backs upon the foe——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have unbounded confidence in the capacity of these men, if we give them an opportunity of learning how to use a rifle, that they will fill up the ranks, and provide the flesh and blood, the plastic material, that round out this skeleton and make an army fit for duty whenever it is required.

I have already referred to the importance of housing the militia. If we want to make the infantry force of this country what it ought to be, we must provide for every single unit, every company, sufficient accommodation for at least 100 men, where they may meet together and spend their evenings, using it as a sort of club-room, and having blackboards and other means to educate themselves in the art of war. If you do that, you will excite renewed interest among the men, and you will get together and get the sympathy of the very best men in the community. You will not then have to worry over the question whether you are to pay them 75 cents or a dollar or fifty cents a day. It is not the money that brings that class of men out. It is the loyal spirit in them, and the desire to serve their country ; and all they will ask is the opportunity to acquire the necessary knowledge in order to do so.

I would like to say one word with regard to the Royal Military College. This is an institution of which we are all justly proud. It has sent men to fill prominent places in the British army. I think there were something like a hundred officers, graduates of the Military College, taking part in the South African war ; and one or two of them greatly distinguished themselves there, and are to-day occupying in that country positions of very great responsibility. In 1896 the Royal Military College was almost in the throes of dissolution. There were scarcely a baker's dozen in the college. There were not more than half a dozen graduates. To-day, instead of having to look around and ask for young men to come to the college, we have the agreeable fact staring us in the face that the young men have to compete to get into the college. Whereas formerly the classes were composed of ten or twelve or less, to-day every place in the college is filled, and each year at the examination there are half a dozen or a dozen more young men who are anxious to get in. Only a day or two ago I had a letter from a gentleman in Canada whose son has a commission in the British army, in which he sent me a quotation from a letter which he had just received from his son telling him in what high estimation this college was held in England and in the British army ; and well it might be.

I am happy to be able to say that whereas during the early years of my administration we could hardly induce a graduate of the college to come into our force, to-day we have a considerable number of graduates in the permanent force of this country. This is because they see that the force, to some extent at least, is being cared for, and that there is some future for it, and also because we have provided a generous pension fund which will insure the care of the men after they have passed the years prescribed as the limit of military age. We have to-day in the intelligence branch three or four graduates of the Royal Military College, which is most satisfactory to me. It is all very well, and we cannot regret very much, perhaps, to see our young men going into the British army and taking prominent places there ; but I must say I would very much prefer seeing them remain at home and endeavour to work out the problems which we have to solve in this country, the solution of which need their assistance.

I wish to refer to the recent establishment of a rifle factory in this country. I think hon. gentlemen will all agree with me that it is important that the militia force of this country should be as far as possible a self-contained as well as a self-reliant force, and that we should be able to manufacture our own rifles as we are manufacturing our own ammunition. Our rifle is not precisely the same as the service rifle in England ; but there is practically no difference, while the ammunition used is exactly the same. So that if a British force were fighting alongside of ours, or vice versa, no difficulty could possibly arise from the fact of their using two slightly different rifles.

Then, as I have stated, we have enlarged our arsenal. Formerly the cartridge factory at Quebec was turning out in the whole year as many cartridges as the Woolwich arsenal was turning out in one day. To-day we are able to turn out, or will be before this year is through, 13,000,000 rounds of cartridges, as against 1,500,000 seven years ago. We have established, in connection with the arsenal, a school of gunnery. We are not only making cartridges for rifles, but we have put in the necessary plant to make shells and all the projectiles required for the use of larger guns, and we are constructing a building at a cost of some $30,000 for the purpose of a Dominion school of gunnery.

We are devoting more attention also, as far as we can under the present

condition of the law, to the encouragement of cadets. I am sorry that we are not able to do more; but we are prescribing systems of instruction, and we are sending drill-sergeants whenever requested to do so, and to some of the older classes we have been able to supply rifles. This is only a beginning. I recognize in the cadets, the young lads at school and college, the material which will make up the future army of this country if it should ever be required for serious work. That is the time to make the impression on the young mind. Three or four weeks of drill and training at that time will do more good, I was going to say, than an equal number of years after a man has reached the age of twenty-five or thirty.

In this connection perhaps I may say a single word as to the militia law. Early in the session I gave notice that I would introduce a Militia Bill. A Bill was prepared, but I was asked later on, through the colonial office, if I would go to England and discuss certain changes which I had made up my mind to introduce; and I might have gone if I had known that we were going to have such a long, interesting and pleasant session as this, and might have returned in time to introduce my Bill. But I did not know that and consequently thought better to leave the Bill over to another year.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does the hon. minister not think he will be able to bring it up yet this session?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I shall consider that. I do not think it is desirable, perhaps, that I should go into the question of what I propose in the Bill, under the circumstances. When the time comes to introduce it it will be time enough to discuss its provisions. In conclusion, I have only to say that I hope the committee will not consider the programme which I have laid down as too ambitious. I believe it is a programme which can be carried out, and I have every confidence that if this or some similar line of action is proceeded with it will be possible for us to have within a measureable period—I would say five years at least—one of the best militia fighting organizations on the face of the earth.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Last year, when discussing militia matters, I used the following words, which I shall quote as expressing my feelings at present:

> I shall make my remarks on this subject entirely free from politics, and entirely free from any fault finding, even if there be room for finding fault. It is my opinion, as I have often said before, that the militia should be kept entirely out of politics. It is above and beyond all politics. Of course, it must to some extent have a political bearing because the minister who controls our militia for the time being must belong to one or other of the political parties, but so far as I am concerned I will exclude politics as much as possible from the consideration of this question. If I have any fault to find with the Minister of Militia, or with the manner in which the contingents were despatched to South Africa, I propose to do as the Liberals do in the old country: viz., keep my criticism until the war is over and then bring the minister to account. I intend to show to the people of the world that whatever our political disagreements may be in Canada, we are ready and willing to show a united front in defence of our country and of the empire, and to leave complaint and criticism until we have conquered the enemy.

I do not propose to bring any politics into the discussion to-day. At the same time, if I find it necessary or desirable to indulge in any criticism, I shall not be debarred from doing so through the fear that anybody would think I was moved by political reasons. I would just say one word about politics and then drop that subject altogether during this discussion. I want to warn my hon. friend the Minister of Militia that he will have to be very careful, very strong-minded and firm in order to keep politics out of this question. He will have to stiffen his backbone and make his will stronger if he is going to do that effectively, because I think, in spite of the glowing picture he has given us of the state of the militia to-day, there are some difficulties which require to be remedied. I do not propose just now to take up the propositions of the hon. gentleman, because that can be better done at a later stage in the few remarks which I propose to make in connection with this most important matter. We have had three very important events within the year, with which our military organization has some connection. We have had the South African difficulty ended, and we have had a Colonial Conference and a new Major General to take command of our forces. The South African peace having been accomplished, now is the time, as I said in my remarks last year, for criticism. Fortunately that war is over and we contemplate with pride and sorrow the lonely graves which mark the valour and endurance of our young men who gave up their lives for the maintenance of the empire and the credit of Canada. Our heroes who survive have returned and taken off their war paraphernalia, and you would scarcely know them now from the other individuals gathered throughout our country, but, in common with their dead comrades, they will ever live in the hearts and memories of Canadians for the valour they displayed and the evidence they gave the world that Britain no longer stands alone, but is surrounded by her children, ever prepared, when the call is sufficiently urgent, to unite and uphold British unity and the glorious principles that underlie the British constitution. Before proceeding to discuss the Colonial Conference, I wish to make some reference to the militia report. I think we may congratulate ourselves upon our good fortune in getting so distinguished and gallant a soldier as our present Major General to take

command of the militia. He has been with us now sufficiently long to enable us to appreciate his work. Before coming here he had some experience of the militia of Canada, because he is one of the ablest soldiers which the great empire found it necessary to send to South Africa. I propose to read some extracts from his report, so as to show where we stand in connection with those very important matters to which my hon. friend the Minister of Militia has alluded. In his report he says :

I have proposed that in future the regimental establishments of the active militia shall be at war strength, each unit containing in addition within itself the germ of a reserve. These proposals have met with your general approval, and I am now drawing up the establishments which, when complete, I will submit to you

I may say that in his report he gives no explanation about the result, but my hon. friend has given us some insight into that. The Major General proceeds to say :

These camps of instruction covered a total period of twenty-five days, the whole of which I devoted to the personal supervision of the training, visiting each camp in turn.

As men who have only nine working days in the year to learn their duties as soldiers and non-commissioned officers cannot afford to spend any of that time on ceremonial, I arranged that instruction should be entirely devoted to practical work.

The officers and men under instruction worked with great zeal and intelligence, and though the system was in many cases quite new to them, they picked it up very quickly, and the tactical exercises engaged in towards the end of the training were useful in showing to all ranks how much they had still to learn before they could be considered efficient soldiers, let alone non-commissioned officers qualified to instruct and lead others.

Observation at these camps has shown me that the Canadian soldier takes the greatest interest in anything which his intelligence proves to him is of real practical benefit. Therefore, I propose in future to leave out marches past and ceremonial, and instead to convert the camps practically into schools of instruction for fitting the soldier to take the field, with not one item in the programme that does not make for fighting efficiency.

Though the rural militia contains a large proportion of earnest, self-sacrificing officers and men, it does not satisfy the requirements of a national defence force. Nominally it is a body of men who engage to serve for a period of three years. As a matter of fact it consists and always has consisted of a number of regiments which are almost recruited afresh every time they are called out for training. Large numbers of entirely raw men enlist before the particular training and are perhaps never seen afterwards, no real effort being made to compel them to fulfil their engagement, owing to powers of compulsion being quite inadequate for the purpose. Consequently it is impossible to carry instruction beyond the most elementary stages. Such a system is unduly expensive and ineffective from a military point of view. So small is the rate of pay, and so unsatisfactory have been the conditions of training, that the best men do not enter the militia as they might. From this it follows that the non-commissioned officers also are to a large extent insufficiently qualified for their posts, nor can they command ready obedience from the soldier when, as in many cases, they are quite ignorant of the very rudiments of their duties. Numbers of men go out to camp as non-commissioned officers without any previous training whatever, and the proportion of these men who are new to the rank on such occasions shows clearly that there is a want of continuity in the personnel of the units.

As with some of the non-commissioned officers, so it is with some of the officers. Many have evidently not studied their profession sufficiently to act as the leaders and instructors of their non-commissioned officers and men. I make suggestions, later, on this matter.

Self-instruction by means of books, lectures to their men in well-appointed comfortable armouries (when these are provided) during the winter, and thoroughly practical work in the summer months will, joined with the excellent spirit which pervades the officer class of the Canadian militia, soon, I anticipate, produce the required result.

Material.

There is a great deficiency of all kinds of military stores and material essential for active service. This deficiency should be made good in time of peace.

It is absolutely necessary that the regulation allowance of every article of equipment required for mobilization of companies should be at company headquarters, for regimental mobilization at regimental headquarters.

Though there appears to be almost a sufficient stock of camp equipment for the existing units at their present strength, there is certainly no reserve available for the large force which would have to be placed in the field in time of war.

City Corps.

The city regiments, under the present organization would as a whole be the easiest to mobilize, but even they cannot in any sense be said to approach a state of readiness to take the field. They labour under the greatest difficulties and disadvantages. They all suffer from want of field training, owing to the fact that they get practically no camp experience. The allowances for instruction are too small ; so, in the most efficient of the corps much of the necessary expense has to be undertaken by the officers and men instead of by the public. This unfair expense causes the loss of many good officers to the country. Many corps suffer from want of proper accommodation in the way of armouries, &c. Deficiencies of this kind have either to be made up by private effort or the corps must suffer.

Army Service Corps.

This branch of the service has been started this year. Of the four skeleton companies authorized, two are now complete and another is in process of organization. Lieutenant Colonel Biggar and two non-commissioned officers were sent to Aldershot where they were given every advantage by the authorities to gain information on army service corps work.

Since his return to Canada, Lieutenant Colonel Biggar has conducted a six weeks' course of instruction at Montreal with the company there, with satisfactory results

He goes on to speak very highly of the school of musketry, and I think I will read part of that, because I consider that one of the most important improvements that have been made :

School of Musketry.

Courses of instruction were held during the months of July and August at the Rockliffe Rifle

Range. The number of officers and non-commissioned officers taking the course totalled sixty, this being double the number that attended the same term of the previous year. Of these 31 officers and 22 non-commissioned officers obtained certificates.

Under the able and energetic command of Lieutenant Colonel Cartwright, the inspector of musketry and commandant of the School of Musketry, great progress has been made in the past year in extending and popularizing the knowledge of rifle shooting throughout Canada. The history of the new rifle clubs shows a steady growth, and the value of the work done by the School of Musketry, not in the teaching of shooting, but in the teaching of instructors in shooting can hardly be overestimated, even though its work is as yet on a small scale

I read these things, not merely for the information of the House, but to get them on 'Hansard,' where they can be seen by the country. Because we get too little out of this report. A number of military gentlemen get it, but the country generally seem to get very little knowledege of it. He speaks of the cavalry thus :

I have issued a memorandum on the training of the mounted troops of Canada, and also a new syllabus of instruction. I have assimilated the equipment and training of all branches of mounted troops.

I am preparing instructions for the militia on their training, dealing in particular with musketry, field engineering and field work generally.

Referring to the cadet corps, he says :

This branch of the national defence system might easily be of the greatest value to the country, but from various causes it is at present of little account.

The results of the present system compare very unfavourably with what has been achieved in Australasia.

The whole cadet corps question requires to be considered and reorganized on workable lines, as the youth of the country are splendid material now lying waste from the military point of view.

Arrangements should be made to furnish every cadet corps of a certain strength with proper instruction.

These extracts give us knowledge not only of the condition of our militia, but of the capacity, industry and enthusiasm of the Major General Commanding. There is not a detail so small as to escape him, and there is no matter so difficult that he will not undertake its improvement. I say again we have to congratulate ourselves that we have in command a man whose record and reputation we have every reason to be proud of, and not only that, but a man of straightforward common sense, a man of capacity and indefatigable industry. It will be the fault of the department and of the people of Canada if he does not make a success of the militia, and I prophecy that with the proper assistance he will do so to a very large extent. Now, let me read an extract or two in connection with the Colonial Conference, which shows to what extent the government committed this country on the question of defence. Here is an extract from the report of the Canadian government to the Colonial Conference :

But while thus calling attention to the progress that has already been made by Canada in her militia organization, the ministers are far from claiming that perfection has been attained. If defects exist, there is every desire on the part of the Canadian government to remove them, and for this purpose the advice and assistance of experienced imperial officers will be welcomed and all reasonable efforts made to secure an efficient system.

In conclusion, the ministers repeat that, while the Canadian government are obliged to dissent from the measures proposed, they fully appreciate the obligation of the Dominion to make expenditures for the purposes of defence in proportion to the increasing population and wealth of the country. They are willing that these expenditures shall be so divested as to relieve the taxpayer of the mother country from some of the burdens which he now bears ; and they have the strongest desire to carry out their defence schemes in co-operation with the imperial authorities and under the advice of experienced imperial officers so far as this is consistent with the principle of local self-government which has proved so great a factor in the promotion of imperial unity

At that time also we had some important information showing the expenditure per capita of the different colonies, including Canada, in connection with defence, showing that Canada had the lowest rate of expenditure, per capita, and only about one-fourteenth that of the mother country.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. What did they give as the per capita expenditure of Canada ?

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Two shillings. That would be about the average up to this year, according to the figures given by the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Pretty nearly.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I will not trouble the House with these figures. My object was simply to show the position that our government took with regard to this matter. I think that in these militia matters we should support any proposals emanating from the government unless we find in them something very wrong. If I find the government proceeding upon wrong principles, I am prepared to call attention to their errors. But the government represent the whole country for the time being, and they have committed the country, directly or indirectly, to the empire in regard to this matter. Therefore, I think both sides should support the government, except where the government is clearly and widely wrong ; and those who may not be quite satisfied can wait until they get into power to improve upon the government's proposals. I quite agree with the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) when he said :

Taking all these quotations together we find an absolute pledge given by our representatives for militia betterment, a pledge given

on an occasion of grave importance, reduced to writing, mistake or misunderstanding an impossibility.

That brings us to the main question, the state of the militia at the present time and the proposals made by the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence for its betterment. I must say that his presentation of his request for increased expenditure and of his very broad and ambitious scheme for the improvement of the militia of Canada is of very great interest and requires a great deal of consideration. For my own part, I am prepared to join with parliament in approving of an expenditure even beyond what I might myself consider necessary if those in charge of the militia of this country considered it necessary for the advancement of our national defence. While this scheme is of such magnitude that it will startle some people, there is no question that if it is practicable and is properly and carefully carried out it will lay the foundation of a magnificent scheme of defence. On general lines I approve of the policy proposed, but, when I do so, it must be understood that we are not relying solely upon expenditure, and that this expenditure will be supplemented by successful work in other lines. If we are to have an effective system we must be prepared to face the expense, but my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence must not forget that, if we are to entrust him with this very large sum of money, the expenditure of that money must be supplemented by efficient instructions, work and results, so that we may have a proper and sufficient actual fighting force, supplemented with the same sort of reserve. Owing to the South African war and to other troubles which my hon. friend mentioned, he must remember that the expenditure on a peace footing has been very much less than the larger sum he now asks, as all of the present estimates for the militia are on a strictly peace footing, and I admired the courage and straightforwardness of the hon. minister when he said that we will have to stand this increased expenditure for three or four years.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Probably five years.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. My own opinion is that if we embark on this scheme and it can be made a success, it is probable that the annual grant required will never become less. I am not afraid of such an expenditure, especially if the country continues to make progress at its present rate. I believe that if such an expenditure as this is worth while, we should undertake it at once and with our eyes open. With the great development of our industries, production and population, with the prominence that is given to great imperial and colonial matters in the old country, I am most optimistic with regard to the future of this country for no country under heaven to-day offers the inducements to the immigrant that Canada does. We have seen a great colonial minister resign from the highest place that the ambition of man can contemplate in order to fight the battle of closer union between the various portions of the British empire. That battle is of the utmost importance to Canada for when it is won we will have an illimitable market, a market for more than we can produce for scores of years to come, and we will have flowing to our shores all the immigration we desire, and the best immigrants in the world. I do not agree with my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who the other day said that we will in a few years to come ship wheat from Port Arthur into the United States because the population of that country will increase in that time by 20,000,000. If this closer union between the empire and the colonies takes place we will be more likely to see immigrants coming in large numbers from the United States into Canada than to see immigration flowing into the United States from any other country in the world. We should do our share in promoting closer relation with the motherland. We should not halt at the tariff preference which has been granted by the Canadian government to the British people. but back up the efforts of the great Imperial statesman I have mentioned in his efforts for mutual preferential trade relations between the empire and the colonies. Back him up not only by sympathetic words but by acts as well. While this government declined to take up the question of defence on the lines submitted by the imperial authorities, they pledged themselves that they would see to it that our militia would be improved and we should not be deterred by the fear of expense from fulfilling that pledge. Therefore if the Minister of Militia and Defence goes on with this scheme on the lines suggested, carefully and with a view to the best interests of the militia, I should say that the scheme was a good one. If we are to have a militia force it must to some extent be commensurate with what would be required by the experiences of war. While the enlistment should be smaller than what would be necessary in case of war it is very wise to have all of these auxiliary services, munitions of war, clothing, medical supplies, and camp equipment, in an efficient condition. Not only must we have a full supply of materials but these must be supplemented by proper instruction of those who will have charge of and those who will use them in call of need. All of this will cost a great deal of money. Owing I presume to the large appropriations for which he has had to ask for other purposes, the hon. gentleman has not asked an appropriation for the additional arsenal which he promised us last year or the year before. The hon. gentleman is committed to it but we can wait for it a short time as it is one of the most

important requirements of our system of defence.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think I should state, and I forgot to state this, that there is a company now which has approached the government with the view of establishing an arsenal at the city of Ottawa if they can make a contract for the supply of a considerable amount of ammunition.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I would not commit myself to the city of Ottawa, but I am glad to hear that it is to be in Ontario. The place it should be located would be a matter, I presume, that the hon. minister and the Major General would be largely responsible for, but it is a matter that requires very careful consideration and therefore I am not prepared to commit myself to any opinion upon it on short notice. I will say, however, that it should be somewhere well west in Ontario. I am very glad to hear that the hon. gentleman is making some progress in that regard. I do not propose to discuss the details of these different votes now because we will be able when we come to consider them in detail to procure any information which the hon. minister has not supplied in his remarks. The most serious matter of all to be considered is not the establishment of these auxiliaries. I want the hon. gentleman and the government to be seized fully of the responsibility which they are undertaking in asking for these very large sums. That parliament will grant them I have no doubt. The proposal of the government commits us to these expenditures for years. It is a new departure and it is a scheme which at every step should be most carefully considered because those who follow it will be committed to it, and if there are any mistakes in regard to it the country will be committed to them. This is a comparatively easy thing compared with what I am coming to presently; that is the providing of the material for the militia, and the question of how it is to be evolved and how the supply is to be maintained. You can establish all these auxiliary services without any trouble. Nearly all of them will be in the charge of paid men, because those who are in charge of them must be capable of discharging the duties of their positions. The great problem of the militia is in regard to what are called our citizen soldiers. I agree that you cannot make the militia force what it should be and what it is in most countries where it is efficient without establishing these auxiliary services. We have to pay out the money if we are going to have them. But, that is not the difficulty and that is not the hon. gentleman's difficulty now. I call attention to that because I am not satisfied with some features of the hon. gentleman's proposal for reasons which I will give the hon. gentleman presently. I am not saying that I am at all prepared to oppose this vote or to oppose this proposal. It is my hon. friend who takes the responsibility, but I want him to be seized of the difficulty of the problem which is to raise and keep up even the skeleton, if you call 40,000 men a skeleton, and to get the reserve and keep it. Without this we will simply be wasting the money. We had better accept the doctrine of the timid member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) that we should only provide a police force and put ourselves at the mercy of any country that wishes to step in. I cannot accept that doctrine. I have been brought up in a different school. I believe that what is worth having is worth fighting for. You do not look to see what your chances are if you are a man. You will stand up any way and if you are going to lose your life you will do it in defence of what is worth fighting for. I congratulate the hon. minister on his courage at all events because it requires courage to come down and ask for this large expenditure. It requires still greater courage to admit that this is not for this year only. He has presented it in a way that is proper in such matters as this. I want to call his attention to the fact that this is laying down a wide foundation financially. The people will hold him and his colleagues accountable for it or they will give them credit for it, but the easiest part of the problem is to get the money and to spend it. The difficult problem I am coming to, and it is more than the question of the pay of the militia. Last year the hon. minister promised us a reserve sufficient to make a total of 100,000 men. I will come to that presently. He gave us to-day what I think was a rather optimistic statement of the result of this year's camp and of the state of the militia. The ranks of city regiments have always been and are filled. They have advantages in a way. At the same time you see what the Major General said; a good deal has to be learned to prepare them for the field. The difficulty with them is the counterpart of what it is with the rural corps. They can drill and assemble together in their drill halls as often as they please, but unless they go away and do some general work they would have a hard time of it if they were turned out suddenly. That can be mended without any great difficulty, but something or other is the matter with the rural militia or else figures and numbers do not speak correctly. My attention was called to this, though I had thought of it before, more strikingly by the remarks of the hon. member for Haldimand and Monck (Mr. Thompson). Let me say to him that it is very gratifying to find a young member of parliament, with our strong party affiliations, standing up in the way he did and expressing his views as a soldier and as a member of parliament at the same time. He stated what probably some persons might think very unpleasant truths in regard to the militia. I commend him for it and I paid

more attention to what he said on that question under the circumstances than I might otherwise have done. He talks of the state of the camp. I have taken the trouble to prepare some general figures and whatever explanation the hon. Minister of Militia may have made in defence of the Niagara or any other camp I do not think the figures bear him out. The hon. member for Haldimand and Monck said :

> Am I not justified still further in the assumption that once let the cabinet be convinced that the militia is not even stationary but actually retrogressing this cabinet pledged to Britain for improvement, and it must and will gladly meet the situation and destroy the danger?
>
> Well Sir, in all seriousness, after due consideration and recognizing the importance of the assertion, I say here to-day in my place in parliament that the militia, so far as the rural part thereof is concerned, is in infinitely worse plight to-day than it was two years ago, and that in my opinion another year under present conditions will utterly demoralize it.
>
> The reason is not far to seek—it lies in the fifty cent daily wage.

I do not entirely agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Thompson) that the entire cause is attributable to the pay, but I do agree with him that the pay is too small. I approve of the suggestion of the minister that the pay should be graded by the number of years of service ; but in view of the condition the force is in at present, I think it would be wise to increase it at once to 75 cents a day for the first year, and then to scale it up according to the years of service. Like Colonel Thompson, I know the rural militia well. It is true that for some years they have not been turning out as they used to. These men do not want pay in the sense of being hired ; but, all the same, they do not like to be out of pocket. The first-class men, and that is the kind we want, will not put up with the camp fare, and as they supplement their rations out of their own pockets, they very often find that they are at a loss. It may be said that they should put up with the camp fare, but you will find that men who have the spirit that the minister refers to will not do so. Even members of parliament have looked for an increased indemnity, and so it is through all walks of life ; things have changed since the 50 cents a day rate was established. I have the figures here for 1896 and 1897, the last year before the minister came into power and his first year in office, and the difference is very startling.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The camp in 1896 was under my direction.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. The report is signed by the Hon. Mr. Dickey.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I do not know how that can be. The camp in 1896 was not held until September.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. However, that does not matter much, because the previous years to 1896 would make a still worse showing for the minister. The details of the establishment ordered out in 1896 are that the officers and men called out numbered 12,710, and there turned out 11,910, or 800 short. In 1897 there were 10,719 ordered out and 9,970 responded, or a deficit of 749. The rural and the urban battalions were not distinguished in the statement presented by the minister to-day.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The criticism of my hon. friend from Haldimand was directed to the rural battalions, and not to the city battalions.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Quite so. In 1902 the minister ordered out 22,897 and only 7,937 came out, and 14,960 failed to respond.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is a mistake. The number ordered out in 1902 was much smaller than the number ordered out this year. There were only 15 per company, instead of 21. Only one officer per company was ordered out in 1902, and this year all the officers were ordered out.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I am taking these figures from the blue-book, which is headed 'Returns showing the number of officers, non-commissioned officers, men and horses trained during the year 1902 in district camps.' The total of officers called out was 1,905 ; the non-commissioned officers and men, 20,902 ; and the total number that received twelve days' training was : Officers, 881 ; non-commissioned officers and men, 6,932. Then there is a summary at the end.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. What does the summary say ?

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. It gives the same figures for the district camps, and it shows the turn out at local headquarters, which was a splendid one.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There must be something wrong in the heading of that statement. The fact is, no matter what the table shows, that in 1902 only 15 men out of 40 men per company were ordered out, and only one officer per company. Whoever made up that statement has made a mistake. I am very sorry that mistake has occurred ; but, as a matter of fact, less than half were called out in 1902 as compared with this year.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand). If my hon. friend will permit me, I may say that in the camp at Niagara, which I think was the same as any other camp in that year, only one officer and all non-commissioned officers per company with the regimental staff, with twenty-one privates per regiment, the last named for fatigue duties only and not for drill, were called out, so the number could not possibly be as stated in the report.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. All I can say is that that is the statement, and it should be corrected if it is not correct.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is wrong, there is no doubt about that.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Take the figures of this year; 15,904 officers and men were ordered out and 12,009 turned out; that is about three-fourths.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is the usual percentage.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Add to that, from the same table, the whole of the city regiments, numbering 11,754, and you have only 23,763 men out of our total force of 40,000. When you could not fill up the small call you made this year, it was because there were no more men that you could muster.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. But my hon. friend will see that we only called out 15,000 and 12,000 responded.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. It is my hon. friend who does not see. The fact that you called out only 15,904 shows that you had no more left or you would have filled up the ranks. If you are 25 per cent short of your number, are you going to count all those who are absent as if they were there? Suppose you want for active service a certain number of men, and you tell the commanding officers of the different regiments to bring out so many men; they make a call for as many men as they can get until they secure the required number.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Take the case of one company of 40 men. Of these 21 are called out. The captain of that company selects these 21 men. My hon. friend assumes that because all these did not turn out, none of the residue, if they had been asked, would have gone. That is the exception which I take to his argument.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I have been a captain and a colonel, and we do not do any such thing. In that statement Colonel Thompson will bear me out. We say we want so many men, and the word goes out. The necessary number do not turn out. Would we march away without seeing if we could get any others? Not at all.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Unfortunately, as a rule, the officers of the rural battalions, of one of which I have been a member for a quarter of a century, do not get their men until the morning they are starting for camp; and it might be that they would not have an opportunity at the last moment of replacing those who failed to turn out.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. There is no use of our discussing this matter. I say that when you want 21 men out of 45, and you go away with 5 men short, it is conclusive proof that the officers either do not know what they are about or have no other men.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is conclusive proof that five men who promised to go do not go; that is all.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. The trouble with us is always to get enough men. If there were trouble something different might occur, because you could recruit new men. I know that when the old battalion in Norfolk went to camp, the boys did not start without getting every possible man to make up the required number. The captains were humming around for ten days; and, as Colonel Thompson complained, and I sympathize with him, ten days is too short a time.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I agree with that.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Another thing, which may be due to the shortage the hon. gentleman speaks of, is that very often the battalions go into camp with half the number made up of recruits. It was not so formerly. I remember that for years Colonel Davis, the hon. gentleman's predecessor in command of the 38th and 39th battalions, used to march to camp with 300 or 400 men, according to whether he had six or eight companies. I say you have only 12,000 men whom you can turn out in the rural districts on an ordinary call for a camp; and your reserve, which was to be 60,000, amounts to only 10,000. Colonel Thompson's figures—and I agree with them—show that the rifle associations would not amount to over 10,000, apart from those belonging to the force. I speak of them from knowledge of several clubs in my own riding. The hon. gentleman spoke moderately and temperately, as he always does, because he did not want to be unduly severe in his criticism.

I say that this is an unsatisfactory and alarming condition, and the minister ought to look into the organization of these rural battalions. I hear things which he may not, but he is responsible and should take timely warning. I tell you, Sir, that the politicians are busy to-day in our militia. When I was in the active militia, the colonels in command—and I have no doubt the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) follows the same course—were always careful to make each corps as non-partisan as possible and to give promotion to every man who deserved it without considering his politics. I was not a member of parliament then, and we did not care anything about members of parliament. If an officer went courting favours from a member of parliament, he was not allowed to stay very long in the force. There are evidently difficulties of some sort which embarrass our

militia system, there is a lack of inducement to our young men to join the militia, as has been shown by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) in the very temperate and measured speech which he made on this subject some time ago, and which could only have been prompted by his sense of duty and his responsibility as commander of a regiment. Whether the trouble lies in the district headquarters or whether it is the politicians who are at the bottom of it, there is an alarming state of affairs, as the hon. member for Haldimand pointed out; and if the Militia Department cannot discover the cause at headquarters, the hon. minister cannot say that he has not been warned by commanding officers and also by one who, although his time of service has passed, still takes a keen interest in the service and is always anxious to promote its efficiency.

In the speech which he made last year the hon. Minister of Militia thus referred to the report of the Major General, for that year, to which I had previously called attention :

> Now, I will endeavour, very briefly to refer to some of the matters which the hon. member for South Norfolk has brought before us. In the first place, he has referred to the annual report of the Militia Department, and more particularly to the report of the Major General.
>
> I am sure those who will take the trouble to read that report will agree with him, as I do, that he has not spoken in too high terms of praise of it. While, perhaps, in some of its details, or, possibly, in some of the conclusions of the Major General, I cannot literally concur, I say that in the main I approve of all that he has said.
>
> I think it is a convenient thing that the Major General, the head of the militia for the time being, should always have a free hand in placing before the people of the country his own views as a professional soldier upon the question of defence, and therefore, during my term of office, and I think it has been the custom in the past, the Major General of the day has had a free hand to express his real and genuine views in reference to the condition of the militia of the country and in reference to what he thinks ought to be done to improve the condition of the militia.

But what I object to, and have protested against is the refusal of the hon. minister to submit to the House the special report by the general officer commanding to the minister himself. Last year the hon. minister committed himself upon the principle of giving the Major General a 'free hand to express his real and genuine views in reference to the condition of the militia and in reference to what he thinks ought to be done to improve the condition of the militia' as I have quoted above, and this year I find in the report of the Major General the following paragraph :

> With this report I have the honour also to forward another special report to which I have given a great deal of thought, and which contains a broad scheme for the improvement of the militia. If the proposals contained in it are carried out, they will in my opinion conduce to the greater efficiency of the militia.

I have twice before this session requested and insisted upon the minister giving the special report of Lord Dundonald, our new and distinguished Major General to the public.

Let me add that the last time I brought this matter up in the House my hon. friend the Minister of Militia offered to show that special report to me or to any member of the House, but I declined to look at it. The ground I took was that it was not a confidential report, that was not declared to be confidential, and the Minister of Militia has no right at his own sweet will to keep back from the members of this House or the people of this country or those associated with the force whatever propositions the Major General may have submitted. I felt indignant at the refusal to make this report public, and declined to look at what should by right be as public to the humblest individual as to any member of parliament. Here is what one of our great independent dailies, the Toronto 'News,' has to say :

> Militia reform is fairly active at present in Canada. Yet it seems to move in spasmodic fashion on uncertain lines, and to suffer from lack of prevision and careful planning. For some time the main activity has been in the organization of the highly necessary auxiliary services. Good work has been done. The army service corps scored a brilliant success at Niagara. The bearer companies and field hospitals are excellent troops. The intelligence department has made a good start, and the ordinance corps should prove successful. Much, of course, remains to be done. The engineer arm is almost altogether neglected, although every day of the South African war showed how indispensable it is. The general officer commanding has no engineer advice at headquarters, and there are no engineers in the permanent force, although an engineer establishment would be of the utmost value to the country for industrial as well as for militia purposes
>
> The provisicn of auxiliary services falls far short of achieving the organization which the Canadian militia needs.

I commend the hon. minister for having removed some of these deficiencies by the plan he has submitted :

> The unreadiness of the fighting services is appalling. For instance, it has been repeatedly pointed out that the proportions of the cavalry, artillery and infantry are absolutely wrong. One lesson of the South African war was the need for heavy guns and pom-poms. Have effective steps been taken to give our artillery these weapons ? The machine gun is indispensable in the field. When Canada sent an infantry battalion to South Africa, she provided it with two maxims. The second contingent had an automatic gun for each squadron. Yet we have not provided our militia infantry with one machine gun to each battalion. Worse than that—were our battalions to be called out at war strength, it is doubtful whether we could give our men a rifle apiece. We should have an ample supply of ammunition in the country. It is doubtful whether we have more than is needed for target practice.

Many of those defects will be removed by this comprehensive scheme which my hon. friend has brought down, but in this scheme the hon. minister points to something more which the Major General is considering, and what I protest against is that we are called on to vote three and three-quarter million dollars without being informed what the views of the Major General are. The 'News' proceeds to say:

The list of defects in our force could be prolonged at will. Definiteness and coherence of plan constitute the grand need. We do not wish our militia to find themselves ill-armed—or unarmed—and in hopeless confusion when mobilized. We should go about the work as methodically as we would about the building of a new railway. . . . . .

It is precisely in this respect that Canada has shown a singular lack of business method. We have an excellent expert. Lord Dundonald is by far the best general officer commanding Canada ever has had. His particular characteristic is the absence on his part of any desire to professionalize the militia. He has not the slightest wish to set up a little army of imitation regulars. He wishes to establish a system for turning out real citizen soldiers when the need comes. The great feature of all his suggestions which have been made public is their common sense and the way in which they fit into one another—that is, their coherence.

This expert has prepared a carefully thought-out scheme of organization. We may take it for granted that it is a coherent plan, each part depending on and fitting into the other parts. His propositions have been coolly suppressed. The people of Canada have employed Lord Dundonald and they are not allowed to learn what he recommends. The only excuse put forward is that his report is 'confidential.' That is nonsense. Strategical plans may be kept secret, organization cannot. Lord Dundonald's report, according to the portion which was published, deals with organization, not with strategical plans. It should be placed before the people.

Until we know what our expert has proposed, we are working and spending money in the dark. Piecemeal additions, the raising of new corps here and there, are not sufficient. Coherence of purpose and plan is needed. There is a short way to getting that. Let us know what Lord Dundonald recommended.

Then:

The 'Canadian Military Gazette,' after remarking that the Canadian soldier needs training, and is anxious to secure it, 'The Gazette' quotes Lord Dundonald's statement that the 'Canadian soldier takes the greatest interest in anything which his intelligence proves to him is of real practical benefit.' It goes on to say: 'This makes it all the more important that the special report of the General Officer Commanding should not be kept in the pigeon holes of the department at Ottawa. The intelligent Canadian soldier wants to digest it.' 'The Gazette' speaks in high terms of Lord Dundonald, and observes: 'If the special reports of experts like Lord Dundonald are to be suppressed, what is the use of placing an expert in the position of General Officer Commanding. We are simply wasting our money and making ourselves the laughing stock of intelligent people.'

This places the matter in a nutshell. We employ an excellent officer, we get him to draw up a scheme of organization, which, if tried, could not possibly be kept secret, and then we suppress it. For a democratic people we are getting fairly far on the road to autocracy.

Now, I commend these expressions to the minister. I hope he will publish this report. Let us see it; let the people understand it. The hon. gentleman is lessening his own usefulness as head of the force, as well as hurting the feelings of officers and men of the militia, by not letting them know what this report contains. Nor is it just to the general. It is not respectful to the intelligent people of this country that such a state of things should exist. If the report were confidential in anyway or could be considered so, the general would certainly have so stated.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) says that the report to which he refers says it was not confidential. It may not have been marked 'confidential' but I think I am the best judge whether it was confidential or not. The report was a scheme of defence, and was not, in my judgment, such a report as should be published to the world. When I referred to a former report it was to that of General O'Grady Haly, but the very nature of my observations shows that I referred to the ordinary report of the year reviewing the work of the militia of the year. We have done the same thing with Lord Dundonald in this case. He had a free hand. He said what he wanted to say. Not a word has been changed, not a 't' crossed or an 'i' dotted in change of his report. But, besides this, he made a special report, involving a very large expenditure. That report came into my hand twenty-four hours before the whole report had to go to the printer. I had not read it or submitted it to my colleagues, and it would have been out of the question that such a report as that should have been sent to the printer to be published to the world before the minister should have an opportunity of considering it. I have kept that report in my own hands. I have used it and am using it. It was an official report for the advantage of the government of the country. There are parts of it that will be published; I shall have great pleasure in publishing them. But so far as that report involves a heavy expenditure which the government had not decided to make I felt it would be highly improper to publish it, that it is a thing that would not be done in England or anywhere else.

Mr. INGRAM. What did the hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden) say was the nature of this report?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I said it was practically a scheme of defence. We had a committee sitting here in 1898, for which we paid a very considerable sum of money, which made a

report which has never seen the light of day. It was printed by the Defence Committee under the imperial government. It is something secret. Lord Dundonald's report was of a similar character, and one that at any rate for the time being should be treated as confidential.

Mr. INGRAM. Lord Dundonald said it was a broad scheme for the improvement of the militia. If it is this as well as the other, why not publish the part of it that can be published ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have said that that would be done, and I have given part of it to-day.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman used it in his own speech. But that is not very satisfactory to hon. gentlemen on this side who have had no opportunity to read this report. How can we discuss it when we have had no opportunity to read it ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No one on this side has had it.

Mr. INGRAM. Except the hon. minister himself.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Who ever heard of a minister not having the advantage, and, if he saw fit, the exclusive advantage at the outset, of the advice of his principal technical officer ? Who ever heard of the government not having that advantage ? And who ever heard of such an officer's report being published to the world before the government had had an opportunity of deciding whether they would adopt the suggestion set forth in it or not ?

Mr. INGRAM. I was pointing out the effect of this course. The Major General, who is the chief officer of the Militia Department, makes a certain report to the department. That report is treated as a strictly private matter. The minister may differ very materially from the Major General with respect to the contents of that report. But I think parliament should be in a position to say which, in our judgment, is right.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) thinks it is in accordance with the principles and practice of responsible government that an official of the Militia Department should have the right to put forward his views to the people before the minister has made up his mind whether he will adopt those views or not ?

Mr. INGRAM. I will go so far as to say that there is no use having an expert military man come to this country for the purpose of suggesting what would be in the interests of the militia if his recommendations are not carried out.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I take the responsibility.

Sir F. W. BORDEN.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand). I would like to ask the hon. member for South Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) a question if he will allow me. I did not quite understand his remarks regarding politics entering the militia. Did I understand him to say that this was one cause why the force was not in as good a condition as it might be ?

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. No. I said I thought it worth the minister's while to be careful, to make inquiries lest such a thing might exist; and that if it did exist it might explain some matters that we could not explain otherwise. Now, I would say just one word in reply to the minister. According to my idea the hon. gentleman was not quite correct in his reference to the Major General. The Major General is not an officer of the department; he is commander of the militia. The minister is responsible for his actions, and above him, but——

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think he is an officer of the Canadian government.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. He is. But the hon. minister said he was an officer of the department——

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Well, he is. He is certainly not controller of the department, not the 'boss' of the department—not now, at any rate.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. The hon. minister told us to-day of his arrangement about the stores department. I said I commended the hon. gentleman for his arrangement for the ordnance stores department. But if the position of the Major General in regard to it is to be circumscribed, friction will arise, and the arrangement will be of little good. I laid it down before and I do it now that the general is under the minister. The minister is under our system responsible. His position is political.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is right.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. And the minister cannot divest himself of that responsibility.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is right.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. When we use the word 'political,' we use it in the sense in which the hon. member for Haldimand and Monck uses it. But this matter is different. I cannot be satisfied without an assurance from the hon. minister that the Major General would ever have put in his general report what he did about the special report unless he were perfectly willing that the hon. minister should show it anywhere, because, judging from what I have heard of him from all quarters, he is the last man who would do anything else. I believe the Major General put that in there not to decide whether it was to be used or not, but to let it be known that he did so. There was

one thing that I forgot to mention in my remarks, and that was the singular absence from his report of any mention of the scheme in regard to the reserve, &c., outlined by the hon. minister. That is the reason I read that little clause where he made the single remark about putting every regimental establishment on a war footing and stating that within each unit there would be the germ of a reserve. I knew that the Major General had written something else about that, and it must have been in the report originally, because I saw a Major General's report so barren of reference to the strength of the different establishments and no mention at all of a reserve except in this one little paragraph, notwithstanding that this was the most fruitful of all subjects upon which he could have written. Of course, it is not for him to dictate to the hon. minister, nor will he attempt to do so. However, the hon. minister takes the responsibility, and if he sees fit, he has the might to do so, but in my opinion it is not a case where 'might will make right', but I think it is a great mistake if the Major General is to be made an automaton. If he has anything to suggest to the minister, let us know what he says when it comes to the regulation of the militia. We want a man, and we have got him for a Major General, and it is a grave step for the minister to repress his special report to which he says he has 'given a great deal of thought and which contains a broad scheme for the improvement of the militia. If the proposals contained in it are carried out they will in my opinion conduce to the greater efficiency of the militia.'

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think my hon. friend will agree with me that the proper means of communication with this House and with the country from the Major General is through the mouth of the minister, particularly when there is a question of policy involved.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Certainly, it must be through the minister's mouth.

Mr. WARD. Mr. Chairman, while I am ready and willing to admit that there are many admirable features of this scheme which have been outlined by the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence to the committee, I must confess also that I feel great disappointment, as I am sure every other member of the militia force—at least, that portion of the militia force which is included in the infantry—will feel that the matter has not been dealt with that bravery that we would naturally expect from the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence. I refer to increased pay for the men. We hear a great deal from the hon. minister's side of the House about the growing times. We hear of every department of the public service benefiting by these growing times. Almost every branch of the militia service, according to the hon. minister's own statement, is feeling the benefit of these growing times, and yet what are the bone and sinew of the defence of this country to get from the great expenditure of money that these hon. gentlemen are indulging in?—not one dollar, not one cent. I propose, as far as I can, in my humble way, to bring to the attention of the hon. minister some matters which I venture to hope may at least change his opinions a little, though they may not change his actions. I would first refer to some of the comparisons which the hon. minister has made in his speech to the committee, and which, I think, are not exactly fair. In the first place, reference has been made by the hon. minister to the percentages of the attendance at the district camps, by way of comparison, in the years 1900 and 1903. I am sure the hon. minister must have forgotten that in 1900 the full strength of the different regiments was called into camp.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is just why I made the comparison. I said, to show that the system adopted this year has not been such a terrible failure, I will take a year when the full force was called out, and I will prove that the percentage of attendance this year of those called out is as good, if not better, than the percentage of the whole force when it was called out. That was the point.

Mr. WARD. I think the hon. minister's point is not well taken, because the percentage in 1900 was of the whole force of the militia which was called into camp, while the percentage taken for this present year is only based on the estimate that twenty-one men belonging to the different companies were called into camp. Therefore, the percentage, based on the whole force, would not have the same effect, it seems to me, as the percentage based on half the strength.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Oh, yes; just the same.

Mr. WARD. I will try and convince the hon. minister that it is not so.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The percentage in 1900 was calculated by me as the percentage of those who attended relatively to the total number of the militia called out. The percentage this year was the ratio of the number who attended to the number called out.

Mr. WARD. Certainly, that is exactly what I say. If it was so difficult in this present year to get even the same percentage of half the strength, surely there must be something wrong. It was not so difficult in 1900 and in the years preceding that to get the same percentage of the full strength as it is now we get the same percentage of half the strength. There must be something wrong if we cannot induce men to go to

camp to make 25 per cent or 50 per cent of the strength with the number called out this year, which was only 21 men to a company. In regard to that, I simply want to give the hon. minister a little of the experience I have had in my own regiment. But, before I go into that, I wish to point out to the hon. minister how unfair I believe the comparison to be which he made. We will take, for instance, military districts Nos. 3 and 4, which assembled at Kingston. It is very well known that about one-third of the number of men at Kingston consisted of cavalrymen, and I think it is well known that nearly every troop or squadron of cavalry was full strength at Kingston. In instituting that comparison he should have left out the cavalry and taken into account the infantry alone. It is not a fair comparison when you take troops, each squadron of which had its full strength, and add that to the number of those who had suffered by reason of want of pay. In regard to cavalry, I wish to state that in my own county we have had a great deal of trouble in keeping up the full strength which is called for, that is, one-quarter of the strength of the regiment.

It is well known to every militiaman that the cavalry and artillery are more favourably treated by the Militia and Defence Department than the infantry. Take for instance the cavalry squadrons that were recruited in my own county. I know as a matter of fact that the officers of that cavalry regiment went through two townships in my county and secured all the horses they wanted for fifty cents per day. These horses were secured for the men of the cavalry squadrons who were not owners of horses and very few of the members were in this position. The consequence of this was that the men of that cavalry regiment almost to a man received a dollar a day and the horses were paid for at the rate of fifty cents per day. That is what I have to contend with in my county and there is no doubt that where men can secure one dollar a day by going into the cavalry they will always prefer it to serving in the infantry for 50 cents. I wish to point out to the minister what appears to me and to many others an absurdity, that one dollar a day should be allowed for a horse and only fifty cents for a man. The hon. minister has stated that he knows of men paying out one dollar and one dollar and a half a day for horses. That may be perfectly true in cities where wealthy gentlemen join the mounted infantry and will pay any price for a horse which will make a good appearance. I can assure the hon. minister that in the country—and I do not think my county an exception—any number of horses can be procured at fifty cents a day. It seems to me that the cavalry and artillery are placed on a higher basis altogether than the infantry and it is therefore impossible to secure men to fill up the different companies of infantry even if these companies are called upon to take only one-third of their strength into camp. I had almost persuaded two young men in the county to take two lieutenancies in my regment, but finally they refused altogether to go into the regiment simply because it was utterly impossible to get the men at fifty cents a day and they said it was a perfect farce for them to attempt to pose as officers when they could not have the men. I mention these facts only in order that the minister may take them into consideration. It may be too late to do anything this year but next year when we may have a Bill making some changes in the rate of pay of the militia the minister might consider this matter favourably. I can only say that the proposition of the minister to add five cents per year of service to the daily pay of the men who have served more than one year would be utterly inadequate.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I did not mention the sum; I certainly would not think of five cents being sufficient.

Mr. WARD. I think the minister has stated that on previous occasions.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Nothing less than ten cents I think.

Mr. WARD. Even with ten cents it would require three years to entitle a man to the pay of eighty cents per day. I can only say from my own experience in the county which I have the honour to represent and in which I command a regiment, that unless something is done this, as the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) has said, is only the beginning of the disintegration of the rural corps.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have listened with much interest to the debate that has taken place and to the statement of the Minister of Militia and Defence which contains many propositions that I think will meet with the hearty approval of the country at large. I believe that a careful investigation into the conditions of the rural corps will demonstrate that there is a manifest decadence in the military ardour of the young men of this country compared with that of fifteen, twenty or twenty-five years ago. There must be some cause for this. In the county where I live the officers of the various companies find it difficult to get a contingent of men to go to camp for the annual drill although in former years they had no difficulty. One of the causes, I presume, is the very insufficient pay given to the men. Fifty cents per day is so ridiculously small that it does not come up to what might be called an indemnity. Had it not been that the county council of the county in which I live have added to that rate of pay twenty-

five cents per man, year after year, the corps would not be in as good condition as it now is. I have been a member of the county council for years and every time that question came up there was opposition to it on the ground that the municipal council having no authority or control over the volunteers, it was the duty of the federal government to pay the men, although it was generally admitted that the present rate is very far from being sufficient. There may be other causes. When the young men see the condition in which the drill halls erected twenty-five or thirty years ago are to-day, wrecks and ruins in all parts of the country, they must be impressed with the thought that the government have but little interest in the rural corps. They see that while large sums are spent in cities for building large and expensive armouries, the drill halls throughout the country are allowed to go to ruin. In the town where I live there is a large drill hall, and in connection with it a well fitted armoury in which arms and clothing could be well stored were it not for the fact that the roof is bad. The officers of the district have made appeals again and again for sufficient money to make the roof tight but without success so that the armoury is practically useless for purposes of storage.

The proposal of the minister that the pay of the men should be graded in proportion to the number of annual drills they have put in will meet with the hearty approval of the House and of the country at large. It is a fact that on many occasions when the officers of a company desire to make up a contingent they have to pick up a few loose men who happen to be out of employment. These men of course enlist for three years, but, when the next camp comes around they may not be in the country. That they should be paid at the same rate as men who have put in two, three, five or even ten annual drills is absurd and ridiculous. As it is now they receive the same rate as men who have learned their drill and who have had sufficient interest in military matters to go to camp year after year. An increase of ten or even twenty cents a day would be inadequate, and I think that this matter should be met in a fairly generous and liberal spirit. There is sufficient military spirit in this country to justify the additional expense that would be involved in paying a fair rate for the few days annual drill so as to give the men a reasonable indemnity and tend to arouse to some extent the military ardour of the young men of Canada. I think that something might perhaps be done with regard to the encouragement of rifle ranges throughout the country. The city corps have the advantage over the rural corps in this respect. It will be admitted by the minister also, that the armament of the rural corps cannot very well be dispensed with. You can get good companies in the city and have them turn out well, because they have better advantages for assembling and for constant drill. But yet, in the rural corps you have men who in wars such as the recent war in South Africa have already learned the art, or who from boyhood up, have handled a rifle and are naturally good shots. The members of the rural corps have also that resource which perhaps men accustomed to city life have not; they possess that initiative which is so necessary in military work at the present day. Therefore, in view of the decadence in the ardour and military spirit which characterized the rural corps in the past, I appeal to the minister that there should be a careful inquiry made into its causes.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand). On the 30th of June last I made some rather extended remarks upon the Canadian militia, and on looking up that speech I find I prefaced it by saying :

> At this late date in the session I will not speak at any great length.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand). If I had that feeling at that time, you can readily understand that since July, August and September have taken to themselves wings, and now that October is speedily following in their wake, I shall not ask this committee to listen to me at any length at all, and especially so in view of the very excellent and extended addresses of the Minister of Militia and of the gentlemen who spoke after him. I shall not attempt to touch in detail the many points which the minister raised, but I shall rather confine myself for five or ten minutes to a discussion of that, to my mind very important point, an increase of pay for the rural militia. I have the most excellent feeling of friendliness for the Minister of Militia, and I believe I am not altogether lacking in discipline in the party as in the army.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand). I will say, however, that I have not got up to apologize for what I said with regard to the rural militia, nor yet to recant because I did not study that question so much from the books as I did from the actual camps themselves. I have been there; I have seen. Referring, in order, to what the minister said: First of all, as to this large expenditure of $1,300,000. I believe that this is an excellent thing, and, with the member for South Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale), I join in congratulating the minister upon his courage in making the announcement of this vote, not apologetically, as we are so accustomed to do when dealing with militia matters in this country, but bravely and boldly, as if he had something to be proud of—as I think he had in making that statement. I compliment the minister that he was further courageous enough to

go on and say that this vote would not be for one year only, but might even be for five years in succession. The minister has told us to-day, what many of us knew before; he told us that we have in Canada something less than 40,000 arms of modern make—referring, of course, to the rifles. We all know that supply would be inadequate in case of serious trouble. We know that our militia is formed on the skeleton basis—that is a word that I did not coin myself; it is a well-known word in the militia—and that in case of war we would expect to increase our companies from a strength of 42 to 125 in all. What would be the use of increasing these companies to 125 men if you only had 42 rifles for the 125 men? The other fellows could not fight very well with pitchforks and clubs, and therefore you must furnish each of these men with a rifle. I therefore say that the minister is doing no more than his duty, and this government is doing no more than its duty, in voting even a considerable sum, such as this, towards furnishing this increased armament, which will put one rifle in the hands of one man for whatever force we may find it necessary to put in the field in case of trouble. The same thing applies to the armament of the artillery, with which, however, I am not quite so conversant. I believe, Sir, that every cent of this expenditure will be justified; that not one cent of it will be found fault with by the intelligent electors of Canada. It does seem to me rather a pity, however, that when we are expending this comparatively large sum, we cannot add just a little more to it. It would not look very much added on to the end of that $1,300,000—or to the end of $3,750,000, which I understood the member for South Norfolk to say will be the total expenditure of the Militia Department for all purposes this year——

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Including public works.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand). Including, of course, the drill sheds, which really are a militia expenditure as much as anything else. I gave figures to prove, and I believe that these figures are unquestioned, that by paying one dollar per day instead of fifty cents per day to all the militia men of Canada, it would only cost something like $225,000 additional; and that if the increase of pay applied only to the rural militia, it would cost about half that amount. I gave reasons why there might fairly be a difference made between the rural and city corps in regard to pay. I would not weary the House by repeating my argument at length on that point, but one of the main reasons which might commend itself to the common sense of every hon. gentleman here is that city soldiers all perform their drill at night, when their day's wage has been earned, whereas the country soldier leaves his home for twelve whole days in the year. The question of pay is much more important to the rural soldier than to the city soldier. More than that, one point which I made, and which cannot be satisfactorily answered, is this: The city soldier is not troubled about the question of pay, the best evidence of which is that he does not draw his pay. If you had your city regiments but half filled up, and if the men that did go into these regiments drew their pay, it might be fair to argue that the low pay was responsible for the depletion of the ranks of the city corps. But when you find these city corps full to overflowing, and the men in the ranks not even drawing their pay, but turning it into a central fund for the purpose of a holiday on Thanksgiving Day, or the 24th of May, or the 1st of July; then I say that the pay is not at all a question with the city men. My object is not to fill anybody's pocket, but to fill the regiments of this country with men, as they should be filled; and, therefore, if the city regiments are already filled by the pay they have got, I have enough respect for these city regiments, enough confidence in their loyalty to the militia, to hold the theory that they would be the first to say: If our country brethren must have half a dollar more than we, in order to have good country regiments, give them the half dollar a day, it does not affect us at all. I do not believe in there being any jealousy between the city corps and the country corps; I do believe in the esprit de corps of the whole force, and I have reason for my belief in a long personal experience. Now, Sir, there is more than one thing to consider in regard to the camps of instruction, when you come to the question of the men who attend them. It is always a dangerous thing simply to count noses; you have to look to the quality of the men, and I want to say that from the experience I had in two camps this year—and I think my brother officers will bear me out—not only were the regiments much under strength, but the physique of the men who did go into camp was so inferior that in actual active service, a very large percentage of these men would never be able to make a campaign. I do not believe that in this commercial country of Canada you can get a $1.50 man for 50 cents. It is all very well to talk about loyalty and patriotism calling the men into the ranks. Canada has just as much patriotism as any other country. Let a war, or a serious danger, menace this country, and you will find the fellows flocking to the colours. But we are talking now of a peace footing; a preparation in time of peace for a possible state of war, and I say that it is nothing against a man's patriotism that he does not want to go into camp for 50 cents a day when he earns $1.50 by remaining at home. I would like to ask: How many members of this hon. House hold His Majesty's commission? Not 3 per cent. And would any gentleman say that the members of this House, who are not members of the militia,

are disloyal because they are not in the ranks ? Not at all. Being in the ranks of the active militia is no proof of loyalty, disloyalty, patriotism or the reverse.

But we are living in a commercial age. I understood the minister himself to say that he believed in indemnifying the soldiers. He did not believe that a young Canadian who went to camp should want to make money, but he believed he should be indemnified. As I understand the word 'indemnify,' it means to save from loss. How can a man who earns $1.50 a day be indemnified on 50 cents a day ? He is just a dollar short. Therefore I say that the present pay does not indemnify the men at all. I do not believe that we require to raise the pay of soldiers to an equality with that of men in commercial life ; but we have to approximate it. Give the boys a dollar a day, and the ranks will be filled, and not with the class of men we have at present, a considerable proportion of whom are unfit, but with the best young men that can be got in our country. The Major General Commanding has recommended, the minister has adopted the recommendation, and it has been decided, not to call out the full strength of our force each year, but only about one-half of it. One hundred thousand men, I believe, are to be the total militia force. Of these 60,000 are not to be called out at all, but are to be enrolled as a reserve subject to call in time of war ; and each man is to be given a rifle and trained in rifle shooting. Of the other 40,000 the minister proposes to call out all the city corps and about half the country corps. The remaining half of the country corps are I fear in limbo. They are betwixt and between. If only one-half are to be called out, what a bagatelle it would be to give them $1 a day. It would only amount to one-half the figures I have already given to the House. It would cut down the cost to 1¼ cents per head of the population of Canada. I estimated that it would cost four cents per head to give $1 a day to the whole force, or two and one-half cents per head to give $1 a day to the whole rural force. If you only call out half the rural force, one and one-fourth cents for every man woman and child in Canada, would give the men a fair wage, and would fill our regiments to overflowing with the best bone and sinew of the country. It is not much to ask. I know that the minister has it not in his power to increase the pay of the militia. That is regulated by the Militia Act. But we in this House have power to amend that Act, and I believe that next session a new Act is to be introduced. If so, one thing we should see to is that power is given to the minister of the day to regulate the pay of the soldiers, so that it will bear some proportion to the current rate of wages in commercial life. I am rather sorry that the whole force is not going to be called out every year. I am afraid speaking from experience, that such a turnout as is here indicated will not encourage that spirit in the officers which will bring good men into the officers' mess. The average captain does not want to have simply three or four men trailing behind him. He wants to have a fair company, and the colonel wants to have a regiment to command which is somewhat larger than a large company. You have to consider the effect this system will have on the men. The minister has very properly said that the militia officers must be educated men. That is true ; but you have first to have your militia officer before you can begin this process of education ; and unless you give the officer something to be proud of in his unit, you are not going to get him to join the force. I believe that is what this is coming to. Therefore, I regret that the whole force is not to be called out. But time will tell. There are those who say we can get along well enough on the present pay. I do not think so. I believe that if you took a poll of the present militia force, you would find 99 per cent of the officers in favour of paying at least 75 cents a day, and nearly as many preferring $1 per day. It is all very well to talk of grading the pay ; but even then you must give the men enough to get them in the first year before you can have them in the second or the third year. This is to be a kind of corps d'elite ; as the minister says, they are to be selected men. If we are to get rid of a certain percentage of men who are not by any means selected, and to get these selected men on the roll, I really think it will be necessary to pay $1 a day. If you just want ordinary men, 75 cents a day might do. But if you are going to get the class of men we should have, when you are cutting the number down one-half, they should be paid at least $1 a day. Now, I believe I have already transgressed the time limit. I understand that the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes), whose speeches are always instructive, is to follow. I believe I misled him in saying that I was going to speak only a short time, and therefore I tender him my sincere apology.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). I do not on this occasion intend to make any extended remarks. There were a number of questions which I desired during the session to bring before the minister and the House ; but with that usual fatality which characterizes such intentions, the remarks are put off to the end of the session, and the session closes, and there is nothing done. However, I have taken the liberty and the opportunity of conversing with the minister from time to time, and, although we are politically opposed, and he is a great warrior, none of us on this side of the House are afraid to approach him to lay suggestions before him for the benefit of the militia ; and I am glad to say that he is always

ready to receive those suggestions in the kindest manner. I will just run over a few points which I propose discussing.

I want to supplement what my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) stated about the importance of having an esprit de corps in any camp. The various corps this year marched out from their quarters to the brigade camps, and there was scarcely a regiment headed by its band. The scattered few collected from each company fell in at the battalion headquarters, and took the back streets to the station, carrying their knapsacks and rifles, and got into the train as quietly as possible ; and they came back in the same way. That is not the way a regiment should go into camp.

Another thing I wish to speak of are the pensions to those who were seriously injured in the South African war. I have already had the honour of bringing this subject twice before the minister this session, and he promised to give it his consideration. There are many young men. It is not necessary for me to speak at length on this question, as we have had it up twice before this session. There are many young men in Canada whose claims should be considered in this connection, notably one who had both eyes shot out, and others with both arms shot off, another with his leg shot off. These young men, by reason of their wounds, have lost their positions, and have practically to depend on their pensions. I am satisfied that the country will endorse the Minister of Militia if he takes the same bold stand on this matter that he has taken on other matters, and insists on the Minister of Finance giving him a grant to supplement for all time to come the pensions which the British government is paying to these men. I am sure the hon. gentleman need not fear the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) in doing so, for the hon. gentleman's bark, as every one knows, is worse than his bite. I purposed discussing at considerable length the permanent corps and the basis on which it is established.

I withdrew a notice of motion which I had on the order paper regarding rifle practice in the schools of this Dominion, but nevertheless my opinion is that every boy of the age of eighteen should be trained in the use of the rifle. If Canada had her young men trained to-day in miniature rifle practice, not the long range—because as I have again and again pointed out those of us who learned shooting in the old days learned it, not with the long range rifle but with the old muzzle loading Lee-Enfield with a snap-cap—we would in ten years be invincible. There is a most excellent device in the department whereby one can test the accuracy of his aim. If these machines could be obtained cheaply enough, they would be capital things to have at the headquarters of every company in order that the boys might learn rifle shooting. If our youth were trained in this practice, the entire forces of the United States could not make an invasion of Canada which would be effective for twenty-four hours.

I purposed also discussing the position of the permanent officers of the force, such as the district officers commanding, and the district staff adjutants, and the functions they should perform. They are very excellent officers indeed, but in order to carry out to the letter the plan of the minister and the idea he has in forming his brigades and divisions, it is absolutely necessary that retired officers who have passed the age limit and have served five years in command of regiments—and who are the men who, in time of trouble, will command the army corps—should be given an opportunity of gaining experience in that service. The question of the pay of the officers and men I also purposed discussing at length.

I notice in the estimates that the hon. minister proposes to have monuments erected on some battle fields, including the battle field of Fort Erie. I commend this expenditure and would suggest that he should lose no time in placing these monuments on every battle field. We should have monuments at Chateauguay and Chrysler's Farm, and various other historic grounds. I do not know that Queenston Heights has any monument except that erected to General Brock. But that was not erected by the Canadian government. There is nothing better calculated to inspire in the youth of our country loyalty and love for their native land than these records of great deeds of valour. I have no doubt that the monument at the city hall in this city, commemorating the men who fell in South Africa stirs in the hearts of our rising population the throb of patriotism—the noblest sentiment that can actuate men.

I also purposed saying a few words in connection with the Ross rifle, and I did purpose drawing attention to some remarks contained in the report of the intercolonial conference on that subject. Although I am a Britisher and have endeavoured to prove myself so to the core, still I do not believe that the British war office should dictate to the people of the Dominion what rifle they should use. I believe that our people are perfectly qualified to select for themselves. The hon. minister has rightly taken the precaution that the bore of the rifle which we use shall be the same as that of the imperial rifle, and that the ammunition for the Ross rifle shall be the same as that used in the imperial army. I want to say this—and I have had the opportunity to obtain as good knowledge of rifles as most men of the community—that in so far as the action of the Ross rifle is concerned, I consider it much ahead of any other rifle yet manufactured. I had the privilege of meeting the inventor of this action just after the South African war, and in discussing the defects of the present

British rifle, I pointed out what I considered three serious defects. He asked me if I would be good enough to go and see the arm he invented. I did so and he showed me the Ross rifle of which I had hitherto heard nothing, and in that rifle each of the three defects that I pointed out have been removed. I therefore have no hesitation in endorsing the Ross rifle.

I also purposed saying a few words with reference to the military college and intended touching on the water suppply. I have learned, however, since that a new system of purifying the water supply is about to be introduced there, a similar plan to that adopted in Winnipeg. The Winnipeg water comes from Lake Manitoba underground and goes through a purifying process which rids it of alkali.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is the Philadelphia system which is adopted in the college.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That is on the same principle, but the system used in the college would not suit at all. However, the hon. minister will no doubt succeed in getting pure water. I am satisfied that the best way would be to have a pump station on Garden Island and force the water over to the college.

I purposed discussing the advisability of having inland arsenals to be placed as far inland as convenient from the frontier, so that in case of war we would not be liable to have them cut off. We ought to have two or three establishments for the manufacture of ammunition, owing to the peculiar nature of our country and also owing to the fact that the new transcontinental road is not yet constructed. That would give a supply of ammunition to the great centres of the Dominion in case of trouble. Talk of your pom-poms and big guns, but after all it is the rifle and the Maxim guns that unman the enemy and empty the saddles.

I commend also the item in relation to the military survey and the establishment of the intelligence branch. I congratulate the hon. minister and the major general commanding on having secured an able officer, Colonel Dennison, to take command of that department. He has proved himself a most efficient officer, wherever he has been, especially in South Africa. The only fault I would find is with the smallness of the sum which the hon. minister is asking. In keeping up a militia system, we must always recognize that our neighbours to the south are an aggressive race, just as we are, and we must always bear in mind that the possibility may arise some time of war between Canada and the United States. I have a paper in my desk of a fire-eating nature, but not very dangerous, which was sent me from the wild and woolly west. This paper is published in Kansas. It suggests that the American government should settle this Alaska boundary business by simply gobbling up Canada.

Mr. GOURLEY. They would have a hot time doing it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Undoubtedly, the Nova Scotia and Ontario boys would give a good account of themselves. The point I wish to make is this—that every foot of land upon the border between Canada and the United States, as well as the country for a considerable distance this side of the border, should be surveyed, and maps should be made so as to be at the disposal of officers and men in case of war. I have before me the report of the military commission in Great Britain. Every one knows that at the beginning of the South African war Great Britain had no maps even of her own Cape Colony and Natal. We had to go through by pure guesswork. It was my privilege to be intelligence officer to two columns in that war. I never found a map that was of service. It was far better to take the data furnished by people who had travelled over the country, and of Kaffirs and others who lived in various localities. After a time we were able to get hold of a number of the Boer maps of the Transvaal, Orange Free State, and other parts. These were all scaled and made up with the greatest nicety. I commend the step that the minister proposes. But the amount will need to be greatly increased year by year in order that the country may be surveyed and these maps prepared.

I do not apologize to the House or to the country for saying that we should be ready to meet the United Staets. I believe in being friendly with our friends to the south. I have always been friendly with them and respected them. But there is no use in shutting our eyes to the fact that there is an element there, as there is in every country, that is antagonistic to their neighbours. That element very nearly asserted itself under President Cleveland. In carrying out the laws of this country, laws recognized by the government of the United States, a thieving Yankee ship was captured in British waters while engaged in taking fish that rightly belonged to our own fishermen. President Cleveland called upon the governors of the several states along the border to know how many men they could throw upon the Canadian border inside of a week.

An hon. MEMBER. Was that despatch published ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It was a private message. Nobody knew anything about it, it was entirely secret. They went from governor to governor of these states, and it was found that they could not put 50,000 men on the Canadian border inside of two weeks. Otherwise the chance is fifty to one that trouble would have been sprung upon us at that time without notice. We

might as well let it be known frankly, as Palmerston did on one occasion, that we have rights and are prepared to defend them. We have boys who know how to use firearms, and I trust that in a short time we shall have officers in great numbers trained to take command of these lads. And, if once that status is arrived at, any enemy, I care not who, will hesitate long before they will set foot across the Canadian border.

I purposed also taking up a very delicate subject, a rule that has been promulgated that, for the future, no lieutenant in the permanent force shall marry without the permission of the head of the department. I would suggest that a better way of meeting this question would be for the Minister of Militia and Defence to increase the pay of these permanent corps officers, so that every one of them can support the little girl of his choice in, at all events, a fair degree of comfort. And as soon as any of these boys finds the young lady who, he thinks, would be fit to become his partner in life, he should be encouraged to take such a partner rather than debarred from doing so.

Another point that I purposed touching upon at some length, if opportunity had offered, was the question of medals to the first men of the fourth contingent who went to South Africa. I would just point out to the minister that these men had reached Cape Town harbour. They went to South Africa in full expectation of engaging actively in the war. Disaster had fallen on British arms and the hearts of all these men beat high in the hope of being able to serve their country in the field. They reached Table Bay; they were within the three-mile limit and would have landed had not orders been received sending them around to Durban. I maintain that the minister would be justified in insisting on the British government recognizing the claims of these men. It was while they were proceeding under orders to Durban peace was declared. If the rule is enforced as now proposed, these men will be deprived of the only recognition, the only remuneration, that many of them coveted for their services in South Africa.

I also purposed taking up the question of the permanent corps, as contrasted with the rural corps, and the rural corps as contrasted with the city corps. But time will not permit me to do so on this occasion, and so I shall defer it until another time.

The question of pay is an important one. As the hon. minister knows, this matter was brought up by me early in the session. I suggested that, in all fairness to the men, the pay should be increased and graded. I believe that 50 cents per day should be the pay for the first year and increased by 25 cents for the subsequent years. Suppose that that had been brought into force, in the coming year a man would receive 75 cents per day. In the third year he would receive $1 per day, with a corresponding increase for non-commissioned ranks. I do not think the country would mind the expenditure much, and I think the minister would do well to look at that aspect of the case. However, I will take that up at greater length on another occasion. For many years I have objected to a horse being paid $1 per day in camp and a man being paid only 50 cents per day in camp. If the minister is going to graduate the pay of a man, let him graduate the pay of a horse. Pay the horse that comes into camp for training 50 cents per day. The horse that comes in for a second year for training and is partly familiar with the bridle and knee-action, let it be paid 75 cents per day ; and the third year it will be worth $1 per day. In other words, let the man and the horse be graduated year by year. I am satisfied that it would not cost the country such a very great sum, and the force would be much benefited. On this question of pay, I desire to refer to the excellent speech of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson). I had not the pleasure of hearing that speech, but I have taken occasion to read it. That hon. gentleman says that the falling off in the percentage of attendance in the various camps is due entirely to the fact that the pay is so small. I have endeavoured to point out, as occasion offered, how the falling off in attendance was brought about, what the cause of the lack of energy is on the part of the officers, and why it is that the military spirit which was characteristic of this whole country and is still characteristic of parts of it has waned. It is due to the fact that we have no efficient system for training officers. As the minister knows, I gave my views on this question again and again to the House. And, if I have an opportunity, I will again point out to the House that if a proper plan be pursued in the training of officers it will have the effect of infusing a military spirit into the country. I do not believe in a great increase in the permanent force. Why should two hundred men be placed in the city of Montreal ? In the whole city of Chicago—and it is one of the toughest cities on earth—the United States government does not keep anything like that number. There are a number at Fort Sheridan, but that is twenty or thirty miles away, and they are kept there because it is a good place to drill. From a police standpoint they are entirely unnecessary in the Dominion of Canada. If we want police along the water stretches of the frontier, at the canals and at the Soo let us employ them as a permanent police, let us not enroll them as soldiers and then have them called out to preserve law and order. I have too high a respect for the people of Canada to think that it is necessary, in order to preserve order, to have men stationed over them with fixed bayonets. I believe in making the permanent corps an educational rather than

a military institution. I would have our officers appointed to positions on the basis of knowledge rather than of military rank. I would have the men attending these classes graded according to their military education so that those of similar knowledge would be placed in the same squads and conducted from class to class until they would arrive at such a stage of instruction as would be desired. In regard to pay we all have read the famous lines of Bobby Burns which conclude with this stanza :

> Glory is the soldier's price
> The soldier's wealth is honour.

I am satisfied from the statements which have fallen from the lips of the hon. member for Haldimand and Monck (Mr. Thompson) when he pointed out that the city corps throughout Canada are kept to full strength and never draw one cent of pay——

Mr. INGRAM. They are not kept at anythink like full strength.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If they are not kept up at anything like full strength in a one horse town like St. Thomas it is because their officers and non-commissioned officers are not up to what they ought to be.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to stick up for the one horse town of St. Thomas ; it is equal to Lindsay at any rate. While the strength is kept up in St. Thomas there are other towns where it is not.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Wherever you find a rural or city corps that is not kept up you will find a deficiency in the spirit of the officers and non-commissioned officers.

Mr. SPROULE. Would that apply to Haldimand ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Certainly, if the officers and non-commissioned officers in Col. Thompson's regiment were all living up to their duty, that regiment would have gone into camp with their full complement.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman has had a large experience ; will he kindly explain why so many rural corps are dropping out and disbanding ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I intend explaining it before the close of the session. We have had some experience in the South African war that should be instructive. For instance I have here the report of the royal commission and I have before me the evidence of Sir Thomas Kelly-Kenny, the present adjutant general of England and one of the best fighting officers in South Africa. Speaking of the pay of the men who went out like the first Canadian contingent and the yeomanry and imperial volunteers of England he says :

> Those are what I would call the men who went out through patriotism in the end of 1899 and the beginning of 1900. But as to the other lots the yeomanry and also the other lots of colonials—for I do not think there is very much difference—I think we have had to buy them, and rather dearly.

With the first lot it was not a question of buying and they went through patriotism ; after that it was a question of buying. The pay was raised from one shilling to five shillings and as Sir Thomas Kelly-Kenny says it really meant that they purchased these men for service in South Africa. The volunteer private did not see why he should get only one shilling a day in the volunteer service if he could go out at five shillings a day as a yeoman. The yeoman was receiving five shillings a day without qualification and the service companies one shilling a day for very high qualification. If the strength of volunteer regiments is declining it is owing to a lack of spirit on the part of the officers and non-commissioned officers. I have seen the same thing happen in volunteer regiments years ago. I remember one gentleman marching into camp with a company consisting of six sergeants, one private and himself, when every other company in the regiment had its full complement. Why was this ? Because that gentleman had never taken the trouble to qualify himself or to look after the interests of his company.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. As it is almost six o'clock, we might if the committee is agreeable, take a few items and leave an item on which it would be understood we could have a full discussion of all these estimates.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I have waited patiently since 11 o'clock this morning in order to make a twenty minute speech and before these items are passed I wish to say something further in reference to this matter.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There are two items under civil government for my department which might be allowed to stand. We might put the others through and permit discussion on all of the items on these two votes.

Mr. HACKETT. The best way would be to discuss each item as it comes up. If you desire to adjourn now, I have no objection, but I have listened with much pleasure to the address of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) ; he made a splendid speech and he quoted from a military officer, Sir Thomas Kelly-Kenny. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if Sir Thomas Kelly-Kenny is Irish. There is an item here in connection with an armoury on Prince Edward Island, $500. I would ask the minister if the officers and men there, loyal and true men, who provided this armoury without any assistance from the government have been reimbursed for their expenditure.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have been unable to hear my hon. friend, but if he comes down to the

front and repeats his question, I will try and answer it.

Mr. HACKETT. Between my bad voice and the hon. minister's bad ears, it is pretty hard for us to understand each other. I would like to ask the hon. minister, in regard to this $500 to reimburse the officers and men of Prince Edward Island, how long it is since they paid out their money for this work ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It was three or four years ago. About three or four years ago the Militia Department was asked for a grant, and it was understood that $500 would be sufficient ; $500 was granted, but the officers were more ambitious and they spent something over $1,000. I took the ground at first that they had no authority to do it, but after carefully looking into the matter and finding that the expenditure was a proper one, I thought it was only fair that they should be reimbursed.

Mr. HACKETT. We voted two days ago $2,000 for the same kind of work. These are two votes of the same kind.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There are extensive repairs going on. I understand that this vote is to reimburse the officers for providing an armoury in the drill hall, while the work that is going on now, I think, is an extension of the drill hall, an entirely different thing. This vote is simply to reimburse the officers for money which they paid out, for which we have vouchers in the department, and we are satisfied that the expenditure is bona fide.

Mr. HACKETT. Who had charge of the work ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I could not tell my hon. friend now.

Mr. HACKETT. That is very important.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will give my hon. friend all the information. I will undertake to satisfy him.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose there would be no objection to passing this resolution, it being understood that anything in connection with the resolution can be discussed on any other item in the estimates ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Certainly. There are two items in connection with civil government which will be left, and it will be understood that any question that any hon. member wishes to put in relation to these items may be put, and that I will give an explanation.

Mr. SPROULE. Or any discussion ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Certainly.

Mr. CLARKE. When will these items be taken up—to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No ; I would prefer to leave them until next week.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As the items are very short, the hon. minister might let the House have some notice as to when they will be taken up, because there are other hon. gentlemen who would like to continue this discussion and who may not be present if the items are brought up unexpectedly.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. If my hon. friend will suggest a day and let me know the day before, I am sure the right hon. leader of the government will be glad to agree to that day.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Very good.

Some resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) be good enough to tell us what business we may expect to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Public Works estimates, I think.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 6.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, October 9, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

ORDERS DISCHARGED.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that the Order for :

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 217) respecting penitentiaries.—The Minister of Justice.

be discharged.

Motion agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER moved that the Order for :

Second reading of Bill (No. 251) to amend the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act.—The Minister of Finance.

be discharged.

Motion agreed to.

MOTION DROPPED.

The item on the Order paper for leave to introduce Bill to amend the Dominion Lands Act (the Minister of the Interior) was dropped.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Anse aux Gascons—extension of wharf, &c., $6,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to extend the existing wharf to reach 13 feet depth at low water spring tide, to permit the steamers plying on the Baie des Chaleurs, between Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie, to call at all times. This is in Bonaventure county, and the total cost will be $19,000.

Anse aux Gris Fonds—improvements at mouth of river, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is the estimated cost. It is practically to give the fishermen a harbour of refuge.

Mr. MORIN. What county is that in ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Gaspé.

Anse St. Jean—extension of wharf, $3,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is the total cost of the work, as estimated by the chief engineer. It is to give a depth of from 8 to 16 feet of water at low tide, and it is in Chicoutimi and Saguenay.

Barachois de Malbaie—breakwater, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in the county of Gaspé, and the estimated cost of the work is $16,500. It is for the construction of a breakwater.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this a new work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is the first expenditure on a new work.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the size of that place ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is a very flourishing parish, with a population of 1,300. There is a sand bar there running parallel to the coast line which it is proposed to remove, so as to give boats access to the inner basin. It is a most important fishing centre, and we have had petitions from the inhabitants praying for this work.

Mr. HACKETT. Might I ask the hon. minister if he has considered the case of Skinner's Pond in Prince Edward Island ? He is very desirous of promoting the fishing industry, and I can tell him that in the vicinity of Skinner's Pond there is the most important fishing industry in Canada.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that Skinner's Pond item was passed a day or two ago.

Mr. HACKETT. I beg to differ. There is no item for Skinner's Pond, and I would like to ask the hon. minister if he will not do something to assist the fishermen there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This matter was brought to my attention, and instructions have already been given to the chief engineer of the department to report upon it.

Bonaventure East—breakwater, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to provide for the construction of a breakwater in Bonaventure county, 700 feet long, 20 feet wide, and to give six feet at low water, spring tide. The total estimated cost of the work is $20,000. It is a new work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the use of a breakwater which will give only six feet of water ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At the present time a sand bar forms at the mouth of the river, and prevents the fishermen getting into the river, which forms a harbour at that point. The construction of this breakwater will prevent the bar forming, and will give them six feet of water at low spring tide, so that they can take their vessels in.

Mr. MORIN. What is the population of that place ?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). The population of the township of Bonaventure is 2,682. It is one of the largest parishes on the Baie des Chaleurs.

Mr. SPROULE. When we come to an item for a new work, I think the minister should tell us something about the size of the place, its requirements, why the work is needed, and what we are committing the country to in commencing the undertaking. In the province of Ontario a township is about ten miles square, and a harbour or dock usually accommodates two or three townships or more. There is no township in our part of the country with a population of less than 3,000 or 4,000 or 5,000. No one would contend that the fact that a townsip had a population of 2,000 or 3,000 would be any justification for the building of a breakwater. I take it that the people in this township are farmers. There may be a few who fish ; but, so far as I can judge from the information given, this breakwater is for fishing purposes, and not for commercial purposes.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). I may say that this township extends wholly along the sea-shore. The townships in the county of Bonaventure are not as they are in Ontario; they are all along the sea-shore. All these 2,862 people practically will be benefited by this breakwater. It is true, some farming is carried on in the parish, but the main occupation of the people is fishing and lumbering. Probably one hundred fishermen will be benefited by this breakwater. The township of St. Bonaventure, by which name it is popularly known, or Hamilton town-

ship, as it is called in the census is one of the largest parishes of the district. At present there is no breakwater or wharf, and the fishermen there have never had any assistance of any kind. They are exposed to storms, especially in the fall, and have no protection whatever for their boats. The steamers that pass there have to land in open boats both people and goods at their inconvenience and sometimes loss. It sometimes happens that steamers pass without being able to stop, and the people have been asking for this improvement for the past thirty years. St. Bonaventure is bound to increase and the time has arrived when something has to be done. In rear of the parish of St. Bonaventure are the famous Robitaille limits, 40 square miles, given to the family of the late lieutenant governor of the province of Quebec, which are reckoned among the most valuable timber limits in the province. They are still held by the Robitaille family, but in a short time it is expected that they will pass into the hands of a lumber company and be exploited, thus furnishing considerable employment. All are unanimous in the opinion that this work should be done at once.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the size of the fishing fleet and to what extent is the industry prosecuted ?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). There are about 100 to 125 fishermen in each parish. The importance of the locality was recognized by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries when he had built at St. Bonaventure the first bait freezing establishment erected in the province of Quebec. The local House passed a special law authorizing the fishermen of the parish to form a bait freezing association at this point.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member has not told us how many vessels there are in the fishing fleet. Here is a township with a population of 2,862, and we have $10 per head of that population spent at one place. There are 125 fishermen, which would mean $20 per head spent on one small hatchery, and we do not know to what extent the industry is prosecuted and whether there is any commerce carried on there or not. These things may not appear to necessitate a very heavy outlay at the time, but they must be kept up permanently in the future. There ought to be a pretty strong justification before we commence new undertakings of this kind. Here we are proposing to spend about $20,000 to build a breakwater for a harbour, which has not much of a village or town behind it, and only a few fishermen. I am not underestimating the value of the fishermen, because they are a very important class and deserve consideration as well as any other, but if along our shores or lakes—take Georgian bay if you like—in every village where there is a number of fishermen, a breakwater or a wharf is to be built, there will be no end to the expenditure. We are committing ourselves to a dangerous precedent.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). This is not an ordinary fishing station. It is a township with a population of 3,000.

Mr. SPROULE. They are not all fishermen.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). One of the chief industries is the fishing industry. The amount may seem high, but unfortunately the coasts of the Baie des Chaleurs are very shallow and wharfs have to be built much longer than they otherwise would. If we were to build a $5,000 wharf it would be carried away with the first storm, and the most economical plan is to make a substantial work which will last two or three generations.

Mr. HACKETT. How far is that from Gaspé ?

The PRIME MINISTER. 160 miles.

Mr. HACKETT. I have travelled up that river, the St. Lawrence, and I know that frequently the fishermen of that section labour under great difficulties in getting their products to the market, and any assistance this parliament can give those poor hard working men should be given freely and without comment.

Bois Brûlé—training pier, &c., $2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for a pier 90 feet long and 15 feet wide. It is for the purpose of confining the water of the river into one channel in order to give sufficient water for the boats to come in.

Cacouna—extension of wharf, &c., $2,300.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why do you require to extend it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. To get into deep water. The extension will be 75 feet and this is to complete.

Caplan—breakwater, $5,000.

Mr. HACKETT. What county is this in ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Bonaventure. It is to make provision for the construction of a breakwater 40 feet long and 20 feet wide. The estimated cost is $15,000. It is said in the report that there is no shelter of any kind for the fishing boats. This is also for the purpose of allowing a larger class of boats to engage in the fishing industry at this point. It is also stated in the report that there is at this point an extensive shipping of ties and shingles, and that twenty large vessels, including three barques, loaded there in 1902.

Mr. HACKETT. Is the work on the Baie des Chaleurs or on the gulf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On the Baie des Chaleurs.

Mr. HACKETT. About what part of it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In Bonaventure county.

Mr. HACKETT. How big is that ?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). Perhaps I may be allowed to give a little further explanation with regard to the locality. I may say in answer to the hon. member for West Prince (Mr. Hackett) that Bonaventure is 150 miles long. Gaspé is about 300 miles long.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much of it is not covered with breakwaters ?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). Since confederation, on this Bonaventure coast-line of 150 miles, three small wharfs had been erected ; and out of 19 parishes practically 16 have been left for these 35 years without any protection whatever for the fishermen —no wharfs, no breakwaters, and nothing to facilitate the carrying on of their calling. The parish of St. Charles de Caplan adjoins that of Bonaventure. The census of 1901 shows that this has a population of 1,990. There is this remarkable about Caplan that, in the rear a new parish has sprung up, called St. Alphonse de Muselyville. This was founded by a Belgian priest, who brought out a Belgian colony and began the first extensive effort to settle the interior of that immense peninsula of 10,000 square miles. This parish of St. Alphonse de Muselyville has a population of 900, a resident parish priest, a church and all the facilities and advantages to become a growing and prosperous centre. This population will utilize this new wharf which is to be erected near the parish church in the middle of the parish coast-line. The fishermen there have now no protection whatever. When they return from fishing they have to get together fifteen or twenty men to haul their boats on the shore, on the approach of the storm, and this work has to be done sometimes in the day-time and sometimes at night. When the steamer passes, people coming ashore have to be landed on floats. St. Charles de Caplan is a centre and will be the outlet for a considerable trade. The Quebec government last year spent $1,000 in improving the road there, which will make this more a centre than ever. So, I think the expenditure is fully justified. It will have the effect, within the next four or five years, of greatly increasing the business which is done through this point.

Mr. SPROULE. I would be glad if the minister would make up a list of the new works he is commencing and the counties in which they are, together with an estimate of the cost of each work when concluded. I presume he has not such a list at hand, but he could probably have it prepared in a short time. We are commencing many new undertakings on grounds of very doubtful wisdom, if this may be taken as a sample. This work will cost $15,000 or $20,000, and it is to be built at a place where there are only a few fishing boats and about 1,000 people.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will allow me, the parish of St. Charles de Caplan has a population of over 1,900, and in the rear of it is the parish of St. Alphonse de Muselyville, with over 800. Both of these parishes will benefit by this wharf. If the amount seems to be large, it is because these wharfs must be built strongly enough to resist the action of the sea. If we were building wharfs on rivers or inland lakes a small expenditure would be sufficient ; but it is no use to erect a wharf at a cost of $4,000 or $5,000 in such a place as this. One storm would carry it away. There was a storm about a month ago at Port Daniel, and the wharf there, a substantial wharf, begun under the late administration, was damaged to the extent of $2,400 in one night.

Mr. SPROULE. The outlay would indicate a substantial wharf. I do not object to its being made substantial, because if the work is to be done at all, it should be done well. But what I complain of is that heavy expenditures are being undertaken, not only for the present, but for the future, upon grounds of questionable wisdom. I can only judge of this by comparing it with my own section of the country. I find important towns, the homes of large fishing fleets and the centres of fine agricultural districts, and with populations three times that mentioned by the hon. gentleman, yet, if it is proposed to spend even $10,000 on a new work, the answer is that the place is too small to justify such a work. Take, for instance, the town of Thornbury, which has a population of 3,000, and has adjacent townships with a population of 15,000 or 20,000. This place is one of the parts of the Georgian bay and the centre of an important commerce. Yet, it would be very difficult to get the government to grant $15,000 to commence a work there. And, even with the most urgent need of commerce and the fishing industry, it is difficult to get the government to grant even $4,000 or $5,000 to keep in proper repair works that may have been built at any of these points. It will be seen that it is not only the amount we are now voting, but the amount necessary to complete the work that must be considered. And, after that, the work must be maintained, so that we are committing ourselves to a never-ending expenditure.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Sproule's) suggestion is a very proper and reasonable one. I thought I had a list such as he

speaks of, for I desired to have it prepared myself. I do not think that these estimates cover more new works for the province of Quebec than for any other. It is true, as my hon. friend says, that there is no use in spending money on these works at all unless we endeavour to make them substantial. We ought also to understand thoroughly what we are undertaking. With that view I have given the estimates of the chief engineer, which I think are correct as to the total liability to be incurred in each case. My hon. friend will see that out of the ten votes that we have passed for the province of Quebec, only three incur any liability over the amount of the vote, and that the total liability in these cases is only $36,000. I will have a list prepared such as the hon. gentleman desires.

Mr. MORIN. Let me ask the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) how it is that the names of the places that he has given in his county do not appear in the last census.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). When the county of Bonaventure was originally surveyed it was divided up into townships, and the names of the townships appear in the census. The ecclesiastical authorities have since subdivided these townships into parishes, giving them religious names. For instance, you have St. Bonaventure, representing the township of Hamilton; St. Charles, representing the township of Caplan. The member for Dorchester is aware of the system of parishes in Quebec. These divisions are made under the parochial system.

Mr. LENNOX. On several occasions, though not recently, I have expressed my opposition to this system of expending public money. I do not wish to take particular exception to this item more than to a large class of similar items that are constantly brought before us. We have necessarily to incur enormous expenditures of a national character. There may come a time when we can, better than now, apply public money to what may be denominated local purposes. I have endeavoured to think this matter out, and tried to see whether the propositions I have heretofore enunciated are fair, that is, whether a work which does not partake of a character which makes it for the general advantage of the Dominion as a whole, is one upon which we are justified in expending federal money. There may be works which cannot be said to affect the whole Dominion, on which the public money of the Dominion can legitimately be applied. But speaking as a rule, and it is a good rule for us to observe, I think that when a work cannot be regarded as a Dominion work distinct from a provincial work, as a Dominion work distinct from a county work or a purely local work, we are not justified in expending public money upon it. Down by the seashore I have noticed that a good deal of money is spent on harbours, and in procuring facilities for fishermen, and in that instance, when seeing that it will affect more than one province, we can justifiably expend money upon it. It may not be necessary in this case that the money has to be beneficial to more than one province before it can be justifiably spent by the federal parliament. For instance, if you have a public work to be done in some town in the province of Ontario, we might reply to the request of the county council and say: We won't give you a grant for this work. The county council says: It does not affect the county as a whole, therefore we cannot give any public money for it. Now these works, such as the improvement of harbours and small streams, the building of wharfs in places where there is practically no commerce, no interprovincial commerce at all events, are matters of local concern. I know of cases in which the county council would say: It is a good local work, it benefits the town where it is being expended, but it does not affect the county as a whole. In these instances I think there should not be a grant of one dollar by the county council, not one dollar by the township council either; yet they come to this parliament and obtain grants. On what ground? The only ground upon which they can possibly be justified is that they are a national work in some sense or form. Now I enter my protest against that principle. There may be some qualification of the doctrine, but whilst we have large public enterprises to the fore, whilst we have the necessity for a great expenditure on transportation and other great public works which affect Canada as a whole, whilst we have these and have not sufficient money to satisfy those demands—as we know we have not sufficient money—and when we are going into a large increased expenditure, this year mounting up by the millions, at a rate which is unprecedented, I say that the Minister of Public Works ought not to undertake this long list of new expenditures where it is absolutely certain that these matters cannot be said to be for the general advantage of Canada in any proper sense which would justify us in expending federal money upon them.

Now here we have a population, I understand, of some 1,900 in the two parishes. My hon. friend from East Grey has referred to the province of Ontario. I do not care whether it is the province of Ontario or the province of Quebec, neither does my hon. friend, except as an illustration. Take, for instance, the town of Barrie. There was difficulty in getting a grant of $3,000 for a wharf at the town of Barrie. The town of Barrie, now including Allandale, has a population of some 6,000, and is rapidly growing. New enterprises are be-

ing launched there this season, and we have difficulty in getting $3,000——

Mr. McCARTHY. On what does the hon. gentleman base his statement that there is difficulty in getting a vote ?

Mr. LENNOX. If the hon. gentleman disclaims any effort in that behalf, I withdraw the statement entirely. Probably the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is perfectly right in suggesting that there was no difficulty in obtaining this vote, inasmuch as, though it was voted several years ago, it has not been implemented by any work done up to the present time. Probably I had better leave the town of Barrie and go a little further down to the new portion of the riding of the hon. member for North Simcoe, where there is a wharf spoken of as the Hawkestone wharf, in the township of Oro. That is another flagrant instance of an expenditure of public money for a purely local purpose. I venture to say that, except to satisfy a few men in that locality, there is no justification for the expenditure of one dollar of public money upon the Hawkestone wharf. There is no need for it unless it be for a few excursionists who land there from time to time, but very infrequently. This is another instance illustrating the fact that this government is squandering the people's money on wharfs, and what are denominated public works, here and there, for no other purpose, that is self-evident, except to influence the votes of the people in the neighbourhood.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not desire to start an acrimonious discussion but one statement of the hon. gentleman I cannot allow to go unchallenged. His statement about the difficulty of obtaining a grant for the wharf at Barrie of which he spoke is not a correct statement. It has been in the estimates since 1900 ; the difficulty was to decide upon the selection of a site. As soon as the situation was agreed upon the work was undertaken. The lumber is now being hauled there and the work is about to be commenced. In reference to the statement that there was no demand for the Oro wharf, I entirely repudiate that statement on behalf of the township recently added to North Simcoe. The hon. gentleman knows very well that his own town of Barrie profits very largely by that wharf. The few excursionists of whom he speaks are farmers who, owing to this cheap transportation come to Barrie more frequently than they otherwise would and sell and buy goods to the advantage of both the townspeople and the farmers.

Mr. LENNOX. I deny entirely that a reference to the Hawkestone wharf is in any sense out of order. It is perfectly in order in discussing these estimates to refer to the various works undertaken by the government as illustrations of the fact that we are not spending money on the works that are properly within the purview of this parliament. When the hon. member says that the people of Oro are very largely benefited by being able to bring produce to Barrie by the casual boats that call at that wharf from time to time during the excursion season, I can only say that he is not as well informed as perhaps he will be when he becomes more familiar with the people of Oro. There is a railway also passes through the hamlet of Hawkestone and the people who wish to go to market, who do not drive into Barrie, avail themselves of that railway and do not rely upon the fact that once or twice or three times a week an excursion boat may call at the Hawkestone wharf. In regard to Barrie wharf, I may say that the money has been voted for many years. I am not going to enter into the somewhat difficult question between the hon. member (Mr. McCarthy) and the mayor of Barrie as to the reasons why that money has not been expended. I leave these gentlemen to fight that out among themselves. We have, however, the fact that the money in the first instance was granted just previous to an election, and as it was intended to serve the purpose of another election the work was put off, but a change has come over the spirit of the dream of the hon. member for North Simcoe, who is no longer seeking to represent his native town of Barrie, and so it will no longer serve election purposes as effectively as was expected at the time.

Chambord wharf, $2,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this a new work, and if so, what is the estimated cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total cost of this work is estimated at $8,000. It is in the large district of Chicoutimi and Saguenay, and you must recognize that the situation there is somewhat different from that in ordinary parts of the Dominion and of Ontario. The country is settling up and these people have no railway accommodation ; this is the only means they have of getting out their produce ; their only means of transportation is by water. Several of these works are for the purpose of improving the means of transportation in order that the settlers may bring in materials they require and ship out their products.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it a village or a fishing station ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It has a population of 1,020 people along the coast.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it the intention of the government to have the works undertaken by public tender and contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All of these new works, these large works, are undertaken by contract.

Château Richer—harbour improvements, $4,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This item is for harbour improvements at Château Richer, which is in the county of Montmorency, Quebec. It is proposed to remove rocks and to improve the passage along the north shore so as to permit barges or batteaux of eight to ten feet to pass safely over the bar and also for the construction of a small crib-work.

Mr. MORIN. I really think it is outrageous to vote $4,000 for that work at Château Richer. I know that place thoroughly, and I can say that steamboats never stop there ; boats stop there only when they are forced to do so by a storm. It is a poor place for a boat to land at any time, because a bar extends out into the river for about two miles. The only boats that go there are those which are engaged in the hauling of cord-wood to Quebec. These boats ply between this point and Quebec and they draw four, five or sometimes six feet of water. This is the only purpose for which a wharf is required, and there are two wharfs there already.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Hon. gentlemen sometimes insinuate that these works are assigned to different localities for political purposes. I do not suppose my hon. friend will say that the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) has succeeded in having works given to his constituency as a personal favour. Strong representations have been made to me that this was a very important work. It is represented that most of the inhabitants of Château Richer are owners of sailing vessels which are engaged in carrying stone, fire-wood, lime and other materials from points below Quebec to that city, taking back supplies of all kinds from Quebec. It appears that there are there thirty-five boats of a total carrying capacity of 3,500 tons. I am not personally acquainted with the place, but it was on the representations that I brought down this estimate for the purpose of making this improvement. It appeared to me that it was very important in the interests of the population, which numbers between 2,000 and 3,000, and of this very considerable trade which is now going on I should think under the circumstances that this would be a very desirable improvement.

Mr. MORIN. I do not consider politics in dealing with these matters ; I know very well who represents that county in this House, but that makes no difference to me, I am not speaking from political motives. I do not know any place in the province of Quebec or in Canada that has better railway facilities than Château Richer. In summer street cars run through there every ten minutes and in the winter there are three or four trains a day. The settlement is only about twelve miles below Quebec, and I know well that the only boats which go there go to load stone or cord-wood. You cannot get steamboats to land there because the channel of the river is on the south side right along the Island of Orleans, and when a steamer passes this point it is three or four miles away from Château Richer.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Morin) know that Château Richer is an exceedingly important point because of its important stone quarries and also as a centre for the distribution of cord-wood. A very large proportion of the cord-wood used in the city of Quebec comes from that locality. In additions to that, as I said, there are very large stone quarries there. I suppose that about 50 per cent of all the stone that is used on macadamized streets in Quebec comes from that locality. It is practically impossible, under existing conditions, for the boats that go there to get into the wharf on account of certain obstacles that exist at that particular point. My hon. friend says that there are good railway facilities there, but I do not think the hon. gentleman would imagine, that they can carry stone or lime or wood on an electric railway. There is no freighting done by the electric railway there, as a matter of fact. As to the steam railway, it is the old story of the competition between water and rail carriage, with the additional disadvantage in this case, that it is a very short haul. It is not twelve miles, but eight miles, to the Montmorency Falls, and Château Richer is the second parish below.

Mr. MORIN. How much more than eight miles is it ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is nearer twenty miles to this wharf than it is twelve. With respect to the freighting of stone and wood by railway, there would be the additional disadvantage of the high terminal charges at Quebec. Château Richer has been a very important centre for a great many years. I have in my own county a place called Beauport at which there is less business done than at Château Richer, but the Conservative government built a wharf there, and this government has repaired it although Beauport is within a very few miles of the city of Quebec. If there is any expenditure justifiable in these estimates it is the expenditure for Château Richer. It is an important centre which serves a section of the country which is rapidly growing.

Mr. MORIN. I do not rise to prevent this vote passing. If you have a whole lot of money to waste, go ahead and do it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Thanks.

Mr. SPROULE. Will this complete the work.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is for the purpose of removing boulders and obstructions at the entrance to the harbour

and in the harbour itself. Of course it is not a great harbour like Quebec; it is a bay on the north shore of the St. Lawrence and it affords very convenient shipping facilities to the people.

Mr. MORIN. Go ahead; it is all right.

Desjardins—Allumette wharf, $7,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a new work, and the total cost is estimated by the chief engineer at $10,000. There is a small pier there now, and this is for the purpose of giving improved landing and shipping facilities.

Desjardins—Allumette wharf, $7,500.

Mr. MORIN. In what county is this?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In Pontiac county.

Douglastown—isolated block, $6,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What do you mean by an isolated block?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is quite a large and important work and it is in the county of Gaspé. It is to build an isolated block 450 feet long, 24 feet wide at the top and from 26 to 30 feet high, giving 12½ feet at low water springtide. The total cost of this work will be $30,000. This is the commencement.

Gatineau river—protection of east bank below Canadian Pacific Railway bridge including purchase of land, $3,500.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the nature of that work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The river was said to be diverted by some government works and an action was brought in the courts, and the Dominion was condemned to pay damages. This is to pay the balance of the claim and to purchase a certain amount of land to prevent further claims. It would save a great deal of money if the whole thing had been bought in the first place.

Mr. SPROULE. Will this cover the whole expense?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is the whole expense estimated by the government engineer.

Mr. SPROULE. Including the cost of the land?

Grande Rivière wharf—new covering, $800.

Mr. MORIN. Where is the Grande Rivière?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In Gaspé county.

Mr. MORIN. All right; go ahead. If it is not in Gaspé county it is pretty sure to be in Bonaventure.

Kamouraska—extension of pier, $4,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to extend the wharf at Kamouraska, so as to give a depth of 16 feet at high water.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What boats call at this wharf?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sorry to say I have not the information.

Mr. MORIN. If the minister will allow me, I will tell him. The hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Angers) got the government to put on a boat from Malbaie to Kamouraska. That boat is of no use whatever. It only makes a few trips in the summer and none in the winter; and on the Kamouraska side of the river the governmen built a wharf only to please a few of their friends.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All I know is that this work was commenced in 1887, and there has been over $23,000 spent upon it. Therefore, I assume that the work is of some importance, and that it will be of great advantage to the local trade, which suffers at present great disadvantages for the want of a sufficient depth of water. This is the total expenditure. There is a petition from the people in favour of the work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there really no definite information as to how often a boat calls?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am informed that there is no regular line of boats.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the size of the place, and what kind of trade is done? If only a tramp boat calls there occasionally, it seems to be doubtful wisdom to make this expenditure.

The PRIME MINISTER. Kamouraska is a very important village. In the summer time it is a large watering place. It is the county town of Kamouraska, and up to a few years ago was the judicial seat of the district of Kamouraska, which covered a group of counties. Some years ago the judicial seat was removed to Rivière du Loup, which is a more growing place. The trade of Kamouraska is chiefly that of a summer resort.

Mr. COCHRANE. Hear, hear; we have to pay the expenses of people going in bathing.

The PRIME MINISTER. There are mail boats plying between this place and Quebec. My hon. friend will remember that this work was not commenced by the present government, but by a government of which he was a supporter.

Mr. COCHRANE. And I dare say the right hon. gentleman found fault with it.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, I did not. I never found fault with any good expenditure.

Mr. COCHRANE. That is always the answer we get—that the other government did it. The right hon. gentleman got into power because he said we did wrong ; and now, when we criticise anything, he says it was done by us. I can understand that a place might be important enough to have a wharf in days gone by, when there might have been a large local trade in lumber or something of that kind ; but all the conditions may since have changed. The right hon. gentleman tells us that this work is principally for a summer watering place ; and we have to go back to our constituents and tell them that we are voting money from the public exchequer to enable people to go in bathing and to accommodate some boats which carry them food. It is not a work required for the commerce of the country, because we understand that a steamer calls there only once in a while.

The PRIME MINISTER. This work amounts to no more to-day than it did before. It was commenced, and it has to be completed or left in an unfinished condition.

Mr. SPROULE. The right hon. gentleman's own explanation might be a justification for the commencement of an expenditure years ago which it would not be wise to continue at the present time. He tells us that this place was once a county town and the centre of a judicial district, but that other places having arisen in the meantime, it is not now the county town nor the centre of a judicial centre. There may have been a very important trade done there when the expenditure was commenced, which is now transferred to other places. I notice by the census that the village of Kamouraska has a population of only 578. It may have had a couple of thousand when it was the county town, and there may have been a justification for the expenditure then; but that would be no justification for continuing it if the trade and population have left the place, and the only business now done is by casual excursionists or by people who make a summer resort of the place.

Lake St. John—dredging, $3,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for the maintenance and operation of our dredge on Lake St. John.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why do you have a number of special items for dredges and also half a dozen general items ? What is the reason they cannot all be dealt with either as particular items or as general items ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think there is any good reason. It is inconvenient to both the House and the department to have the estimates prepared in this way, and I hope in future to have the items for dredging classified in such a way as to put them in one group, so that we can see at a glance what amount of money is voted for dredging.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this part of some general scheme of dredging to be carried out at lake St. John, and what public interest can be advanced by spending money for that purpose ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The settlement and development of trade around lake St. John have been increasing very rapidly. The dredging is done at the mouths of the rivers emptying into lake St. John in order to improve the approaches to the wharfs built there. A very large pulp industry has started in that district in which several hundred thousand dollars are invested. The only means the farmers have of transmitting their produce to Roberval is by the lake.

Lake Nominingue—wharfs, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Portneuf county and is new work.

Laprairie ice piers and protection wall—additional amount for works of reconstruction and repair, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for the purpose of rebuilding the ice piers. There was an amount in the main estimates, but after consultation with the engineer I came to the conclusion that that amount was not sufficient and that if we were to rebuild in wood it would be the same old story of large expense on maintenance and continual repairs. I concluded that it would be very much better to make a permanent work out of concrete. The total cost will be about $30,000, and we have a vote of $5,000 in the main estimates, which with this amount will make $15,000, about half that cost. We shall call for tenders and have the piers reconstructed with concrete work.

Lotbinière wharf—improvements, $7,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a block there and this is for the purpose of connecting that block with the shore. The total estimated cost is $12,000. Some $14,000 have been expended on this in the past.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the necessity of the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a village about forty miles above Quebec which has not railway accommodation and entirely depends on boats and market steamers to reach the market at Quebec. The block costs $15,000 and it is very inconvenient to have boats start from the shore to the block. The idea is to make connections with the block which is at deep water.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the population ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. 1,800.

Mr. SPROULE. This will complete the repairs ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, the chief engineer informs me that the repairs could not be carried out by tender, but the building of the connection between the block and the shore will be done by tender.

Maguasha—landing pier, $4,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for the construction of a landing pier 200 feet long and 30 feet wide.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How large is Maguasha ?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). This is situated in a town which has a population of 2,446. It is a place from which the farmers from the upper part of the county cross over to Dalhousie the market town. This item was brought in at the request of the commission of public works of New Brunswick in order that there might be a proper landing in connection with the ferry on the Quebec side as well as on the New Brunswick side.

Mistook (Delisle) wharf, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total cost is $4,500 and it is a new work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the population of the town ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are 1,880 inhabitants according to the census of 1901.

Mr. MORIN. What county ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In the district of Saguenay and Chicoutimi.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will it be built by tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In this district it is very difficult to get these works done by tender. It is the rule to purchase the material under the direction of the chief engineer and have the work done under his supervision by day labour.

Mont Louis—wharf, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is the total estimated cost of this work.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this a new work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. GOURLEY. What county ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Gaspé.

Mr. MORIN. Will this be let by tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. In this case the minister takes one vote for the whole estimated cost of the work. In the case we have just been dealing with he asks for only $2,000 for a wharf that is estimated to cost $4,500. Why does he make this distinction ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The reason is that in the case of Mont Louis, it is expected that the wharf can be completed in one season, but, in the other case we expect to purchase the material during the winter and complete the work during next season, and so, if we took the whole vote, a part of it should lapse—it would be of no use. These estimates are made up under the advice of the officials of the department.

Mr. FOWLER. Where can the place be where you cannot complete a job costing $4,500 in one season ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend must remember that the fiscal year ends on the 30th of June. He must remember also that in some of these districts the work of building cannot go on during the long winter. The only work that can be done is the getting out of the timber and, perhaps the stone.

Mr. FOWLER. How far apart are these two places ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know exactly, but many hundreds of miles.

Mr. HACKETT. It appears to me that Gaspé county is being very well favoured in this regard.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These votes do not go by counties. But, the county of Gaspé has a coast line of about 300 miles. It naturally requires more works of this kind than a county with a coast line very much less.

Mr. HACKETT. Is this to accommodate the fishermen of the locality ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. GOURLEY. Is this on the St. Lawrence or on the Baie des Chaleurs ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is on the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

Newport breakwater—extension, $6,800.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Newport is in Gaspé county.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the hon. gentleman give us some explanation of the previous history of this work and what is to be done now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete works already under contract. The original work was commenced in 1900. The work now referred to in this vote is an extension of the breakwater, a distance of 200 feet and to a depth of 15 feet at low water. The amount of the contract is $13,338.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the population ?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). The population is 1,357.

Mr. GOURLEY. And it is on the Baie des Chaleurs ?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). Yes.

Mr. HACKETT. Would the minister make an explanation in regard to it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote is to pay the balance of the contract for the work that was let a year ago.

New Richmond—breakwater, $6,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a new work, and is approved by the ratepayers of the township of New Richmond.

Mr. FOWLER. The mere fact that the ratepayers of the district approve of the work is not a sufficient cause for the government to do it. There must be some reason why this expenditure should be made.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I was proceeding to say that the trade at the port of New Richmond consists chiefly in the export of deals, shingles, railway ties and fish, and the imports, of general merchandise. Forty vessels are engaged in this traffic annually. There is extensive fishing.

Mr. HACKETT. How far is New Richmond from Dalhousie ?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). About 40 miles. New Richmond is one of the most progressive towns on the whole Baie des Chaleurs. It is one of the few places inhabited by English speaking people, and is well known as a famous fishing resort. It used formerly to have a vice-regal residence during the summer time, but that is now in the hands of the fishing people. Apart from its natural advantages, it is a place of much importance. At present there is no wharf, breakwater, and nothing of any kind to show that there is even a Department of Public Works in existence. There is a population of 3,200 people, who have to land in mud, or in open boats, or in scows, as best they can. The government have realized that the time has come when something should be done for the people of New Richmond.

Mr. HACKETT. Carried.

Notre Dame du Portage—wharf, $4,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In accordance with the estimate of the chief engineer of the department, it is proposed to construct a wharf at this place 16½ feet above high water at spring tide. It will be 370 feet long and 20 feet wide. Total cost, $7,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Where is Notre Dame du Portage ?

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In Temiscouata.

Paspebiac—landing pier, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This will be 400 feet long and 30 feet wide, estimated to cost altogether by the engineer $17,000. Paspebiac is the chief shipping port of the county of Bonaventure, in fact of the whole Gaspesian peninsula. There are wharfs now, but they are private property and cannot be used by fishermen and others.

Mr. HACKETT. I would ask the minister to state how far Paspebiac is from Quebec.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). It is situated on the Baie des Chaleurs. It is the oldest shipping port on the Baie des Chaleurs, the headquarters of the firm of Chas. Robin, Collas, Cie., one of the largest fish-shipping firms in the world, doing business in South America and the West Indies. The aggregate trade at this port last year was $334,000, duty collected, $8,800, as compared with $5,000 two years ago. Strange to say, though Paspebiac has been used as a shipping port for more than 125 years, there has never been a dollar of public money expended at that port. There is a small wharf at present belonging to this shipping firm, from which the fishermen and the general public are excluded. The government has realized the importance of this port, which is open for ten months in the year, and which, at no distant date, I hope will be used by the Intercolonial as a shipping port. The government has thought fit to give this small amount, relatively small compared with the importance of the port. I think the committee will have no objection under the circumstances, in a port of that importance, to voting this sum for a public wharf there.

Mr. GOURLEY. I see there is a railway to this place. Is that a branch of the Intercolonial ?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). Yes. Unfortunately, the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway belongs to the creditors at present, but it is operated by trustees. It has been extended to Paspebiac, though trains only run to New Carlisle, two miles from Paspebiac ; but there is no doubt that the moment that road gets into the hands either of the Intercolonial or into the hands of a good company, this port of Paspebiac will be utilized. It is one of the most important ports on the whole gulf of the St. Lawrence. Last year I had the honour of producing before this House a statement from Commander Wakeham, of the government steamer 'La Canadienne,' showing that navigation was quite possible for ten months of the year. If the Intercolonial, when it reaches Matapedia, instead of going on through New Brunswick to St. John, or through Nova Scotia to Halifax, simply

branched off down to the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, and along the shore to Paspebiac, they would have the shortest route from Montreal to Liverpool barring none, not even Sydney, Halifax, St. John, Portland, or any other seaport on the Atlantic.

Mr. HACKETT. In this item we have a landing pier costing $10,000 at Paspebiac. What is the meaning of that and what is that pier for ?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). To land passengers and freight and to do the general business of the port. There is no landing there now except the company's wharf from which the fishermen are excluded. There are 200 fishermen at this place and they have to land in the mud.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would ask the minister what revenue he expects to derive from this wharf and any others that we have passed ? The hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) has explained the very great amount of business that is done at this port and we might have some estimate as to the probable revenue.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My experience with these fishing stations is that generally the revenue is very small. I could not, with any degree of confidence, give an estimate of the revenue to be derived from this wharf ; I do not expect there would be a very large revenue, judging from our experience with other places.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is expected that this pier will be used almost altogether by fishing boats and it cannot be expected that very much of this commerce will come to it.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). It would be used by the general public as well as by the fishermen. At present there is only one wharf there and it is owned by this firm and is used for the firm's own purposes. The general public is debarred from access to it, except when some special arrangement is made as with the steamer that now performs the mail service.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Does the mail steamer stop there ?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). It does.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Does that pay a fee ?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). It would pay a fee when it stopped at a public wharf certainly.

Mr. COCHRANE. It appears to me that this vote is very objectionable. I quite understand that if there were no wharfs at all in this bay the people should be accommodated, but it appears that here that company has built a wharf and that it exacts only such tolls as it has a right to charge the public for the use of the wharf. In our section of the country the wharfs are all built by private enterprise and of course the owners could not maintain them if they did not charge wharfage. Here is a company that has invested money in the construction of a wharf, and we are told by the hon. gentleman representing that county (Mr. Marcil) that a large sum of money is brought into the country in return for the large exports from that section of the country. Why should we cripple the company that has built a wharf there, if all they want is legitimate fees for the use of that wharf by the public. The government, as I understand, propose to spend $10,000 to build a wharf to cripple the company that has already built a wharf there. If the government constructed a free wharf which would come into competition with the company's wharf it would certainly cripple the company.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). I cannot allow the statements of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken to pass uncontradicted. The wharf now in existence at this point is a company's wharf used exclusively for the company's business. There is a population of 1,700 people at Paspebiac who have no wharf accommodation at all. As I have said the public can use the company's wharf only when a special arrangement is made as for example when a steamer should call there, but any schooner coming along is not permitted to land at this wharf.

At one o'clock, committee took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

Paspebiac—landing pier, $10,000.

Mr. COCHRANE. When the House rose I was speaking about this vote, and the minister did not give me any information. We have learned from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux), who represents the riding, that there is in the neighbourhood of $300,000 worth of business a year done at this point, and that the people needed a wharf. But the fishing company have a wharf there now, and why should the government enter into competition with it ? I am satisfied that no company will refuse wharfage privileges to fishermen or anybody else if they are willing to pay wharf dues. I don't blame the people for wanting the government to build them a wharf that they can use for nothing, but is it fair to the company who have already spent a large sum of money there in building a wharf. The government will have to borrow this $10,000 at 3½ per cent, say, and it will take at least 2½ per cent annually to repair this wharf, so that 6 per cent on the $10,000 expenditure would cost us $600 a year. I fancy that if the government wants to go into this business they can make an arrangement with the company to give these fishermen the use of their wharf for less than $600 a year. This expenditure is not justified under the circumstances.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman is mistaken about the situation there. This is a large company, and they have no more wharf accommodation than is necessary for their own business, so that outside steamers and fishermen cannot use it. I should think that although the receipts from these wharfs are small, as a rule, that in this case they would pay the cost of maintenance. If there was a private wharf there that could be used for public purposes, the case would be different, but my information is that the company use this wharf for their own business, and that it does not afford accommodation for the general trade.

Mr. COCHRANE. I think the minister must be mistaken about that. Along the shores of Lake Ontario, in incorporated and county towns, where they must have as much business as has Paspebiac, I never heard of a wharf that was not capable of handling all the business that came to it. This company makes its living out of the fishermen, and they are as much interested in accommodating them as in accommodating anybody else. It does not require such a great number of ships to carry away $300,000 worth of fish.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The statistics show that last year 32 vessels entered at that wharf from Great Britain, British West Indies, Brazil, Norway and Sweden, Spain and the United States; and 60 vessels cleared to Great Britain, British West Indies, Brazil, St. Pierre, Norway and Sweden and the United States. The total tonnage was over 35,000 tons, and the customs receipts alone for that place last year were $9,000. We certainly should give the people there some accommodation to carry on their business.

Mr. COCHRANE. Sixty vessels during 10 months' navigation would only mean six a month.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There were 92 ocean-going vessels in all, not counting the fishing craft.

Mr. FRASER. And some large vessels might be there for quite a while.

Mr. COCHRANE. They might be in the sky. The wayfaring man, though a fool, cannot err in seeing that the government is spending this money simply because the people down there do not want to pay for the use of the wharf already in existence.

Perce—Extension of pier in north cove, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Gaspé county, and the work is to afford protection to vessels in north-easterly gales, and to give additional landing and shipping facilities. The estimated cost is $27,000.

Mr. GOURLEY. How long has the present pier been built?

Mr. COCHRANE.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The original pier was built in 1889.

Pierreville—wharf, $7,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in the county of Yamaska. It is a new work. The total cost is estimated at the amount we are asking for. It will be built by contract.

Pointe aux Trembles—wharf, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to make provision for the construction of a wharf on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, which will be available at all times for the use of steamers. It is in the county of Portneuf. The total cost of the work will be $12,000. It is a new work.

Pointe Fortune wharf—improvements, $1,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is required to complete the renewal of the superstructure of the government wharf. The total cost of the work is $5,000. This will pay the balance.

Port Daniel—extension of wharf and approach to same, $7,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Bonaventure county. It is to make provision for an estimate submitted by the acting engineer for extending the government wharf a distance of 600 feet to a depth of 25 feet at low water. The present wharf is 425 feet long, and reaches a depth of 13 feet at low water. The vote also includes some repairs to the approach to the wharf.

Mr. COCHRANE. What are we to understand by the approach? If it was possible to get on to the old wharf, it will be possible to get on to the extension.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What is called the approach is not on the land, but is the portion of the wharf that runs from the land, which is in need of repair.

Repentigny—wharf, $6,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for a new wharf. It is on the St. Lawrence, in the county of L'Assomption. The total cost of the work is estimated to be the amount of the vote.

Rimouski—extension of pier and tidal basin, including repairs, $30,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote is to make provision for repairing the present pier and for carrying on the works required for the formation of a tidal basin at the end of the pier. The vote is for the immediate repair of the present wharf, which is in danger of going down. The engineers have reported that there ought to be a tidal basin at this very important point with sixteen feet of water. At the present time, as hon. gentlemen know, tenders have to go from this port to the large boats to bring in the mails and passengers. There is a great deal of lumber and

other freight shipped from this point, and there has been an application from all parts of the country for some kind of a port on the St. Lawrence. According to the estimates of the engineers, the works necessary to form a port for general navigation at Rimouski would cost about $240,000. The whole matter is being looked into by the engineers of the department. I may say that the Wolvin Line has now ten boats on the route from the lakes to the lower St. Lawrence. The company have procured large limits, and they have represented to me that they were cutting pulp wood in that part of the country, and shipping it over the Intercolonial Railway. If they had a good port where they could take all the wood that could be furnished to them, they would bring back to the west this wood as return freight. They are doing a very large business, and that is one reason why we have had a much lower rate on grain during the present season than we ever had before. If the company can bring down wheat, and take other freight back, they can lower the rates both ways very much. From Quebec east there does not seem to be a good natural harbour on the St. Lawrence, and representations have been made to me of the necessity of having a good port down there. Rimouski is a central point. It may be that before next session a report will be got with regard to this and other places which may be available as harbours on the lower St. Lawrence. In the meantime this vote is for the purpose of improving the wharf at Rimouski, which is reported to be in a very dangerous state. It would be disastrous to the commerce of the country if we had no wharf there. At the present time the Intercolonial runs a branch out on this wharf, and there is danger of it being, from neglect or decay, washed away altogether.

Mr. COCHRANE. What does the hon. minister mean by a tidal basin ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A tidal basin is where ordinary sea-going vessels can go at high tide.

Mr. LANCASTER. Has any contract been let for this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Rivière St. Maurice—dredging eastern channel, &c., $5,000.

Mr. BUREAU. This channel runs between the eastern shore and the island of St. Christophe. On this island there is a saw-mill, the owner of which, I may tell my hon. friend, to relieve his conscience, is a very good Tory.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not know this.

Mr. BUREAU. I do and I felt it. There is no other way by which they can ship lumber from this mill in barges and there is not enough water for the barges to get to the wharf so that the channel has to be deepened. A new mill has also been built opposite on the main shore, and the channel requires to be enlarged in order to allow boats coming up and down to cross each other.

Rivière Jesus—dredging, $6,000.

Mr. LEONARD. I understand that that work is going on now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. LEONARD. Who is doing it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work is going on and applications have been made to me for a sum of $4,000 more to complete it. It is said to be doing a great deal of good, and urgent representations have been made to continue it. The work is being done by the Canadian Construction Company.

Mr. LEONARD. I am told that the work is going on only on the north side of the river, thus favouring the county of Terrebonne, and that none is being done in my county.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My chief engineer tells me that the work is going on in the natural channel of the river. Whether it is nearer one shore or the other would depend on the channel.

Mr. LEONARD. Is it the intention of the government to do dredging on both sides ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The intention is to dredge the channel, and I may have to ask for a further vote.

Rivière Ouelle pier—repairs, $6,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to make provision for whatever repairs are required to the government pier at Pointe Aux Orignaux. The Intercolonial has extended its railway down to this point so as to connect with the steam ferry which crosses over to Murray Bay.

Rivière Verte—improvements at mouth of, $3,750.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Since the construction of a dam there, there is a flooding each year which damages property.

Mr. LANCASTER. If this occurs every year, how have we managed in other years when there was no vote ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This dam causes the ice to jam and then the water overflows. The dredging will prevent that overflow.

Mr. COCHRANE. The same difficulty arises at the mouth of the Moira river, at Belleville. That city is flooded very often and a large amount of damages caused. Has anything been done to prevent that ? I always understood that the damages were due to the fact that the debris floating down

the river accumulated where the water was shallow and caused it to overflow.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think that that matter has been brought to the attention of the department. My chief engineer says he has no knowledge of it. But of course that being a navigable river, I dare say we would be called upon to do the necessary works to prevent damage.

Mr. COCHRANE. It is on the bay that the difficulty is where the Moira river flows into it. The accumulation takes place there, not in the river.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We will agree to make the improvements if we have it within our jurisdiction. If the plan was approved by the department, there is no doubt liability on the part of the Dominion to make the improvement.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has this dam been constructed by the government or by private parties ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is a new dam approved of by the government, the building of which has created this need of repairs.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would think that if the nuisance were created by a dam constructed by private parties, any person aggrieved by that work should have a right of action to recover damages against the parties who constructed it. I can hardly see how the Crown would be called upon to relieve from liability the private individuals who constructed the dam.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was a suit of Graham against the King, which affirmed the liability of the government because the government had approved of the work which was constructed by private parties. That dam was constructed on the Ottawa river a few miles from the city, and the parties were allowed $3,500 in damages.

Mr. COCHRANE. The government allowed it to be done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was no liability. The department, and I suppose the Department of Justice as well, thought that the government were liable for allowing it to be done. But outside of legal liability, we have always acted upon the policy that when works were allowed to be done upon navigable rivers that caused any obstruction which did not exist before, it was our duty to make these improvements when such works required them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was not aware of any decisions affecting the Crown for having approved of a public work or that rendered us liable for damages occasioned by the construction of such work. If there are any such decisions I would think it very advisable they should be carried to a court of appeal. If the court of appeal should determine that we are liable, it seems to me one of two things should be done : Either we should amend the law by providing that there shall be no liability by reason of approving the plans, that any liability shall be confined to the private individuals constructing the work, and that the action for damages shall not be taken away by the fact that the Crown approves the works. Otherwise in every case where works are approved by the government there should be great care taken to investigate the question as to whether those works are liable to lead to any damage for which action could be brought ; and in all cases a proper security should be taken from persons constructing the work that they will indemnify the Crown in respect of any such damages. But it seems to me manifestly absurd that the Crown, by reason of approving works which are constructed for the benefit of private individuals, should be liable in damages created by the construction of those works. There is an absolute flaw, either in the legislation or the administration of the department. If a private individual requires the sanction of the Crown for the construction of works to be operated for his private benefit, he certainly should assume all the liability that might accrue by reason of the construction of those works. The duty of the Crown should be confined, I think, to this : As the works are being constructed on navigable waters, the Crown should see to it that the erection of those works does not interfere with navigation—that is all the Crown is called upon to do. And I think the statute should be amended so as to provide that the remedy of a private individual against the person constructing the work is not taken away, and at the same time that the Crown, by reason of its approval, is not to be rendered liable for damages so occasioned.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am informed by the deputy minister that in this case, to which I referred, of Graham against the King, I made a little mistake. The improvements were made by the Crown and not by private individuals. But our idea was that the liability where we approved of them would be the same as if we had done the work ourselves.

River Saguenay—dredging, $15,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a large development of trade on the Saguenay river at the present time. The pulp industry alone on that river amounts on an average to 120 tons per day. That is all for foreign shipment. Up to the present time they have carried that out in barges for a considerable distance, eight or nine miles, to a point where the water is deep enough to allow the vessels in which it is to be transhipped to approach the land. It was thought that the dredging should be

undertaken at an early date. We hope to go on with it next spring, and we ask for this small vote in the meantime to start the work.

Mr. GOURLEY. I thought the river Saguenay was navigable for large steamers up to Chicoutimi.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Richelieu steamers go to the wharf at Chicoutimi at high tide. The great development of trade in that country will make it necessary, if possible, to get a channel that will allow them to reach the wharf at low tide. We intend to do this dredging with our own plant.

Mr. GOURLEY. To fourteen feet at low tide ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is what we aim at.

River St. Louis—improvements, $15,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to make provision for dredging a channel six miles long, and thirty feet wide and six feet deep at ordinary low water, from the intersection of the canal into Lake St. Francis, with a view to preventing the periodical overflow of lands adjoining the water-course. The total cost will be $25,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is this a new work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not quite see how the need for it arises.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This is in connection with a long standing grievance with the people who live on the shore of the river. The government built a dike along the shore, and in that there is an opening. The proprietor of the mill at the other end of the stream claims this to be his property. I may say that this story is an old one. The difficulty dates as far back as 1837. The government have, at times, acknowledged the claim and at other times resisted it. The little stream is very shallow, and when the gate is open the lands on both sides are flooded, causing a serious grievance. The proprietor of the mill has taken suit against the Crown to have that gate declared to be his property, and that he has exclusive control of it. I do not wish to commit myself or say anything as to what the result of the suit is likely to be ; but I have advised that, in case the result of the suit should be in favour of this man, whose name is Robert, it would be wise to make provision to dredge the river. I do not mean to say we are going to lose, but it is wise to make provision.

Mr. LANCASTER. I quite understand that the hon. minister would not care to discuss the merits of the case, but would it not be well to wait until it is decided before we authorized the expenditure ? Would it not make a difference in the case itself how we view this matter ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There have been interlocutory proceedings that are indicative of what is likely to happen. The case has not proceeded because it happens that the judge is on the Pacific coast at this time. If the gate is opened this autumn the results will be very serious. The lands are hay lands, and, if water spreads out and the frost comes, there would be very serious damage to the farmer and very serious cases of damages against the government. The overflow would be by the canal which we built for which we are responsible.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps I do not quite understand the facts. The gate to which the hon. gentleman refers is some distance away from the property of the owner of the mill ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The gate is on the side of the river, and then there is a highway and then the land affected.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why does he want to open the gate and let the water in upon the lands ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The mill is immediately below the lands affected, and the water to reach the mill must come down by the stream. He claims that he cannot operate the mill successfully because we keep the gate closed and deprive him of a certain portion of the water.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps the better way would be to buy the mill.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is a rather important mill and I need not say to a gentleman of the experience of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) how this importance grows when it comes to a question of the government exercising any claim with regard to any property.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not like to commit ourselves without information, and the most important information would be the decision in the suit that the hon. minister was speaking about. It cannot be many months until that will be decided. We have got along without this expenditure all these years, and I do not understand that the state of facts has changed. There may be, perhaps, an increasing damage to the people, but still, that must go on at a very slow rate, as I understand the minister. I do not understand why we should be in such a hurry to vote this money for these improvements until the suit has been decided.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Looking over the papers I find that, as far back as 1891 or 1892, application was made for a petition of right. We took possession of the gate forcibly and keep it closed, and

the petition of right was persistently refused until last year, when it was granted. I cannot say what the result of the suit will be, but I know the opinions that have been expressed by previous judges. And, if the case goes against us, there may be serious damages against the government.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In my own province, under such conditions, the proprietor of a mill flooding the lands of other people would be liable to damages unless he had acquired the right by grant or by prescription.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If the stream continued in its natural course, the lands as they stand would be flooded. As I understand—and, no doubt the principle is the same in my hon. friend's province—the proprietor of the mill below would have the right to the flow of water in its natural condition. But the flow has not been in its natural condition for a good many years, and the result is that the proprietors abutting on the river have reclaimed lands on either side. They would have no claim against the mill below if the water flowed in its natural course and flooded lands as it did originally before anything was done.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is this the first item of expenditure for this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I notice there is an expenditure of $900 last year in this locality.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are considerable public works there.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, I do not know the length of the flow of the water before it reaches the mill. One would think that if proprietors reclaim land along the bed of a navigable stream they would not have much to complain of, because any man who reclaims land along the stream is bound to raise dikes of some kind to keep the water off the land. Would it not be cheaper, if liability is assumed, to do it that way—building a dike on either side ? Has any investigation been made ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, the Railway Department have large works and have built a big dike in connection with their works. I do not know whether it is the result of the building of that dike, but that is what is claimed at any rate.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The officers of the Public Works Department deny that this is the result of our work. I had a report made by the engineer of the department and the remedy suggested is the dredging for which I am now asking a vote.

Hon. Mr. FITZPATRICK.

River du Loup (Fraserville)—harbour improvements, $20,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a very important point and $250,000 have been spent on this harbour previous to and since confederation. The trade is increasing very much. One of the items in the report of the engineer is that over 20,000,000 feet of lumber was shipped from this wharf during the past year. I am now having an investigation made by the engineers of the department for a large extension of this work, an extension which will probably cost a considerable amount of money under all the conditions. The present vote we are taking for the purpose of making such improvements as we can at the present time. In addition to the 20,000,000 feet of lumber shipped last year there is a considerable general trade.

Mr. LANCASTER. Who owns the wharf there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The government.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is there any revenue from it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a very considerable revenue but I have not the figures here. From my own recollection of the returns of the department I can say that there is a very large revenue.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the hon. gentleman explain the nature of the improvements ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The engineers are now making a general investigation. In a report which my hon. friend may have seen reference is made to the growing trade on the St. Lawrence and the desirability of important improvements being made at one or more ports on that river to afford sufficient facilities for this growing trade. Perhaps my hon. friend did not hear me state that the engineer mentions the shipment of 20,000,000 feet of lumber from that port last year. The Intercolonial road is extended to this wharf and in addition to the lumber trade there is a very large general trade. Until I get the report of the engineers with regard to the whole question of establishing better accommodation on the St. Lawrence, I could not say whether we will go on with these works or not ; that will be for consideration at a future session of parliament. But I may say that the reports, so far as I have seen them, indicate that the estimated cost of the improvements at Rivière du Loup is between $200,000 and $250,000. However, I am asking for this vote in connection with the improvements that are required at the present time.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In what will the improvements consist ; in giving an in-

creased depth of water or the erection of wharfs and accommodation of that kind ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for increasing the depth of water, but some of it will be used in improving the basin and general improvements to the works we have there now.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will there be dredging ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, there would be a good deal of dredging if we went on and made the protected basin or artificial harbour of which I spoke. A very large proportion of the estimate I have taken will be used in dredging this artificial basin or harbour. The present purpose is to improve the accommodation for vessels that come to the wharf and to extend the deepwater.

Mr. LANCASTER. What proportion of the $20,000 would be used in that way ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sorry to say that I cannot give that information exactly. It is a large general work in which a great deal of money has to be spent and the work is not divided.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is this under contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for improvements and repairs which will be done by our own plant.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is there any contract in relation to any part of it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If we went on with all the work there would be, but repairs and dredging immediately necessary we will do with our own plant.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The export is chiefly lumber ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Chiefly lumber.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the lumber sawn at Rivière du Loup or is it brought down the river, or it brought there by railway ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is brought there by railway.

Mr. GAUVREAU. Rivière du Loup is a prosperous town which has a very important trade. It is the first divisional point on the Intercolonial Railway below Quebec.

Mr. GOURLEY. What is the population ?

Mr. GAUVREAU. Six thousand. A great quantity of lumber is brought there over the Intercolonial Railway, and especially over the Temiscouata Railway from New Brunswick. The counties of Temiscouata and Kamouraska are tributary to Rivière du Loup, and there are in the neighbourhood important lumbering operations. We have Mr. Fraser at Cabano, who exported last year over 20,000,000 feet of lumber, and we expect that if these improvements are made at Rivière du Loup many firms will send their lumber by the Temiscouata Railway and by the Intercolonial Railway. The Intercolonial Railway has a branch down to the wharf. At the present time there is no accommodation for the vessels coming there and we have to first load the lumber on barges and tow these barges quite a distance from the shore in order to load the vessels. As soon as they have accommodation the vessels can come alongside the wharf, which will save time and money and increase the traffic at Rivière du Loup to a large extent.

Mr. GOURLEY. What depth of water is there at the present time ?

Mr. GAUVREAU. About six or eight feet.

Mr. GOURLEY. What depth will there be when the improvements are made ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are supposed to give twenty-five feet.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Every hon. member who goes to and from the maritime provinces via the Intercolonial Railway knows that Rivière du Loup is a very important point. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works rather misled me about it, as in the estimate he gives the first half of the name in English and the second half in French, and on behalf of my friends from the province of Quebec, I am going to object to that. I would like to know whether or not the lumber trade is likely to increase ? Are there limits there to supply that trade for a great many years to come ; is it a trade that will develop ? If it is, I think this expenditure would be amply justified.

Mr. GAUVREAU. A large area of timber limits will be developed by this accommodation, and if we had time to look over the report made last year by the board of trade of Rivière du Loup, we would see that it is anticipated that 40,000,000 or 50,000,000 feet of lumber will be exported from this same port.

Mr. GOURLEY. Why is the word 'Fraserville' inserted in the item ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is really the same thing. Fraserville is the name under which the old parish and Rivière du Loup had been incorporated. Rivière du Loup is now a town and the name 'Fraserville' is taken from the old seigneurs who were named Fraser and who were descendants of Colonel Fraser, who was a well-known Hudson bay man in our country.

Sacré-Coeur—wharf, $1,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in the district of Chicoutimi and Saguenay.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is it a new wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is for a new wharf 210 feet long and 25 feet wide. The intention was to get out the

timber this winter and the total cost of this work when completed will be $8,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the population ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not the population, but it is in the district of Chicoutimi and Saguenay, which is being settled very fast. There has been a cheese factory erected there, and there is considerable business. The people now have to team their produce to Tadousac over a very bad road.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is this work to be let by tender and public advertisement ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Shegawake—harbour improvements, $4,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the nature of these improvements ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Bonaventure, and we have had a petition from the inhabitants. It is undertaken on the report of the resident engineer who reports that a small wharf there would cost $7,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. This $4,000 is a vote on account.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). This is situated in the township of Hope, which has a population of 2,411. This township runs along the Baie des Chaleurs for fifteen miles, and the people have no accommodation of any kind in the shape of a landing pier at which to do their business.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the nature of the business ?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). It is a general lumbering, farming and fishing business, and Shegawake is the most important settlement in that township. It is largely populated by the descendants of United Empire Loyalists.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is a wonder they didn't build a wharf themselves long ago.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). The only wharf in that locality is Port Daniel, ten miles east, or New Carlisle, twenty miles to the west.

Seven Islands—wharf, $25,000.

Mr. RICHARDSON. What is that for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to make provision for the construction of a deepwater pier on the west side of Bay of Seven Islands. The pier will run out in a northerly direction, nearly at right angles to the shore, and it will have a total length of 1,325 feet, reaching a depth of 48 feet at low water spring tide. The estimated cost is $65,000. The reason for the work is that there is a most important development going on at that place, and there are now large pulp mills in that district which was up to a year or so ago almost unknown.

Mr. GOURLEY. Where is it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Opposite the west side of Anticosti Island, almost due north.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have been led to understand that this property is entirely in the hands of a private corporation which has monopolized the whole business, and that they alone will be benefited by the expenditure of this money. A full explanation is necessary, as to how the public interest will be served by this expenditure.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I know something of the Bay of Seven Islands, and of this wharf—partly built by a private company. The deputy minister has just informed me that this bay is six miles long and two and a half miles wide, but it looked to me even more extensive than that, when I was there. The north shore of the St. Lawrence in this locality is now experiencing a wonderful development. As we know, our pine timber in Quebec has practically become exhausted, and our spruce limits are now being exploited. There are no spruce limits in Canada equal to those of the Lower St. Lawrence and the Gaspé peninsula.

Mr. GOURLEY. Nova Scotia comes first.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I will let my hon. friend have his opinion as regards that, but we will still retain ours. There is no objection to a man standing up for his own province. There is only one place suitable for trans-Atlantic shipment from Tadousac down to the Bay of Seven Islands.

Mr. GOURLEY. Where is it ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is a place which is very well known to the people of the province of Quebec, and which is fast becoming known all over Canada. It is immediately at the entrance to the gulf, opposite Anticosti.

Mr. LEMIEUX. They are building a railway there now.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I was going to refer to that. There are very extensive establishments now at the Bay of Seven Islands, but there is no shipping point in the whole of that district. Nature has done more than human ingenuity could possibly devise, to make the Bay of Seven Islands a splendid harbour, and with a comparatively small outlay it can be made perfect for shipping purposes. The entrance is from the west ; it is protected from easterly gales so that it affords perfect accommodation for shipping. The harbour is absolutely landlocked. I do not think I need say more, than that the people who have gone in there

have sufficient confidence in the future of the place, to invest over a million dollars in the erection of important pulp works. When my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Richardson) says that only one private company will be benefited, I have no doubt he has in mind the Seven Islands Pulp Company, of which Messrs. Meaney and Clarke of New York and Toronto, are the chief shareholders. But in addition to that there are the Boyds, who I think come from Bobcaygeon, Ont., and who have large limits in the neighbourhood, and they, to my knowledge own a portion of this bay. I may say that they have applied for a charter for a railway to connect their limits with the Bay of Seven Islands, and in order to accommodate this locality, it is absolutely necessary that we should make this expenditure.

Mr. GOURLEY. The limits are on the north side ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, all on the north side. There are very important rivers there, with very important water-powers. I would ask my hon. friends simply to look at the map and realize that the whole of the north shore of the St. Lawrence from Tadousac down to Labrador is without a single harbour. As they know, the island of Anticosti has for many years borne the name of the graveyard of the St. Lawrence, so numerous have been the wrecks in the neighbourhood of that island. If a vessel is wrecked on the lower St. Lawrence, there is nothing to be done but to take her to Quebec or to Halifax. It is of the greatest importance to the navigation of the St. Lawrence that there should be a port in the Bay of Seven Islands, which would be a place of refuge for the vessels, and where they could be repaired. It would be in the public interest to have a wrecking plant and a dry-dock there. It is really more central than Quebec, where there is a wrecking plant now. When a vessel gets aground, it is of the utmost importance that she should be taken off at the earliest possible moment, so as to be saved the consequences of the terrible battering she would get if a storm came on. If a vessel happens to be stranded and is allowed to remain on the rocks for a week, and one of those terrific storms which we have down there comes on, she will, as the saying is, practically pound the bottom out of herself. This place is not in my constituency, but is in the constituency of my hon. friend (Mr. Girard); but it is the only point on the lower St. Lawrence where there is a harbour, and it is important that we should have at that central point conveniences for enabling us to go to the help of vessels which may be wrecked in the locality. This work is not for the benefit of one firm only. All those American firms which come in there for the purpose of exploiting our spruce limits will use this port as a port of shipment. How can you ship pulp from the lower St. Lawrence if you cannot get vessels into a harbour whence it can be shipped ? You have to put it on lighters and send it to some harbour elsewhere; and you cannot ship it in stormy weather at all. If you look at the map, you will see that from the entrance to the harbour of the Bay of Seven Islands there is an absolutely straight line to the other side of the ocean, with nothing intervening; and this port is equally convenient if you want to ship the products south to the United States. So that it has all the natural advantages that a port should have. You cannot expect to have any great agricultural development on the lower St. Lawrence. You may have some mineral development in the future; but there is nothing that I know of in the immediate future except the development of pulp and lumber, and the only harbour from which these can be shipped is the Bay of Seven Islands.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the distance from there to Quebec ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It must be 300 miles.

Mr. GOURLEY. I concur in the view that all these harbours in the St. Lawrence river should be thoroughly exploited. Our whole sea-coast has, in fact, been sadly neglected. But there is a suspicion over here that this is done for the benefit of some private company.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not deny that there is one private company, the Seven Islands Company, that is going to benefit very largely. But it will not be benefited to any greater extent than other companies which are in the course of development.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Two years ago I do not suppose there was any person living at that point, while now there are 300 families; and the general development will go on.

Mr. GOURLEY. I am not concerned about the country not being an agricultural country. The poorest country in the world is an agricultural country, while the country that turns out to be the most valuable is the rocky country. There are parts of Nova Scotia where there is nothing but rock, but it is full of gold. If this is an honest vote for the purpose of serving the trade of the country and promoting its development, then it is desirable; but we do not want any of the public money of this country to be exploited for the benefit of private associations or people with a political pull. The great danger of Canada is that our public money, instead of being used for the benefit of the country, should be pulled away for political purposes; and that must have been the case in the past, for the enormous sums of money we have voted in the last twenty years ought to have given us many navigation facilities; yet, so far as

Nova Scotia is concerned, we have scarcely begun to get our seaports into proper condition.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friends from Ontario know the Boyds, of Bobcaygeon, as one of the largest and most respectable firms in that province; and they know that they are not political partisans of ours.

Mr. SPROULE. I know the Mossom, Boyd firm, and I know that, like all other firms of lumbermen, they are quite willing that the government should spend money for their needs in any part of the country. It may be that a harbour of refuge is required at this point. If so, that would be a strong argument for spending the money. But if it is only for the purpose of helping one, two or even three firms that have made investments there in pulp or timber, then I do not think it is altogether defensible. We have a great many men engaged in that line of business in Ontario, and it is a very rare occasion when they apply to the government for a harbour or a dock to enable them to carry on their business. If the hon. Minister of Justice will go along Georgian bay and the Manitoulin islands, he can count the docks by the dozen which have been built by lumbermen for their own needs and in very few instances did they get any aid from the government. Years ago I applied on behalf of some of these to get a small expenditure made, and I was told that it was not the object of the government, nor did they intend to make expenditure for the purpose of helping private individuals. In cases where there is a harbour or a large town, and where considerable business is done by water, the government may consider themselves justified in spending public money in the general interests, but not for the purpose of helping some one to get out timber who had acquired large lumber limits in the district. There is one instance down here in Quebec, Grand river, where there was an expenditure made for no other purpose than to help a lumbering firm which had acquired timber limits there. After the timber is gone, after the pulp wood has disappeared, what will become of this harbour?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I look upon this particular item as of vital importance. We should develop as much as we can industries in the lower St. Lawrence. The harbour of refuge is the first consideration, and this is the only natural harbour on the whole of that coast.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the water very deep?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, you can float any vessel in it. The deputy minister says it is fifty feet deep. I have gone in there on the 'King Edward,' which is not a very large boat, but it looked like a small sail boat when we got within the harbour. As a harbour of refuge it is an ideal place. The industry established at that place is not an ordinary saw-mill, but a manufactory of pulp, and it seems to me most desirable that we should encourage people to come in and manufacture pulp in our own country. In order to get them to do that, we must provide them with shipping facilities.

Mr. VROOMAN. After listening to the explanation of the hon. Ministetr of Justice, I am convinced that this vote will do considerable good. The firm mentioned are constituents of mine, and are men of very considerable repute.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Supporters of yours?

Mr. VROOMAN. Yes, and this assistance which is given to a large industry is one that should commend itself to the House, more particulalrly as it will also operate to the advantage of shipping by providing a safe harbour of refuge.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) was evidently mistaken when he spoke of Grand river as being a place where some public money has been wasted. I presume that he alluded to Grande Vallée, in the county of Gaspé. In Grand river there is only an expenditure of $800 provided in the estimates. But regarding Grande Vallée, I may tell my hon. friend that he is completely in error. The money spent there will be well spent. It is the only harbour on that side of the coast, and I may tell him further that I had no political advantage to gain by this expenditure, because there are no voters of mine there. Although there is a population of 800, these people do not vote, because they are not erected into a municipality.

Mr. SPROULE. I know nothing about that; but I know that at Grande Vallée, the government did not own a foot of land, and had to buy the road to the wharf. There is no settlement there, no village, no shipping interests. But there is a firm which has large timber limits there and which wanted this expenditure to be done for its own purposes. Go to the Manitoulin islands, where there are large limits; go to Providence bay or to Michael's bay, and take the other bays along the coast where large firms are carring on their operations, and not a dollar of public money has been expended to enable them to carry on their business. But at Grande Vallée we find the very reverse. We find the public money expended there for no other purpose than to enable private individuals to prosecute their own enterprises. So far as the present vote is concerned, if this is a suitable harbour of refuge, it is justifiable in my opinion to spend money in order to improve it, and if there are great industries there, that will be additional reasons, but what we desire on this side is information which will justify us for voting this money.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that a company have gone in there to exploit this pulp wood industry and the government is making a grant to them, and to that extent adding value to their property—adding much more value than probably the Minister of Finance understood. The need for a harbour of refuge existed before this company came there, but it was not until this company came to exploit this business that this need for a harbour of refuge began to be felt, and we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that in the estimates the government are making a handsome grant to private enterprise.

Sabrevois wharf—improvements, $1,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I notice last year that there was expenditure to complete this wharf for $898. How is it we have another vote this year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is on the report of the engineer, and in a great many of these cases we thought that a certain amount would complete the works. Seven thousand five hundred dollars have been spent on this work already. Where there are large public works, there will be something for repairs from time to time, but wherever work is going on, I am most anxious that we should know exactly the amount. My desire is to change the system so as to inform the committee of the exact amount.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Of course, the engineer could make an estimate showing practically just what the repairs would cost when the expenditure is only about $1,000. I suppose there is only one wharf there, and I suppose that the expenditure of a year ago was made on an estimate showing what it would cost to put the wharf in good repair. The Auditor General's Report shows that the expenditure was $998.07 to complete the work. But now again we are asked for a similar amount. The minister will find about the same with regard to these other small wharfs in this list.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is mainly for a stone embankment to protect the work.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why was this not included in the first place ? It appears to me there is a good deal of force in what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Reid, Grenville) has said. This way of spending money is very misleading to the committee. Last year we voted money supposing that it was all that was required to complete this work. This year we find a call for a further appropriation. To say the least of it, it looks a little suspicious. I suppose the minister acts upon the advice of his engineer, but why should the engineer report in this way? If there is any explanation for making these expenditures in this fashion, we should have it. I am sure that you, Mr. Chairman (Mr. Macdonald), remember how, in years gone by, when the party I support was in power, we heard it often said that the government was spending the people's money to buy the constituencies. I suppose the Minister of Public Works remembers that also. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), I am sure, remembers it well. If the late government spent the money to buy up the constituencies, what is this government doing ?

Mr. GOURLEY. The Minister of Trade and Commerce does not hear you.

Mr. COCHRANE. Oh, yes he does. He cannot stay in the House long at a time discussing these estimates, and I attribute that to the fact that they remind him of the days gone by, when he used to harass the Conservative government.

Mr. GOURLEY. Get the Prime Minister to work him up.

Mr. COCHRANE. No ; I am not speaking in that way at all. I do not want to harass the Minister of Trade and Commerce or the Prime Minister. I know that in their sober moments——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. COCHRANE. I am sorry that hon. members on this side of the House take it so lightly. For my part, I take it very seriously. I feel very much as the Minister of Trade and Commerce felt, no doubt, when he sympathized with the farmers, and said that under an expenditure of $35,000,000 they were being bled white. I would like to hear from the hon. gentleman what the complexion of the farmers is now, when we are voting between $80,000,000 and $100,000,000 for one year. And I do not understand how you can be so pleasant about this matter, Mr. Chairman. But I can understand why you say 'carried' so quickly over every item. These things must harass your mind, and you do not want to think of how the money is being squandered. When hon. gentlemen opposite used to charge the government that I support with spending the people's money to buy up the constituencies, I sometimes really thought that they believed there was something in it. But now I see that they must have known that it was a statement made to mislead the public, for we see them supporting a government that has far more than doubled the expenditure. We find one hon. gentleman opposite, one who has attained a venerable age, who gets more money spent in his constituency than any other member in Nova Scotia. I would urge the Prime Minister to consider the result of this lavish expenditure of the public money. If it goes on, the government will have to borrow to meet the obligations they are entering into this year. I wish the Minister of Public Works would tell us what he means when

he speaks of the report of the engineer. The engineer does not go to a place of his own volition. He goes because he is sent. And, no doubt, he goes with instructions that certain things are to be done and he is to report on them. I wish to repeat what I have said time and again. Neither I nor any other member from Ontario will object to public expenditure on the ground that it is not in our own province. I do not care where the money is spent, so long as it is spent in the best interest of the Dominion as a whole. But I do not think that we are being justly dealt by when wharfs are being built, not only on the Atlantic coast—where, I suppose, there would be a good claim for them—but on every little river in the maritime provinces and in the province of Quebec. We think we have a right to complain when in a riding like mine, facing on Lake Ontario, which is often boisterous, there are six or seven wharfs, and not a single dollar of public money has been spent on any of them. Why, the government is spending $10,000 to supplement the expenditure of a wharf built by a private company. I can understand that the Dominion government is bound to keep in repair wharfs taken over at the time of confederation, but I say, and no fair-minded man will contradict me, that if these new wharfs are to be built, the people I represent have as good a claim upon the Dominion exchequer for expenditure upon their wharfs as have the residents along the rivers in the maritime provinces and Quebec.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I see that nearly all the other items following this are in the same position as this one—Sorel, Ste. Anne du Saguenay, Ste. Geneviève piers and others. If you turn up the Auditor General's Report, you will find that on these same works small amounts were spent last year, stated to be for the completion of repairs. I cannot believe that in each and every one of these cases the engineer would make the mistake of estimating just about half what the repairs would cost. It looks as if this was merely an annual expenditure in some of these constituencies.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not believe the member for the constituency ever knew this vote was to be asked. It is simply recommended by the department, in accordance with the report of the resident engineer, to complete this work.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Last year we voted $1,000 to repair the wharf, and we were told that would be sufficient. This year we are asked for a similar amount. In looking up the Auditor General's Report I see that planking and iron and everything else was purchased for that work. Where the amount is so small we have a right to expect that the department will make a closer estimate. In every case, the repairs should be completely finished by the first vote where the amount is so small.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think there must be something wrong in the engineer's department. I do not see how he could have reported last year that the vote was needed to complete the work, and then make a report this year that the amount was too small, though it is not small in comparison with the amount of work done there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The only answer I have to make is that last year I had not sufficient money to complete the work.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then, how do these improvements become necessary?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are a continuation of the same work. We are raising the structure.

Ste. Anne du Saguenay wharf—improvements, $1,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The purpose of this vote is to substitute a movable slip for the present stairway, which can only be used half the time. This wharf is right opposite Chicoutimi, on the Saguenay.

Ste. Anne de la Pérade—repairs to river bank protection works, $3,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to protect a portion of the bank of the river against further erosions from the action of the water.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This protection was put on the shore of the Ste. Anne river after that terrible disaster that occurred a few years ago, by which the channel of the river was altered and the river rose to such an extent that it practically carried away the shore at this particular place. It is quite close to the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge, and any one who passes along on the Canadian Pacific Railway can see the situation. In a little more time the action of the river would carry away a part of the shore at that place. This is a navigable river, and is therefore under the control of the Dominion parliament.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is the Ste. Anne river navigable?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, at the point where this occurs. I am speaking of Ste. Anne above Quebec.

Mr. FOWLER. Should not the province of Quebec look after this work?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The province of Quebec has no control over it. It is where the Ste. Anne enters the River St. Lawrence. It is practically a basin of the Ste. Anne river.

Ste. Famille—extension of pier, $4,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This pier will be 60 by 60 feet and 30 feet high. It is in the county of Montmorency.

This is estimated to be the total cost of the work. It is an extension to deeper water.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This is on the Island of Orleans, below Quebec.

Mr. LANCASTER. Has this been done by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer tells me this will be under the supervision of the local engineer there.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why is it not done by contract ? An extension is not like repairing. I can quite understand why repairing might be done by the engineer, but the extension is new work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If, as my hon. friend says, it is an additional work and specifications can be drawn and contracts let, I would very much rather do it that way.

Ste. Anne de la Pocatière—reconstruction of pier destroyed by ice shoves, $5,400.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to restore the pier which was destroyed by the ice almost entirely. This vote will cover the total amount of the cost.

Ste. Anne de Sorel—repairs to ice piers, $3,800.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These are repairs to the resistance works or ice piers made on the report of the engineer, and are being done under his direction.

Mr. FOWLER. Where are they situated in relation to Sorel ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Just below Sorel on the St. Lawrence river.

Mr. FOWLER. It is near Sorel ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, quite near Sorel on the St. Lawrence river.

St. Alphonse—Baie des Ha ! Ha !—repairs to wharf, additional amount required, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for general repairs to the wharf which has been found to be in a deficient state of repair. It is principally for sheeting and planking. There was an appropriation for 1902-3 of $1,500, and this amount is required in addition to that, the total amount of the repairs being $3,500.

St. Godefroi de Nouvelle—breakwater, $6,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is an entirely new work. It makes provision for a breakwater of cribwork, 700 feet long and 18 feet wide.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is it in Bonaventure ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, it is in Bonaventure ; the total estimated cost of the work when finished is $22,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Is this at the mouth of the Nouvelle river ?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). I may say that the citizens of the whole township who are mostly fishermen, have asked for this work. They sent in a large petition at the head of which appeared the name of the Rev. Mr. Léonard, parish priest, an uncle of Mr. Léonard, the hon. member for Laval, and that reverend gentleman asked me to secure the support of that hon. gentleman in regard to this vote. I regret that the hon. gentleman is not at present in the House. This is situated in the township of Hope, in which there is a population of about 2,400. There are in that place probably 100 fishermen with absolutely no protection. Their only protection is in the Nouvelle river, but that is now almost filled up with sand, so the parish have asked to have this breakwater built one-half mile east of the Nouvelle river. The work is not an expensive one, and it is badly needed by the fishermen who have no protection. This reverend gentleman, Mr. Léonard, mentioned to me the case of three fishermen who had to spend a whole night in open water during a storm, because, having no protection whatever, they were unable to land.

Mr. FOWLER. Are there any fishing vessels beyond small boats ?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). They are all small boats.

Mr. FOWLER. Would it seem to be necessary to build so extensive and expensive a work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It appears from the report of the engineer that owing to the formation of the coast, they have to go out a considerable distance, and the work has to be substantially done, so that it will not wash away with the storms.

Mr. FOWLER. If it is only a shelter for small vessels, I do not see why it is necessary to have it of such great length. I can see that it may be necessary to have it very substantially built.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). There is an attendance at the church at St. Godefroi of about 1,200 or 1,400 people. The province of Quebec are opening up townships in the rear of this settlement, and the population is bound to increase. It increased 50 per cent during the last census decade. There is no wharf there now. They have to go out to the open sea in open boats to meet the passing steamers, and they have no way of landing boats or shipping lumber ; in fact there is nothing but what nature has put there. It is hoped that this breakwater will serve the purpose of a landing wharf, where a boat can call, as well as a protection to small boats.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. One hon. gentleman asked why it was necessary to go out so far. I think that even with this length of breakwater there will be only between five and six feet of water.

St. Gédéon Islands—wharf, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to make provision for improvements at St. Gédéon, which is near Chicoutimi, in the district of Saguenay and Chicoutimi The total cost is $6,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is it proposed to do this by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Was there a petition for this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think the petition was addressed to the hon. member for that locality (Mr. Girard), and by him forwarded to the department. I see that it was prayed for by the inhabitants. There were three petitions during 1902, and two during 1903, altogether five petitions from the locality.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to ask the minister if there are any districts in Canada from which the government have received petitions to which they have not given heed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sorry to say that there are a great number. In fact I have stated, and I state now that nearly all of these works are being undertaken on the reports of the engineers of the department in places where they were found to be most urgently needed

St. Fulgence wharf, $1,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. Where is this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in the district of Chicoutimi and Saugenay. The total cost will be $6,000.

Mr. FOWLER. How far away from the other wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Seventy miles.

Mr. FOWLER. This has been petitioned for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

St. Maurice river—dam at Grand Piles, $10,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the explanation of this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for the construction of a dam 940 feet long at the head of Grand Piles Falls. A large deputation from the district waited upon me, and I had an investigation made by our engineer, and we came to the conclusion that by building this dam we would avoid a large expenditure for dredging, and that the cost of maintenance of booms, &c., might be reduced at least $20,000 a year. The total cost of this work will be about $65,000. If the engineer is right in saying that this dam will save the necessity for dredging, and will reduce the cost of maintenance $20,000 a year it will be one of the best investments we have made for a long time.

Mr. FOWLER. Why should this government maintain these booms ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. For bringing down logs and for the navigation of the river.

Mr. FOWLER. The government are not bringing down logs.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, but we have expended over $1,500,000 on these works.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you get any revenue ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We get a revenue of $29,000, which is considerable, but which is nothing in comparison with the cost of the works.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not see why the government should object so strongly to government ownership of railways, when they go in for the government ownership of lumber slides. They seem to be very cheerful about voting large sums of money for this purpose.

St. Andre de Kamouraska—extension of pier and additional repairs, $3,700.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to repair damage done by the ice in the spring of 1903, and for the construction of an addition to the pier.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it to be done by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, it would be done under the supervision of the local engineer.

Mr. FOWLER. What steamers call there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am told that it is principally for schooners.

Mr. FOWLER. Are they building schooners to draw a greater depth of water than formerly ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The explanation is that at present they can only come in at high tide and with an extension of 75 feet they can get in at low tide.

Mr. COCHRANE. What are we to understand by the 'local engineer.' These wharfs are 100 miles apart, and we are always told that they will be repaired under the direction of the local engineer. Are we to understand that there is an engineer in every one of these places ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I should perhaps have said the resident en-

gineer. There is a resident engineer of the department who lives at a central point, and who has supervision over the work in the district. For instance, we have four engineers who reside at Toronto, but they are in charge of the works in different districts of Ontario.

Mr. COCHRANE. I suppose it is another job like the one we discussed this session; where you have a foreman, and a deputy foreman, and a man to buy material, and about as many officials as you have workmen. These works should not be done by the resident engineer when that can be avoided. There are always a lot of men employed who get large salaries and do very little work. I fancy that the same thing takes place wherever work is done under that rule. Instead of letting a contract for the timber, of which an engineer ought to know how much he wants and have it got out in winter, we generally have a man to buy timber on commission, a superintendent, a deputy superintendent and a lot of other men putting in their time and drawing a large amount of money, and not doing much work for their pay.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Generally speaking, we are endeavouring as much as possible to let these works by contract. When the engineers do the work, very often a foreman has to be put on, and sometimes better value is obtained in that way than by doing it by contract. But I agree with the hon. gentleman as to the general policy, and we are doing as much work by contract as possible.

St. Fidele—wharf, $4,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Charlevoix county. It is for the construction of a wharf for general landing and shipping purposes. It is a new work. The estimated cost is $10,000. It will be let by contract.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is there not a private wharf near there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

St. Simeon wharf—extension, $4,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for the purpose of connecting the present block with the shore, so that boats can land.

Mr. FOWLER. Why do you build a block at a distance from the shore?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The water is shallow for a long distance from the shore, and a block is built which serves to accommodate the people. A steamer can tie up at the block, and the people can take their goods to and from it in small boats.

Mr. FOWLER. Has the business increased ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is the statement. I have not the statistics here.

Mr. FOWLER. Have you the petition there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to me that we ought to have some information about this. For some years the people seem to have got along very well with this block system. Now my hon. friend proposes to connect the block with the land, and he should give some reason for it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The reason we have these blocks is to provide accommodation without a large expenditure of money. Even if there were no increase of business, I think it would be perfectly justifiable to spend this reasonable sum of money in so important a section of the country to connect the block with the land, so that the people will not have to row out in their boats.

Mr. FOWLER. That would be a good argument if there were not so many applications for wharfs where there is now no accommodation at all. These expenditures can only be justified on one of two grounds —either that there has been or that there will be a large increase of business.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This block was built in 1889, and the people have been petitioning and complaining ever since.

Mr. FOWLER. This is on the principle that if you give them an inch they will take an ell. The minister has not given us either of the reasons I have mentioned to justify this expenditure.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My information is that there has been an increase of trade; but even if there had not been, I think we would be justified in providing this accommodation.

Mr. FOWLER. But in order to do so you have to deprive others who have no accommodation at all, while these people are partially accommodated.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think we are doing pretty well.

Ste. Michel de Bellechasse—repairs to pier, $2,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This block was sinking, and the vote is taken on the report of the engineer to protect our work. The total cost of the work will be $2,500.

Mr. FOWLER. Was there a petition for this, and was each of the names on it certified ?

St. Jean des Chaillons—wharf, $6,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is this a new work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for the construction of a wharf about three-eighths of a mile below the present ferry wharf. The Lotbinière and Megantic Railway has a terminal there.

Mr. LANCASTER. You are evidently making a terminus for a railway.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total cost is $28,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. For the benefit of this railway ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is the only point where a deep water wharf can be built on that section of the St. Lawrence. It is a terminus of a railway and there is a large trade being done there.

Mr. FOWLER. But you have a steamer wharf within three-eighths of a mile, at the end of which there must be deep water.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that that ferry wharf is owned by a private party and does not meet the requirements of the shipping and the railway.

Mr. FOWLER. Why should not the railway look after its own requirements ? There is a wharf within three-eighths of a mile, which is a public wharf owned by private parties, if that wharf is not good enough, the railway ought to build its own wharf. Is this new work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. The ferry only draws six feet of water, and this is for the purpose of giving fourteen feet of water at this point.

Mr. FOWLER. The Grand Trunk Pacific is supposed to supply its own terminal facilities. Why should not this railway ? Between what points does it run ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. From Lyster it extends down to the shores of the St. Lawrence. It was formerly known as the King road, and was practically built for the purpose of enabling the King Brothers to exploit their large timber limits. The intention is to build this wharf in order to enable the people in that locality to have communication with Quebec and Montreal. It will serve practically four large parishes. There are very large brick yards there from which the city of Quebec gets practically its whole supply. In addition there is a large mill at that point. Comparisons have been frequently made, with reference to these wharfs, between Quebec and the other provinces, but let me say that to a very large extent the parishes on the river St. Lawrence are deprived entirely of railway communication. Take the parishes in question. With the exception of that little road which runs back a few miles to Lyster, they are about forty miles from the line of railway, and the river front is the most thickly settled part of our country. The people have to depend absolutely on the river for communication. These people are not asking for much assistance in the way of railway subsidies, and in this locality we have all these parishes absolutely helpless for communication except by water.

Mr. FOWLER. We have parishes along the St. John river without railway communication, and depending entirely upon the river to carry their products to market. They have no wharfs built by this government. In some places, I believe, the government has contributed a portion of the cost, the balance being made up by the provincial government. Now, I contend that New Brunswick should be treated in the same way as Quebec, where, as in this case, the circumstances are exactly the same.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know that my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) can compare the two rivers. However, both are important. My recollection is that the Dominion has contributed to a great many wharfs along the St. John. I think I put through a vote this year myself to assist the building of a wharf on that river. I think the people on the St. John are better accommodated than those on the St. Lawrence.

Mr. FOWLER. Since the present Minister of Public Works came into office there have been no contributions by the Dominion to wharfs on the St. John. Well, there may have been one. As to comparing the two rivers, I think there will be the same trade on one as on the other.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This part of the St. Lawrence is the most thickly populated part of our province and the most prosperous from an agricultural point of view. And the river is absolutely the only outlet for the trade, unless the people go forty miles back to the railway.

Mr. FOWLER. Who owns the railway now ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not know. After James King died it passed into other hands.

Mr. FOWLER. Does it not belong to the Grand Trunk ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, that runs farther back.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does not the hon. minister think that, as the railway is as much interested as anybody in having the wharf there, they should contribute to the cost ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The railway, apparently is very little interested. They regard the competition by water as very serious. If the products of that country could not be exported by water the rate charged by the railway would be prohibitive. The brick yards would then be dependent exclusively on the road. The hon. gentleman can see what the rates would be running over this road to Lyster and on to Montreal or Quebec.

Mr. LANCASTER. The road must have been built for some purpose, and no doubt, it was to tranship the lumber. The government, in making this expenditure will benefit the railway. Of course, others will get benefit from it also, but it is to the special benefit of the railway to have a wharf there. Surely the railway ought to pay a part of the expense.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think the railway company will look upon this as a detriment to them, because it will relieve the people of the locality from the monopoly which the railway would have but for the means provided to use the water transportation. If there is no wharf there, the people are at the mercy of the railway.

Mr. COCHRANE. Unless I misunderstood the Minister of Public Works there is a wharf there about three-quarters of a mile away.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is no good, and never can be made of use.

Mr. COCHRANE. I am a little bit afraid that, if it were not for the government proposing to make this expenditure, the present wharf would be considered very good.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) simply wants to learn the facts as they are.

Mr. COCHRANE. Let me state my case—

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I want to say just one word. We on the St. Lawrence are in an unfortunate position because of the rise and fall of the tide. We have these shoals stretching far out from the shore, so that it is difficult to make wharfs. There is a wharf there built by Mr. King, but it is practically useless and cannot be made useful at any reasonable expense.

Mr. COCHRANE. I understood that the wharf was not a deep-water wharf. But the minister said the principal industry was the manufacture of brick. I do not think the Minister of Justice will say that it would require a deep-water wharf to ship brick, because, I am satisfied those brick would be carried in barges. Here in Ottawa during the present session I have seen them again and again unloading brick from barges. Let me draw the minister's attention to the case of another wharf which I have in mind. The Central Ontario Railway runs back into the country, in Hastings county, and when a terminal wharf was wanted for that road the company built it at their own expense. I am satisfied that the brick will be carried in barges and not in steamers. Is not that correct ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. COCHRANE. I sympathize with the people there, if they are without facilities to ship their products, and, I am willing to give my vote for the expenditure of public money to provide these facilities where necessary. But I do not want to vote money to build a deep-water wharf for the accommodation of an industry if there is a wharf already there at which the products can be shipped.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would point out to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cochrane) that we are spending a good deal of money in the province of Ontario to help to provide terminals for railways.

Mr. TAYLOR. In the absence of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Calvin) I wish to make one more appeal to the hon. minister on behalf of the residents of Wolfe Island and Howe Island. There we have two municipalities situated at the foot of Lake Ontario. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) knows all about them and can verify all I say. These two municipalities include a large population, yet the people have no opportunity to leave the island except by ferry, and I do not think the government have ever spent a dollar in building or maintaining a wharf in either of them. I think it quite time the Minister of Public Works should look into this matter, and I trust he will send his engineer to inquire, and that next year we shall find a sum in the estmates for a wharf there. I think that Ontario is entitled to something and the inhabitants of these islands should receive attention.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Is this where we are doing the dredging ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will take a note of it and have the inquiry made.

Yamaska lock—dredging below lock, $8,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This estimate is asked for by the resident engineer, for dredging the River Yamaska below the Yamaska locks, to a depth of six feet. This river takes its rise in the county of Brome, and after a course of about 90 miles, empties into the St. Lawrence eight miles above the town of Sorel. It is a navigable river.

Department of Public Works—to provide for arrears of salary due to the chief architect, November 1, 1897 to June 30, 1903, at $3,200 per annum, together with $200 short-estimated in his salary for 1903-4, $1,333.33.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to pay arrears of salary due to the chief architect between the dates mentioned. The chief architect, Mr. Ewart, has been employed in the department since 1871. On the superannuation of Mr. Fuller he was appointed to the position at a salary of $3,200 per year, but he was never paid the full amount of his salary up to the present year.

Mr. FOWLER. Why.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know why. It has been going on, and never was made right. This is to pay the balance due him.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not usual for men to let their salaries remain unpaid like that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This gentleman is one of those peculiar men who do not look carefully after their own interests, for he did let it lie all these years. He is entitled to it as a matter of law, and he never got his increase. He is a very fine old gentleman.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the hon. gentleman think it is a sign that he is a very good servant if he does not look after his own interests better than that?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It means that he was looking after public business more carefully than after his own.

Mr. SPROULE. To say that he has been neglecting for six years to draw $200 a year coming to him is more than I can understand. It is strange that the department knew nothing about it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say that. I said that as a matter of fact he only drew $3,000 a year, whereas he was entitled to $3,200 a year from the time he was appointed chief architect up to date.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am afraid he is not a very good architect of his own fortunes.

Mr. SPROULE. It is so extraordinary that one can scarcely consider it with patience. It looks so absurd that a man should allow this to be going on for six years and did not know enough to ask for it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not say that he did not know it. All I can say is that, as a matter of fact, the books show that he never drew his full salary.

Mr. FOWLER. I think his action is highly commendable. It strikes me you ought to pay him interest on the arrears that he has allowed to accumulate.

Mr. FRASER. He ought to suffer the loss of interest for his mistake.

Department of Public Works—salaries—to promote Mr. J. B. Hunter to a first-class clerkship notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $300.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Hunter is private secretary to the minister, and has proved a very hardworking, capable man, as every person admits. His present salary is $1,100.

Mr. FOWLER. How many private secretaries has the minister?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sorry to say I have only one.

Mr. FOWLER. I must commiserate the minister if he has only one secretary. Evidently he is more modest than the Minister of Inland Revenue, who, I believe, has now three and an assistant.

Mr. COCHRANE. What has been done with the others?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will have a private conference with the hon. gentleman if he wants to know further.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No. 146, the Yukon.

Mr. SPROULE. We want to know what the salaries are before that is called.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend will see that from the increased amount of work done in the department there must necessarily be a greatly increased expenditure for printing. All these specifications have to be printed; this is not for newspapers.

Mr. FOWLER. I understood the hon. gentleman to refer to newspapers.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The subscriptions to newspapers have not increased. I understood my hon. friend to ask what had increased, and I was giving the principal items of increase. Printing, stationery and telegraph charges have increased owing to the increased number of works, and the greater number of men in the employment of the department.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will have to ask this other Yukon item to stand; the hon. leader of the opposition is not present, and he will have something to say on this question. My hon. friend behind me will also have a statement that he will have to make either now or on concurrence, and I think it would be well to have the item stand.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend has made out a rather bad case, for I would rather put this through when these gentlemen are away. While I was anxious to get through, I must say that the opposition have treated me with a great deal of courtesy, and at their request I shall certainly allow the item to stand.

Some resolutions reported.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) moved that the House again go into Committee of supply.

Mr. SPROULE. Owing to the absence of some members who wish to discuss the matter, the motion which it was intended

to move from this side of the House, will not be moved until a later date.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee.

To provide for a grant to the Toronto Industrial Exhibition Association, to assist in the holding of a National Canadian Exhibition, in Toronto during the present year, 1903, $50,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Was not this amount voted last year ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. It was agreed to by the government at an early period of the session, that it would be put into the supplementary estimates.

Mr. SPROULE. Was it not decided last year to give this money ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, but there was never any vote taken for it. The exhibition took place within this fiscal year.

Mr. SPROULE. Were there any conditions attached to this vote ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, the Order in Council explains the conditions. This is a letter which was written to the exhibition authorities under date of March 31st :

I have the honour by direction of the acting minister to inform you that an Order in Council has been passed, granting an amount to the Toronto Industrial Exhibition to assist in the holding of an all-Canadian exhibition in Toronto during the present year; such grant to be applied to the following purposes; first, to equalize freight rates for exhibitors. Second, special and extraordinary prizes. Third, advertising outside the province of Ontario. Fourth, the cause of securing and maintaining an educational exhibit, and fifth, the increased cost in the management.

After the exhibition, I wrote to the authorities and asked them to give me some information as to the manner in which they had arranged to apply this money. I received the following details from Mr. Orr, manager and secretary of the exhibition company :

The estimate under the headings named which was given to the government at the time the application was made will be approximately correct and is as follows :

Equalization of freight rates for exhibitors $15,000 ; special and extraordinary prizes, $14,000; advertising outside Ontario, $9,000 ; securing and maintaining educational exhibits, $8,000; increased cost of management due to the increased length of time the exhibition was held, and fine arts exhibit, $4,000, total, $50,000.

Mr. SPROULE. The reason I made the inquiry was, that one of the Toronto papers stated that this grant had not all been used, and that it was intended to return about $13,000 to the government. I was surprised. It displayed a magnanimity and an honesty that most corporations usually do not get credit for. However, I fully endorse this grant. It did a great deal of good, and I believe the exhibition was a great deal better than usual. I am sure it would be much appreciated if the grant were continued from year to year.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I hardly think we could promise that, because the Dominion government has not been in the habit, for a number of years back, of granting any help to local institutions, but this was an extraordinary occasion. The exhibition was very much better, I believe, than it had been for many years, or perhaps ever before. I think the grant accomplished the object aimed at.

Further amount required for fumigating stations, $500.

Mr. SPROULE. Why are we not able to estimate the cost of this in your main estimates, without spreading it over two or three votes ? It would require no very high degree of discernment on the part of the medical health officer, to calculate the amount he would need for this purpose.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is for the fumigation of nursery stock.

Mr. SPROULE. Why are you not able to make your calculation in the main estimates ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Last year we found our estimates had been exceeded, and we had to ask a supplementary estimate. We have to make provision for the same increase in expenditure this year. It has been found that in British Columbia they can import nursery stock all through the winter, and as they have asked that their stations should be kept open for a longer period in the year than is the custom in the east, this increase is almost entirely due to that reason. In other stations we have had to pay a little higher for labour.

Mr. SPROULE. What has been the success of this system in keeping out the San José scale ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The prohibition of the importation of nursery stock has kept the San José scale out of Canada, and the fumigation stations were a concession to the trade, so as to allow the importation of nursery stock at certain designated ports. I do not think there is any doubt that fumigation as carried on at these stations has been completely successful.

Mr. SPROULE. I saw a statement to the contrary some time ago in a paper. I forget what paper it was. It stated that some of the stock showed evidences of being affected after it was growing.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No such statement has been brought to my attention, and no complaint of that kind has ever come to the department. In the agricultural and horticultural press, where

I suppose we might expect to see such statements, nothing of the kind ever appeared.

Mr. SPROULE. How many of these stations have we to-day, at how many places is stock allowed to be brought in, and what is the aggregate cost of this work ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The aggregate cost, with this supplementary vote, will be $3,000 a year. The stations are at Vancouver, B.C., Winnipeg, Man., Windsor and Niagara Falls, Ont., St. Johns, P.Q. and St. John, N.B. At each of these places we have a small house for fumigating purposes and a man in charge. He has to employ day labour occasionally when a large consignment comes in.

Further amount required for archives, $3,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What is this for ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is an addition to what we have already had for the archives in years gone by. It is required to provide for an entirely new arrangement of the work. Some four years ago a report was made to council by a commission of officials who were appointed to investigate the condition of our records and our state papers. That commission reported that there was an immense mass of historical and other records of various kinds scattered through the various departments, that they were in a dangerous condition, and that a new arrangement ought to be made for their collection, care, classification and cataloguing. For one reason and another, chiefly because it was quite impossible to ask the late archivist, Mr. Douglas Brymner, at his time of life, to undertake a new work of that kind and reorganize the department, nothing was done ; but on the occasion of his demise and the consequent vacancy in the position of archivist, I drew up a memorandum to council recommending certain changes in the archives branch. These would involve a considerable addition to the work and the responsibility of the officer in charge, and would involve his having some assistance.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who is in charge ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Nobody is in charge. No appointment has been made to the vacant position. The change would necessitate considerable work in the way of collecting these documents and records which are scattered through the different departments, and which we wish to bring together under a responsible officer, whose duty it will be to care for them, watch over them, study them, make extracts from them, and compile them for the report on the archives. I have no hesitation in saying that in the interest not only of the history of our country, but the safety of our records, this work is necessary. To show the danger and the necessity of some such work, I may mention that some years ago, by the order of a certain officer of the Militia Department, a number of boxes which appeared to contain waste paper were taken out of a room in the Militia Department and put in the furnace. It was afterwards found that in these boxes were a large number of important military plans and other papers of the greatest value from a historical and departmental point of view; and they had all been destroyed by people who were really not responsible, and had no right to act in that way. There has been abundant opportunity for that kind of thing to occur at any time in a number of our departments, and I think it is quite time that these important documents should be brought together and classified and catalogued and put into the charge of a responsible officer of sufficient standing.

Mr. SPROULE. It would not be amiss if you extended the same protection to the ballots in Ontario.

Mr. HACKETT. Who is the chief clerk now at the head of that department ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The branch is under the charge of the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, along with all the other branches of the department. The clerk who has charge of the documents at present is a Mr. Duff, who has been for many years under the archivist.

Mr. HACKETT. I noticed a few days ago in one of the papers published in Ottawa that Mr. Casey, the late member for West Elgin, was to be appointed to that position.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No appointment has yet been made, and no decision has been come to in regard to it.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that in 1892-93 we voted $8,000 for the archives ; in 1893-94 we increased the vote to $9,000 ; and now it is proposed to further increase it to $12,000. I cannot understand why it should be necessary to have a part of this item in the main estimates and a part of it in the supplementary estimates. It is not a matter in regard to which there can be any unusual demand created which could not be known at the time the main estimates are prepared. To divide the item in this way doubles the work in the House, and makes the matter less understandable. We have to make an inquiry into two items instead of one, thus virtually doing the work twice over.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is a good deal in what the hon. gentleman says, but in this particular instance the circumstances are different. The item in the main estimates was sufficient for the old work, but there has been a change made. It was only since I came back from Japan that I secured the consent of my colleagues to the change or the whole amount would have been in the main estimates.

Mr. SPROULE. Then the hon. gentleman got this new idea in Japan.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I did not say that.

Mr. SPROULE. I see there is a vacancy, Mr. Brymner having died. Is it intended to fill that vacancy ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I hope so, but I did not wish to fill it until I had the assurance that these changes would be agreed to.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that the position reserved for our late colleague, Mr. Casey ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is not reserved for anybody.

Mr. SPROULE. I may say that if Mr. Casey is qualified—and I have no doubt he is—I would be glad, and I have no doubt that a great many other hon. members would be glad, to see him get it. I think many less deserving men have got positions. In my opinion, our late colleague, Mr. Casey, would be eminently fitted for the position, both on account of his literary qualifications and general ability.

Further amount required for Archives, $3,000.

Mr. HACKETT. What progress has been made with this work ? It is a very interesting subject to us in the maritime provinces to trace the families who came from France.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can only say that Mr. Gaudet, who is in charge of the work, reports that he is making steady progress. He has been travelling in the maritime provinces to secure data and lately he has been working at Ottawa compiling that data for the volume to be issued. It is a work in connection with the Acadian families, somewhat similar to the work of the late Abbé Tanguay with regard to the French Canadian families of the province of Quebec. It will give information with regard to the lineage, genealogy and origin of the Acadian families in the maritime provinces. This item would not have been in the supplementary estimates had it not been inadvertently omitted from the main estimates.

Mr. COPP. I take great interest in this matter. Mr. Gaudet has got all the information necessary to have the first volume issued with the exception of some information regarding a couple of censuses, which cannot be obtained in this country and which he is securing in Paris. Upon receipt of this information from Paris, the first volume will be completed, and be shortly in the possession of the public. Mr. Gaudet has assured me that he thinks he will be able, between this and next spring, to have the first volume published. The first volume is the most difficult. He has all the material and data prepared for the issue of the second and third volumes. There will be in all probability about four volumes, and each will follow the other very rapidly as soon as the first is published.

Mr. SPROULE. While I have no special objection to this work, I fail to see why we should collect information about the Acadian families any more than about the English, Irish, Scotch, German or any other nationality. I do not see why parliament should vote money for keeping a work of that kind going on which will practically go on for ever, because when you start a work of that kind it rarely ever stops. It is like a pension, the recipient of which lives a very long time. Why this work should be done for one nationality any more than another is what I cannot understand.

Mr. HACKETT. I must object to the remarks of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman and myself are both descendants of the old Irish race and we are proud of it.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you want a record of your genealogy ?

Mr. HACKETT. We have a record. What we are seeking to obtain is a genealogy of the old Acadian people, the first settlers of the eastern provinces, and it seems to me that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is not exhibiting that broadness of mind which should distinguish a descendant of the race to which he and I belong when he objects to this work. I would like to ask the hon. minister if Mr. Gaudet is still in charge of that work and has he made any report ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, Mr. Gaudet is in charge of the work, and he has reported verbally from time to time, but there is no published report.

Mr. GALLERY. Do I understand from the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Hackett) that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is an Irishman. That is something new to me. I always understood that the hon. gentleman from East Grey came from Scotland.

Mr. SPROULE. It is a strange coincidence but the hon. member for East Grey had the same impression with regard to the hon. member for Montreal. But I have to say in reply to my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island, who complains that a man is not very broad in his views who objects to this expenditure, that I think the breadth of view of the hon. member for East Grey will compare favourably with that of the hon. member from Prince Edward Island, as regards anything pertaining to the welfare of the country. If it be the aim of parliament to set apart a portion of money for the purpose of tracing the history and the record of the different nationalities of this country, I have no objection. But I ask, why select the Acadians in preference to the others ? While

I have no objection to the Acadians—on the contrary my acquaintance with them leads me to the conclusion that they are a very estimable people—I fail to see why this work should be done for them any more than for the U. E. Loyalists, who came to this country and who are reputed to be the pioneers of this continent, and whose name stands so high in the history of the world to-day.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). Why not do it for the U. E. Loyalists ?

Mr. SPROULE. That is what I say. If it is desirable to do it for one nationality, why not for the other, and to make a selection of one seems to me like partiality. I am not objecting to this, provided it is thought desirable to carry it out with regard to any celebrated class in the country who have a notable history. But what I object to is the fact that one nationality is selected and all others ignored. That is what I cannot understand or regard as just.

Mr. BLAIN. When may we expect the first volume of the work ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think it is expected about next spring.

Mr. BLAIN. How much has been expended on it up to date ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This item of $1,400, being $1,200 for salary and $200 for travelling expenses for the gentleman in charge, has been voted for three years.

Mr. BRUCE. With regard to the remarks that the hon. member for Montreal, St. Anne (Mr. Gallery) made. I may say that if he wished to discover a Scotchman in the House he has only to look in this direction. I am at a loss to understand why a distinction should be made between nationalities in such a grant, as is being done.

Mr. GALLERY. As that point has come up again, I would like to correct the hon member from West Prince (Mr. Hackett). I distinctly state that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is not an Irishman. If I understood him aright, the hon. member for West Prince said that the hon. member for East Grey was an Irishman.

Mr. HACKETT. I insist on the fact that the hon. member for East Grey is an Irishman, and just as good an Irishman as the hon. member for Montreal, St. Anne.

Mr. HENDERSON. If I understand the meaning of the word 'Irish' as used in the north of Ireland, I would say that the hon. member for East Grey is not Irish, according to the strict use of the word. And so I think the hon. member for Montreal, St. Anne, is quite correct. If in Ireland to-day, the hon. member for East Grey would repudiate the designation of 'Irish' as applied to him.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. SPROULE. I think, since this seems to be a disputed question, that we had better have another branch of this inquiry to determine the genealogy of the hon. member for Montreal, St. Anne, and myself, and determine to what nationality we belong.

Further amount required for renewing and improving Canadian exhibit at Imperial Institute, London, $5,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before this item is discussed, I have a matter I wish to bring before the attention of the Minister of Agriculture. It is not quite apropos of the item, but there was a matter brought to my attention in a letter which I handed to the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn). That hon. gentleman is not in his seat and I have not the letter, so I can only give the information I have. First I would inquire if Mr. J. G. Anderson is an inspector of fruit in the Department of Agriculture ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He is. I answered that question yesterday.

Mr. TAYLOR. The information I have is to this effect—that this gentleman who is inspector of fruit and drawing pay from the government, is also an apple buyer and speculator, and ships apples every day to the market at Ottawa. These are facts I know. The statement is made that he will go to a farmer to purchase his fruit, and, if the farmer does not sell to him at his own price but sells to another speculator, Mr. Anderson is brought in to inspect the fruit and cuts him down to the last point. And so the farmers of Prince Edward are under compulsion to sell to Mr. Anderson. That is the statement made in this letter from one of the large dealers in Ottawa, and now in possession of my hon. friend from Prince Edward.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is the first I have heard of such a charge. I know nothing about it. Mr. Anderson was a dealer in fruit before he was appointed inspector. When he was appointed he had to close out his business and cease carrying on any trade of that kind. If he is dealing in fruit he must either cease doing so or cease to be inspector. My inspectors cannot for a moment be allowed to deal in fruit or to have anything to do with the trade.

Mr. TAYLOR. The writer of this letter says that Mr. Anderson is shipping apples to Ottawa every day in the week, and he is his own inspector.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will inquire into that.

Mr. TAYLOR. Of course, Mr. Anderson is a very strong supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite and an electioneering agent through the country, and he must draw a salary in order to keep in the field. Yet,

he is making his profits out of purchasing apples.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. All I can say is what I have already said—that this is the first I have heard of this allegation, and with all due deference to my hon. friend's informant, I do not believe it. But I will make inquiries. And, as I said a moment ago, no inspector in my department is, or can be, allowed to deal in fruit. I will investigate the matter and secure the information.

Mr. RICHARDSON. What is the object aimed at in this Canadian exhibit at the Imperial Institute in London ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The older members of the House will remember that a good many years ago, at the time of the Queen's jubilee, the Imperial Institute was established in London, specially for the purpose of having an exhibit of colonial industrial products. Propositions were made to the Dominion government to secure their co-operation. The institution was then under the patronage and presidency of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, the present King. The arrangement come to at that time was that the provincial governments should deal with their respective exhibits in the Imperial Institute in London, the Dominion government taking no part. This went on for many years, but complaints began to arise and were voiced in this House by hon. members on both sides who said that the Canadian exhibits in the institute were not at all creditable to the country. The High Commissioner in London made very strong representations to the government on the question, and asked that some thing should be done to improve the character of the exhibit there. I was over in London some few years ago and visited the institute. On so doing, I fully concurred in the view that the exhibits of Canada's products there were entirely inadequate and not creditable to Canada. After a good deal of discussion, I asked for a small item in the estimates to improve those exhibits. That was granted me to the extent of $3,000. Almost immediately after the vote was given the imperial authorities undertook to reorganize the Imperial Institute. It had been under the control of a royal commission of eminent people of the old country who were specially interested in it and who had been invited to take part in its management by His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, and joined with them were colonial representatives, including the High Commissioner for Canada, at first Sir Charles Tupper and afterwards his successor Lord Strathcona. The different Canadian provinces have had each a representative. Speaking from memory, I think that three of the provinces asked Lord Strathcona to act as their representative, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and perhaps some other provinces had their local representative in England. The institute, I may say, had been getting into disrepute and had almost failed of its object, and the imperial authorities, after consultation with the various representatives of Australia, South Africa, New Zealand and Canada, decided on a change. It took a long time to carry that change through, and for two years back the fate of the Imperial Institute has been hanging in the balance. This last winter, after the main estimates were submitted to this House, Lord Strathcona sent out a communication to us explaining that at last the institute has been taken over by the Imperial Board of Trade, which is the department corresponding to our Department of Trade and Commerce, and that in the future the Imperial Institute was to be managed as a branch of the Board of Trade, but with the concurrence and co-operation of the different colonies. They proposed some additional work in the shape of a city branch. I ought to say perhaps for the information of those who are not familiar with it, that the Imperial Institute is located at South Kensington, in the part of London where the great exhibition of 1862 took place, quite out of the business part of the city, although it is a place where there is a large number of museums and educational establishments. The new organization and management propose to have a city office with show-rooms and accommodation for a library and reading rooms. In addition to that they have asked the various colonies to fit up the exhibits in the institute proper in South Kensington, on a grander and better scale, and completely to renovate the exhibit.

Now, this work seems to fall naturally into the exhibition work of my own department, and when Lord Strathcona's communication was received by the government here, after careful consideration, we concluded it was in the interest of Canada to be worthily and properly represented in that institute, and we propose to carry out the scheme as submitted by Lord Strathcona, after discussion with the authorities of the institute. That scheme involves a slight increase in the expenditure of the ordinary work of the institute, and an increased subscription to the city office, and the employment in addition of a caretaker, of a stenographer or clerk, who will be able to reply to correspondents and to be present, either at the west end institute building or in the city alternately with the curator himself. This office expenditure which we are asked to agree to by the imperial authorities involves an expenditure of about $6,000 a year. I propose to ask altogether for $8,000, $2,000 to be devoted to preparing, sending and installing the characteristic exhibits of Canadian products. Six thousand dollars will not be all, because Lord Strathcona, as the representative of the different provinces, is asking them to continue their contribution to the general expenditure of the exhibition,

and in that case there will be a sum of money available out of the sum I am asking, to arrange for the permanent exhibits, and also to arrange for the temporary exhibits of a particular character. The main estimates for the current year included a sum of $3,000 for this Imperial Institute, the same as we have had for two or three years back, and I ask this $5,000 additional to make the $8,000 which will be necessary to carry out the scheme outlined by Lord Strathcona.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). What will be the nature of these exhibits ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have a memorandum which Lord Strathcona sent out here in which he says in regard to that :

The scheme is for the arrangement and reorganization of the exhibits in the South Kensington building of the institute. Visitors will in future be assisted in getting information by special demonstrations in the courts, by means of pamphlets and other printed information systematically distributed, and also by public lectures.

6. It is understood that a number of the colonies are in favour of placing the responsibility for the care, maintenance and renewal of their collections—at the expense of the colonies—on the authorities of the Imperial Institute, who would of course be in close communication with the respective colonial governments on these subjects. The Canadian collections now need complete renewal and numerous additions to make them thoroughly representative of the country, and no doubt the Imperial Institute will if desired, be prepared (in conjunction with the curator) submit a scheme for this work, and to explain how it is proposed to carry it out.

He goes on to explain what has been in the past, and then he says :

I understand that a special staff is to be appointed by the board of trade, in connection with the collections, so that their care and maintenance shall be continually attended to. This arrangement would set the Canadian officer (now termed the curator) free from much of the routine work, and would enable him to devote himself almost exclusively to answering the inquiries addressed to the Canadian section, and to supplying information to intending emigrants and commercial men. The collections at the Imperial Institute might be further utilized with great advantage by our own emigration department for the purpose of illustrating the general natural resources and industries of the Dominion. The board of trade propose to amalgamate their own commercial intelligence department now at Whitehall, with the office established by the Imperial Institute in the city of London, where additional premises will be taken.

Then he goes on to say that the colonies will have an opportunity to occupy offices in that building. One part of the exhibit will be in the commercial city of London and the other in this west end place.

Mr. SPROULE. Why is it desirable to have two ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. To accommodate the larger exhibit in the city would require an enormous expenditure to get sufficient room. The building is a very large one, and it would require an enormous expenditure to transfer that to the city and to procure the accommodation required for these exhibits. They wish to have what may be called a business branch in the city, at which information may be given and temporary and partial exhibits can be made of particular articles at particular times. It is taken from the west end branch or part of that supplied temporarily. I would suggest that we in Canada could very properly take one of the rooms in the city branch and from time to time make exhibits of different Canadian products. For instance, at one time we could have an exhibit of dairy products, butter and cheese, another time an exhibit of bacon, at another time of dressed poultry, at another time of minerals, or of some particular mineral with which Canada is particularly favoured. Then we might make an exhibiit of certain manufactured goods which we thought we might be able to induce the British people to buy. These exhibits would be temporary, lasting perhaps a week or two weeks. These exhibits could be especially advertised and special invitations could be sent to those engaged in trade in the particular product which might be on exhibition. That is the object in keeping the city office in addition to maintaining the reading rooms and supplying information to business men in the city who have not time and who would not take the trouble to go to South Kensington to make inquiries, but who would call at a room or building in the city of London.

Mr. SPROULE. That would mean a dual set of officers.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Practically it would mean an assistant to our curator so that when the curator was in the city the assistant would be in South Kensington and vice versa. Lord Strathcona has given the following suggested list of payments. A payment to the Imperial Institute of £600 a year ; a payment to the city office of £200 a year ; and the salary of the present curator, Mr. Watson, and his assistant and some slight office contingencies, £400 a year ; making a total payment of £1,200, or in round numbers, about $6,000 a year. If we were to adhere to this arrangement and fall in with the plans and proposals of the Imperial Institute of London, we would be definitely committed to the payment of about that amount, $6,000. I am asking for about $2,000 more to carry out the suggestion I made a moment ago in regard to the Canadian exhibits there, that they should be completely renovated and put on a creditable basis.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Has the hon. gentleman seen the building ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have seen the Kensington building, but

not the city offices, I do not think they are yet taken. When Lord Strathcona was here, about a month or two ago, they had not yet engaged or acquired any city office.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). In what part of Whitehall will the building be ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It will not be in Whitehall ; it will be down in the city in the neighbourhood of the Royal Exchange. Last year, or the year before, we had a temporary city office in Eastcheap, which is a little east of the Royal Exchange, but I understand from Lord Strathcona that they have given that up and are going to get larger and better rooms.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Then I understand that these exhibits will consist of the natural products of the soil, the forest and the mine ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. And industrial products as well.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Have you provided for large maps to be displayed in these buildings, so that the people may understand the geography of Canada ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not yet made any definite plan in that respect. We have to-day in my department a large map which was exhibited at Paris, and which I think is now in London, and that map could be utilized. In fact I gave orders a little while ago that that map should be kept in London for the purposes of the Imperial Institute. It is a very fine map of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). It would be a good plan to show on that map the unoccupied lands in Canada adapted for cultivation and settlement.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is shown on the map.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would ask the minister if there is anything in this exhibit to demonstrate what progress Canada is making in the fine arts ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have not any fine art exhibit there ; it is an exhibit purely of what I might call the natural and industrial arts of the country.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I wish to offer a few remarks on a subject that is perhaps germane to this question. We have in this city a gallery of fine arts, so-called. It is entirely unworthy of this country, and of this city, and some provision ought to be made with the view to procuring a better exhibit of the works of Canadian artists. Canada has already found a place in the appreciation of the artistic world beyond the confines of this country. Canadian art is recognized in the United States, and has had very favourable notice from American critics, while we at home seem to be less appreciative than we should be of what our artists are doing and struggling to do. The fine arts can make progress in any country only by having some reasonable patronage, either from the wealthy people of the country or from the government. Art has made the greatest progress where it has had the support and patronage and recognition of governments. I notice that several new pictures have been added to the collection at the old rookery in Ottawa which we call an art gallery, and on inquiry, I have been informed that some $7,000 have been expended in the purchase of pictures, the culls of the studios of the old world, which could not be disposed of there and which have been sold through some medium to the Canadian government. I am not an art critic, but I have been privileged to see some of the rarest collections of art in the old world, and I am bound to say that we have in the gallery some work of Canadian artists which is worthy of a place in any art gallery in the world. But there are some very meritricious works in our gallery, and I fear that some works have recently been added at a large expense which could have been bought from some picture dealers by people who know how to go about it, for perhaps from $10 to $20 each. How they have added to the collection in this city to the extent of $7,000, I fail to see, while the works of Canadian artists have been passed over without recognition or notice. I am sure that we have occasion to be proud that we have in this young country—for we are still a young country—such a development of artistic taste and ability as has taken place in Canada in the last eight, ten or fifteen years. We have in Canada men who have made for themselves a place in the old world ; a picture by Paul Peel in our gallery is worthy of a place in any art gallery in the world. We have such names as Homer, Watson, Coté, Verner, Harris, Krieghoff, Gauthier, Forbes, Brownell, Sherwood, Bell, Smith, in Ontario and Quebec, while in British Columbia we have working Mower Martin, a man who has contributed a great deal to Canadian art. In Nova Scotia we have Mr. Miles, and then in New Brunswick we have an artist whose name I cannot now recall, of whom a well known art critic in America has said that if he were selecting the three greatest artists in America he would not omit his name. I think the time has come when these men should have some fair consideration. It is thought by some that in the rural districts, among the toilers of the country, there is not that recognition of art there should be ; it is felt that they do not consider art and attach importance to it. I can tell the House that this is not so, and that importance is attached to art in this country, and there is a budding and steady growth and development of artistic taste. In this connection I will re-

late a little incident that came in my own experience. I was looking over some fine Christmas cards in a shop just before Christmas, when a man came in with whom I entered into conversation. I said something about their being beautiful, and he said: Well, there is great waste of money in these things. I said: Do you think so; have you no love for pictures? He replied—None at all; I suppose there are hundreds of dollars spent on these things, I told them that there were tens of thousands of dollars spent on them, and he said that it was a terrible waste of money. And I said to him: You have no appreciation of pictures or of the beautiful; I have never seen where you live, but still I can tell you what it is like; if you come to it on a June day you will see thistles and weeds growing in the fields and between the fences; you will see no avenue of shade trees, leading from the roadway to your house, and if they were there you would cut them down for firewood; you will see no flower beds ornamenting your garden; nothing of the beautiful; if your buildings have any paint at all the colours are inharmonious and incongruous; your farm is cultivated in a slovenly manner; your fence corners are filled with weeds, and your outbuildings are in a ruinous condition. He said: That will do, I do not want to hear any more. I had the fortune to be passing by his place some time afterwards, and when my companion told me who lived there, I said: Turn in, I want to have a look at it. I went up to the door of his house and he met me, and he recollected the picture I had drawn. It was too true. Nature has placed us in a grand country. We have the means of making Canada a place of paradisiacal beauty. It only needs the development of the artistic faculty to make our roads, our fields, our homes and everything about us beautiful. There are no more beautiful trees in the world than the Canadian maple, which we have chosen as our national emblem. No one can travel through Canada at this season of the year without feeling that it is a constant panorama of beauty, unequalled in any part of the world. We only need a recognition of the artistic taste which I believe we have in this country. We need our fellow countrymen who have sufficiently advanced their artistic taste to be genuine critics in this respect, should bring into our art galleries these Canadian paintings which are worthy to be in any art gallery in the world. We should have art centres in every large city in Canada, and we should make our native art accessible to our young Canadians. It is not a useless expenditure; it is an expenditure which will redound immensely to the credit of all Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot refrain from thanking the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) for his appropriate and eloquent address. Unfortunately I cannot act upon the suggestions he has made, but I will draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works, in whose department the matter is, to the remarks of my hon. friend. I appreciate very highly what he has said with reference to our Canadian artists. We have a group of men, and I may say of women too, whose art works exhibited in the art centres of the old country, would attract attention even amongst the best. The hon. gentleman has given us a list of the greatest Canadian artists, and I have no doubt there are others whose art will confer credit on this country. I endorse what the hon. gentleman has said with reference to the art gallery in Ottawa. We have pictures there worthy of any gallery. I recognized a picture there the other day by Paul Peel to which this remark would apply, and right alongside it is a picture of a young Canadian, by Mr. Robert Harris, which was presented by a lady of Ottawa, and which shows the true characteristics of the young Canadian of whom we are all so proud. There have been one or two pictures added to the gallery lately which are certainly most creditable. The picture by Ten Kate is a splendid specimen of Dutch art, and friends of mine who are art critics have praised very much the work of Challener, which has recently been added to the gallery. We have lately increased the amount to be devoted to this work, and we have provided that these works are to be purchased under the advice of a committee of artists to be chosen from the members of the Royal Canadian Academy. I have no doubt that by this means there will be added to the gallery in the future, works of merit. I trust that before long we will have a building worthy of Canadian art, and that there will be a national museum in this capital city, which will include a picture gallery in which will be exhibited the finest works of our country. I would not, however, like to have these confined entirely to the works of Canadian artists, because I feel that we should have accessible there, for the inspiration and study of Canadian artists, paintings, by the masters of the old country. I must confess that I would advise the purchase of first-class works of foreign schools. We are young in art but we are making progress. As an encouragement to my hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) I would say that I have made arrangements with the Royal Canadian Academy to assist them out of the funds which parliament has voted, to secure a representative and creditable exhibition of Canadian art at St. Louis exhibition. At the Pan-American exhibition the Canadian academy made a most creditable showing, and I believe that at the greater exhibition which is to be held in St. Louis, Canadian artists will be able to achieve even greater success than at Buffalo. I again thank my hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) for the patriotic words he has uttered

on behalf of Canadian art, and I trust they will sink into the minds of all who hear them and of all who will read them.

Mr. RICHARDSON. In mentioning a few names of Canadian artists, I might have included Coté, and Forbes, and Knowles, and Sherwood, and others of great ability. As to the suggestion of the hon. minister that the selection of paintings should be left entirely to artists, I must say that is an open question. There are no more jealous men in the world than artists, they all admit it themselves. We have in the history of English art the name of the celebrated portrait painter Romney, one of the grandest that British art has ever produced; and yet he had to struggle on and be kept out of recognition from the very first, by the jealousy of men like Sir Joshua Reynolds, though he was far superior to them all. Therefore we should not lose sight of the fact that artists as a class are very jealous of each other, and good art critics who have the means of possessing themselves of specimens of art should have some recognition.

Mr. HACKETT. I am very much pleased indeed to find that the hon. Minister of Agriculture is endeavouring to encourage art in this country. I desire to state in this connection that one of the gentlemen he has named, Mr. Harris, of Montreal, is a native of Prince Edward Island. In the encouragement of art and learning, our small province has not been neglected. We have given you Harris, one of the chief artists of Montreal; Shurman, the president of Cornell University, and Archbishop O'Brien, of the city of Halifax. The progress of art shows the highest advancement of civilization, and I trust that my hon. friend will see his way clear to bestow on the artists of this country every possible recognition.

Grant to assist the Canadian Association for the prevention of tuberculosis, $2,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What is that for? Is that in connection with cattle?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, it is in connection with the association which was formed in Ottawa two or three years ago under the patronage of His Excellency, following the lead of the association which was formed in Great Britain under the patronage of His Majesty the King, for the purpose of spreading information amongst the people at large as to how the spread of the dread disease of tuberculosis could be prevented and lessened by ordinary means independent of medical practice. I have here a memorandum from the secretary of the association, in which he states that a large amount of literature is being sent out. The secretary himself is devoting his whole time to the work. He goes about the country at the request of medical associations and gives lectures and explanations with regard to it. The association holds an annual meeting in Ottawa, at which papers are read by eminent medical gentlemen, and these are printed and distributed throughout the country. The money is used chiefly in paying the secretary and in defraying the cost of distributing the literature.

Mr. SPROULE. I was at the annual meeting of the association, which I think will be productive of good; but it occurred to me that additional benefit might result if articles were written and sent periodically for publication in local papers, giving directions regarding the prevention of the disease. It must take more than this amount of money to keep the association up.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is a subscription for membership in the association. I do not think any fee is exacted, but a large number of people have subscribed various sums, some of them quite handsome sums, towards its expenses.

Further amount required for repairs to government steamers 'Stanley and Lansdowne,' $27-000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. With regard to the 'Stanley,' public tenders were called for by advertisements in the press of Montreal, Quebec, St. John, Halifax, Charlottetown and Pictou for removing indentations from plating and reinforcing the plates. The tender of the Pictou Foundry and Machine Company being the lowest, their tender was accepted for $3,975. Extensive repairs are now being made to the engines and boilers by Bruce Stewart & Company, Charlottetown, by day's labour. The boilers are fourteen years old, and, owing to the severe test these parts are exposed to and the nature of the work, the boilers and machinery require to be kept in the best condition possible. Besides the repairs to the engines and boilers the deck-houses became loose and are being thoroughly and strongly repaired. These repairs will be the means of putting the ship in excellent condition for the winter ice work. The department considers that the repairs to the 'Stanley' to make her fit for the winter work will not exceed $15,000. If the ship had been sent to England to her builders to be repaired, the cost would be in the vicinity of $40,000, if not more, as the expenses of the taking the vessel to England and keeping a crew would be considerable.

In regard to the repairs to the 'Lansdowne' tenders were invited for placing a new main boiler and funnel mountings. The tender of the estate of James Fleming of St. John being the lowest, for $8,820, was accepted. This is considered a very low figure.

In addition, tenders were invited for six fresh-water tanks, and the tender of the estate of James Fleming was accepted for this work for $2,135. Tenders were also asked for the painting, according to specification. These tanks are fitted in the hold for the

purpose of carrying fresh-water for the use of the boiler and ship's service, as well as for the fog alarms which the 'Lansdowne' visits, such as Gannet Rock and other isolated places.

The amount asked for is considered ample to make the extensive and necessary expenses required.

In addition to the repairs to the 'Stanley' and the 'Lansdowne,' I may say that when the 'Minto' and the 'Stanley' were icebound last winter, there was a possibility of both steamers being pushed ashore by the ice, and, in that event these valuable ships would certainly have been lost.

The department had arranged with the owners of the sealing steamer 'Newfoundland' to go to the assistance of the disabled ships, and although the 'Newfoundland' did not succeed in reaching the 'Minto' and 'Stanley,' still there is a claim for services rendered by that vessel which amount will be paid out of the above vote.

Mr. HACKETT. Where are those repairs going on ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. At the Pictou Foundry and Machine Company, who were the lowest tenderers, and the amount is $3,975. The other repairs are made by Bruce Stewart and Company, of Charlottetown.

Mr. HACKETT. What are the other repairs ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The repairs to the machinery and engine are made by Bruce, Stewart & Company.

Mr. HACKETT. When will this work be completed ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Towards the end of this month.

Mr. HACKETT. Where does the hon gentleman intend placing the 'Stanley' ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not yet decided. I intend to visit Prince Edward Island myself, if the session does not last too long. Otherwise I will consult the officials of the department.

Mr. HACKETT. I trust the hon. minister will see his way clear to placing the 'Stanley' on the route between Cape Tormentine and Summerside. Does it require a visit from the hon. minister to decide this ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I trust that the session will not last so long that the hon. gentleman will get lost in the ice when he does get down. Did we not have some vote for the repairs on those steamers last year ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, we have votes every year to repair these boats.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much was voted last year and what was the nature of the repairs ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The total vote in 1902-3 was $273,000, and the expenditure was $275,000. In 1903-4, including the present vote, the amount was $277,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much was voted last year for repairs on these steamers ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The amount this year is not an extraordinary one. It is only $2,000 more than the previous year.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have evidently not made myself quite clear. Here we have a special vote of $27,000 for repairs to the 'Stanley' and 'Lansdowne.' I suppose there are repairs every year but not anything like that amount. My recollection is that a very considerable vote for repairs on these two steamers was given last year, and I want to ascertain just what that was. It seems to me that $27,000 is beyond the normal amount which should be expended each year.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Most of the expenditures last year for repairs were on the 'Stanley' and 'Aberdeen.' This year they are on the 'Stanley' and the 'Lansdowne.'

Mr. HACKETT. It is very important to the island that communication should be maintained winter and summer between it and the mainland. This government has undertaken to keep up that communication, and what I am insisting upon is that we should have the 'Stanley' on the route between Cape Tormentine and Summerside. But the minister will not give any definite reply. I ask again if that is the intention of the government ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I shall not declare anything of the sort, because if I were to decide one way or the other I would be sure to arouse the hostility of one section of the island, besides I do not know at present what is the best line and shall have to wait for information.

Mr. HACKETT. I presume that the hon. gentleman desires to do what is right, and I hope therefore he will see his way clear to placing the 'Stanley' on the route between Summerside and Cape Tormentine. There is another question of great importance and that is the building of a third boat for the island. We have during the session voted away millions of dollars to other provinces, and I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that there is no province in this Dominion more deserving of consideration than the province of Prince Edward Island. I insist that the third boat shall be constructed for the purpose of maintaining that com-

munication. Yesterday we had a question on the Order paper by my hon. friend from East Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) with regard to the loss sustained by the shippers of frozen fish and other products from that province. I would like to have the minister tell us if he intends to compensate these people for the loss sustained.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The question was put yesterday, and I answered that the claims had been received and that the matter was under consideration.

Mr. HACKETT. That is a very plausible answer, but I insist on having something more definite. Is it the intention of the government to compensate the young men of Prince Edward Island for the losses they sustained?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Every legitimate claim, of course, will be entertained. But all have to be looked into, and the Department of Justice has to be consulted as to whether we are responsible or not. It is a very serious question, as the hon. gentleman knows, and we have to take the necessary precautions.

Mr. HACKETT. The minister is very cautious. He wants to be advised by the Minister of Justice. I insist that this is a case for the consideration of the government. We have no legal claim against them at all. But the loss arose through the failure of the government boat to carry the freight from Georgetown to Pictou. Will not the minister himself, as having charge of these boats and knowing the circumstances through which the loss arose, grant the young men of Prince Edward Island compensation for the loss which they have sustained ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I shall certainly not come to a decision without consulting the Department of Justice, for our decision involves immediately a very large amount. Then there is the question of law to be decided, for it may be that this case would establish a precedent. Under the circumstances, my hon. friend (Mr. Hackett) must see that the question cannot be decided offhand. It may be necessary to appoint experts to ascertain the amounts, and also whether the interruption to navigation was inevitable, or whether it was caused by the officers of the department. These things have to be looked into, but the hon. gentleman knows very well that we have been busy with the session of parliament ever since the claims have been presented, so that, whatever my desire to do justice to these people, there has been no opportunity to adjust the claims.

Mr. HACKETT. I allege no legal claim against any officer of the department or against the minister. But I would like to have the minister consider the fact that the young men of Prince Edward Island had their products ready for the market, and those products were delayed at Georgetown on account of the absence of the government steamer. This is not a legal case. Our young men are not going to go to law with the government. What we insist upon is that the government, in their own way, shall grant to the people of Prince Edward Island compensation for the losses sustained.

Mr. LEFURGEY. This matter is of the utmost importance to the people of Prince Edward Island. Early in the session I reviewed the history of the boats engaged in the work of maintaining communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland last winter. We certainly do not want a recurrence of the disastrous events of that season, events due, as I pointed out, to neglect on the part of the department and bad administration at the island end of the winter boat service. The minister, on that occasion, said that he intended to take a trip to the island to look into the question of placing the boats so as to prevent a recurrence of what took place last winter. As we all know, the session has kept the minister here, and he will not have time to go to the island this year. The session is likely to go on for four or five weeks yet, and, by that time, the 'Stanley' and 'Minto' should be placed and shippers should know exactly where the boats are going to ply. Last year, after the 'Northumberland,' the summer boat, stopped at Summerside, it was over a fortnight before the 'Stanley' was put on the route between Summerside and Cape Tormentine, and even then it was after much telegraphing and humbugging between the department here and the agent of the department at Prince Edward Island. Anybody who looks over the correspondence of that time will be appalled at the humbugging that went on before that boat was put upon the route from Cape Tormentine to Summerside. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows that that is not a desirable state of affairs; and, while he will not be able to visit Prince Edward Island to look into the facts himself, he knows that shippers to and from the island need to be informed in good time as to the arrangements to be made. There are goods coming through from the United Kingdom, from the United States and from the upper provinces, and shippers must know how they are to send their goods. They want to know whether the 'Stanley' will be on the route between Summerside and Cape Tormentine immediately after the summer boat is withdrawn. That is the vital point. The matter should not be delayed until the summer boats stop, and then have a repetition of the humbugging that went on last year, when shippers could not get freight rates and could not learn where the boats would ply. And

even when we did get the 'Stanley,' she was in Georgetown cutting boats out of the ice instead of rendering the service she should have rendered at the beginning of the winter. This is a most vital question to the commercial interests of Prince Edward Island. The neglect of last year in carrying out the compact by not arranging for these boats in good time, and using the 'Minto' to cut the 'Stanley' free when she was caught in the ice at Summerside—these things are responsible for the condition of affairs from which we suffered last winter. My hon. friend from West Prince (Mr. Hackett) has called attention to the way in which the shippers suffered loss because the 'Minto' was taken off her legitimate course and taken to the relief of the 'Stanley,' which had been caught in the ice, where she remained for two months and had finally to be taken out by the government of Prince Edward Island, assisted by the board of trade. I pointed out the legal aspect of the question when I brought it before the House. If the question is to be decided on the legal merits of the claim, there are strong facts bearing on the case to be considered. But, as the hon. member for West Prince said, we do not want to compel these men to take legal action against the government. It is the duty of the government, under the circumstances, to consider more than the legal aspects of the case. The goods were waiting at Georgetown to be transported across to Pictou, and they were not transported because the government, whose duty it was to provide the means of transportation, had failed to do so. It is the duty of the government to compensate the people for the loss they sustained on that occasion. Before I sit down I would like to have an assurance from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that this matter will not be left until the last moment, and that the people of Prince Edward Island will be notified that the boat 'Stanley' will be put on the route from Summerside to Cape Tormentine, at least as long as there is open navigation to those points, and that the 'Minto' will be placed on the Charlottetown and Georgetown to Pictou route.

Mr. HACKETT. Will the minister state what is the intention of the government this year in connection with maintaining communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We intend to maintain the communication.

Mr. HACKETT. Where will you place the boats ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I said the question had not been decided. We have two months yet to decide.

Mr. HACKETT. We must insist that a boat shall run between Tormentine and Summerside. Is it the intention of the government to build a third boat to maintain this communication ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We have not yet considered the construction of a third boat.

Mr. HACKETT. Well, if the government desire to maintain that communication they must build a third boat. We are a small province, but our rights rank side by side with the rights of the other provinces. Now, I would like to ask the minister again, does he intend building this third boat to maintain that communication ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have told the hon. gentleman that that question has not yet been considered.

Further amount required for examination of masters and mates, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We have replaced Captain Smith, deceased, by Captain Reginald Salmon, at a salary of $2,000. There has been a necessary increase in the expenditure, and the former amount of $5,000 has been increased to $7,000. This department is being thoroughly reorganized under a very able officer, and we try to make it as effective as possible. Captain Salmon is an officer of the Royal Naval Reserve, holding the rank of lieutenant.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is his salary larger than that enjoyed by Captain Smith ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is $200 more.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Even so, why do you require $2,000 additional ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. On account of salary and travelling expenses. Last year we inaugurated a system of holding investigations into every casualty that occurred, and the expenses connected with the travelling of Captain Salmon are a good deal more than they used to be when we held examinations only in special cases. The members of the committee will recollect that this has been done at the special request of the Board of Trade in England, in order to render the service as effective as possible.

Mr. FOWLER. But what has the investigation into wrecks to do with the examination of masters and mates ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He has to travel to hold these examinations.

Mr. FOWLER. There is an item just below, 'further amount required for investigation of wrecks.' The minister is looking in the wrong place. The minister shakes his head. Does he mean this committee to understand that this first item, 'further amount required for examination of masters

and mates,' is required by the expenses of investigations into wrecks covered by the item below ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Besides the salary of Captain Salmon, the department has to provide for the salaries of the examiners at several shipping ports in British Columbia, Quebec, and the maritime provinces. The late Captain Smith also travelled in connection with the examination of masters and mates, and some of his expenses had to be specially voted. Now, instead of leaving them behind, we thought it was better to provide for them along with the travelling expenses for this officer.

Mr. FOWLER. How much was in arrears at the time of Captain Smith's death, and how many years do these arrears cover ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. About seven years. There are four new examiners appointed.

Mr. FOWLER. Are there more captains and mates to be examined to-day, since the shipping has fallen off ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is aware that all of these services, like all other business in the country, have increased, and we have to provide for that increase.

Mr. SPROULE. How many examiners do you require ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Four more have been appointed.

Mr. SPROULE. How many have you now ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will give the list. It is as follows :

Names and Addresses of Examiners of Masters and Mates.

Lieutenant Reginald Salmon, R.N.R., Chairman, salary $2,000, Ottawa, Ont.
Captain Bloomfield Douglas, R.N.R., Halifax, N.S.
Mr. A. E. H. Gilpin, assistant to Captain Douglas, Halifax, N.S.
Captain David Hunter, Halifax, N.S.
Captain A. J. Wolff, Lunenburg, N.S.
Captain John E. Murphy, Yarmouth. N.S.
Com. P.H. Morgan, R.N., Sydney, N.S.
Mr. W. C. Seaton, Quebec, Que.
Captain M. P. McElhinney, Ottawa, Ont.
Captain R. C. W. MacCuaig, Ottawa, Ont.
Mr. W. L. Magee, Ottawa, Ont.
Captain Thos. Donnelly, Kingston, Ont.
Captain Wm. McIlwain, St. Catharines, Ont.
Mr. Geo. P. Phillips, Rat Portage
Captain E. B. Tingling, Winnipeg, Manitoba.
Captain James Gaudin, Victoria, B.C.
Captain L. H. Fraser, Nelson, B.C.
Captain H. A. Mellon, Vancouver, B.C.
Captain Alex. Cameron, Charlottetown, N.B.

And all collectors of customs are authorized to examine candidates for freight boats under 100 tons or for tug boat certificates.

All examiners are allowed $4 for each candidate examined, and $1 for renewals, with the following exceptions :—

The chairman of the board who is paid a salary, does not receive any fee.
Mr. Gilpin does not receive any fee ; he is paid a salary.
Captain McElhinney, no remuneration.
Mr. W. L. Magee, no remuneration.
G. P. Phillips, no remuneration.
Captain J. Gaudin, $300 per annum.
Collectors of customs, no remuneration.

During the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1902, 12 masters and 28 mates of foreign sea-going vessels, received certificates, and 275 masters and 110 mates received certificates for coasting and inland vessels. Thirty-one renewed certificates were issued.

Mr. FOWLER. Where are the additional men under salary stationed ? Those who are paid by fees are no charge upon the public treasury, and I would ask what additional salaries have to be paid ? The minister has read us a list of items which do not at all refer to the question at issue.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am informed by the officers of the department that four examiners have been appointed in order to render the service more efficient.

Mr. FOWLER. Why is it necessary to appoint these additional officers by salary ? Why not continue the present system of having them paid by fees ? The fee does not involve any expense upon Canada, and it would seem to be the preferable system.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The additional examiners will have to travel, and I do not know whether they will be willing to be paid by fee or will desire to have the salary.

Mr. FOWLER. Where do they travel ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. To the different places where they hold examinations.

Mr. FOWLER. Why not appoint examiners at these different points ? Why send the government examiner around to the candidate to examine him ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman will understand that if you are to have an examiner in every place it would be necessary to appoint 100 more.

Mr. FOWLER. You have these examining officers only at the great seaports, and they are residents of these cities. It is not necessary for them to travel, that I can see ; let the candidate travel to them. Why should the country pay ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We are trying to do the best that is possible in the interests of the people, and we are trying to lessen the cost. We should afford to those who desire to take the examination every facility for doing so. Last summer, for instance, many complaints came to me that the examiners were not able to go from place to place in time to hold these examinations, and the vessels

were delayed by the certificates not being given promptly. Under these circumstances I thought it was better to increase the number of examiners and to provide for the examinations in order to give better satisfaction to those who were engaged in navigation.

Mr. FOWLER. Why should a vessel be delayed because certificates are not given to masters or mates who were up for examination ? The minister apparently does not understand the question.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman does not understand the question ; if the vessels are not provided with captains and mates duly certificated the vessels cannot go to sea.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not think there is any particular dearth of captains or mates throughout the country. I do not see why the country should pay the cost of sending around to all the different inland ports or the different maritime ports if you will, to examine these candidates who wish to become captains or mates. Why should the candidate not pay any reasonable expense in connection with the examination ? It seems to me that the system of fees is the proper system, and you are making a very wrong departure if you depart from that and establish the system of payment by the country and of sending the examiners around to any port where there might be the captain of a fishing schooner who wanted a certificate. By doing this you are converting the whole thing into a screaming farce. The minister has not given us any explanation whatever of why this additional charge on the public treasury is to be made. The explanation he has given is worse than none at all, and it looks as if he did not know much about the matter. I think that he should move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again in order that he may acquaint himself with the facts.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is very clever.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister says that is very clever, and says it sarcastically. I think the exhibition the minister has made of his lack of knowledge in respect to this matter should convince the members of the committee that we should not be called upon to vote an additional $2,000 in order to make these examining boards a sort of travelling show that will go around like a pedlar's cart to every candidate who wishes to be made a captain or mate. The thing is so absurd that the minister should take my suggestion in good part as being kindly meant —for it was kindly meant. There are only two examining boards that I know of in the maritime provinces, one in St. John, N.B., and the other in Halifax.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman does not seem to have listened to what I have said. I have given the names and addresses of the examiners.

Mr. KENDALL. There has been one at Sydney for years.

Mr. COPP. They have one in Yarmouth and always had one.

Mr. FOWLER. Have they not one in Digby ? There should be one to examine the new wharf which the hon. gentleman is to get a $5,000 grant for.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Holmes). Order.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the matter ?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Holmes.) You have no right to make an insinuation about an hon. member.

Mr. COPP. I beg your pardon, I said nothing of the kind. The hon. gentleman said there were only two in the maritime provinces, and I thought he had forgotten the others.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order. I have no right to be spoken to in that way by the chairman. I made no remark whatever.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Holmes). I made no reference to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) at all.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood you said I called his attention to it.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Holmes). I did not refer to you at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. COCHRANE. No it isn't. A candidate for the civil service has to go to the place where the examinations are held and why have the examiners to go from place to place after these captains who want to be examined. I never heard of such a thing in my life as to pay men to run about the country to meet captains who want to pass an examination. We all know that these officials of the government, when they are travelling around the country, want all the luxuries of life ; probably those examiners will want down quilts, and things like that. But if they were travelling at their own expense they would not be so extravagant.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is the duty of the minister to give a detailed explanation of what he wants the vote for. We want a detailed explanation of this.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I stated that last year the vote was for $5,000 and we require $2,000 more this year, because we intend to have four more examiners. Capt Salmon will be obliged to go to the different ports and organize for these examinations to see that

they are carried out properly. You must pay his travelling expenses and you must pay the four examiners who will be required. Capt. Salmon was obliged to go to British Columbia to look after the service there. We have had a great deal of difficulty in finding a man qualified as Capt. Salmon is to take the position at $2,000. It was only after a good deal of inquiry in Canada and England that we succeeded in getting Capt. Salmon. He had been employed in Canada on the surveys by the British government, and he became attached to Canada, and accepted the position. We will have to pay his salary and travelling expenses, and also the travelling expenses of the four extra examiners.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister has as yet given no detailed explanation. He says he will spend this money in sending men trotting around the country.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I never said anything of the sort, and the hon. gentleman has no right to put words in my mouth that I did not use. I did not say that I would send the examiners trotting around the country, but I said that the chairman of the board would have to travel, and that some of the examiners would be obliged to travel, and we must pay their expenses.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then the minister should tell us how much he will spend on these travelling expenses.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. How can I tell this in advance. How can I tell whether Capt. Salmon will have to make two or three trips to British Columbia ?

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister should have a detailed estimate from his officials of what he is going to do with this money. He is asking for a blind vote of $2,000, but he will not get his estimates through unless he tells us in detail what he is going to spend this money for.

Mr. LEFURGEY. At what points in the maritime provinces are there standing boards where masters and mates can take their certificates ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Halifax, Lunenburg, Yarmouth and Sydney, N.S.; St. John, N.B., and Charlottetown, P.E.I., and Quebec.

Mr. LEFURGEY. At what points will those four new examiners be stationed ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Capt. Salmon has recommended that we should provide for four additional examiners.

Mr. LEFURGEY. It is extraordinary to submit a vote without any more definite information than that four new examiners are required and that the man who recommends them does not know where they are to be stationed. Are they required in the maritime provinces ? If there are four examiners in Nova Scotia, one in New Brunswick, one in Prince Edward Island, within a distance of a few hundred miles of each other, I cannot understand why we need more examiners down there. Are these to be travelling examiners ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are no travelling examiners. Only the chairman of the board travels around and sees that the various boards are properly organized and the examinations properly held. He has ascertained that there will be required in the course of the year four more examiners to be placed at Victoria, B.C., St. John, N.B., Halifax, Charlottetown, and he has asked me to provide for their remuneration and their travelling expenses as well as his own. His own travelling expenses will be considerable.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What is Mr. Salmon's salary ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. $2,000.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Is he a recent appointment ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He was appointed in February or March.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Who held the position before him ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Captain Bloomfield Douglas was doing the work in the meantime.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Then the hon. minister cannot state how this $1,000 will be expended.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I said it would cover extra travelling expenses not only of the four men, but other necessary expenses. As I have pointed out, in three or four instances last season there were complaints of very serious delays, owing to the examiners not being able to hold the examinations in time. The hon. gentleman must know that I have no interest whatever except in getting the best service possible. I do not know anything about it personally. I have to take the recommendation of the head officer, who is supposed to know all the details, and if it is reasonable, I submit it to the House.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I am only asking for information, because I have had something to do with the shipping business for a number of years, and I cannot understand why there should be any delay to the shipping interests of the maritime provinces to necessitate four additional examiners being appointed. The candidates go up for examination at either St. John or Halifax, and their examination is simply a matter of a

day or two. Yet it appears from the hon. minister's language that these men have to travel around to meet the exigencies of any particular person who wants to take an examination as master or mate. I would like to know if it is customary to bring down estimates with the small amount of information which we have regarding this item ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Is there any use of having members of parliament here to vote money ? The hon. gentleman says that Mr. Salmon states that two examiners will be required; but he refuses to state where these gentlemen are to be placed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. One is going to be at Charlottetown—Mr. Alexander Cameron.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman wishes us to vote this money without knowing where these gentlemen are to be placed. The House should know as well or better than Mr. Salmon whether two more examiners are required or not. The hon. gentleman volunteers a little information, saying that one of them is going to be at Charlottetown. It is probably for the representatives of Prince Edward Island to say whether he is required there or not. I understood the hon. minister to say a few moments ago that there was a board for Prince Edward Island. Where is the other to be, and what is the salary of each ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have already mentioned the locations.

Mr. TAYLOR. The House ought to know before we vote the salary.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is not salary. There may be a little remuneration paid to them, but the most important item is the travelling expenses.

Mr. BLAIN. Is this a new system ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No. What is new about it is improvement. Formerly the president of the board did not follow up the business as closely as Mr. Salmon is doing at present; and of course it stands to reason that if he wants the work to be done properly, and he has to visit the different places, he will incur more expenses than formerly. I do not want the certificates to be delayed, and whatever travelling expenses may be deemed necessary will be taken out of this sum of $2,000.

Mr. BLAIN. How many examiners are there at present ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are nineteen, with the new one appointed at Charlottetown.

Mr. BLAIN. In the discussion of this item last year the hon. minister gave the names of the examiners, and I think there were not more than seven or eight. When were these new ones appointed ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Some of them are officers of the department, and they have no salary as examiners.

Mr. KAULBACH. How many boards of examiners are there in the province of Nova Scotia ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are four places in Nova Scotia where examinations are held. There are three officers in Halifax, one in Lunenburg, one in Yarmouth, and one in Sydney.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Was the additional appointment at Charlottetown made on the recommendation of Mr. Salmon ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Is it because more business is being done there by the shipping interests ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. LEFURGEY. It is a strange thing if more help is required by the examining board at Charlottetown than was required twenty years ago, when there was three or four times the amount of shipping that there is at the present time.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman is not satisfied that we should have this examiner at Charlottetown, we will cancel the appointment. That is very easily done. The appointment was made on the recommendation of Mr. Salmon, to accommodate the shipping interest of Prince Edward Island. They used to go to Halifax before and if the hon. gentleman wants the old system restored, I shall do it with pleasure.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The hon. minister may think that that is good political talk, but it will not go down to the people of the Island. We are here to ask for information, and I want to know why he is appointing an examining officer there ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. To accommodate the people of Prince Edward Island, who are always ready to claim their rights. I wish to save their travelling from Charlottetown to Halifax in order to get an examiner. We have appointed one at Charlottetown.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I understood that there had been one there right along.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, this is a new appointment.

Mr. LEFURGEY. When I asked the hon. minister to give me the examiners in the maritime provinces, he said there was one at St. John and one at Charlottetown.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I read the names of those I have in this return, and I read the name of Mr. Cameron, at Charlottetown, because he has been appointed.

Mr. LEFURGEY. At the same time he said that he did not know that there were new appointments at the time, and I therefore understood it was an old appointment.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I said I did not know either of the four. I read the name of Cameron as one of the examiners, and he has been appointed. I gave the information as I got it from my deputy.

Mr. FOWLER. When the Minister of Public Works comes down with his estimates he has the information all before him, and can give it, and it seems to me that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has been long enough in the department to explain his expenditure. The shipping owned in Canada has declined within the last twenty years notwithstanding the boast of the hon. gentleman a few minutes ago. There is not as much tonnage owned in Canada as there was twenty years ago, yet we are to have a great many additional examiners to examine candidates for masters and mates. Why should this be necessary? These hon. gentlemen seem to be so anxious to spend the public money that they are looking all around for opportunities to do it. Where will these examiners have to travel to hold examinations? Will any examiner go beyond the county where he lives?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That will depend entirely on circumstances.

Mr. FOWLER. By what section of the law, of what regulations of the department is an examiner bound to travel at the request of some candidate for a master's certificate? There is no examination point at Digby. Suppose some one at Digby wants to be examined for a certificate as a master, will he write to the examining officer at Sydney to go down and be examined? Under what circumstances are those examining officers at the different points obliged to stop?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot say under what section. Their travelling expenses may be very trivial.

Mr. FOWLER. Why should they amount to anything?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Most of this travelling will be done by Mr. Salmon himself.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the hon. minister say that $1,000 of this $2,000 is for Mr. Salmon's travelling expenses? What do you do with the other thousand dollars?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I said that the $2,000 provides partly for the salary of Mr. Salmon and partly for travelling expenses, and there might be some travelling expenses for the other.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. gentleman now says that Mr. Salmon's salary is $2,000, $200 in excess of his former salary. Now he says that his travelling expenses will be $1,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Perhaps more.

Mr. FOWLER. That will be a very large amount, $3 a day for the whole 365 days. Surely he would not travel twelve months in the year. The hon. minister has now $800 to account for, how is he going to account for that? It cannot be for the salaries of the examiners, because they are paid by fees. He has appointed Mr. Cameron resident examiner in Charlottetown, and there is another one to be appointed on the recommendation of Mr. Salmon. Why is it necessary that this second man should be appointed? This man does not get a salary and the hon. minister cannot say why one of these examining officers should travel from one point of the country to the other at the expense of the country. These men who are candidates for certificates as masters and mates are obliged to go to these examining stations and the government has been very generous in establishing so many excellent stations. The government has done more than its duty by these men. A man who reaches such a position is perfectly able to travel, besides these candidates can sail in the vessels in which they are engaged to these various points where the examiners are to be found, and pass his examination when he reaches any one of these points. Therefore it is absolutely unnecessary that any travelling expenses should be charged up by these examining officers, and the committee would be derelict in its duty if it passed this vote of $8,000 which the hon. minister is absolutely unable to account for.

Mr. HACKETT. Is Mr. Salmon a resident of Charlottetown?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. HACKETT. He is a very good man. What is he to be given as compensation for his services?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is not yet decided what the salary is to be.

Mr. HACKETT. The hon. minister could not appoint a better man.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am very anxious indeed to see our mercantile marine a suc-

cess, and I think the Minister of Marine has the same object in view as myself. In order to accomplish what we both desire, it is necessary that our young men who desire to follow the sea for a livelihood should be given every opportunity to prepare themselves for their calling by a suitable education. It would be therefore, advisable to open marine schools in some of the most important ports in the maritime provinces. And I would ask for one in my own town, which represents an amount of shipping beyond that of any other county. There are more vessels belonging to Lunenburg, I believe, than to all the other counties combined. I would suggest that a school be opened in that place in order that we should be able to advance our young men as far as possible in preparation for their work in connection with navigation. I am sure that the effect will be to advance the interests of the whole country.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is another item in the supplementary estimates providing for the special study of schools of navigation. At present I am only following what has been done by my predecessors and voting enough money to maintain existing services. But I intend, under the advice of Captain Salmon, who is a very efficient officer, to have this matter gone into thoroughly and have efficient schools of navigation established at the proper ports. The matter will be brought before the parliament next session.

Mr. KAULBACH. The hon. minister will not forget, then, the county I represent, the centre of a very large class who are deserving of a great deal of attention in this respect.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Kaulbach) will see that Lunenburg is not neglected. There is an officer there already.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am aware of that, but we are deserving of a little more.

Mr. FOWLER. I think the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) is somewhat sarcastic when he speaks of establishing a marine school in Lunenburg. There is already a school in St. John, and one school, it strikes me, is enough for the maritime provinces. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Kaulbach) is poking fun at the minister and the examining stations and suggesting schools. There are examining points. I understand, in other places than the maritime provinces. At what points in Ontario does the hon. minister intend to have officers ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In Ontario there is Captain Donnelly, at Kingston, who is one of the examiners, and, one at St. Catharines, and of course, these at Ottawa.

Mr. KAULBACH. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) makes reference to Lunenburg. I want him to understand that Lunenburg is a centre. It is half way between Cape Sable and Cape North, and immediately on the coast, where most of the sailors concentrate. I think the appeal I have made should be favourably considered.

Mr. BOYD. Is the hon. minister establishing examining boards on the Lake of the Woods ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is an officer at Rat Portage and one at Winnipeg.

Mr. BOYD. Who are they ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Phillips at Rat Portage and Capt. Tingling at Winnipeg.

Mr. FOWLER. Are these officers paid by salary or by fees ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The two I have just named are paid by fee, but not all are so paid.

Mr. FOWLER. How is Captain Cameron, who was appointed at Charlottetown, paid ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. By fees ; only foreign going deep sea examiners are paid salaries.

Mr. FOWLER. What is his salary ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No salary. He is not paid a fixed salary.

Mr. FOWLER. And is the officer at Sydney paid by fees ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. And at Halifax ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Captain Douglas, who is the officer there, is paid by salary, $300 I think.

Mr. FOWLER. Is the officer at St. John paid by salary ? I think Mr. Stammers was the officer there, but he has since died.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Captain Cole has been appointed at St. John.

Mr. FOWLER. How long is it since the officer at St. John died ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Captain Murphy of Yarmouth, used to hold the examinations at St. John.

Mr. FOWLER. No officer at St. John ? No officer at the leading port of the maritime provinces and the great winter port of Canada. And you are appointing officers at Charlottetown, Lunenburg, Yarmouth, Halifax, and these other small towns ? I am surprised. Why, the hon. minister must know that it is the natural point for many of these people to go for their examination. As the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Copp)

knows, St. John is the natural centre of Bay of Fundy ports ; it is the place where the vessels go with their loads and for their loads. The hon. minister could appoint an officer there and pay him by fee, and he would make enough to remunerate him.

Mr. COPP. I was going to ask about St. John. I do not see why there should not be an officer there. I desire to say also that I think the observations of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) deserve consideration. There should be schools in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, where the candidates can be prepared for these examinations. I was under the impression that there was a school in St. John and one in Yarmouth.

Mr. FOWLER. There used to be one in St. John, presided over by a gentleman named Stammers. But I think he has since died, and I do not know whether the school was kept up or not. It is a very proper thing that there should be a marine school. I would be willing to support any grant for that purpose. But, of course, it should be at St. John. That is the only point for a school.

Mr. BLAIN. What revenue is there from this department ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Last year it was $5,292.

Mr. BLAIN. Are the charges upon the country greater than that amount ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Last year they were about the same.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is there any examiner between Kingston and St. Catharines ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Though there is no examiner in Toronto, an officer goes to that city when an examination is to be held there.

Mr. SPROULE. What constitutes a board, one examiner or a number ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It depends upon the circumstances. Sometimes it is only one, sometimes two or three.

Mr. SPROULE. I take it that if you have examinations where you have officers, travelling expenses will be saved.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As I have said, the travelling expenses of the examiners, other than Mr. Salmon, are very small. An examiner goes from Kingston to Toronto and his expenses have to be paid ; in the same way with an examiner going from Ottawa to Toronto to hold an examination. They may be two or three holding examinations at the same time for masters and mates. Mr. Salmon is nearly all the time on the road, either as an examiner, or as controller of the other examiners, or as holding investigations into casualties.

Mr. SPROULE. Are we to understand that Mr. Salmon has to go round and organize a board where it only consists of one person ? What kind of an organization does he require to make where there is only one examiner ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He has to visit most of the stations where these examiners are placed in order to instruct them how to perform their duties.

Mr. SPROULE. That would be quite proper. I understood the minister to say there was one at Kingston, one at St. Catharines and one at Rat Portage. Are these the only three in the province of Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They are supplemented by our own officers here in Ottawa, where we have Capt. McElhinney, Capt. McCuaig and Capt. Magee.

Mr. SPROULE. Should there not be one at Sault Ste. Marie, or Port Arthur, or Owen Sound, somewhere on the upper lakes, where there is a great deal of shipping ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have taken the service just as I found it when I came into office. There was no head to it, no officer in charge, and I appointed Capt. Salmon as the head. Capt. Salmon, after entering upon the office, investigated the whole system to see if any improvements could be made, and he recommended the improvements which we are now trying to carry out by appointing four more examiners this year. Probably it will be necessary to change or to increase the number of places where examinations may be held.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister is making a reflection upon the gentleman who preceded him in the office. He says he found the service all out of shape, disorganized.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is distorting the words I used. I did not say the department was disorganized, I said there was no head to this particular service, because there was no officer holding the position which I found it necessary to fill by Mr. Salmon. I did not reflect upon my predecessors at all.

Mr. FOWLER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman did not intend to make a reflection, but his words could be easily construed as having that meaning. I am glad to know that the hon. gentleman did not intend to cast any reflection upon his predecessor. Still, I must say, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. gentleman has not shown us any reason why an official appointed at Charlottetown should be given a salary. He does not ex-

pect a salary, because he accepted the appointment with the understanding that he should only receive the fees. If a man in Sydney has only the fees which he earns, why should the man in Charlottetown be placed on a different footing? He does not perform any work. If he performs work, pay him for it; if he does not, why should he receive any salary? As a matter of fact, it seems to me that instead of increasing the examinations there might very well be less, by concentrating them in a few places. You have two examiners in some places and in other places only one. Now, is a certificate granted by one examiner just as good as a certificate granted by three? There should be some system. I really think this whole department requires a very severe shaking up. There is no reason why at Sydney, for instance, a man should go before one examiner and be granted a certificate, whereas at another place he requires to go before three examiners to get a certificate. The thing is absurd on the face of it. Instead of having examiners at a number of little places like Sydney, you should have a board of examiners at the great ports of the country.

Mr. KENDALL. Oh, you had better go and make butter and cheese and not talk about shipping.

Mr. FOWLER. I know more about shipping than the hon. member does, although he does come from a little place where they dig coal. So far as butter and cheese are concerned, I understood the hon. gentleman was a connoisseur, an adept in that line; he looks as if he had been milk-fed. I say that if the hon. minister wished to do his duty he would change this whole system and establish some principle with respect to the examination of masters and mates; he would establish at the ports like St. John, Halifax and Montreal, where all these vessels come at some time or other, boards of examiners of three men each, and then let these candidates come before these boards and pass a thorough examination, for nothing is more important than that these men should have a complete and thorough training. Then, he should establish schools. He should re-establish a school at St. John and should establish schools at these other points, and in that way something would really be done to benefit the sailor and the mercantile marine of this country.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there a uniform qualification for these masters and mates? How long has a man to be in the service before he can obtain a certificate to become the master of a vessel?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. These regulations are published in the report of the department, but I will lay them on the Table of the House.

Mr. FOWLER.

Mr. BLAIN. I will not press that question further. Might I ask the hon. minister if it is possible for a person to get a certificate as master without first having served as mate?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. COPP. I think he has to serve before the mast for five years as what is called an able seaman, and then serve two years as mate.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it a uniform qualification throughout Canada?

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister has told us that Mr. Salmon has double duties to perform, first to inspect the boards of examiners, and second, to investigate wrecks. There is another item of $2,000 for that purpose. Then he says that the cost of Mr. Salmon's travelling expenses will amount to about $1,000. Is he taking the whole of that $1,000 out of this $2,000, or is most of it for travelling in connection with the service of investigating wrecks?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is perfectly independent of whatever may be expended on the other item.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is perfectly independent. He has double duties to perform, will the general travelling expenses be charged against this item, or only a portion of them?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The travelling expenses for this service will be charged against this vote.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will his travelling expenses in this connection be $1,000 independent of the other?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot say.

Mr. TAYLOR. What estimate have your officers made of it?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This is the estimate of the officers and of Mr. Salmon.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, the salary is $2,000; will the hon. minister tell us what he is going to do with the other $800.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no $800.

Mr. TAYLOR. In the estimate last year there was $1,800, including the services of the officer who was to do this work.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That went back into the treasury because there was no officer to be paid.

Mr. TAYLOR. The estimate was there; we voted the money, and if it went back

to the treasury it was not spent. It is only increased by $200 this year. There is $1,000 for travelling expenses which is Mr. Salmon's estimate. Now, that is $1,200, and what is to be done with the other $800? Surely the hon. minister knows that no other minister asks in this way for a sum of money without stating exactly how he intends to disburse it. We want the details of every expenditure, and the Minister of Finance will at once acknowledge that it is the duty of the opposition to ascertain these particulars and of the government to furnish them to the House. The minister cannot expect us to vote money blindly to his or any other department. We ought to know the minister's explanation and his statements should be on record; then if he exceeds the appropriation made for that service he would come down for a supplementary estimate next year and the House would vote it, but the House should be put in possession of all the facts when the money is first asked for.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to make some further inquiry about British Columbia and Quebec, which were not spoken of by the minister. He did not tell us what stations there are in Quebec or British Columbia.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. For British Columbia we have provided for an extra expenditure of $300, which is not to be taken out of the $2,000 for Captain Gaudet, who performs these services. He is an old officer of the department. The officer in charge at Quebec city is Mr. Seaton.

Mr. SPROULE. Then you have no officer at Montreal?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, there is none in Montreal, but this whole matter is being studied at the present time in order to arrive at a complete reorganization of this department and to decide where it would be most advantageous to hold these examinations.

Mr. FOWLER. As a matter of fact, then, you have an examining board at Rat Portage and not at Montreal?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not say that.

Mr. FOWLER. Is that not the fact?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What do you mean by a fact? You need not point your finger at me in that way.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister need not get excited. I was not pointing my finger at you.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You are excited.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister is very sensitive, he should not get so excited. I asked if there is an examining board at Rat Portage and none at Montreal?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I never said anything of the sort, I said there was an officer at Rat Portage; I never said it was an examining point.

Mr. FOWLER. What kind of an officer?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. An examining officer.

Mr. FOWLER. If Rat Portage is not an examining point, where is the examining done?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The officer examines at Rat Portage or elsewhere.

Mr. FOWLER. Then he does examine, as a matter of fact, at Rat Portage?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Suppose he does?

Mr. FOWLER. Does that officer come from Rat Portage, or any other point, to Montreal?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is not serious.

Mr. FOWLER. I am.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No member of the committee thinks he is serious, when he asks if I would bring an officer from Rat Portage to Montreal. It is absurd; it is ridiculous.

Mr. FOWLER. I said from Rat Portage or any other point.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are officers at Ottawa and Quebec.

Mr. FOWLER. Do they hold examinations at Montreal?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly, when necessary.

Mr. FOWLER. Would it not be more necessary to have an examiner at Montreal than at Rat Portage; Montreal being the greatest port in Canada?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Oh, no.

Mr. FOWLER. Do I understand the Minister of Justice to say that Montreal is not the greatest port in Canada?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Nearly, but not quite.

Mr. FOWLER. I can understand why the Minister of Justice should stand up for Quebec as I do for St. John. I was speaking in all kindness to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, but he seemed to get enraged, and if he chooses to do so he has a perfect right. I say that the whole system is rotten. I say that these examinations should

be held by a board and not by a single person ; I say that the examiners should be stationed at the great ports in Canada. I say the present system is ridiculous and whether it has existed from confederation or not, if it is a bad system it should be abolished.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the minister bring down a detailed statement, so that we may have it on 'Hansard,' of how much of this $2,000 is for travelling expenses, how much for salary, and how much for other things. If he promises to do that we will let the item pass.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have no objection whatever to give full details of the proposed expenditure.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to say one or two words regarding this vote—that unseemly noise and slamming of desks will not facilitate the passage of these items, and that may as well be understood early as late. We are here to do our duty according to our judgment, and we do not wish to delay, but such votes as this must be accompanied by detailed information. The minister is comparatively new in his department, and he may not know the details, but the opposition will not discharge its duty in passing these votes unless we have the information at some time.

Marine biological station, $3,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In 1898 a vote was taken for this purpose, and as the terms of the Order in Council expired in May of this year, the amount for maintenance was not placed in the main estimates. It was found that the $2,000 for maintenance was not sufficient, and university professors and others called on me and asked that it should be increased.

Further amount required for cattle inspection, $300.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where is this required ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. A large number of cattle have recently been shipped from St. John, N.B., and as the inspector there had only a salary of $500, and the officers at other ports had from $1,000 to $1,200, we thought that $500 was not sufficient for him.

Mr. FOWLER. Who is the officer at St. John ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Buckley.

Further amount required for awards for saving of life ; for life-saving stations, and for wages of crews and drill, clothing, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The department has twenty-nine life-saving stations ; fourteen in Ontario ; thirteen in Nova Scotia ; one at Grand Manan and one at Cape Tormentine. The men are required to sign articles to attend to drill or active service whenever called upon by the coxswain. They are supposed to put in fourteen drills during the season. It is important to secure the services of good boatmen. It is proposed to increase the drill allowance of the men from $1.50 to $2. They are doing very good work, and it has been represented that $1.50 is not sufficient.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the coxswain drill the crew ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Will it take all the $2,000 to give that increase ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there anything for this life-saving station on the Gulf of St. Lawrence, with reference to which the Prime Minister told us to-day the government would make a harbour of refuge, and where a life-saving station was needed ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not yet.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the minister give us the names of the life-saving stations in Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. On the great Lakes, Cobourg, Collingwood, Goderich, Pelee Island, Poplar Point, Port Hope, Port Colborne, Port Rowan, Port Stanley, Toronto, Wellington, Consecon, Long Point (Lake Erie) Kincardine.

Mr. BLAIN. I wish to draw the minister's attention to a very important place on Lake Ontario, in the county which I have the honour to represent—Port Credit. There is a volunteer crew there at the present time, which has been organized for several years. It has rescued several vessels that have been driven out on their way to the city of Toronto. I think it is a place which should be made a permanent station.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will call the attention of my officers to it, and have a report made upon it.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister do that soon ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As soon as possible.

Mr. BLAIN. If the department make the examination and find what services have been rendered by this volunteer crew, I think they will feel it to be their duty to establish a service at that point.

Further amount required for investigation into wrecks, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This is on the recommendation of Captain Salmon. This board is completely organized under him at the present time. Of course, it does not entail as much work as the organization of the examiners. But it was found that the amount of $2,000 was not sufficient to hold the examination asked for by the insurance companies and the British Board of Trade. We have adopted the rule in the department of holding an investigation into every casualty to ascertain who is responsible, whether it is the channel, the men in charge of the boats, or the boats. The results of all these investigations have been transmitted to the British Board of Trade.

Mr. FOWLER. How many were there last year ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Fifteen. This year, I think, we have already held twelve.

Mr. FOWLER. How much did you expend altogether last year ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Last year we had not enough money. We spent $4,000.

Mr. SPROULE. If I understand it correctly, Mr. Salmon is practically a commissioner to make all these inquiries.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He is a commissioner of investigation under the law, and he has associated with him two expert assessors.

Mr. SPROULE. Do the same men do the work all through ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No. Two assessors are taken from each place where he holds an investigation.

For expenses of inquiry into the subject of a Naval Militia and School of Navigation, $7,500.

Mr. FOWLER. Is this something new—a naval-militia ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There was originally asked $5,000, and the amount has been increased by $2,500 in order to enable us to study the system of establishing this naval reserve, of which so much has been said. It may be necessary to send an officer to some other countries in order to see how the same thing is organized in these countries. It may be necessary to send this officer to some other country to see how that is organized elsewhere. The school of navigation established last winter in Montreal gave very good satisfaction and I shall have a copy of the report made and put before the House. It is very interesting and shows that Captain Salmon knows the subject very well. These schools should be encouraged and the amount of $5,000 should not be considered too much.

Mr. KAULBACH. What is the number of the staff ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In Montreal they had four professors and the school was attended by about fifty pupils. There were lectures given on thirty-two subjects.

Gratuity to Alfred Couillard second mate of steamer 'Druid' for injuries while on duty, $600.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This poor fellow lost an eye while on duty. He claimed $1,000, and consented to accept $600.

Mr. FOWLER. I wish to commend the action of the hon. minister in granting this gratuity to this officer and I desire to take this opportunity to point out the different treatment accorded to officials on the Intercolonial when any accident occurs to them. Last year an accident took place near Belmont on the line of the Intercolonial. Several persons were killed in the accident and one brakesman severely injured. It was a miracle he was not killed. He had several ribs and a leg broken. He was laid up and unable to work some six or eight months. During that time all that he received was three dollars a week, which he got as a member of an insurance association. To show how differently he was treated from this man, let me point to this fact. His run was to Moncton, and as he was unable to get into Moncton on account of the wreck, he was only paid half a day for that day. That sort of treatment cannot be too severely condemned. It is not the treatment which would be accorded by any private firm or corporation to its employees. There is not a man in business who would use an employee in that way, when that employee was injured in his service, without any fault on the employee's part. This man was injured in the service of the Intercolonial, and they would not pay him his full day's wage on the day of his accident because he was unable to reach Moncton where his day's run ended. I am glad to see that the Department of Marine and Fisheries treats its employees in a different manner. I would ask the hon. minister to look into this case—the case of Brakeman Crandall—who was injured in the Belmont disaster. He has a wife and large family, and all he got was $3 per week from an insurance company.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not had that particular case before me, but I promise to look into it. I would remind my hon. friend that this insurance fund to which he refers is supported to a considerable extent by the government and that fact may have been taken into consideration. However, I do not offer an opinion as to whether the compensation was adequate and will inquire into the matter.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to suggest that if the hon. gentleman who is leading the House would consult with the right hon. the Prime Minister as to what items on the paper shall be dropped and what gone on with, we could estimate better how long we are likely to be kept here.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister will make such a statement probably to-morrow, certainly not later than Monday. The Bill which the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has in charge, and which is being transferred to government Orders, with respect to the election law, will be taken up to-morrow. If that be disposed of, we will proceed with the estimates at the point where we left off to-night.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, October 10, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

NOTICES FOR PRIVATE BILLS.

On motion of Mr. Demers (St. John and Iberville), House went into committee to consider the report of the Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons for the purpose of revising Rule 51 of the House of Commons and Rule 49 of the Senate, and making them agree. (Votes and Proceedings of House of Commons, August 18, 1903.)

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). I beg to move:

That the report of the Select Committee appointed to confer with a similar committee of the Senate, for the purpose of revising Rule 51 of the House of Commons and Rule 49 of the Senate, be amended by striking out the words 'over the name and address of the solicitor for the applicant,' in the 8th and 9th lines, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:—'signed by or on behalf of the applicant, with the address of the party signing the same.'

This will make rule 51 read as follows:

All applications to parliament for private Bills of any nature whatsoever shall be advertised by a notice published in the 'Canada Gazette.' Such notice shall clearly and distinctly state the nature and object of the application, and shall be signed by or on behalf of the applicant with the address of the party signing the same. And when the application is for an Act of incorporation, the name of the proposed company shall be stated in the notice.

This has the consent of the Senate.

Amendment agreed to.

On section (a), subsection 4,

In addition to the notice in the 'Canada Gazette' aforesaid, a similar notice shall also be published in some leading newspeper, when the application is for an Act to incorporate a railway or canal company. In the principal city and town or village in each county through which the proposed railway or canal is to be constructed.

Mr. SPROULE. On behalf of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), I beg to move the following amendment:

That at the end of the first paragraph thereof the following words be added:—

And if the works of any company (incorporated, or to be incorporated) are to be declared to be for the general advantage of Canada, such intention shall be specifically mentioned in the notice; and the applicants shall cause a copy of such notice to be sent by registered letter to the clerk of each municipality which may be specially affected by the construction or operation of such works, and also to the secretary of the province in which such works are, or may be located; and proof of compliance with this requirement by the applicants shall be established by statutory declaration.

That is for the purpose of giving notice to municipalities interested when in any Bill it is declared that the work is for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). I understand that this has also been agreed to by the Senate.

Amendment agreed to.

On section (b),

(b.) When the application is for the purpose of amending an existing Act:

1. For the extension of any line of railway, or of any canal; or for the construction of branches thereto:—In the principal city, town or village in each county or district through which such extension or branch is to be constructed.

2. For the extension of the time for the construction or completion of any line or railway, or of any canal, or of any telegraph or telephone line, or of any other works already authorized:—In the place where the head office of the company is, or is authorized to be.

3. For the extension of the power of a company (when not involving the granting of any exclusive rights); or for the increase or reduction of the capital stock of any company; or for increasing or altering its bonding or other borrowing powers, or for any amendment which would in any way affect the rights or interests of the shareholders or creditors of the company:—In the place where the head office of the company is situated.

All such notices, whether inserted in the 'Canada Gazette' or in a newspaper, shall be published at least once a week, for a period of five consecutive weeks; and when published in the provinces of Quebec and Manitoba, shall

be in both the English and French languages ; and marked copies of each issue of all newspapers containing such notice shall be sent to the Clerk of the House, endorsed 'Private Bill Notice' ; or a statutory declaration as to due publication may be sent in lieu thereof.

Mr. SPROULE. Why not have that private Bill notice in duplicate ? The notice must be considered by the Senate as well as by the House of Commons.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Senate have the same rule.

Mr. SPROULE. These are rules agreed to by the Joint Committee of the House of Commons and Senate.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, but they are to be rules of the House of Commons. They are not rules of the Senate, though the Senate will have the same rule.

On proposed rule 51c,

No petition praying for the incorporation of a railway company, or of a canal company, or for the extension of the line of any existing or authorized railway or canal, shall be considered by the Standing Orders Committee, until there has been filed with the committee a map or plan, showing the proposed location of the works, and each county or district, through which the proposed railway or canal, or any branch or extension thereof, is to be constructed.

Mr. DEMERS (Iberville). The applicants are obliged to furnish the Railway Committee with a map. We want to have a map before the Standing Orders Committee, in order that we may know that the notices have been given where they should be given. Of course, the same map can be used before the Railway Committee.

Resolutions reported, read the second time, and agreed to.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House do on Monday next go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolutions :

That it is expedient to enact as follows :—

1. The Governor in Council may grant a subsidy of $3,200 per mile towards the construction of each of the undermentioned lines of railway (not exceeding in any case the number of miles hereinafter respectively stated) which shall not cost more on the average than $15,000 per mile for the mileage subsidized, and towards the construction of each of the said lines of railway, not exceeding the mileage hereinafter stated, which shall cost more on the average than $15,000 per mile for the mileage subsidized, a further subsidy beyond the sum of $3,200 per mile of fifty per cent on so much of the average cost of the mileage subsidized as is in excess of $15,000 per mile, such subsidy not exceeding in the whole the sum of $6,400 per mile:—

RENEWALS OF SUBSIDIES PREVIOUSLY VOTED.

	Miles.
1. To the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company for a line of railway from the present terminus at Ingersoll to Woodstock, not exceeding 9 miles, in lieu of subsidy granted by chapter 7 of 1899, item 26 of section 2..	9
2. To the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company for a line of railway from Burketon to Bobcaygeon, not exceeding 40 miles, in lieu of the subsidy granted by chapter 7 of 1899, item 11 of section 2..	40
3. To the Toronto, Lindsay and Pembroke Railway Company for a line of railway from Golden Lake to Bancroft, not exceeding 51 miles, in lieu of subsidy granted by chapter 7 of 1901, item 6 of section 2..	51
4. To the Central Ontario Railway for a further extension of its railway from a point at or near Bancroft to a point on the Canada Atlantic Railway at or near Whitney, not exceeding 40 miles, in lieu of subsidies granted by chapter 8 of 1900, item 5 of section 2, and chapter 7 of 1901, item 16 of section 2, respectively..	40
5. To the Strathroy and Western Counties Railway Company for a line of railway from a point at or near Caradoc Station on the Canadian Pacific Railway to Strathroy and from Strathroy northerly to Forest, Thedford or Parkhill, not exceeding in all 31 miles, in lieu of subsidies granted by chapter 7 of 1899, item 4 of section 2, and chapter 8 of 1900, item 2 of section 2, respectively..	31
6. To the Montfort and Gatineau Colonization Railway Company to extend its railway from Arundel to a point in the municipality of the United Townships of Preston and Hartwell, not exceeding 30 miles, in lieu of subsidy granted by chapter 8 of 1900, item 31 of section 2..	30
7. For a line of railway from Jonquières to La Baie des Ha Ha, not exceeding 20 miles, in lieu of subsidy of 12 miles granted by chapter 7 of 1899, item 21 of section 2..	20
8. For a line of railway from Lime Ridge northerly through the county of Wolfe into the county of Megantic, not exceeding 50 miles, being a revote of subsidy granted by chapter 4 of 1894	50
9. For a line of railway from Joliette to or near Lake Maréan, a distance not exceding 60 miles, being a revote and in lieu of subsidies granted by chapter 4 of 1897 and chapter 8 of 1900..	60
10. For a line of railway from St. Eustache to St. Placide in the county of Two Mountains, not to exceed 18 miles ; from St. Eustache to Sault au Recollet, 12 miles; and from St. Placide to St. Andrews, 8 miles, not exceeding in all 38 miles, being a revote of subsidies granted by chapter 24 of 1887 and chapter 5 of 1892, respectively..	38

Miles.

11. For a line of railway from Roberval westward towards James Bay, not exceeding 60 miles, in lieu of subsidy granted by chapter 7 of 1901, item 25 of section 2.. 60

12. For a line of railway from Yamaska to Lotbinière, a distance not exceeding 70 miles, in lieu of the subsidy granted by chapter 7 of 1899, item 27 of section 2.. 70

13. To the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company for that portion of its line from a point at the east end of the Hull station yard of the Canadian Pacific Railway to a point of junction with the Interprovincial bridge approach in the city of Hull, not exceeding one mile; and for a line of railway into and through the city of Hull from a point on the Ottawa and Gatineau Railway, now the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway, not exceeding 4 miles, in lieu of the subsidies granted by chapter 7 of 1899, section 2, items 12 and 39 respectively.. 5

14. To the International Railway Company of New Brunswick (formerly the Restigouche and Western Railway Company), for a line of railway from the western end of the ten miles of its railway, as already constructed from Campbellton towards a point on the St. John river between Grand Falls and Edmundston, not exceeding 67 miles, being a revote, and in lieu of subsidies granted by chapter 4 of 1897, chapter 7 of 1899, item 42 of section 2 and chapter 8 of 1900, item 22 of section 2..... 67

15. For a line of railway from Woodstock to the International boundary, not exceeding 26 miles, being a revote of the subsidy granted by chapter 4 of 1894.. 26

16. To the St. John Valley Railway Company for a line of railway from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway at or near Welford or Westfield or between said two points to Gagetown, not exceeding 30 miles, being a revote of the subsidy granted by chapter 4 of 1897.. 30

17. To the Shediac and Coast Railway Company for a line of railway from Shediac to Shemogue and towards Cape Tormentine, in Westmoreland county, not exceeding 38 miles, in lieu of subsidy granted by chapter 8 of 1900, item 25 of section 2.. 38

18. To the Mabou and Gulf Railway Company, Limited, for a line of railway from Mabou Coal Mines to a point at or near Glendyer, thence to Orangedale on the Intercolonial Railway, not exceeding 34 miles, a revote of subsidy granted by chapter 4 of 1894, and in substitution of the 25 miles subsidized thereby from Orangedale to Broad Cove.. 34

Hon. Mr. FIELDING.

Miles.

19. To the Nova Scotia Eastern Railway Company, Limited, for a line of railway from New Glasgow to Cross Roads, Country Harbour, thence to the town of Guysborough, and thence to the strait of Canso ; with a branch from Cross Roads, Country Harbour, aforesaid, down the Country Harbour river to the Deep Waters thereof, not exceeding 116 miles; in lieu of the subsidies of 40 and 80 miles granted by chapter 7 of 1901, items 4 and 1, respectively, of section 2.. 116

20. For a line of railway from Debert station on the Intercolonial Railway to Debert Coal Mine, not exceeding 4½ miles, in lieu of the subsidy granted by chapter 8 of 1900, item 29 of section 2.. .. .. 4½

21. For a line of railway from a point on the Joggins Railway near River Herbert Railway bridge to the village of Minudie, not exceeding 6 miles, being a revote and in substitution of subsidy granted by chapter 4 of 1894.. 6

22. To the Middleton and Victoria Beach Railway Company, Limited, for a line of railway from Victoria Beach to Middleton, not exceeding 41 miles, in lieu of subsidies granted by chapter 8 of 1900, section 2, item 28, and chapter 7 of 1901, section 2, item 21.. 41

23. To the Halifax and South-western Railway Company for the following lines of railway:—

(a.) for a line of railway from a point at or near Halifax to a point on the Central Railway at or near Mahone Bay, not exeeeding 68 miles.. 68

(b.) for a line of railway from a point on the Central Railway at or near Bridgewater towards Barrington passage not exceeding 77 miles.. 77

(c.) for a line of railway from a point at or near New Germany on the Central Railway to a point at or near Caledonia, not exceeding 22 miles.. 22

(d.) for a line of railway from a point at or near Caledonia to Liverpool, not exceeding 29 miles.. 29

The subsidies to the said lines of railway being granted in lieu of the subsidies granted by chapter 7 of 1899, items 17, 18, 35 and 36 of section 2, by chapter 8 of 1900, items 26 and 40 of section 2, and also chapter 7 of 1901, items 5 and 23 of section 2, respectively.

24. To the Inverness Railway and Coal Company, formerly the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company, Limited, for 8 miles of railway between Point Tupper and Broad Cove ; and for a line of railway not exceeding 37 miles, from Cheticamp to a point on the line already built between Broad Cove and Point Tupper, being a revote and in substitution of the subsidy granted by chapter 4 of 1897 45

Miles.

25. For a line of railway from a point at or near Wolfville or the Dominion Atlantic Railway to the government pier on the basin of Minas, not exceeding one mile, in lieu of the subsidy granted by chapter 7 of 1901, section 2, item 19.. 1

26. To the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company for a line of railway from a point at or near Spence's bridge on the Canadian Pacific Railway to Nicola lake, not exceeding 45 miles, being a revote of subsidies granted by chapter 5 of 1892 and chapter 4 of 1894.. 45

27. For a line of railway from Winnipeg Beach or Teulon to a point on Icelandic river by way of Gimli, not exceeding 35 miles, in lieu of subsidy granted by chapter 7 of 1901, section 2, item 26.. 35

28. To the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company for a line of railway from the town of South Edmonton, N.W.T., to North Edmonton, and thence westerly towards the Yellow Head Pass, a distance not exceeding 50 miles, in lieu of subsidy granted by chapter 7 of 1899, section 2, item 41.. 50

29. To the St. John Valley and Rivière du Loup Railway Company for a line of railway from Fredericton, N.B., to Woodstock, not exceding 59 miles, in lieu of the subsidy granted by chapter 7 of 1899, item 5 of section 2.. 59

NEW SUBSIDIES.

30. For a line of railway from Hawkesbury, Ontario, to South Indian, not exceeding 35 miles, in lieu of subsidy granted by chapter 7 of 1899, item 22 of section 2.. 35

31. To the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company for a line of railway from Woodstock northerly to a point on the Grand Trunk Railway at Berlin, or from Ingersoll to Stratford, or to any point on the Grand Trunk Railway between these places, not exceeding 35 miles, being in addition to, and continuation of the nine miles mentioned in item one of this section.. 35

32. To the Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Railway Company for a line of railway from the present terminus of its railway, near Bancroft, easterly to a point at or near Renfrew, not exceeding 75 miles.. 75

33. To the Nepigon Railway Company for a line of railway from Lake Superior to Lake Nepigon, and from a point on the North Shore of Lake Nepigon northerly, not exceeding 80 miles.. 80

34. To the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company for a line of railway from Little Current on its present line, to Sudbury, and thence towards the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, not exceeding 30 miles, in lieu of the subsidy of 21 miles granted by chapter 7 of 1899, item 38 of section 2.. 30

Miles.

35. To the Thunder Bay, Nepigon and St. Joe Railway Company for a line of railway from Port Arthur northeasterly, not exceeding 50 miles.. 50

36. To the Temagami Railway Company for a line of railway from a point at or near Sturgeon Falls in a northwesterly direction to a point on the westerly shore of Lake Temagami in the district of Nipissing, not exceeding 50 miles.. 50

37. To the Bay of Quinté Railway Company for further extension of its line of railway, from the northern terminus thereof, commencing from a point at or near Actinolite, thence in a northwesterly direction via the villages of Queensborough and Bannockburn to a point in the township of Marmora or lake in Hastings county, not exceeding 20 miles in all.. 20

38. To the Bruce Mines and Algoma Railway Company for a line of railway from the end of its line, as subsidized by chapter 7 of 1901, northerly, not exceeding 19 miles ; and for a line of railway from Bruce Mines to Bruce Mines junction, not exceeding 2 miles. 21

39. To the James Bay Railway Company for a line of railway from Toronto, via the east side of Lake Simcoe, Parry Sound and Sudbury, towards James Bay, not exceeding 265 miles, in lieu of two subsidies granted by chapter 8 of 1900, of 35 and 20 miles respectively, from Parry Sound towards James Bay.. 265

40. To the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company for one mile of railway from Roberval to the government wharf at Lake St. John.. 1

41. To the Montfort and Gatineau Colonization Railway Company for the extension of its line of railway from Morin Flats to St. Jerôme to connect with the Great Northern Railway, not exceeding 22 miles.. 22

42. To the Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company for a line of railway from Lake Temiscamingue at the present terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway line, in a northerly direction, not to exceed 50 miles.. 50

43. For a line of railway from Waltham station to Ferguson Point, in the county of Pontiac, not exceeding 20 miles.. 20

44. For a line of railway from Lake Nominingue to La Lièvre, not exceeding 35 miles.. 35

45. For a line of railway in extension of the line from Lime Ridge into the county of Megantic to the bridge over the St. Lawrence at or near Quebec, not exceeding 30 miles.. 30

46. To the Quebec Central Railway Company for an extension of its line of railway from St. François to St. George, not exceeding 9 miles ; also for a railway from Scott Junction to the Quebec bridge, not exceeding 22 miles.. 31

Miles.

47. For a line of railway from the station of Lac Bouchette on the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway to St, André, not exceeding 13 miles.. 13

48. For a line of railway from Quebec towards Seven Islands, not exceeding 200 miles.. 200

49. For a branch line from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway at or near St. Philippe d'Argenteuil, thence in a northerly direction, passing through the village of Brownsburg, not exceeding 3 miles.. 3

50. To the Orford Mountain Railway Company from a point on its main line between Lawrenceville and Eastman to Lake Bonella, 5 miles; from Kingsbury to Windsor Mills, 10 miles; and from Eastman to the town line between township of Bolton, east part, and township of Potton, 12 miles, not exceeding in the whole 27 miles..... 27

51. To the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company for a line of railway from Gaspé to a point at or near Causapscal on the Intercolonial Railway, and from that point to Edmundston, N.B., not exceeding 260 miles; and for a line of railway from Paspebiac to Gaspé, as near the shore as practicable, not exceeding 102 miles.. 362

52. For a line of railway, in addition to and in extension of the line mentioned in subsection 11, from Roberval towards James Bay, not exceeding 40 miles.... 40

53. For a branch line from a point near the bridge at River Trois Pistoles on the Intercolonial Railway in a south-easterly direction to Mackenzie and Renouf Falls, River Trois Pistoles, not exceeding 2½ miles.. .. .. 2½

54. To the Matane and Gaspé Railway Company for a line of railway from a point at or near St. Octave, on the Intercolonial Railway, to Matane, not exceeding 30 miles.. 30

55. To the Chateauguay and Northern Railway Company for a line of railway from a point on its main line at or near L'Epiphanie, passing by way of the parish of St. Jacques l'Achigan to the village of Rawdon, not exceeding 16 miles.. 16

56. For a line of railway from the line of the Montreal and Atlantic Railway Company at St. Guillaume to the River Yamaska to join with the South Shore Railway, a distance not exceeding 12 miles.. 12

57. For a line of railway from La Tuque on the St. Maurice river to a point on the Lake St. John Railway near the River Jeannotte, not exceeding 35 miles.. 35

58. To the Montreal Northern Railway Company for a line of railway from a point at or near Ste. Agathe des Monts station towards the township of Howard, in the county of Argenteuil, passing near Lakes St. Joseph and Ste. Marie, in a southerly direction, a distance not exceeding 15 miles. 15

Hon. Mr. FIELDING.

Miles.

59. To the International Railway Company of New Brunswick for a line of railway, in addition to and in extension of the line of 67 miles mentioned in item 14 of this section, to a point on the St. John river between Grand Falls and Edmundston, not exceeding 33 miles.. 33

60. To the Beersville Coal and Railway Company for a line of railway from Adamsville, on the Intercolonial Railway, to a point at or near Brown's Landing or Beersville, not exceeding 7 miles.. 7

61. To the York and Carleton Railway Company for a line of railway from its present terminus westerly, not exceeding 5 miles.. 5

62. To the Mabou and Gulf Railway Company (limited), for a line of railway from a point on the Intercolonial Railway at or near Mines Road station to the wharf at Caribou Cove, not exceeding 4 miles, being in addition to subsidy mentioned in item 18 of this section.. 4

63. To the Nova Scotia Eastern Railway Company (limited), for a line of railway from Dartmouth through the Musquodoboit valley to a point at or near Melrose, to connect there with the railway mentioned in item 19 of this section, not exceeding 120 miles. 120

64. To the Midland Railway Company (limited), for a line of railway from Truro northerly towards Brule, not exceeding 34 miles.. 34

65. For a line of railway from St. Peters to Louisburg, not exceeding 50 miles. 50

66. To the Kootenay Central Railway Company for a line of railway from Golden to the international boundary line, via Windermere and Fort Steele, and crossing the Crow's Nest Railway at or near Elko, not exceeding 106 miles.. 106

67. To the Kettle River Valley Railway Company for a line of railway from Grand Forks to a point 50 miles up the north fork and west fork of the north fork of Kettle river, not exceeding 50 miles.. 50

68. For a line of railway from Wellington to Union bay, not exceeding 55 miles. 55

69. For a line of railway from Midway to Vernon, not exceeding 150 miles..... 150

70. To the St. Mary's River Railway Company for a line of railway from Spring Coulee, crossing St. Mary's river to Cardston, 16 miles, and from a point on this line to or near the intake of the irrigation canal, about 16 miles, in all not exceeding 32 miles.. 48

71. For a line of railway from Dawson City to Stewart river, passing at or near Grand Forks, not exceeding 84 miles. 84

72. To the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for a branch line from a point on the main line between Moosomin and Elkhorn, north-westerly to a point in the neighbourhood of the Pheasant Hills, not exceeding 136 miles.. 136

	Miles.
73. For a line of railway from a point at or near Medicine Hat, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, to the coal fields in or near townships 12 and 13, range 6, west of the fourth principal meridian, not exceeding 8 miles..	8
74. To the Great Northern Railway of Canada for a line of railway from Garneau Junction to the Quebec bridge, not exceeding 70 miles....	70
75. To the Halifax and South-western Railway Company for a line of railway to Barrington Passage, in addition to and in continuation of the 77 miles mentioned in item 23 (b) of this section, not exceeding 35 miles..	35
76. To the Lake Superior, Long Lake and Albany Railway Company for a line of railway from Peninsula harbour in a northerly direction, not exceeding 10 miles..	10
77. To the Cumberland Railway and Coal Company for a line of railway from Parrsboro' station to Riverside wharf, not exceeding 1 mile..	1
78. To the Indian River Railway Company for a line of railway from a point at or near the north end of Lake Megantic, thence southerly along said lake to a point on the international boundary, not exceeding 19 miles..	19

2. The Governor in Council may grant the subsidies hereinafter mentioned towards the construction of the bridges also hereinafter mentioned, that is to say :

1. Towards the construction and completion of a railway bridge and approaches over the Nicolet river at Nicolet, in lieu of a grant under chapter 8 of 63-64 Victoria, item 39 of section 2..	$15,000 00
2. Towards the construction of the steel superstructure of a railway bridge on the St. Francis river, in the county of Yamaska, in lieu of a grant under chapter 8 of 63-64 Victoria, item 38 of section 2, but subject to the same conditions as expressed therein, payable to the Canadian Bridge Company of Walkerville, as their claim may appear for work already done on said bridge..	50,000 00
3. To the Canadian Bridge Company of Walkerville. To strengthen and complete the foundation and approaches to the bridge over the St. Francis river subsidized to the South Shore Railway Company by section 3, chapter 7, Victoria 62-63, a sum of $35,000, which amount shall remain the first charge on the road, and to be recouped to the treasury out of subsidies earned or to be earned..	35,000 00
4. To the Chateauguay and Northern Railway Company. In addition to the subsidy for the Bout de L'Ile bridge granted by chapter 8, section 33, Victoria 63-64.. ..	50,000 00

3. In these resolutions, unless the context otherwise requires, the expression 'cost' means the actual, necessary and reasonable cost and shall include the amount expended upon any bridge, up to and not exceeding $25,000, forming part of the line of railway subsidized not otherwise receiving any bonus, but shall not include the cost of terminals and right of way of the railway in any city or incorporated town; and such actual, necessary and reasonable cost shall be determined by the Governor in Council, upon the recommendation of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and upon the report of the chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals, certifying that he has made or caused to be made an inspection of the line of railway for which payment of subsidy is asked, and careful inquiry into the cost thereof, and that in his opinion the amount upon which the subsidy is claimed is reasonable and does not exceed the true, actual and proper cost of the construction of such railway

4. The subsidies hereby authorized towards the construction of any railway or bridge shall be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, and may, unless otherwise expressly provided in this Act, at the option of the Governor in Council, on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, be paid as follows:—

(a.) upon the completion of the work subsidized; or

(b.) by instalments, on the completion of each ten-mile section of the railway, in the proportion which the cost of such completed section bears to that of the whole work undertaken; or

(c.) upon the progress estimates on the certificates of the chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals, that, in his opinion, having regard to the whole work undertaken and the aid granted, the progress made justifies the payment of a sum not less than sixty thousand dollars; or

(d.) with respect to (b) and (c), part one way, part the other.

5. The subsidies hereinbefore authorized to be granted to companies named shall, if granted by the Governor in Council, be granted to such companies respectively; the other subsidies may be granted to such companies as establish to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council their ability to construct and complete the said railways respectively ; all the lines for the construction of which subsidies are granted, unless they are already commenced, shall be commenced within two years from the first day of August, 1903, and completed within a reasonable time, not to exceed four years from the said first day of August, to be fixed by the Governor in Council, and shall also be constructed according to descriptions, conditions and specifications approved by the Governor in Council on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and specified in each case in a contract between the company and the said minister, which contract the minister, with the approval of the Governor in Council, is hereby empowered to make. The location also of such subsidized lines shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council.

6. The granting of such subsidies, and the receipt thereof by the respective companies, shall be subject to the condition that the Governor in Council may at all times provide and secure to other companies such running powers, traffic arrangements and other rights, as will afford to all railways connecting with those so

subsidized, reasonable and proper facilities in exercising such running powers, fair and reasonable traffic arrangements with connecting companies, and equal mileage rates between all such connecting railways ; and the Governor in Council shall have absolute control, at all times, over the rates and tolls to be levied and taken by any of the companies, or upon any of the railways hereby subsidized.

7. Every company receiving a subsidy under this Act, its successors and assigns, and any person or company controlling or operating the railway or portion of railway subsidized under this Act, shall each year furnish to the government of Canada transportation for men, supplies, materials and mails over the portion of the line in respect of which it has received such subsidy, and, whenever required, shall furnish mail cars properly equipped for such mail service ; and such transportation and service shall be performed at such rates as are agreed upon between the minister of the department of the government for which such service is being performed, and the company performing it, and, in case of disagreement, then at such rates as are approved by the Governor in Council ; and in or towards payment for such charges the government of Canada shall be credited by the company with a sum equal to three per cent per annum on the amount of the subsidy received by the company under this Act.

8. As respects all railways for which subsidies are granted by this Act, the company at any time owning or operating any of the railways shall, when required, produce and exhibit to the Minister of Railways and Canals, or any person appointed by him, all books, accounts and vouchers, showing the cost of constructing the railway, the cost of operating it, and the earnings thereof.

9. The Governor in Council may make it a condition of the grant of the subsidies herein provided, or any heretofore authorized by any Act of parliament as to which a contract has not yet been entered into with the company for the construction of the railway, that the company shall lay its road with new steel rails, made in Canada, if they are procurable in Canada of suitable quality, upon terms as favourable as other rails can be obtained, of which the Minister of Railways and Canals shall be the judge.

He said : His Excellency the Governor General having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution recommends it to the consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I beg to say that on Monday next I will make a statement to the House as to the further business of the government to be introduced during the present session.

PETITIONS AGAINST NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I desire to ask the right hon. Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if any action is being taken with respect to the motion passed a day or two ago concerning alleged irregularities in petitions presented to the House ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I have not conferred with the Chairman on Privileges and elections in this matter. Nothing has been done so far.

SHIPPING CASUALTIES ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 263) to amend the Shipping Casualties Act, 1901.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I have looked over the memorandum furnished me through the kindness of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with respect to the provisions of this Bill. I find that my hon. friend was not exactly accurate in the statement he made to the House that this Bill is introduced in accordance with suggestions of the British Board of Trade. I find, however, that the amendments have been made and are introduced upon the recommendation of Captain Salmon, a newly appointed officer of the department, who takes the place of the late Captain W. H. Smith. If I had not supposed that these amendments were in accordance with the suggestions of the British Board of Trade, I perhaps, would have scrutinized them a little more carefully. However, as they have been made upon the suggestion of an officer who is said to be a very capable and efficient man, and as, of course, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the government as a whole take full responsibility for the introduction of this measure, I shall not detain the House at the present time with any further criticism of the provisions of the Bill.

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

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

House went into committee on Bill (No. 3) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.

Mr. CHARLTON. The question of coping with the tendency to increase the electoral corruption in Canada is one the importance of which I need not dilate upon. Such corruption does exist to some extent, and to the extent to which it does exist it is detrimental to the interest of our country, and threatens the integrity of our institutions. The Bill with reference to this question was referred to a special committee some weeks ago. That committee was composed of five members of the government side and four of the opposition side, and it entered upon its labours with a

sincere desire to report a Bill which would be serviceable to Canada and in the public interest. Such a thing as political feeling was not manifested in this committee in the slightest degree. Every member of the committee gave his best efforts to perfecting a Bill which we had reason to believe would be acceptable to the House and in the interest of the country. The committee had the aid in its labours of the Department of Justice. One of the officials of that department attended the meetings of that committee regularly, and acted as counsel in every legal matter. It had also the assistance of the law clerk of the House of Commons. The members of the committee were unanimous in their approval of the provisions of the Bill now submitted to the committee except on the one point, that one with regard to compulsory voting.

The provisions of the Bill as now submitted received the unanimous approval of the special committee, with the exception of the clause with reference to compulsory voting. We had the benefit during some of the sittings of this committee of the services of the Minister of Finance, and they were invaluable to us; and the feeling that characterized the members of the committee in their labours and at the conclusion of their labours, was most agreeable, pleasant and satisfactory, and gave augury, I trust, of the acceptance of this Bill by the House. The Bill we now proceed to commend to the consideration and the judgment of this House. If it is the opinion of the House that any other provisions of the Bill should be dropped, of course the committee is in the hands of the House in that respect, and it may be, from the fact that there was not unanimous concurrence on the part of the special committee with regard to the provision about compulsory voting, that it will be prudent and desirable to drop that provision. I leave the House to consider that question. I will now describe very briefly the provisions of the Bill. The first provision is with regard to compulsory voting, or penalty for non-voting. By a provision of the Bill, an elector failing to vote is disfranchised for a period of six years; but if he is absent from the riding, if he is ill——

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How do you disfranchise him?

Mr. CHARLTON. Prevent his voting for six years, he is not eligible to cast a vote for six years.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. By what mode or manner?

Mr. CHARLTON. By the fact that he refrains from voting, and his name does not appear on the list. But as I was saying, if he shows that his failure to vote was due to absence, and that absence was not by design for the purpose of abstaining from voting, if it was due to illness, if it was due to having voted in some other riding, then he is exonerated from the provision of the Bill. This provision, as I say, did not receive the unanimous approval of the committee, and that is the only provision which did not receive unanimous approval. Section 11 of the Election Act of 1900, is amended. The section as it stands on the statutes provides that:

> The person to whom a writ is addressed, as hereinbefore provided, shall be the returning officer at the election to which such writ relates; provided always, that if the person to whom the writ has been addressed refuses, or is disqualified or unable to act, the Governor General may appoint another person to be such returning officer.

This section is repealed, and the following substituted for the same:

> Section 11. The writ shall be addressed to the sheriff or the registrar of deeds, or to one of the sheriffs or one of the registrars of deeds, for the electoral district or some portion of the electoral district for which the election is to take place, and he shall be the returning officer at the election.
>
> 2. If, from any reason, there is no sheriff or registrar to whom the writ can be addressed, or if the sheriff or registrar is disqualified or unable to act, or if any other person to whom the writ has been addressed refuses or is disqualified or unable to act, the Governor in Council may appoint another person to be such returning officer.

No more than one writ shall be addressed to the same returning officer at one time. The object of this provision is to place the office of returning officer in the hands of sheriffs and registrars so far as that may be possible, and I think this is a provision which will commend itself to the judgment of the House. These are officers of high standing, not likely to be influenced by political considerations, and corrupt motives in making their appointments will of course be absent. The next change in the Bill is an amendment of section 13. A subsection is added to this as follows:

> Any person who, when he is disqualified under the provisions of this or of any other Act, acts as returning officer, election clerk, deputy returning officer or poll clerk, shall be disfranchised for a period of seven years, and shall be guilty of an indictable offence, and shall be liable to imprisonment, without the alternative of a fine, for a term not exceeding twelve months and not less than six months, with or without hard labour.

A section is added to section 12 as subsection (i):

> Persons other than sheriffs or registrars of deeds holding any public office either Dominion or provincial——

Are also debarred from acting as returning officers. Section 21 of the Act is amended by inserting after the word 'lists' in the third line thereof, the words 'and of an abstract of the offences and penalties under this Act.' This is the result of a previous

Bill which requires that an abstract of all the penalties under this Act shall be sent to the returning officers to be posted up at two polling places, as notices of election are, and a subsequent provision also provides that an abstract of the offences and penalties under the Act shall be sent to the returning officer and mailed to each elector in the division of which he is returning officer, and shall pass through the mails free of postage. There is added to the provision about the lists, a provision for distributing this copy of penalties and offences under the Act. Section 26 of the said Act is amended by inserting after the word 'proclamation' the same provision as in the first line thereof the words 'and the abstract of the offences and penalties under this Act.' The Act as it now stands reads thus :

The returning officer shall cause such proclamation and writ——

Simply adding to that provision the list of the offences and penalties under the Act. Then section 26 has a subsection added to it which is as follows :

Within the shortest possible time after the reception of the writ, the returning officer shall send by mail to each elector upon the voters' list a copy of the abstract of the offences and penalties under this Act, which abstract shall be carried in the mails post free ; and in the province of Prince Edward Island the returning officer shall send a sufficient number of copies of the said abstract to each postmaster within the electoral district, and it shall be the duty of the postmaster to deliver a copy to each elector to whom any mail matter is delivered.

This provision with regard to Prince Edward Island is in consequence of there not being any voters' lists in that province. In section 41, section 1, subsection 1 is repealed and another is substituted therefor. Paragraph (f) as it stands at present relates to the directions for voters. The paragraph substituted for it is as follows ;

(f.) Furnish each deputy returning officer with at least ten copies of printed directions in the form L, for the guidance of voters in voting, and at least ten copies of the abstract of the offences and penalties under this Act, which printed directions and abstract the deputy returning officer shall, before or at the opening of the poll, on the day of polling, cause to be posted up in some conspicuous places outside of the polling stations, and also in each compartment of the polling station.

The object being to have posted up in different places the law in reference to penalties and offences. There is a provision in connection with section 26 as to the mailing of these abstracts of offences and penalties to voters as follows :

2. Any postmaster who wilfully neglects or refuses promptly to deliver to the electors any such abstracts shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding fifty dollars and costs to any person who sues therefor: provided, however, that this penalty shall not be imposed more than once for each election at which such neglect takes place.

Mr. CHARLTON.

Subsection 8 of section 96 provides that no ballot paper shall be displayed, that voters shall not be induced to display ballot papers, that the numbers on ballot papers shall not be disclosed, that the votes shall not be disclosed and that secrecy shall be maintained in respect to the counting of votes

Subsection 8 of section 96 is as follows :

Every one who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be guilty of an indictable offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding $200 and to imprisonment for any term not exceeding six months, with or without hard labour, in default of payment of such penalty.

The subsection substituted for this is as follows :

8. Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be disfranchised for a period of seven years and shall be guilty of an indictable offence, and shall be liable, if he is a returning officer, election clerk, deputy returning officer, poll clerk or other officer engaged at the election, to imprisonment, without the alternative of a fine, for a term not exceeding twelve months and not less than six months, with or without hard labour, and if he is any other person, to a fine of not less than one hundred dollars and costs and not exceeding two hundred dollars and costs, or, in default of payment of such fine and costs, to imprisonment for any term not exceeding six months and not less than three months, with or without hard labour.

Paragraph (i) of section 108 is repealed and another paragraph substituted for it. Paragraph (a) of section 108 refers to giving money, &c., to procure votes, paragraph (b) to giving or promising employment, paragraph (c) to gifts or promises in order to obtain money of any person, paragraph (d) to procuring return in consequence, paragraph (e) to advancing money to be used in bribery, paragraph (f) to demanding bribe of candidate or agent, paragraph (g) to receiving money, &c., before or during an election and paragraph (h) to receiving money after an election. Paragraph (i) which refers to bribery of candidates which is repealed is as follows :

(i.) Every person who, to induce a person to allow himself to be nominated as a candidate, or to refrain from becoming a candidate, or to withdraw, if he has become a candidate, gives or procures any office, place or employment, or agrees to give or procure, or offers or promises to procure, or endeavours to procure any office, place or employment for such person or any other person.

The following lines are also repealed :—

And every person so offending is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months and shall also forfeit the sum of two hundred dollars to any person who sues therefor with costs.

Provided always, that the actual personal expenses of any candidate, his expenses for actual professional services performed, and bona fide payments for the fair costs of printing and advertising, shall be held to be expenses lawfully incurred, and the payment thereof shall not be a violation of this Act.

Paragraph (i) and these lines are repealed and the following substituted for the same :

(i.) Every person who offers, promises, gives, or procures or agrees to offer, promise, give or procure, or endeavours to procure any money, office, place, employment or other valuable consideration to induce any person to allow himself to be nominated as a candidate, or to refrain from becoming a candidate, or to withdraw if he has become a candidate, and any person receiving or agreeing to receive any such offer, promise or gift for the purposes aforesaid.

Then two new subsections are added :

(j.) Every employer of labour who, within the ninety days next preceding a general election, pays any employee his wages or salary in a pay envelope, or puts up or otherwise exhibits in the shop, factory, establishment or place where his employees work, or in any place adjacent thereto, any handbill or placard, upon which pay envelope, handbill or placard is written or printed anything which contains any threat, expressed or implied, intended or calculated to influence any such employee in the exercise of his franchise at such election, or which contains any notice or statement that the wages or work in such shop, factory, establishment or place will be affected by the success of any candidate of any political party, or by the success of any political party ;

(k.) Every person who, being an officer or employee of Canada or of any province thereof, directly or indirectly pays or promises to pay, or induces or compels, or attempts to induce or compel any other person to pay or promise to pay, or who receives from any other person, any subscription, contribution, or assessment for political purposes, or who prepares or makes, or takes any part in preparing or making, any political assessment, subscription or contribution ;

And every person so offending shall be disfranchised for a period of seven years and shall be guilty of an indictable offence, and shall be liable, if he is a returning officer, election clerk, deputy returning officer, poll clerk or other officer engaged at the election, to imprisonment, without the alternative of a fine, for a term not exceeding twelve months and not less than six months, with or without hard labour, and, if he is any other person, to a fine of not less than one hundred dollars and costs and not exceeding two hundred dollars and costs, to any person who sues therefor, or, in default of payment of such fine and costs, to imprisonment for any term not exceeding six months and not less than three months, with or without hard labour.

The next and last provision of this section is one which will be of interest to the members of this House and to the country :

Provided always, that the actual personal expenses of any candidate, his expenses for actual professional services performed, and bona fide payments for the fair cost of printing, advertising, bill posting and rent of halls or rooms for public meetings, or for meetings of committees, or for expenses for speakers at public meetings, or for canvassers or organizers—which canvassers and organizers in electoral districts situate wholly or in part in cities shall not exceed ten, and in other electoral districts shall not exceed three—shall be held to be expenses lawfully incurred, and the payment thereof shall not be a violation of this Act.

Section 108 has added to it the following as section 108a, in addition to the provisions preceding.

108a. A person offending against any provision of the next preceding section shall be a competent witness against any other person so offending, and may be compelled to attend and testify on any trial, hearing, proceeding or investigation : provided that if such person has answered truly all questions which he is required by the court to answer, he shall be entitled to receive a certificate of indemnity from the court, which may be in the form FF, and the testimony so given shall not thereafter be used in any prosecution or proceeding, civil or criminal, against him.

2. A person testifying and obtaining a certificate of indemnity shall not thereafter be liable to any action, indictment, prosecution or punishment for the offence with reference to which his testimony was given, and may plead the said certificate of indemnity accordingly, in bar of such action, indictment or prosecution.

This provision is, of course, one of very great importance, and the friends of this measure rely largely on it to stamp out the evil of electoral corruption. It places the briber at the mercy of the person with whom he tampers ; it makes the business of bribing eminently unsafe. It is not a mere experiment for it has been tried in some of the United States and found to be effective. The objection was raised and discussed that there was a probability of blackmail being levied, but it is impossible to avoid the chance of blackmail where prosecutions may be made by a private person. In practice the plan has been found to be satisfactory and efficient. And the evil of electoral corruption by the purchase of votes at the poles has been stamped out.

Section 113 is also amended. Section 113 relates to the conveying of voters to the polls and the penalty and the disqualification of voters offending in this regard. The provision that follows is also one of great interest and one which will meet the approval of the House. It was fully discussed and it is admitted that it has been found impossible in practice to prevent the doing of that which this provision makes legal.

Section 113 is amended by adding the following proviso :—

Provided, however, that nothing in this section shall be held to make it illegal for any candidate or other person to hire bona fide for any purpose and for the ordinary and reasonable price, any horse, team, carriage, wagon, cab, sleigh or other vehicle belonging to, or in the usual and ordinary employment of, any regular cabman or livery man.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is in section 113 ?

Mr. CHARLTON. I shall read section 113. It is as follows :

The hiring or promising to pay or paying for any horse, team, carriage, cab, or other vehicle,

by any candidate or by any person on his behalf, to convey any voter or voters to or from the poll, or to or from the neighbourhood thereof, at any election, or the payment, by any candidate or by any person on his behalf, of the travelling and other expenses of any voter, in going to or returning from any election, are unlawful acts ; and every candidate or other person so offending shall forfeit the sum of one hundred dollars to any person who sues therefor ; and any voter hiring any horse, cab, cart, wagon, sleigh, carriage or other conveyance for any candidate, or for any agent of a candidate, for the purpose of conveying any voter or voters to or from the polling place or places, shall, ipso facto, be disqualified from voting at such election, and shall, for every such offence, forfeit the sum of one hundred dollars to any person who sues therefor.

With this amended provision applying only to conveyances belonging to regular cabmen or liverymen, the committee were unable to see, after a full discussion of this matter, where any criminal intent or any consequences that would be corrupt in its character would follow the hiring on election day of the conveyances of a liveryman or cabman for the purpose for which they are uniformly and universally employed at every election. This simply makes legal what has been done with a great degree of impunity without such legislation.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does this legalize the hiring of cabmen or liverymen during an election day ?

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, but it does not legalize the hiring of farmers' rigs or others than those of liverymen.

Mr. DAVIS. What happens in the case of a rural constituency where there are no cabmen and no liverymen ?

Mr. CHARLTON. In such a case no rigs can be hired. If they could be hired you would have all of the farmers wanting to have their rigs hired.

Mr. DAVIS. That legislation is for cities.

Mr. CHARLTON. This legislation is for cities. It is in the judgment of the House whether it is proper legislation or not ; it is in the knowledge of the House that in cities it is the universal custom to employ cabmen and this cannot be avoided.

Section 117 is also amended. Section 117 relates to voting by persons who are not qualified. The amendment is as follows :

Any alien or any other person, not being a voter, who resides outside of Canada, who canvasses for votes or works in any way to secure the election of any candidate, shall be guilty of an indictable offence and shall be liable to a fine of not less than one hundred dollars and costs and not exceeding two hundred dollars and costs, or, in default of payment of such fine and costs, to imprisonment for any term not exceeding six months and not less than three months, with or without hard labour.

We have had in elections in Canada the evil of touters and election workers from the United States who are brought into Canada and who travel up and down violating the election law. But the day after the election or the night of the election they are gone beyond the jurisdiction of the Canadian courts. Under the provisions of this law they are prohibited from doing this, and by a provision to which I will refer later they can be arrested.

Then we have :

Form U in schedule 1 to the said Act, as enacted by section 12 of chapter 16 of the Statutes of 1901, is repealed and the following is substituted therefor :

This is a provision with regard to compulsory voting. If the provision for compulsory voting is retained this will be retained ; if it is not this will be dropped. I do not know whether it will be necessary to read it. It is merely a provision for the person who is disfranchised in consequence of having failed to vote, securing his vote if his absence is unavoidable or for sufficient reason.

Section 131 makes provisions with regard to civil and criminal procedure ; with regard to the recovery of penalties and forfeitures and a new section, which is added to is as 131a, is as follows :

If a person is charged with any indictable offence under this Act, and it is feared that he will endeavour to avoid arrest, it shall be sufficient to charge generally that he has committed an offence under 'The Dominion Elections Act,' without specifying the nature of such offence. The information in that case may be in the form GG, and the justice receiving any such information shall thereupon issue a warrant in the form HH. Upon such person being arrested and brought before a justice, the justice shall state to him the particular offence with which he is charged and thereafter the case shall be proceeded with in the usual manner.

This provision enables a summary arrest to be made without specifying the nature of the charge for which the prisoner is arrested. These specifications will be made when the case comes before the justice of the peace. This law will enable the authorities to arrest such people as these workers from the United States or any person who is suspected of transgressing the provisions of this law. The mere fact that there is power to make such arrests, or the making of two or three arrests will have a deterrent and salutary influence and will also enable the prompt administration of justice in the case of such offences. These are the changes and provisions in this amended Bill, and I repeat what I said at the outset, that with the exception of that referring to compulsory voting, they received the unanimous approval of the special committee. The gentlemen on that committee were thoroughly competent for the work they had to perform ; they were men who took a broad and critical view of all the questions discussed. These questions were discussed fully, with the utmost freedom and the greatest parti-

cularity. I do not suppose that a discussion of the character held by that committee could be excelled by a discussion in Committee of the Whole, or perhaps equalled; because the members of the committee sat down quietly to the discharge of their duties, with a sincere desire to arrive at the facts and at a proper conclusion. They had no political purpose to serve; they had no such thought in their minds. Their object was to perfect a Bill which would be beneficial and salutary to the Dominion of Canada, which would tend to cure evils of a growing and threatening character; and I commend this Bill to the judgment of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. As the promoter of the Bill has gone over its salient points, as proposed, we had better now take it up section by section.

Mr. HACKETT. What protection is provided for the ballot boxes after the voting has taken place?

Mr. CHARLTON. The same protection that exists at present. The election law of 1900 is not superseded.

Mr. HACKETT. There is no change, then, in that respect.

Mr. CHARLTON. No.

Mr. HACKETT. Then, I want to state that I was subject to great difficulty at one time by the stealing of a ballot box, and I would like to have in this Bill some protection for the ballot box after it leaves the returning officer's hands until it reaches the place where the boxes are to be opened, in case of a recount. The ballot box I speak of was actually stolen from the train in transit between Alberton and Summerside. I would ask the hon. gentleman to insert a clause in the Bill protecting the ballot boxes from the time they are opened until the recount takes place before the judge.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am sure that the members of the committee would be delighted to accept any suggestion to further perfect the Bill. However, at this stage of the session, perhaps it would be wise to accept the Bill if it is good as far as it goes. We shall have another session—at least, I venture the supposition that we shall—and there will then be time to add other provisions which my hon. friend and other members may suggest. If we accept the Bill as it is presented to-day, I think we shall make a long step in advance, and shall be in a better position to consider other proposed amendments than we should be if no action were taken with regard to the Bill at the present time.

Mr. HACKETT. I think that in the Act referring to Prince Edward Island the postmaster is required to place in the post office a list, or something of that kind.

Mr. CHARLTON. He receives a bundle of lists, which he is required to hand out to the electors who come for their mail.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would again suggest to the committee that we now take up the different sections, and hon. members can discuss these points under the respective sections to which they refer. Otherwise we shall not make any progress.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not see why this Bill should be handled differently from any other. The custom is to have a general discussion first, and I do not think that is a waste of time. I fancy that men say what they have to say in a general discussion, so that when we get down to the particular sections they go through quickly. It strikes me that the chairman, by taking the step he proposes, will cause more obstruction than there would be if he allowed the Bill to take the usual course.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is just the usual course which I wish to take. We commence the discussion of a public Bill with the first section. In the case of a private Bill, the principle of it is discussed on the preamble. As the promoter of the Bill wished to make a general exposition of the changes proposed, I allowed him to go on. We can now deal with the Bill better by taking it up section by section.

Mr. SPROULE. The only difficulty is this, that the promoter of the Bill is allowed to explain it in a general discussion, and then others are not allowed the same right.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If it is the general wish of the committee to have a general discussion on the first clause, I am perfectly willing.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We can have a discussion on the adoption of the preamble at the close.

Mr. HOLMES. As I understand, the idea of bringing this Bill forward at this time is to take the sense of the House upon it, and I think you would arrive at that better by means of a general discussion than by taking the Bill up clause by clause. I have no idea that a Bill of this importance should be placed on the statute-book at this period of the session. There are several contentious clauses in it which will provoke discussion, and if it is not the intention to press the Bill at this time, I think it would be better to allow a general discussion of its various features.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am willing to be governed by the wishes of the committee.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You should be governed by the rules of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am governed by the rules of the House, and I think

if we follow them, we shall make better progress.

On section 2,

The Dominion Elections Act, 1900, is amended by inserting the following immediately after section 9 :—

9. Any person who does not vote at an election at which he is qualified to vote shall be disfranchised for a term of six years from the date of such election.

2. Reasons sufficient for not voting.

3. Penalty for disfranchised person voting.

M. DEMERS (Saint-Jean et Iberville): M. le président, je crois de mon devoir de dire quelques mots sur la présente clause. Quand cette question est venue devant le comité spécial,—comme l'a dit le président de ce comité (M. Charlton), il y a un instant,—les membres de cette commission ont différé sur l'opportunité d'adopter le vote obligatoire, depuis cette époque, nous avons eu l'occasion d'en conférer avec nos collègues, et je crois que le sentiment, dans la province de Québec du moins, est opposé à l'adoption de cette loi pour le moment.

J'ai aussi examiné les commentaires de la presse anglaise et je crois, qu'en général, elle s'est prononcé contre l'adoption de cette mesure. On a fait observer que c'était une punition toute particulière qui serait infligée à l'électeur en le privant de son droit de vote pour l'espace de six ans, parce qu'il n'avait pas voté lors d'une élection.

La question qui se pose maintenant est de savoir quand et comment cet électeur sera remis sur la liste et aux frais de qui ? Voilà des questions auxquelles les députés doivent réfléchir avant d'adopter une mesure semblable parce que, s'il y a des faux frais à faire, ils retomberont sur les candidats ou les députés actuels. Je crois que cette clause ne devrait pas être adoptée.

Mr. SPROULE. As the Gaelic of my hon. friend from Iberville was rather imperfect, I appeal to him to use the tongue we are accustomed to.

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). I shall be happy to oblige my hon. friend, although I am afraid I will be still more imperfect in my English than in what the hon. gentleman describes as my Gaelic. Some of the members of the special committee appointed to consider this Bill were of opinion that we should not adopt this clause providing for compulsory voting. Since then I have had occasion to consult my colleagues, and I believe that public opinion, in the province of Quebec at least, is opposed, at the present, to any such law. As some of the newspapers have justly pointed out, we are, by this clause, taking a very peculiar position. Because a man did not vote at one election we are going to punish him by disfranchising him for six years. We say : Because you did not vote this year, you will not vote for six years to come. That is not the proper way to teach people to do their duty, if we consider it is their duty to vote. The question then presents itself : How and when is this man to be put back on the list after he has been disfranchised, and at whose expense ? If a man has not had the right to vote during six years, the probability is he will for ever be precluded from voting. I consider this a very harsh measure to adopt. In my opinion, a man should not be obliged to vote. There may be many reasons why he should not. The candidate who represents his opinions may be opposed by one of his relatives, and so on, and there may be delicate reasons, which everybody will approve, why a man should not vote. And if he went to the polls he would be suspected. It is not allowed to an English jury to refuse to say whether a man is guilty or not, but I am told that a Scotch jury may do so by returning the verdict 'not proven.' In many cases people should be at liberty to say that they do not know for whom they should vote. We are told that a man may be obliged to go to the polls, but he need not vote, because he can throw a blank ballot into the box. In my opinion, no one should be obliged to resort to such a subterfuge. No man should be compelled to make the pretense of doing a certain thing. If a man goes to the polls he should vote, but he should have the right of deciding for himself whether he shall go or not.

Mr. PUTTEE. This section is no doubt the most material in the whole Bill. I can see a good many things in it which should lead the majority of the committee to report favourably on it. It is probably a fairly good compromise with compulsory voting. I do not think it is properly called 'compulsory voting,' but it is a pretty fair compromise. To that extent I endorse it. We have the right to insist that a man should vote when able to do so ; and if he does not take sufficient interest in public affairs to vote, in all probability he would not be much damaged by having his franchise taken from him ; and those who refrain from voting for corrupt purposes, as is frequently the case, should be disfranchised. It would appear to me that the committee have not studied this matter as deeply as they might. For instance, there is no extension of the hours in which the polls are to be kept open, as there should be, if you are going to make voting compulsory. At present the hours are too restricted. Either you should lengthen the hours or make the polling day a holiday. Nor should it be a sufficient reason to take before a judge that a man did not poll his vote because he was at work or that he had not time during dinner to cross the city to cast his ballot. When we make compulsory voting a law, we should not allow it to be evaded by trivial excuses. There are, no doubt, many excuses which, while they would not appeal to those interested in elections, would be sufficient to prevent those who are not keenly interested from

going to any extra trouble. Take the city of Winnipeg during an election in the middle of January. It is quite a feat for a man to go and cast a vote in the middle of the day, or between nine and five. The only time the workingmen really have is after six o'clock at night. Men living a quarter of a mile away from their work, with the temperature twenty to forty degrees below zero, are not very much disposed to lose time in going to the polls; and if we are going to make voting compulsory, we will have to extend the hours. I am decidedly in favour of the principle of compulsory voting, but I am not in favour of it with the restricted hours of voting that we have at the present time.

Mr. DAVIS. I cannot see my way to support the proposition. I think the people themselves are the best judges as to whether they should vote or not. The amendment provides that a man who does not want to vote shall go to a judge and show that judge that he has 'good and sufficient reasons' for not wanting to vote. If you carry that out, then, so far as the North-west is concerned, you will need to employ a good many more judges. And what are 'good and sufficient reasons'? Supposing one member of a man's family is sick is that a reason that he could give before a judge to relieve him from the penalty of being disfranchised. Suppose a man is quarantined with his family on account of contagious diseases would that be 'a good and sufficient reason'? Suppose a man has religious convictions against voting——

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, there are hundreds of men who do not vote on account of their religious convictions. And among them are first-class citizens. There are many of them in my own constituency. They are among the best citizens we have.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) allow me to ask him a question? If these persons are disfranchised on account of religious conviction, why should they want to get on the list?

Mr. DAVIS. The list in the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Fowler's) part of the country is not the same as in ours. In his province they have a printed list prepared at a certain time by a revising officer. But in our country we have nothing of that kind, but lists made up by enumerators about ten days before the election. And these enumerators put on the list every person who is a citizen and entitled to vote.

Mr. BELCOURT. That is the way the lists are made in Ontario.

Mr. DAVIS. A man's name may be on the list but he exercises his own judgment about voting. Our election laws seem to have worked very well for the last thirty years or so, and I do not think any good reason has been given for disfranchising a man at one election because he did not think it well to vote at a previous election or because, for any reason, he did not go before a judge and give 'good and sufficient reasons.' It either disfranchises him or puts him to a lot of expense and trouble.

Mr. FOWLER. As a member of the committee to whom this Bill was referred, I may say that there was no clause of it to which we gave more attention than to this one. The committee tried to do their duty in the amendment of our election law as well as they could at the time at their disposal. It was late in the session before we got to work on this Bill, but when the matter was placed in our charge we worked faithfully and did our best to make such a Bill as would commend itself to the House. On the subject of compulsory voting we took a different view from that of some hon. gentlemen with regard to the fundamental question of the right to vote. While the right to vote is a privilege, it carries certain responsibilities, and one of these responsibilities is that the man shall exercise the franchise that is given him. It is not for the man who enjoys his privilege to say whether he shall exercise it or not. The committee felt that he should be obliged to fulfil the duties and accept the responsibilities of citizenship. Moreover, we felt that to make such a law as is here proposed would be to take a long step towards putting down the bribery which, we must all admit, is altogether too prevalent throughout this country. That is the object. And we made the period of disfranchisement six years so as to cover the next election. What the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) has said with respect to lengthening the hours of voting might be necessary in cities, I can quite understand that. But it would not be necessary in rural constituencies, which of course, are the great majority of constituencies throughout Canada. That is a matter for this committee and the House to provide for by any further amendment which they may deem necessary. I think that subject was referred to in our committee, but we did not feel that we had much time to consider the distinction. The provision might easily be made covering the city constituencies, so that workmen would not be prejudiced by this clause. It seems to me that this could be very easily worked out. If a man does not vote there is no necessity to take any steps. If his name is upon the list it is the right of any person at the time of tendering his vote to object to the vote, and then he must take the oath. The point is covered by the oath and a penalty is imposed by this section. Any person representing either political party at the arranging and making up of the lists can object to a man's name being put on the list on the ground that he had not voted the previous election. There is no difficulty in arranging the matter.

Mr. HENDERSON. Are not the lists arranged by the provincial authorities ?

Mr. FOWLER. I admit that that is a point to be considered. We ran up against that contention in the committee.

Mr. HEYD. That is the knock-out.

Mr. FOWLER. It is a difficulty so far as the making up of the list is concerned, but not so far as voting is concerned. Any one can object to a man voting. The hon. gentleman from South Brant (Mr. Heyd) does not know what a knock-out is. So far as the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) is concerned, he tells us that there may be persons whose religious convictions may prevent them from voting. Well, how are they injured by being left off the list or refused the right to vote ? Unless we assume that these persons are going to change their convictions between one election and the next.

Mr. DAVIS. Something might arise to cause them to change.

Mr. FOWLER. If so, then let them wait a little longer, until the next election, and then they will be able to vote. The principal idea that governed the committee with regard to the matter was to get at bribery and corruption, and we thought that if men were compelled to go to the poll there would be less object in attempting the bribery that is sometimes attempted. We felt that the privilege of voting carried with it the duties of citizenship, and that it was right to compel these persons to vote who, from indifference or any other cause refused to take part in the public work of the community.

Mr. DAVIS. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) a question. Provision has been made in the case of illness on the part of a voter. But suppose that some member of a man's family is sick ; suppose that one of them is dead. Must the man then be disfranchised ?

Mr. FOWLER. That can be explained to the judge.

Mr. DAVIS. Well, he will have to go to the judge and explain ?

Mr. CHARLTON. It will cost him nothing ?

Mr. DAVIS. It will cost him his time.

Mr. FOWLER. Well, suppose a man's name is left off the list, he has to go to the judge to get it on. This is not a singular hardship. You cannot make any general rule about anything without having individual cases in which the law seems to operate harshly.

Mr. MACPHERSON. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this is legislation run wild. That may be thought too strong language. If the franchise is a privilege I cannot quite understand how you can compel a man to use his privilege. But this compulsory voting does not seem to me to be consistent with British right and liberty, and I for one am against bringing in legislation of this kind. I may be too young a member of this House to be quite justified in declaring my opinion so bluntly, but it seems to me that legislative bodies sometimes forget that there is a possibility of over-legislating. I think that if a Bill were brought in to stop such a thing as canvassing in an election, you might do some good. But merely to make laws against corruption that are easily broken will not put a stop to corruption in our politics. When it is possible for men to be coerced into voting for individuals and at the same time, the voting is compulsory, I think it is legislation run wild, and, I for one strongly object to such a proposition. I think it is one that should be struck out, and let us go on with some other work that will be more advantageous to the country.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. gentleman talks about liberty, yet he is willing to restrict men from canvassing. I do not think that compelling a man to vote is half as much a restriction of his personal liberty as to refuse him the privilege of canvassing. Yet the hon. gentleman talks about legislation running wild. He forgets that while we have the privilege of voting, that privilege carries with it duties and responsibilities.

The PRIME MINISTER. The privilege of canvassing also.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I merely made that suggestion, without intending to lay it down as a principle.

Mr. HOLMES. The committee endeavoured to overcome a difficulty that prevails in all election campaigns. The idea no doubt was to compel a man who holds back his vote to about five minutes to five, to go and poll his vote in good time. At the same time, I think the thing is practically impossible ; you cannot carry out compulsory voting. It is an ideal system, over which there has been considerable discussion, yet I think any one who has had experience in election matters will know that it is utterly impossible to carry that out. Take for illustration the case of two candidates, both of whom we will suppose happen to be undesirable men. A man may say to his friends, or he may say to himself : I am not going to cast my vote for either of these men ; they do not come up to my standpoint of what a candidate ought to be, and I am not going to vote for either one of them. But this law compels him to go to the polls and vote ; if he does not, he becomes a criminal. Further than that, reference has been made to the fact that in the North-west Territories, and the same may be said of other parts of the country, there are in certain places men of peculiar religious convictions who do not desire to

poll their vote. We know also that there are the Brethren who hold religious scruples against voting, and some of them do not vote. I understand that in the North-west there are also a number of Mennonites who hold that it is wrong to vote. Now, I think, as men have a right of individual action, this parliament has no right and has no power to compel a man to go forward and record his vote. I think every citizen of this Dominion, or anywhere else, has the individual right to do as he likes to a certain extent. I do not agree with the idea that the right of citizenship carries with it the duty of voting. I agree to some extent with what has been said by the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Macpherson), that this is a privilege offered to a man to exercise if he desires, or to refrain from exercising if he feels so disposed. But I do not think it is within the province of this parliament to compel a man to go forward and record his vote against his will. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that in this respect the less we interfere with what might be called a man's privileges, so far as election matters are concerned, the better will we be consulting the interests of the community at large. There is such a thing as legislating too much. It is all right to legislate against improper practices in any respect that will be detrimental to the welfare of the community, but in respect to this particular form of legislation, I am satisfied that it will do infinitely more harm than good. You cannot imagine, if you were to carry out this principle, what might be the consequences in a community where, we will say, 40, or 50, or 100 men do not choose to go to the polls and record their votes. I do not know whether the Liberal party, I am very doubtful whether the Conservative party, would feel disposed to prosecute those men because they did not vote. If they did prosecute them, you can easily imagine the dismay that would exist in that community. I am satisfied that the outcome would be infinitely worse than if you left them to do as they please.

Mr. FOWLER. There is no penalty except the loss of the right to vote, they are not prosecuted.

Mr. HOLMES. Very true, but in the eye of the law a citizen becomes a criminal if he does not vote, and is punished by being disfranchised.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Macpherson) and the hon. member for West Huron, both misconceive the legislation, as I understand it. The effect of this legislation is that if any voter, entitled to vote in Canada, chooses to say: I do not want the privilege of voting, and therefore I wont't vote—you disfranchise him for six years. Now this man who refrains from exercising his right to vote is not being punished at all, he is only being told: Since you have said that you do not want to vote in this election, we won't let you vote for six years to come; but if you change your opinion within the six years, you will be allowed then to vote. There is no punishment about it, there is nothing except an enforcement of the man's own exercise of his privilege to refrain from voting. He has now the privilege of voting and he says he does not care for that privilege.

Mr. HOLMES. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? He says he is not punishing the individual. Now is it not doing a great wrong to the individual who, on one occasion, will not vote, if the government compels him for six years after to refrain from voting?

Mr. LANCASTER. Well, if this man whom my hon. friend is so anxious to protect wants to exercise the privilege of voting, he has it in his own power to decide whether he wants to vote or not for six years. He knows the law, everybody in Canada is presumed to know the law; and if a voter knowing that law does not vote, and knows that he cannot vote again for six years, why, he decides his own case, and you are practically confirming him in his decision. He decides his status for six years, decides it deliberately, with all the knowledge of the consequences. He says to the government: I declare, by staying away from the polls, that I do not want to vote for six years. You allow him to decide his own case, and what harm are you doing him? You cannot say to the Speaker of this House that you do not want to vote on such and such a measure, when you are present. Every man here has to vote unless he is paired. It is a duty to the state, here as in a political election. I am not so sure, however—and I do not want to be misunderstood—that the section as drawn will carry out the object in view. But I think that we can agree upon the principle that when a voter who declares by not voting that he does not want to vote, when he knows that by so doing he cannot vote for six years, we are not depriving that individual of a privilege by disfranchising him, we are in fact giving him the highest privilege we can give to any man, and that is the privilege of deciding the extent of his own rights for the next six years.

Mr. DAVIS. Supposing two undesirable candidates are before the electors, and that a clergyman, for instance, did not choose to cast his vote for either of them, thinking they were both undesirable, would the hon. gentleman disfranchise him for six years?

Mr. LANCASTER. I have always found that when there were two candidates there was one who was less undesirable than the other—if the hon. gentleman can understand that—and I say it is the duty of the clergyman, or

of any other elector, to select the least undesirable and to vote for him, that is, if he desires to vote at all. In my own county we have had to select between men neither of whom would be our choice if we had the right of nomination. The voter has got to come to a conclusion as to which of the two men, on all the evidence that he can procure, is the least desirable, or the most desirable, and he has to give the best decision he can. I think anything that will increase the responsibility of a voter will by so much advance the welfare of the general community ; and if we teach voters that a responsibility attaches to them, that they are under an obligation to inquire into the qualifications of the candidates and to vote for the least unfit—that is if they deside to vote at all—we will be legislating in the right direction. Let the voter pause before he decides not to vote, let him inquire a little further into the qualifications of the candidates, and perhaps a day or two later he will come to the conclusion that he does see a distinction between the two men, and that he will vote for the one he thinks the better man. I think a provision of this kind will cause the elector to be more careful, to search into the qualifications of the candidates with more care, and in that way the effect will be beneficial.

Mr. FRASER. I agree with what the hon. member for King's, N. B. (Mr. Fowler) has said that voting is a privilege or duty. But who is to be the supreme judge of the exercise of that privilege or duty—is it the parliament or the individual ?

Mr. LANCASTER. The individual.

Mr. FRASER. Then you cannot prevent him. I believe that he ought to be the judge of the exercise of that privilege and duty, and if he should be the judge of both, he ought to be allowed to stay at home if he thinks he is performing his duty thereby better than, under the compulsion of this parliament, going out and voting. Who is to be the final judge of privilege and duty ? There is such a thing as parliament taking legislation into its own hands that it has no right to take, and I think it would be a grave mistake for this parliament to say that a man, who perhaps has studied a question just as much perhaps as this parliament has, shall exercise his franchise although he says that by refraining from exercising the privilege of voting he is serving his conscience better than if he went out and voted for one or other of the parties. He should be the supreme and final judge of that. A question may come up which may be a political question. It may be a direct party question. On one side we may take one view and on the other side there may be a different view. There may be an hon. gentleman on the opposition side who says that he agrees with the view which the government take, and there may be an hon. gentleman on the government side who may say that he does not agree with it. What are these men to do ?

Mr. COCHRANE. They will be whipped into line.

Mr. FRASER. Not at all. A time comes in parliament on one side or the other when a man simply says : I will abstain from voting. I cannot vote against my party, but the fact that I disagree with my party in regard to the view which has been enunciated by it does not make it necessary that I shall sever my connection with my party.

Mr. FOWLER. Then the hon. gentleman's argument is that a member representing the people is doing his duty by refraining from voting ?

Mr. FRASER. That gentleman as a representative of the people, must be the judge of what his duty is. I would like to see you introduce an Act into this parliament to provide that every man who is in Ottawa must vote or otherwise he cannot be a member of this parliament. There would be no difference between that and saying that a man who did not vote at an election should be deprived of his vote for six years. I remember a vote not long ago when a number of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House were glad to go out of this House and refrain from voting. They had a right to do it. I have known occasions on this side when hon. gentlemen felt it their duty not to vote. In any case it would be dangerous to say to a member of parliament : You must vote. If he is in his seat he accepts the responsibility of doing so, but he may abstain from voting. If you say to a man, you must vote or you lose your privilege, I venture to make the assertion that you will make a number of people in this country worse citizens than they are to-day. You cannot drive men. There is nothing like individual liberty in the world. It is the only thing that makes for stable government that a man shall be the judge as to whether he shall vote or not.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that increasing the responsibility of the citizen degrades citizenship ?

Mr. FRASER. You can degrade it by increasing it in this way. That is where the hon. gentleman and I part company. I say that it degrades a man if parliament steps in and says that it shall be the final arbiter of your ideas of duty of privilege and of conscience. A man may be far more conscientious on a given occasion in not voting than hundreds of thousands of men are in voting. He may be all right in abstaining from voting, but the individual must be the judge of that. I would not interfere with any man's liberty, as I be-

lieve liberty full and free is best in the interest of stable and independent government, and I would like to——

Mr. FOWLER. Quotation.

Mr. FRASER. We never say very much that is new, and if some hon. gentlemen understood that, they would not be so proud of what they do say. Feeling that, I would be very loath to say that because a man did not conscientiously think that on a given occasion he should vote he should therefore be told that he is not a good citizen, and that he cannot exercise that privilege. We do not cease visiting our friends because they may do something that we think they ought not to do. I do not think we should interfere with the liberty of the individual to decide for himself whether he is best discharging the duties of citizenship by voting or refraining from voting.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) seems to have forgotten the object of the Bill which is now before the committee. The statement of the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) and admittedly of every person in this House is that corrupt practices have been committed in the different ridings of this country, which both parties have resolved to stamp out. What principle is it most necessary to apply for the purpose of doing this? The committee have applied, as a first principle, that of compulsory voting. That will do something to prevent the crime of corruption, if it does nothing else. But, I think they would have made it more effective if they had added another clause to the Bill—I know I differ from the great mass of the members of this House in reference to this—and that is a clause providing for open voting. If a man receives a bribe for depositing his vote his neighbours know what his convictions are, and he is ear-marked if he votes against his convictions. This would be a means of preventing that crime. There are only two ways of preventing bribery and corruption, and they are by adopting the principle of open voting and compulsory voting. Talk about the liberty of the individual! How is it infringing upon the rights of conscience to say that a man shall go up to the poll and deposit his vote? There are lots of people who do not exercise their franchise, and who have not the right to do it. The party who has the right is the delegate of all the others, and if that right is delegated to him, he should exercise it. If no candidate is acceptable to him, he has the right to nominate a man who is acceptable to him. He has the right to vote, and the community have the right to expect that he will exercise the power which they have given him, because where there is power given to him it is his duty to exercise it. I have heard that principle advocated by perhaps the ablest Liberal who ever sat in this House—Hon. Edward Blake. It has been advocated by Liberals in every section of the world. I think it is the correct principle, and I think the time has arrived in this country to compel every man, for the sake of decency in elections, for the sake of preventing bribery and corruption to exercise the right which parliament has conferred upon him. If the system of enfranchisement under the Act is not correct, let us have a correct one, but let us adopt the principle of compulsory voting, because it is one of those principles that will do more than anything else to prevent the crime of bribery and corruption.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). There is just one point in favour of the motion under discussion to which I wish to refer, and that is that more people are bribed to stay at home and refrain from voting than are bribed to vote. If they were compelled to vote then they would not stay at home, and if they went to the polls they would naturally vote as they felt. That is why I think that this clause is a step in the right direction. As for the charge that a man is injured by being compelled to vote it seems to me that he is only doing his duty by voting. Every man who is enlisted as a soldier is compelled to take arms to fight his country's battles and here is a duty, the duty of preventing bribery, corruption and bad government, more serious than any that a soldier was ever compelled to perform. We want to turn out bad governments, we want to put down any bad thing in the government. We want to destroy everything that is bad in this country and it can be done only through the ballot box. I think it is right that every man should be compelled to vote and to register his name personally previous to the election in the section where he lives. It costs the municipalities hundreds of thousands of dollars to get people on the voters' lists. I heard it said only yesterday in the House that the lists were not prepared. The lists should be ready every moment. Every man should be compelled, as I have said, to register his vote just as he is compelled to register the birth of his child, the death of his father or a marriage ceremony. If the man is capable of walking he should be compelled to register himself; if he cannot walk he is able to talk and he should depute some one else to register for him. The enormous expenditure of putting people on the lists should be undertaken by this government. Not only should it be a duty to vote but there should be some one of the right sort for the people to vote for. It so often occurs that we have not the right men before us and so we are obliged to vote for a poor Liberal or Tory when we otherwise would not. You are obliged to vote either for a Grit or a Conservative when in nine cases out of ten, if you had your will, you would not do so. You are

obliged to vote for one of them simply because you have put a barrier in the way of an honest man being a candidate. You fine him $200 if he does not get one-half as many votes as the highest candidate at the election. This is what you should remedy, that $200 fine if the candidate does not get half as many votes as the highest number polled by a candidate. Then you would more often have candidates of the right sort in the field; you would have a great many working men and you would have more men in the House of my stamp. I tell you it would be no injury to this country to have more men of my stamp here and everybody in this country knows that. But the Grits and Tories will bring out their candidates and the old man will be left at home.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). That is nothing to me. It is the people who will suffer, not me. Now Sir, I do not wish to make a burlesque of this, but I do hope that you will not amend this in the direction proposed but that you will add another clause providing that no man will be allowed to contribute any money whatever to an election fund. That will do away with the bribery in this country.

At one o'clock, committee took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

The PRIME MINISTER. As section 2 involves considerable discussion, and the House is very thin, I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it be suspended, and that we pass to another.

On section 3—returning officers,

Mr. DAVIS. What is the object of having sheriffs and registrars act as returning officers ? ?

Mr. FOWLER. The object is to have some official person who would be absolutely responsible.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand). Somebody as far as possible removed from the political struggle that is going on.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am afraid that whoever drew this section did not consider the matter very carefully, for there is no sheriff for an electoral district nor a registrar of deeds for an electoral district.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand). The second subsection covers that objection. It provides that if there is no sheriff or registrar to whom the writ can be addressed, or if the sheriff or registrar is disqualified or unable to act, another person may be appointed.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Every word in a section of a statute has to have a meaning, and there is no sheriff for an electoral district nor a registrar of deeds for an electoral district.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin).

Mr. FOWLER. That can easily be amended by making it read : ' for the county in which the electoral district is situated.'

Mr. DAVIS. In the North-west Territories one sheriff would have jurisdiction over perhaps three ridings. For which would he be appointed ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). He could be appointed for any one of them. There is nothing more than a technical objection to any part of this section. The Minister of Justice is perfectly right in saying that you do not appoint a sheriff or a registrar of deeds for any area as an electoral district. But in the province of Nova Scotia there are seventeen counties which are electoral districts, and for each of which the sheriff is appointed. Therefore, you have the substance of the provision, although it may be necessary to make some slight correction in the words themselves.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In my own district there are four sheriffs and four registrars of deeds. I think this Bill ought to have received more consideration than it has, and more perhaps than there is time to give to it. Perhaps it might be amended so as to read in this way : ' The writ shall be addressed to one of the sheriffs or one of the registrars of deeds for the county, district or territory served by him and comprised in the electoral district.' I am not sure but that would meet the case of the North-west Territories.

Mr. DAVIS. No, it would not. This provision would necessitate the sheriff leaving his office to attend to this business, and no ordinary person could fill his position.

Mr. FOWLER. Does he never leave his office for a day ?

Mr. DAVIS. It would take more than a day ; it would take three or four weeks. Suppose you addressed the writ either to the sheriff or the registrar of deeds, and he was not able to act. That would necessitate his notifying the government of that fact, and it would be necessary to issue another writ addressed to somebody else, and by that time it would be too late.

Mr. FOWLER. You have to find out in the first place whether the sheriff or the registrar can act.

Mr. DAVIS. For instance, in the county of Huntingdon, in the province of Quebec, the writ was issued to a gentleman, who held it for some time, when it occurred to him that he wanted to become a candidate himself, and he sent the writ back.

Mr. SPROULE. The objection raised is overcome at the present time by the fact that every returning officer has an election clerk, who does most of the work. It very often happens that the returning officer does not leave his home, while the election clerk puts up the notices and distributes the other necessary papers.

Mr. HOLMES. What would be the advantage of appointing a sheriff in my county, for instance, where there are three ridings ? The sheriff would have one writ, and in the others the writs would be sent to reputable citizens. If you also had a registrar, one of the writs would be sent to him, which would still leave one to be sent to a reputable citizen ; and if you sent one to a reputable citizen, why not send the whole three to reputable citizens ?

Mr. DAVIS. In a very large constituency, 500 or 600 miles long, it is absolutely necessary to have the returning officer as near as possible to the centre of the constituency. If the sheriff or registrar happened to be in one corner of it, he would not be a fit person to act as returning officer.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose you had no suitable person in the centre of your riding, what would you do ? Would you get the nearest man to the centre ?

Mr. DAVIS. We will assume that within a riding there are people sufficiently intelligent to act as returning officer.

Mr. HOLMES. I know a case in which it became necessary for the sheriff to leave his own riding and become returning officer of the adjoining riding. There was apparently no impropriety in this, but it gave rise to a good deal of acrimonious discussion.

Mr. DAVIS. Suppose you had a sheriff living in Saskatchewan and you appoint him as returning officer in another riding. If the election resulted in a tie, the people would not like the casting vote to be given by one who was not a voter there.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Holmes) inquired why, if it is necessary in any case to appoint some reputable citizen as returning officer, such citizens, not office-holders, should not be appointed in every case. The committee took the view that it would be in the public interest to appoint registrars and sheriffs, because they are removed from political influences and have the confidence of the public. instead of appointing gentlemen directly interested in the contest and who, in some instances, might not be as acceptable and as well fitted for the position.

Mr. HENDERSON. I fail to agree with the hon. gentleman with regard to the non-partisanship of sheriffs and registrars. In Ontario, at any rate, these men are as a rule active partisans. No man is likely to be appointed sheriff or registrar in Ontario unless he has been a strong, active politician, and he is not apt to forget his political prejudices even after he has assumed office. We have had experience in Ontario, in connection with Dominion elections, of the law requiring the sheriff or registrar of deeds to act as returning officer, and we have also had that position given to other reputable citizens. To my mind the elections were just as fairly conducted in the one case as in the other. Besides, why should a man receive an appointment of this kind simply because he happens to be the custodian of an office ? I would prefer distributing the perquisites of the government more widely rather than have them go to the fortunate men who chance to have been appointed sheriffs or registrars. It seems to me we are proposing to give away too many of our powers. We have already adopted the franchise of Ontario and its voters' list. We practically have nothing to say now as to how our lists shall be made up and who shall be put on or struck off. We have gone further. Under the Redistribution Bill we have practically handed over to the Ontario government the formation of our constituencies, because if, in any instance the Ontario government should choose to organize a new county, that becomes an electoral district of the Dominion. Now we are proposing to hand over to the provincial government the appointment of our returning officers. Very soon we will have nothing left. Everything will be done by the provincial government. I think we should keep some of these powers in our own hands and have something more to say as to the constitution of the House of Commons than we appear willing to do in this Bill. Although I take no exception to the sheriffs and registrars, I think we should allow the government to name whomever they like, whether sheriffs or registrars or private individuals.

Mr. OLIVER. I should think that the registrar would be the last man in the county to name as returning officer. If he has any duties, they call for his presence in his office all the time. If he has not, he has no business to be the registrar. The duties of the sheriff may leave him more free but, as far as my knowledge goes, in the west the duties of the returning officers are such as to take up the whole of their time and attention ; and if the sheriff has any duties to perform as such, he cannot at the same time act as returning officer. If there are exceptional circumstances or conditions, it is quite in order for the government to appoint a sheriff as returning officer, but to say he must be appointed is simply to say that, if he has any business to do as sheriff, he will have to neglect it while he is returning officer. In the constituency which I represent there are three sheriffs and two registrars. This constituency is to be divided into four, so that there will not be sufficient registrars or sheriffs to meet the requirements. In any case, therefore, somebody else will have to be returning officer in place of the sheriff. It would be very much better to leave the matter entirely in the hands of the government and let them appoint the sheriff where suitable, and somebody else where it is not suitable.

Mr. CHARLTON. I should judge from the discussion and the opinion expressed by the Minister of Justice that this section does not receive that unanimity of approval which is desirable if it is to become law, and I am quite willing to drop it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not consent to drop it at all. No reason has been advanced which should defeat the object of this section. That object is to take your returning officer from a class of persons in whom the people have confidence. If you do not have some provision of that kind, you will subject the government to the temptation of appointing ward heelers, and when irregularities take place they will be charged against the person who was selected as returning officer. The sheriffs in Nova Scotia are appointed by the local government and are Liberals for the most part, and they discharge the duties of returning officers fairly well. One or two have been charged with certain offences, and I am inclined to think that in one case the charge is well founded, but that was only one out of many instances. I believe it would be far better to name some class of persons from whom these returning officers are to be selected. So far as sheriffs are concerned, they have been doing this work in the province of Nova Scotia without any inconvenience so far as the public is concerned. I do not know about the registrars of deeds in the North-west Territories. But I do not think there would be any great difficulty in the province of Nova Scotia about having the registrar of deeds perform these duties. Because, in most cases, I believe, if not in all, they have some assistance in their offices and they could readily spare the time necessary to perform these duties. But it seems to me that in any case the intention of the committee is safeguarded perfectly well by subsection 2, which gives power to the Governor in Council in this matter. Wherever it is undesirable or inconvenient to appoint one of these officers the government must appoint some one else. But the government would have to make its choice from this class of officers or take a certain responsibility in going outside of their ranks, and it would be expected that if they did so, they would appoint men of similar character and men in whom the public would have confidence. That is the main point—that both political parties should have good reason to believe that the men selected will do what is right and just. You can do that better, it seems to me, by selecting your class, and then appointing, as far as possible, from that class.

Mr. DAVIS. I would draw the attention of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to the fact that if you are going to confine the selection to the sheriffs and registrars of deeds, then, as has been pointed out there would be a shortage in the North-west Territories; there are not enough of these officers to go round. If it is necessary to have public officials you might include the land agent, the homestead inspector, the fishery inspector and the forest ranger.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). You might do a great many things which do not seem to be at all necessary. If an officer cannot be found among those specified in the Bill, the Governor in Council has power to appoint some other person. There is no need to make an exhaustive list such as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) has referred to. It is not even necessary that the appointment should be confined to government officers. But it is not only desirable but necessary that the person appointed should be one in whose fairness and impartiality all the people would have confidence.

Mr. DAVIS. So far as our part of the country is concerned it would be better to insert the name of the land agent instead of the registrar of deeds because the land agent can get out at any time while the registrar of deeds in many cases cannot leave his office.

The PRIME MINISTER. Stand.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The section will stand.

On section 4,

Section 12 of the said Act is amended by adding thereto the following paragraph :—

(i.) Persons, other than sheriffs or registrars of deeds, holding any public office, either Dominion or provincial.

Mr. DAVIS. What does this mean ?

Mr. CHARLTON. Section 12 of the Dominion Elections Act provides :

12. None of the persons following shall be appointed returning officers or deputy returning officers, election clerks or poll clerks ;

(a.) Members of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada or of the Executive Council of any province ;

(b.) Members of the Senate or members of the legislative council of any province ;

(c.) Members of the House of Commons or members of the legislative assembly of any province ;

(d.) Ministers, priests or ecclesiastics of any religious faith or worship ;

(e.) Judges of the courts of superior, civil or criminal jurisdiction, or judges of any county or district court, insolvent court or admiralty court ;

(f.) Persons who have served in the parliament of Canada in the session immediately preceding the election, or in the then present session of parliament ;

(g.) Persons who have been found guilty by the House of Commons, or by any court for the trial of controverted elections, or other competent tribunal of any offence or dereliction of duty in violation of this Act, or of an offence in violation of a provincial Act relating to elections, or of the Act to disfranchise voters who have taken bribes, being chapter 14 of the Statutes of 1894 ;

(h.) Persons who have been convicted of an indictable offence.

And to this will be added subsection I as given in this section 4.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This seems to depend on the previous section.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I was just about to suggest that. If the Bill goes through it will be necessary to amend the previous section by adding 'prothonotary' as suggested for the province of Quebec. The prothonotary with us is the clerk of the court. In a district such as the district of Quebec where we have one sheriff, you would have a prothonotary selected for one of the constituencies. That is the law with us. Thus, the government is limited to the sheriff, the prothonotary and the registrar of deeds, and it might be as well to extend the list of officers from which the choice can be made. If section 3 is to be amended this one will need to be amended also.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We have in our province an officer called the prothonotary. I do not know whther he is the same as the officer of that name in the province of Quebec.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. He is the chief clerk of the court. I think it is the same office as in Nova Scotia.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes. I would not object to having the word 'prothonotary' apply also to the province of Nova Scotia.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We could make it general. Of course it would only apply where there is a prothonotary.

The PRIME MINISTER. Stand.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 6,

Section 21 of the said Act is amended by inserting after the word 'lists' in the third line thereof the words 'and of an abstract of the offences and penalties under this Act.'

2. Section 26 of the said Act is amended by inserting after the word 'proclamation' in the first line thereof the words 'and the abstract of the offences and penalties under this Act.'

3. Paragraph((f) of subsection 1 of section 41 of the said Act is repealed, and the following is substituted therefor :--

(f.) Furnish each deputy returning officer with at least ten copies of printed directions in the form L for the guidance of voters in voting, and at least ten copies of the abstract of the offences and penalties under this Act, which printed directions and abstract the deputy returning officer shall, before or at the opening of the poll, on the day of polling, cause to be posted up in some conspicuous places outside of the polling stations and also in each compartment of the polling station.

4. The following section is inserted immediately after section 26 of the said Act :—

26a. Within the shortest possible time after the reception of the writ, the returning officer shall send by mail to each elector upon the voters' list a copy of the abstract of the offences and penalties under this Act, which abstract shall be carried in the mails post free ; and in the province of Prince Edward Island the returning officer shall send a sufficient number of copies of the said abstract to each postmaster within the electoral district, and it shall be the duty of the postmaster to deliver a copy to each elector to whom any mail matter is delivered.

2. Any postmaster who wilfully neglects or refuses promptly to deliver to the electors any such abstracts shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding fifty dollars and costs to any person who sues therefor : provided however that this penalty shall not be imposed more than once for each election at which such neglect takes place.

Mr. DAVIS. Section 26a says :

Within the shortest possible time after the reception of the writ, the returning officer shall send by mail to each elector upon the voters' list a copy of the abstract of the offences and penalties under this Act.

Now, who is to pay the returning officer, who has the trouble of sending out letters to each elector in the whole district ? For instance, is he going to have them printed himself ? Suppose you have 10,000 names on the list, you are in the throes of an election, and the returning officer is called upon to send out circulars to every elector on that list. I want to point out another thing that relates to the North-west Territories, to show how this provision will not work up there. We have a system whereby we make up our lists ten or twelve days before the election, and three days before the election the lists must be posted up ; afterwards any person who wishes can get his name on, or can get other people to have their names put on, or he can get any name struck off the list. But who is going to furnish the returning officer with copies of these lists all over a big constituency, four or five hundred miles long, by three hundred miles wide ? In some polling districts the enumerator has had to go 300 miles away from a railway. How is he going to get back that list and give it to the returning officer so that the returning officer may send an abstract to each of the electors ? In our part of the country it is absolute nonsense to try to put this into application.

Mr. HUGHES (King's, P. E. I.) I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Justice and of the committee to that section referring to Prince Edward Island. We have no voters' lists there at all, we have open voting in provincial elections, consequently there are no voters' lists for Dominion elections. It would be very difficult, I think, to tell whether a man votes or not in a Dominion election, and therefore to tell whether he could be penalized. I see a provision here that in the province of Prince Edward Island :

The returning officer shall send a sufficient number of copies of the said abstract to each postmaster within the electoral district, and it shall be the duty of the postmaster to deliver

a copy to each elector to whom any mail matter is sent.

What does that abstract mean ?

Any postmaster who wilfully neglects or refuses promptly to deliver to the electors any such abstracts shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding $50 and costs to any person who sues therefor : provided, however, that this penalty shall not be imposed more than once for each election at which such neglect takes place.

Now that returning officer gets those abstracts ; suppose that ten days have elapsed —there are only 30 days, I understand, between the issue of the writ and the election—supposing a week or ten days have elapsed before the returning officer sends out his abstract to the postmasters. Well, the postmasters in the rural districts get them, but the people may not come very often to the post office, and very often it is the younger members of the family who are sent for the mail matter. Therefore the postmaster will have no opportunity of delivering to the elector this abstract, whatever it means, and then he will be fined if he does not do it. There might be an elector in the district who did not receive any mail matter regularly, or a fisherman who seldom receives any mail. I see a great deal of difficulty so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, and I imagine that no representative from that province could have been consulted by this committee.

Mr. DAVIS. I would like to know who is to pay the returning officer ? I think he receives the magnificent sum of $50 or $60 for his services. If you are going to impose this duty on him of sending out circulars to 10,000 electors, where is his pay to come from ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think hon. gentlemen are magnifying the difficulties in the way. Whether the wording of the Bill is sufficient to carry out the objects we have in view, may be a matter of debate, but the object is that every elector in Canada shall, immediately before the election, have his attention called to the provisions of the election law, so that he may not remain in ignorance of it. It is useless for us to pretend that people understand all about the election law ; there are thousands of honest electors in Canada who really do not understand the provisions of the election law, and who would not wilfully violate it, but who do violate it because of lack of information. The object of this proposal, even if it costs a little money, even if you have to pay the returning officer more—the object is to make the electors acquainted with the law under which they are to cast their votes, and that is the whole object. If it has not been effectually accomplished by the wording of this Bill, then let us try to amend it in some way, let us try and cause the distribution of this abstract containing in brief the chief provisions of the election law under which a man is going to cast his vote ; I cannot see any difficulty in doing it.

Mr. DAVIS. I would ask the Minister of Finance to answer me this question : In the North-west Territories there are no printed lists in some places, and how is the returning officer to get possession of those lists so that he may carry out the law ? What is he going to do when some of the electors are 400 miles away, and there is no mail ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I assume at once that under the peculiar conditions in the North-west Territories you cannot address this abstract. I assume that in the case of Prince Edward Island you cannot address it. But surely we can find some way by which to secure the public distribution of the abstract. That is what we are driving at, and if it cannot be done in this way, then take the best way available, in the North-west and in Prince Edward Island, for distributing this abstract.

Mr. HOLMES. Technically the position of the Minister of Finance is correct. But when he comes to the practical application of the provision he will realize the difficulty. Take for instance a riding where there may be 8,000 or 10,000 electors, in a rural constituency. You impose upon the returning officer the necessity of sending out circulars, putting them into an envelope and mailing them to 10,000 electors. Speaking from my own observation, I know that as a general rule the returning officer has all that he can attend to in the short time at his disposal to see that the ordinary duties imposed upon him are properly carried out.

Mr. GOURLEY. He may employ a clerk.

Mr. HOLMES. But suppose he does employ a clerk, as they do in the majority of cases, even then they find it very difficult to carry out the work imposed upon them. I would call the attention of the government to a feature that is not in the Bill, but that we should consider, because it is the outcome of the last election. There were two or three additional duties imposed upon the returning officer last year, for which no provision whatever was made for their remuneration. They were required to see that every ballot was numbered consecutively, and in my county they found it necessary in a number of instances to send thousands of those ballots from the town of Goderich to Stratford, in order to have them run through a numbering machine. The local office had not the equipment to do that work. When they put in their bill for this work it was disallowed by the Auditor General, because there was no provision in the Election Act for paying work of that kind. There were two or three instances wherein the additional work and expenditure had been imposed upon returning officers for which no compensation was provided. I think the government ought to take that

into consideration, and to provide that where additional work is put upon the returning officer some further remuneration should be given him. The Auditor General himself told me in conversation at the time that there were a number of instances wherein the returning officers did not get what they should get for their services in doing extra work.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Apropos of what the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Holmes) has said about the payment of returning officers, I have this remark to make: I look askance at all kinds of legislation which attempts to make me good, or attempts to make the public good. I do not think we can legislate along that line. But I want to call attention to this fact, that in our country we were obliged to send a deputy returning officer from Vancouver to Atlin, a distance of 1,500 miles, in the dead of winter last year. The personal travelling expenses of the returning officer were over $500, when he put in his bill to the Auditor General, after having paid this money out of his own pocket, the Auditor General refused to allow him any more than the $500 altogether. He was away two months. To my personal knowledge he is a straightforward man. He had to break the trail for 80 miles when the thermometer was from 50 to 60 degrees below zero, and he had to remain in the hospital for two weeks after as a result of the exposure to which he had been subjected. Yet, the Auditor General, sitting in his well-furnished office, would only pay him the same rate that he pays men for serving in a similar capacity in the old settled ridings in Ontario. This matter has come under my own personal observation. I will not stand up for any man who is trying to loot the country, nor will I stand up for any man who makes use of his official position to keep back from a person that which rightly belongs to him.

Mr. OLIVER. I think it is proper in considering any proposition before the House that all features of it should be taken into account. While it may be said that this question of expense is only a detail in my humble estimation it is a detail that comes very close to the principle and certainly should be attended to. It seems to me that when the principle is being established the committee should be thoroughly aware as to what is involved in giving effect to the principle. The expenses being what they will be and the difficulties in giving effect to the proposition being what they will be, they should be provided for. In regard to the requirement of sending information around to the electors to tell them how to cast their votes on election day, while I agree that it is very desirable that there should be the fullest degree of information, I think most of us will admit that in elections in the past there has been a fair amount of information current amongst the electors, that they have been fairly well informed as to how to cast their votes, and although they have not always marked their ballots, so the judges say, in the way in which they should have marked them, I think in many such cases the judges were rather in fault than the electors. The main reason for requiring this great expense to be undertaken is, first, the provision in the Bill providing for compulsory voting, and second, providing for the disfranchisement of any person who does not vote. That is the chief reason for the great expenditure which will be incurred in sending this information around and if that proposition is not adopted I thing there is no necessity for this clause at all.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I do not think there is very much necessity for sending that information to the electors because the newspapers usually print all the proceedings of the elections and nearly always tell every elector how to cast his ballot. They even mark it for him and they mark it for the candidate for whom they wish the elector to vote. But, there is one point I wish to make. We have discussed the question as to the personnel of the returning officer. I do not think the deputy returning officer has been mentioned and I think there should be a clause in this Bill saying who the deputy returning officer shall be and providing that he shall reside not only in the electoral district in which the election takes place, but in the polling division. We had a great deal of trouble in the county where I live owing to a clause of this kind not being in the Ontario Act at that time. But the Ontario Act now provides that the returning officer must be a resident not only of the electoral district in which the election takes place, but in the polling division. Then no stranger can be brought into the section to manipulate the ballots or to commit any wrong which neither party are willing to see carried out but which when committed they are willing to palliate. I want the law so changed that a man cannot act as a deputy returning officer unless he is a respectable man and unless every man who comes to vote shall know who he is.

Mr. OLIVER. I am afraid that would prevent an election being held in some constituencies.

Mr. BLAIN. I agree with the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) on this question. I am of the opinion that any money expended by the parliament of this country to more fully educate the electors upon the law governing voting would be money well expended. It can not be very well argued, as my hon. friend from the west has said, that because this law will not be able to reach every elector that therefore the great mass of the people should suffer. I do not think that is a good argu-

ment. I think that in a large number of counties, in fact in all of the counties of old Ontario, it would be possible to carry out this law and I think that if a copy of the Election Act in so far as it may be obtained in a short, concise form, were placed in the hands of every elector it would be in the interests of the purity of elections. I think the clause should go still farther. I think that 200 or 300 extra copies of the law should be given to the candidates. In the election trials in Ontario, when the courts have investigated elections, many cases have been found in which the candidates themselves are entirely unfamiliar with the law of elections. If that be the case in many parts of Canada how can we expect the electors who are not taking such an active part in politics to be familiar with the law? I agree with this clause and I approve of the expenditure of money for that purpose. I believe that the effect will be to purify the elections.

Mr. CHARLTON. My hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) had a difficulty about this question because he was unable to see from what source the expenses were to be met for the circulation of the abstract of the law, to furnish the returning officer with copies to send to the electors and with copies to be posted up. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to section 21 of the Act, which says that:

> Immediately after the issue of the writ of election the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall transmit to the returning officer a sufficient number of copies of the voters' lists, &c.

In the Bill we have a provision that:

> Section 21 of the said Act is amended by inserting after the word 'lists' in the third line thereof the words 'and of an abstract of the offences and penalties under this Act.'

So that it will be the duty of the clerk of the Crown in Chancery to send the lists to the returning officer and to send him the requisite number of copies of the abstract of the law for circulation. That difficulty then is overcome.

Mr. BLAIN. Does it say that the candidates themselves shall have a specified number?

Mr. CHARLTON. No, the provision is that the returning officer shall have a sufficient number to post up ten at each polling place and to furnish each voter on the list with a copy. It would be his duty to have these copies mailed and they shall pass through the mails free of postage. The only failure to provide fully for the requirements of carrying this provision into effect, perhaps, is the lack of a provision as to the remuneration of a returning officer. It was held during the discussion of this matter in the committee that this would be an incidental expense which the returning officer would be entitled to charge, that he would be entitled to charge clerical expenses, and for the directing and furnishing of the envelopes if they were not sent by the department. As far as the objection raised by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Holmes) is concerned that it will be a job so difficult that the difficulties will be insurmountable, I do not think there is anything in that contention. It is a plain simple matter to receive a sufficient number of abstracts of the law and to mail these abstracts of the law to the persons whose names are on the lists. It is a simple question of clerical force and clerical work. It can be accomplished in a very short period. There is no difficulty about it and as the Minister of Finance has forcibly said this is a provision of the utmost importance. My hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) says that there is among the electors a fair amount of information regarding the law. I venture to say that at this moment not one-tenth of the members of the House would be able to tell us the provisions of the Election Law in regard to corrupt practices, practices prescribed by law; and the amount of information on such subjects current in the country at large is very meagre. In multitudes of instances voters transgress and violate the law through ignorance; they do it innocently and if just before an election, when they would be most likely to read it, they had placed in their hands an abstract of the Election Law, the infractions of the law would not be so frequent as they now are. If this provision of the present Bill passes, the elector would see that the benefits of infringing the law by corrupt practices would be very small indeed. I am surprised that there has been any opposition to this feature of the Bill. It semed to me and to the other members of the committee that if there was one provision of the Bill which would meet with universal concurrence it would be this provision for bringing to the attention of the electors of this country the actual provisions of the law. Whatever might be the difficulties, great or small, that stand in the way of putting this feature into operation these difficulties should not be allowed to prevent the accomplishment of the object in view. The difficulty of addressing 7,000 or 8,000 or 10,000 of these abstracts to electors is one that could be easily overcome, and if a returning officer is not entitled to charge to incidental expenses the cost of doing this, then all that is required is an amendment to this Bill which shall provide for his reimbursement for this service.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. gentleman has not had the same experience with the Auditor General as we have had in the west or he would not propose to charge this to incidental expenses. In a case in my riding he actually refused to pay for sending out the proclamation and the gentleman who published the proclamation in the newspapers for the benefit of the people at large, in order that they might have the information,

has not yet been paid. The hon. gentleman has not taken up the North-west Territory view of the case at all. I have shown that it is impossible to carry out this provision in the North-west Territories. If you want to scatter information broadcast among the electors, to my mind the proper way would be to provide for the employment of men at each poll on election day whose duty it would be to hand a circular containing this information to each elector before he entered the polling place.

Mr. HEYD. Supposing the elector could not read ?

Mr. DAVIS. Then what would be the good of sending it to him by mail ? If he received the circular three or four weeks before the election he would perhaps open it and throw it away and never look at it again. But if it was handed to him at the booth he would look at it and see what it was.

Mr. GOURLEY. He has probably got his money before that.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. member seems to know more about the money part of the business than I do.

Mr. GOURLEY. We all do, be honest. We all do.

Mr. DAVIS. We are discussing a proposition now to place information into the hands and into the heads of the people with reference to the election law and the best mode of doing that. The hon. member who has charge of the Bill suggests that the returning officer shall send out a circular letter to every man whose name appears on the voters' list at a certain time. I take the ground that the better way to disseminate that information would be to hand out the circular at the polling booth on election day. So far as our part of the country is concerned, that is all you can do.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if there are no municipal lists in his part of the country ?

Mr. DAVIS. No, there are no municipalities.

Mr. LANCASTER. What kind of voters' lists have you ?

Mr. DAVIS. In our country we make up the voters' lists ten or fifteen days before the election. The returning officer appoints enumerators. These go into each polling sub-division and enumerate the names of the people whom they find there who are, according to their judgment, entitled to vote. The enumerator has to post up in three conspicuous parts of the polling sub-division a copy of that list three days before the election. Then any person can object to any name that appears on the list or have his name added to the list if he is entitled to a vote. In that way the returning officer has no lists; some polling sub-divisions are 300 miles inland with no railway communication and how is the returning officer to obtain the voters' lists in order to carry out the provision now under discussion ? It cannot be done.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). So far as the preparation of this abstract is concerned, the amendment proposed to section 21 makes provision for that, because the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery is obliged to send a copy to each returning officer and it will therefore be his duty to prepare and print this abstract. That is an answer to one objection which has been urged. As to the expense of sending them out I believe that you can have envelopes addressed at the rate of about $2 per thousand and if you had in a constituency say 5,000 electors the expense for that purpose would be $10. I do not think that the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) would feel himself oppressed with an expenditure of that kind even in each electoral division of Canada, because with 215 electoral districts, even if you expended $15 in each of them you would have a total expenditure of only about $3,500. That would be a trifling expenditure if the good results that are expected from the distribution of this information would be at all accomplished. Then, so far as the North-west Territories are concerned, it seems to me a very simple matter to deal with them in the same way as we are dealing with Prince Edward Island, and probably the same rule might have to be applied to Ontario cities, where lists are made up a short time before election day. You could send the abstracts to the post office and have a copy delivered to any man receiving mail matter and I would add to that an amendment that the abstract should be also delivered to any elector demanding a copy. I am sure that by that method you will get information into the hands not of every elector in Canada but into the hands of the greater part of them. It would be too expensive to undertake to put a copy into the hands of every man but you would accomplish substantially the object aimed at by doing something of the kind suggested. I regard it as important that the people should have in their hands an abstract of this kind. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said that not one-half the members in the House are fully acquainted with the portions of the election law dealing with corrupt practices. He might have gone further and said that not ten per cent of the members and not fifty per cent of the lawyers in the House could tell you, without reference to the law what its provisions are. Under these conditions you can understand what an extremely vague idea of the provisions of the law exists in the minds of the electorate at large. I believe that this will be money well spent and that the proposal should receive the support of this House.

Mr. OLIVER. I have no objection to the distribution of information about the election law; we all agree that that is quite desirable, provided the expense is reasonable. The objection is that the provision which has been made for the distribution is not practicable and it requirts to be amended so as to make it practicable.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What would the hon. gentleman think as to the suggestion I made with regard to distribution in the North-west Territories ?

Mr. OLIVER. What is suggested for Prince Edward Island would very likely measurably meet the case. Any means that will tend to a general distribution of knowledge in regard to the election law is quite acceptable ; but it is not desirable that the provisions of that law should be such as in the nature of things cannot be carried out. This fact, which is evident to every one in the House with regard to this particular provision, has been shown to exist with regard to every section of the Bill which has come before the House so far ; and I submit that it is not fair to the House at this stage of the session to place before it a Bill which, however good the intentions of its promoters may be, evidently has not been carefully thought out in its practical application. The time we have lost on this Bill so far is something that we cannot very well afford at this stage of the session, and we are not getting any closer to a decision with regard to it. For my part, I would be bound to fight the provision with regard to compulsory voting to a finish. I would respectfully ask the House and the mover of the Bill to consider the situation, and to consider whether any good object is to be attained by forcing on the discussion on the Bill, which, with all due respect, has not been carefully thought out in all its details. With regard to the distribution of knowledge on the election law, it is not the man who does not know who transgresses the law ; it is the man who does know. That is no reason why everybody should not be informed ; but the danger to the state is from the man who knows too much rather than from the man who is not thoroughly learned in the law. It is the man who knows all about the election law who burns the ballots and makes trouble, not the man who does not know anything about it. He is likely to keep within what he does know.

Mr. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.). There is another consideration with regard to Prince Edward Island. At the present time we find it difficult to get men to act as rural postmasters, the remuneration is so small ; and if you put greater obligations upon them and render them subject to a possible fine, I am inclined to think that you will find it more difficult still. If a postmaster fails to deliver the notices promptly, he is subject to a fine of $50. So far as the province of Prince Edward Island is concerned, I protest against that provision. I know that there will be trouble over it.

Mr. BLAIN. He would only have to deliver the notices in the polling subdivision once every four or five years.

Mr. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.). Well, as he is paid only about $12 a year, if he were fined $50 and costs, he would not have much left. That is one objection, but it is not the only one. There are many other objections.

Mr. HENDERSON. I presume that it is scarcely expected that this Bill will become law this session. Perhaps the object of this discussion is to point out the difficulties which confront any member who undertakes to draft a Bill of this kind. A good deal has been said about the clause requiring an abstract of the law to be distributed. Allow me to read the law as it will be in that respect if this Bill passes. Section 21 will read :

> Immediately after the issue of the writ for election the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall transmit to the returning officer a sufficient number of copies of voters' lists and of an abstract of the offences and penalties under this Act if there are any.

It seems to me there is something very much wanting there.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The expression ' if there are any,' must have reference to voters' lists. I am afraid that is bad drafting.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think the attention of the Minister of Justice should be drawn to this. With reference to the distribution in Prince Edward Island, it seems to me there should be no difficulty at all. The abstract is to be given to the elector by the postmaster. But I would draw the attention of the promoter of the Bill to another difficulty, which may, however, be arranged. In the province of Manitoba the post office addresses of the electors are not given in the lists, and consequently it would be impracticable there to deliver these documents through the post.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). It is surprising what an amount of trouble we can surround ourselves with in dealing with matters of this kind. It would be much better to direct our attention to removing any objections that appear in this Bill, so as to make it practicable and useful. To give the notices out on the day of election appears to me to be most absurd. If you want to have information given to the electors, it should be in their possession for at least a week before. This Bill has been prepared by some of the ablest and best minds in the House, who have devoted a great deal of time and attention to it, and I do not see any reason why it cannot be put into operation even this session.

Mr. ERB. I agree with those who claim that it is very desirable that the electors should be made acquainted with the election law. To do this will entail a certain amount of expense, which I claim should be paid out of the revenue of the country. To my mind the best way of distributing this information is to have it printed at Ottawa, where it would be printed in very large quantities, and therefore more cheaply than it could be in each constituency. These extracts could be printed here, placed in envelopes by clerks, and held here in readiness until the election. I understand that the lists used throughout the country are printed here, and these envelopes could be addressed from here to the electors, at any rate, in those parts of the country where the addresses of the electors are given. In this way a considerable saving in the expense could be effected. Special provision would of course have to be made for constituencies in the North-west and Prince Edward Island, where there are no voters' lists.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 7 :

Subsection 8 of section 96 of the said Act is repealed, and the following substituted therefor :—

Any person who violates any of the provisions of this section shall be disfranchised for a period of seven years and shall be guilty of an indictable offence, and shall be liable, if he is a returning officer, election clerk, deputy returning officer, poll clerk or other officer engaged at the election, to imprisonment without the alternative of a fine, for a term not exceeding twelve months and not less than six months, with or without hard labour, and if he is any other person, to a fine of not less than one hundred dollars and costs and not exceeding two hundred dollars and costs, or, in default of payment of such fines and costs, to imprisonment for any term not exceeding six months and not less than three months, with or without hard labour.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. I think it is well worth the consideration of the committee whether a clause of this kind should be adopted, when so many of the previous clauses, which involve important principles, have not been approved. It would appear to me also that the suggestion made by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) is entitled to a great deal of weight. We have before us some novel propositions, involving principles which are not, judging by the discussion so far, agreed upon ; and I am bound to say that in my opinion, even if we should affirm these principles, there is scarcely a clause of this Bill which will not require important amendment in order that it may adequately give effect to the objects we are seeking to attain. We are told that the Bill has been very carefully considered by some of the ablest men of this House, who are on the special committee. I am afraid that these gentlemen have not given it as close attention as it required, or perhaps as it has been alleged they have given it, because the legislation—I say it with all due respect—is in many respects very lame and weak indeed, and in some very unmeaning. Why should the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), at this period of the session, ask the House to revise work of such an extensive character, involving so many considerations, and which has to be dealt with by experienced persons ? In my view, it would be only fair that the committee should be asked to rise and let the Bill stand over for further consideration. There are some features of this measure which ought not to pass, and which I am prepared to oppose as far as I can ; and everybody knows that opposition at this period must be fatal. I would have preferred myself that a general discussion had taken place on the general statement of the hon. member for North Norfolk. Then we would have had the views of the various members of the committee ; and if, at a later period, this question should be taken up again, we would be able to profit by the discussion which has taken place.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the condition of affairs in this country is as was stated by the hon. Minister of Finance, when he made the motion for this committee, I do not think that we should delay passing this Bill if we have to remain here six weeks or two months longer. I do not see that the fact that we are now in the seventh month of the session is any justification for delaying an important measure of this kind. It is not too late to pass a law, and this law, or some similar law, if the statements of the hon. Minister of Finance are to be believed, is most absolutely necessary. It is true that we have been here nearly seven months, and that the special committee appointed to deal with this Bill has made some delay in reporting it, and it is also true that for some weeks no steps were taken by the government to place it on the Order paper ; but even as it is, I think the time of the House could not be better employed than in dealing with the election law, and endeavouring to have our elections conducted on a purer basis and with less scandal than during several years past.

Mr. OLIVER. I must say while no member of this House admires more thoroughly the devotion to duty shown by the hon. the leader of the opposition, I cannot enthuse over his proposition to still further delay this session possibly three or four weeks for the purpose of discussing this or any other Bill. In this case he is right in theory, but I cannot agree that he is right in practice. Members of parliament are only human, and, speaking for myself and others, we do not belong to the leisured class. We have to either divide our parliamentary duties with our personal duties, or give up the one or the other. This session has lasted so long that it has come practically to be a question with some of us whether we

shall give up our business or our parliamentary duties. I do not think that it would be for the good of this country that men of business should be debarred from taking part in its legislation, but that is what it will amount to if the session is further prolonged. True, the legislation is important, but there is a great deal of other important legislation that will necessarily have to be done some time in the future. We do not do everything to-day in any line of life or business. We have been here nearly seven months ; and while I have no desire to become controversial and indicate who is to blame, the conviction as to who are to blame is very deeply imprinted in my mind, and I am looking in the direction of the offenders. But at the risk of being controversial, I propose to say this, that an opposition which can keep this House in session, through the efforts of some seven to fourteen members, week in and week out, is not doing its duty by the country in still further declaring its willingness to keep the House still longer in session.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As far as any delay is attributable to the opposition, I think they have a very clear conscience. There has not been any disposition on our part to unduly protract the session. A measure of the very highest importance was brought down by the Prime Minister on the 30th of July, after the House had been in session nearly five monthe, and since that time we have been mainly occupied discussing that measure. And outside of one evening, when some difficulty arose between gentlemen on the opposite side, I believe there has never been one hour of the discussion wasted, from the standpoint of fair, honest criticism. If that measure had been introduced at the beginning of the session the time occupied in this discussion would have been regarded as extremely moderate.

The PRIME MINISTER. What about the time in which the House was busy discussing something else ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What else ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The estimates, for instance. We spent four months discussing the estimates.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And the estimates amount to about $70,000,000. And I think that, if we contrast the time that was taken up in discussing those estimates with the time taken up years ago in discussing estimates amounting to about half as much, even my right hon. friend must come to the conclusion that no undue time has been occupied in dealing with the estimates this session. I do not pretend to any extreme devotion to duty, nor do I claim for a moment to belong to any leisured class. If my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) referred to me——

Mr. OLIVER. I certainly did not.

Mr. COCHRANE. Whom did the hon. member refer to ?

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane).

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I may say to my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) that I think I have been absent from my home and business a good deal longer than he has. I have not seen my home since the 20th of Februray last—a week and a few days less than eight months of absence. Well, I am willing to remain even longer, if necessary, to put through legislation which I regard as of very great importance to this country. And I would not claim to be exhibiting any great devotion to duty by offering to take that course.

The PRIME MINISTER. There are evidently many clauses in the Bill that will have to be recast. What I suggest—and I think it will be the sense of the committee—is to go on with the Bill and see how far we can agree. And when we have seen the points involved in each clause, perhaps we can come to a better understanding.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it is a pity that my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) was not named a member of the committee on this Bill. As one of the law officers of the Crown, he is responsible in great measure for the form in which legislation comes to the House. As some of the paragraphs do not seem to meet his view—and I think, perhaps his view is in some instances correct—it is not too late for him to devote time to the consideration of the ideas that are sought to be expressed, and put them in shape to be laid before the committee.

Mr. OLIVER. I desire to say, in explanation, that, if in my remarks I was understood to make allusion direct or indirect to the leader of the opposition as a member of a leisured class, or to say anything suggesting a failure on his part in attendance upon his duties or willingness to do his duty, I beg to say that such was not my intention. Nobody—even in his own party—honours the leader of the opposition more than I do for his ability, shown in his profession, and his devotion to his duties, shown as a member of parliament and the leader of a party. But what I do want to point out, and what I take the liberty of emphasizing, if I may have that liberty, is that when he speaks of his willingness to stay here three weeks to pass this legislation, he speaks on behalf of from ten to fourteen of his followers, and not on behalf of the party he leads.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. When this Bill was referred to the committee, it was suggested by the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) that I should be a member of that committee. Unfortunately, I was engaged in arduous duties con-

nected with the redistribution, and I did not think I could be an effective member of both committees. I have, however, gone over the Bill very carefully, have prepared a memorandum on every clause, and have formed my own conclusions with respect to all the clauses. I was anxious to hear what the members of the committee had to say before I expressed any opinion whatever on the Bill. I may say that, in my opinion, with the exception of two clauses in the Bill—clause 2, which relates to compulsory voting, and clause 9—the Bill might be amended in such a way as to be of some value in connection with the Election Act. But to the first of these clauses, clause 2, relating to compulsory voting, I am opposed. I am absolutely opposed to anything in the Bill designed to make the exercise of the franchise compulsory—I am opposed to that on principle. Now, with respect to the other clause, clause 9, that seems to be absolutely unnecessary in view of the Canada Evidence Act, for that Act contains provisions of general application that meet the case much more effectively than the clause here proposed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As to clause 2, that relating to compulsory voting, I would point out the difficulty at which that clause is aimed. There are many people in this country who do not vote. They may be broadly divided into two classes. There are those who are indifferent, who do not take enough interest in public affairs to vote. The other class comprises those who, probably for corrupt reasons, do not go to the poll. There may be a few outside of these two classes, but, broadly speaking, these two comprise the people who do not vote. You may talk as much as you like about conscience and duty, about having control of one's duty and one's privilege. But when you bring it down to the real conditions that we have in practice, it amounts to what I have stated. Well, how are you going to deal with these men who do not vote? It is desirable that the indifferent should have some stimulant to cause them to take part in the public life of the country. Our institutions are based upon the idea of representative government, government by the people; and it is undoubtedly an evil if any portion of the people, from mere indifference, refuse to discharge the duties of citizenship which the law imposes upon them. Then, we have the other class to which I have referred, those people who from corrupt motives do not go to the poll. There ought to be some means, by legislation, of reaching at least some of these people; and I cannot see any better way than the way suggested by what I understand to have been a very large majority of the committee. If a better way is suggested, I am willing to consider it; but until that better way is suggested, I am prepared to advocate this. I have an open mind as to the best course to be taken, but I am clear that something should be done, and that we should not leave untouched the condition of affairs that exists at this time. In parliamentary elections some times not half the vote is polled. We know that death, absence, illness and sometimes other causes may account for some of the absentees; but, even allowing for these, there is a very large portion of the people who do not go to the poll and vote, and it seems to me that legislation of some kind ought to be devised by this parliament to meet that condition.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. But my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) must not forget that we are practically groping in the dark in proposing such legislation as this. There is no such law in existence, as far as I know, except in Belgium. It has been brought in under the new constitution of Belgium, and I am not quite sure that it has been found to work very effectively. I do not like to make a new departure without having thought the matter out very carefully. Such new departures should receive careful attention and should be seriously thought out and discussed. I have had occasion to look into the books dealing with such questions. For instance, there is the work of Mr. Lecky, on 'Democracy and Liberty,' which does not favour the principle. There is an article in the 'Forum,' on the same subject. As my hon. friend, no doubt, would like to read it, I give the reference—vol. 14, page 176. I have not been able—one simply cannot with the limited time at one's disposal during the session of parliament—come to a very satisfactory conclusion on matters of this sort. I am not sure that in a country where we have constitutional government and the people are divided into two political parties, as is the case to-day in Canada, that if I did not belong to a political party I should be obliged to go to the poll and, because two men happen to have been selected by my neighbours, vote for one or other of them. I may not want to vote for either. I may have conscientious objections to both.

Mr. SPROULE. What is to hinder you putting in a blank ballot?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Why should I be compelled to go to the poll and indulge in that hollow sham and hypocrisy? So far as that is concerned, as I see the matter at the present, I stand for those who have conscientious objections to being put under compulsion to do these things. I do not think I ought to be put under compulsion. The vote is a privilege. There is a corresponding duty, it is true, but still the vote is a privilege. I cannot see, at the present time, that I should be compelled to exercise a privilege against, it may be, my conscientious convictions.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If we come down to abstract theories of citizenship as a

privilege, whether in this country or in any other, it is certainly a privilege which involves responsibilities. Some of those responsibilities are imposed compulsorily. For example, the obligation of taking up arms in defence of one's country is one of the responsibilities of citizenship, and I do not know that we go any further in saying that a man is under obligation to vote at elections if he is entitled so to do by law. I read Mr. Lecky's book some years ago. It takes rather a pessimistic view of the success of representative institutions. I do not think the condition of affairs in the countries which have parliamentary government is quite so bad as Mr. Lecky is inclined to imagine. I think he has looked on the worst side of democracy in the English speaking countries at least. Further than that, if I am not mistaken, when he was elected to parliament shortly after the publication of that book, he enunciated certain views in parliament which were not in accordance with the views promulgated in the volume to which my hon. friend refers. Now I do not minimize for a moment the objections which hon. gentlemen, more especially those on the other side of the House, have urged against this principle. I know that some of them have devoted a good deal of thought to this question. But I want them on the other hand to look at the conditions we have to face, and to ask them to say in all candor whether they do not thing that there is some reason why we should endeavour to apply legislation to these conditions. It seems to me there is grave reason why we should do so. I could not express the condition better than by repeating, if it were not taking up too much time, the language of the Minister of Finance when he spoke on this question before this committee was appointed. I would ask my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, when he comes to consider the clauses of this Bill, to see whether he cannot devise some legislation, either in the form of section 2 or in some other form, which will meet the unfortunate condition of affairs to which I have referred. It is beyond doubt, as hon. gentlemen have pointed out, that the power to bribe an elector to remain at home and not to cast his vote at all, is one which lends itself to a great extent to the continuance of corruption in this country. If an elector goes to the poll you cannot, except by means of certain fraudulent devices, or by means of some connivance on the part of the officers, tell how he votes. But if that man remains at home you know he has not voted. If he is a man who is likely to vote for a particular candidate, then by bribing him to remain at home, you make sure that that vote has not been cast against the candidate for whom this act is done. So the fact that electors are permitted with impunity to refrain from voting, helps or lends itself to a continuance of corruption, which I think demands the intervention of this parliament.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In this very clause the evil which we seek to deal with is practically sanctioned by this Bill. For instance, if an elector desires to stay at home, all he has to do is to absent himself from the electoral district, and he remains scot free.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend will not understand me as speaking of the details of section 2. That is one thing, and I can see many respects in which section 2 would have to be improved, even if carried out according to the literal idea which inspired the gentlemen who drafted it. But so far as the principle of it is concerned, an elector will know that by deliberately abstaining, either from indifference or from some corrupt influence, from exercising his franchise, the country will say to him: Having taken that course you shall not be permitted to exercise your franchise for a certain number of years. It seems to me that you put a responsibility upon him which would lead him to think twice before he took that course. Let us take in the first place the man who is indifferent, and who says he will not vote. Well, my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, says he should not be obliged to vote because he may not think that either one of the two candidates who have been nominated is a proper man to represent the constituency. Well, I may say to the Minister of Justice and to other hon. gentlemen who have advanced that argument, that if there are twenty-five men in a constituency who are of that opinion, they can nominate another candidate, because all you require is the signatures of twenty-five men, and if necessary parliament can reduce that number, to allow them to nominate another candidate. So there cannot be an evil of that kind imposed upon any great portion of a community. Then a man who is simply indifferent and does not regard the exercise of the franchise as a matter of conscience, what shall we say to him? We say to him: If you are so indifferent to your duty as a citizen of this country, whose laws protect you, that you decline to take the part which every honest citizen ought to take in the government of this country, why, then shall you not be permitted, for a certain time, to take any part in that government which you appreciate so little, and we will deprive you of the right of voting for a candidate to represent you in the House of Commons. As to the man who is staying at home for corrupt motives, there cannot be any doubt, I am sure; no hon. gentleman in this House would say that too great a punishment is being inflicted upon him if we say to him that for a period of six years he shall not have the privilege of voting for a candidate to represent him in parliament. That does not seem to me as a very extreme course, though I appreciate the arguments made against it. I appreciate that in some individual instances it may operate

possibly a little hardly. But you cannot, owing to the complexity of human affairs, pass any law in this parliament that will not in some individual instances do what might strictly be called a certain amount of injustice. It is absolutely impossible to make any law that does not in its operation work harshly in individual instances. But we have to look to the greatest possible good to the country, and it seems to me it would be in the public interest to place some such restraining influence upon those men who at the present time are inclined to stand aloof and not to vote when they are called upon to do so for their representative in parliament.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. It appears to me that there is a want of harmony between the argument which my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden) presents, and the object which he seeks to attain. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) threw out this morning a hint which struck me at the time as a powerful condemnation of that feature of this Bill. Now the hon. member for Halifax contends there is a duty resting upon every citizen of this country to exercise his franchise, and that that duty is of so paramount a character that the law ought to be appealed to in order to compel him to discharge that duty. Well, then my hon. friend comes to parliament for that purpose, and because there may be some influences existing which may affect the result of the elections improperly and corruptly, he asks parliament to say by legislation that you shall prolong and emphasize that evil condition of affairs ; that is to say, that while it is a grievous injury to the state, if a citizen does not always feel it his duty to exercise his franchise, still if he fails in one instance to exercise his franchise, he shall be prevented from exercising it at all times during a certain number of years. If it is of such vital importance that every citizen should see his duty in that light we ought rather to remove the obstacles in the way of his exercising that right in the future than to create them. We should seek to compel him to exercise his franchise then by some other method than to say : You shall exercise your franchise and if you do not we will not allow you to exercise it. I cannot see any harmony between the argument upon which my hon. friend bases the necessity for this legislation and the legislation itself. It is an unpleasant thing for any man to take any exception at all to legislation that is promoted for the purpose of putting down alleged corruption, and I have no doubt the actual corruption, which exists to a great extent in our country. No one likes to do it because I think I am not overstating the case when I say that the great majority of public men would like to see measures passed which would prevent the continuance of this condition of affairs. If you could give us some proposed means by which corruption could be prevented in this country I think there would not be a discordant voice in regard to it, but that all members of this House would be in its favour. But we know that as long as human conditions, human inclinations and human passions are as they are you can place all the obstacles you like in the way of these things and they will still continue. You can legislate session after session but some method will be found whereby the legislation will be evaded. You cannot bring about a perfect condition. You cannot prevent men from running risks who are sordid and degraded in their inclinations and no penalties that you can impose will achieve any such result. But you are running a risk, if you start in upon a proposition that is made simply in the hope that it will promote the purity of elections in the country without examination and consideration, of doing more harm than good while you are absolutely failing to accomplish the purpose that you have in view. Coming to this particular clause that we have before us I may say that I do not believe it is possible to compel people who do not want to vote to go to the poll and vote. You cannot compel them. They can go to the poll, acting the part of frauds, and they can put in a ballot which is not a vote. But my hon. friend says : Look at the frightful conditions which result from the possibility of men remaining away from the poll and declining to exercise their franchise, what opportunities it affords for the use of those corrupt practises. But, let me ask my hon. friend this : Has he knowledge—and he has run elections—of the existence of any such corruption to any very large extent or to even any extent ? I have run as many elections as any man in this House and I cannot at this moment call to mind any considerable number of instances, nor can I call to mind any occasion which I was able to say that a great many people abstained from voting because corrupt means had been employed. They abstained from voting perhaps for fear of offending somebody or for some reason of that sort, but the buying of men to stay at home has not been very generally resorted to, as a means of exercising a corrupt influence. Even granting that it was a proper remedy. We have no very considerable evidence of the existence of corruption of that character to any great extent. How are you going to prevent corruption by that means ? It strikes me that men who are open to influences of that sort will be likely to go to the poll if compelled to, accept the bribe and pocket the benefits. I do not think you are going to stop corruption by any such expedient as that. This is only a theory, as the hon. Minister of Justice says, and his view corresponds with the result of my own examination of the subject, this is a theory that has not been applied anywhere for a

sufficient time to enable us from our experience of it to judge as to whether it will be effective in any such direction.

Mr. SPROULE. Is my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Blair) not aware that a good deal of the corruption exists in hiring rigs to take electors to the polls and would compulsory voting not be the means of doing away with that means of corruption to a large extent ?

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. While I do believe that there is a great deal of money improperly spent at elections I am not one of those who believe that the money spent exercises any marked influence upon the electorate of the country. I do not believe that a very large percentage of the electors of this country, while they will accept money when they see it is going, will vote differently from the way they would have voted if there had not been a dollar placed in their hands.

Mr. GOURLEY. I quite agree if the same amount is used by both sides. If the same amount is used it does not make a bit of difference.

Mr. COCHRANE. Does the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) not know that it does not require a very large percentage in most of the constituencies in Canada to control the election ?

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. I will grant that it does not require a very large percentage where the parties are so equally divided. There is one remarkable fact that I think must have come home to the knowledge of every man who has been contesting elections in this country and that is that the careful canvasses that are made before the elections take place almost always are borne out by the results when the votes are counted. I know that in my own province I have seen calculations based on the result of the work of the canvassers and it has been perfectly amazing to see how accurately these calculations were made. If that is the fact what does it prove ? It proves that many influences which are exercised are vainly or ineffectively used and I do not think the case has been or can be made out to the great extent to which some hon. gentlemen think it has been made out or to an extent which calls upon us to adopt an entirely new theory untried and unknown and the application of which would be to put a man who innocently, who for good reasons to his own conscience and interpreting his own sense of duty to his country, abstained from going to the poll on the same footing as a corrupt individual who had remained away because he had been paid to do so. To deprive him of his franchise for six years who is innocent, absolutely innocent, mark me, and you cannot discriminate between the two, and to put him on the same basis as the other is to act in defiance of all principles of fairplay and I am decidedly opposed to the principle of the clause. While I am opposed to it I want to say with all sincerity that I am prepared to aid and support in any way in my power, any legislation which I believe would be effective to prevent spread of corruption or its continuation to the extent that now exists. But I will not vote for what I think would do more harm than good, for a clause which is indefensible or for measures which I am satisfied would be wholly inadequate and ineffective if passed. Like every man in this House I am entitled to exercise my judgment as to the efficacy of the remedies suggested, without being subject to the implication that I am not in sympathy with every proper and legitimate and honest means to put down what corruption does exist in the elections of this country.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is one point upon which perhaps, the committee have not been very happy in the discharge of their duties, although in the main they have done much good work. I can praise them in this way the more readily because although I am a member of the committee I was not able to be at any of the meetings except the initial meetings and was not present when the Bill was drafted. However, as a member of the committee I take my full share of the responsibility for its actions. I think they were not happy when they described the clause as one for compulsory voting. They thereby antagonized many persons who on a fair consideration may have been disposed to support this principle. It is not compulsory voting in the ordinary sense of the word. I can well understand a man not being willing to have a penalty of fine or imprisonment in connection with compulsory voting, but the clause in this Bill is so mildly worded that it does not seem open to as broad criticism as it would otherwise receive. It is advanced legislation it is true, but we should not shirk from legislation because it is advanced. I do not think it is open to as much criticism and objection as has been raised by some hon. gentlemen. As to the general manner in which the Bill was drafted, there is one remark which I am led to make by my regard for the chairman of that committee (Mr. Charlton). It would be supposed from the criticisms offered that this Bill is very badly drafted. If that is the fact we had better withdraw it from the present committee and refer it to a committee of laymen headed by the hon. gentleman from West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) because this Bill was drafted by a committee composed chiefly of members of the legal profession. They were eminent lawyers, and being wise lawyers they realized that they did not know all about it—it is the man who does not know anything who thinks he knows all—but these gentlemen knew enough to know that they did not know all and they sent to the Department of Justice for the assistance of one of the officials of that department. So you will see that

if this Bill is not all that it should be in the matter of drafting, it is certainly not for want of good legal advice.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. You must not forget that after all the Department of Justice is only there for the purpose of giving effect to the instructions received. The gentleman from the Department of Justice—I have his notes here—simply had to give effect to the instructions received from the gentlemen of the committee. I had no connection with this compulsory voting, but I think the Minister of Finance had something to say about it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am quite responsible, but I never saw the Bill.

Mr. OLIVER. If clause 2 is under discussion, and that clause is placed there avowedly as a means of preventing the corruption of the electorate at present existing, I would say that the objections that I had to it before are intensified by the introduction of that idea. I did not know that the electorate of Canada was as corrupt as some hon. members seem to think. I presume they draw from their own experience. I have been before the electors for twenty years, and as far as my experience goes I have never paid a dollar directly or indirectly to secure a vote in my election, and so far——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER. Hon. gentlemen are speaking for themselves, that is their privilege, I am speaking for myself. I do not know of a dollar having been paid either directly or indirectly to secure votes for, and I have been almost as uniformly successful as any member of the House. Therefore, I do not know from my own experience and knowledge that there is necessity for such drastic legislation to overcome an alleged existing condition amongst the electorate of this country. I object to the implication, I say that so far as my experience goes it is not true and I do not believe it is true. If it is true, representative government in this country is a mistake; we need a despotism and not government by the electorate. In regard to the adoption of compulsory voting as a means of preventing corruption, I should say from my standpoint that what we want is an intelligent election; it is not so much the number of men who go to the polls as it is the intelligence exercised by those who do go.

Mr. ROSS (Victoria). What about the intelligence of those who do not go.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not saying anything about their intelligence. Judging by some of the representatives in this House—I do not wish to speak for myself—I should probably say they use more intelligence by staying at home than by voting. When we undertake to compel a man to go to the polls, we do not thereby put into his mind that intelligence or that good judgment or that freedom from corrupt influences which will ensure to us that he casts an intelligent and an unbiased vote. The effect of a biased vote cast at the polls is worse than the results from the bias which compels a man to stay at home. As to the general result if you compel a man to go to the poll and provide a penalty if he does not go. The provision is drastic and unreasonable and it is bound to meet the same fate, if embodied in legislation, as all other unreasonable legislation does meet. The present law in regard to corrupt practices at elections is an instance. It is drastic and unreasonable in its present form and as a result it is not enforced and there is corruption in elections to-day, so every one here seems to say, just as there was twenty or thirty years ago, and the results and penalties are avoided by the principle of saw-off. I maintain that if this provision were enacted, the penalty proposed to be enforced against those who did not go to the polls would simply be settled by the principle of saw-off and there would be no penalty enforced on any one, the law would be in disrepute and the parliament which passed it would be discredited. The hon. member for Guysboro (Mr. Fraser) drew a comparison between the position of a member of the House and an elector in the country, and he said it would not be very satisfactory to have a law which would compel members of parliament to vote on every occasion and that therefore it was not desireable to have a law which will compel electors to vote on every occasion. His argument was good as far as it went, but it was hardly fair because the conditions as between members of parliament and those who elect them are not the same in the matter of voting. A member of parliament is elected for the purpose of voting. He assumes an obligation when he stands for election in regard to that vote.

Mr. TALBOT. Is not the elector created for the same purpose ?

Mr. OLIVER. No ; an elector is not created for the same purpose. The vote is a privilege, if you like ; it is a duty, if you like ; but it should not be a penalty, as it is proposed to be made by this Bill. The true condition is absolutely reversed when you provide that the privilege of voting shall become a penalty which shall be attached to the qualification of voting.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the penalty ?

Mr. OLIVER. It is disfranchisement for six years.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is that a penalty for the man who does not want to vote ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes ; the penalty is an extreme penalty, and is improperly applied. The sufferer from that penalty is the general electorate more than the individual ; and the same fault is to be found with the

present election law; that is to say, instead of the man who casts a corrupt vote being punished, it is the electorate generally who are punished. In this case Mr. A is disfranchised for six years because, for one reason or another, he did not cast his vote, and the general electorate of the country is at the loss of the weight of his influence and opinion for six years in consequence. This is putting the punishment on the wrong shoulders. But in regard to members of parliament, they are elected for the purpose of casting votes. Their business is to vote on every question that comes up. That is the undertaking which they made with their constituents when they were elected; and it would be the height of absurdity, it would be one of the most ridiculous things that ever occurred in the history of any country, it would make this parliament a laughing stock of every elector in the Dominion of Canada, if this parliament, which, on the most important question that came before the parliament of Canada for twenty years, showed a voting strength of only, I think, 36 on one side and 74 on the other—it did not even do that, but that is the best construction we can put upon it—if this parliament, which was not present in half its numbers on that occasion, should turn around to the electorate and say: Whether you are willing or able or not, you must go to the poll and vote or you will be disfranchised. Surely we have not taken leave of our senses altogether to put ourselves in such a position before the people who sent us here? If the electors who sent us here are under obligations to vote for or against us at the polls, surely we are under ten thousand times greater obligations to vote for or against the measures which come up for consideration in this parliament. When we have so mended our ways, when we have so advanced, if you will call it an advance, that we have passed a law that every member of parliament shall vote on every question that comes up or be penalized, then we may discuss, with some measure of reason, a proposition that will compel the electorate to go to the polls; but, I submit, not till then.

Mr. GOURLEY. I have listened with great pleasure to the debate up to this time. I think it is well to have a little mild hypocrisy in life, as long as it injures no one——

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. member speaks for himself, I presume.

Mr. GOURLEY. And we have had not an unfair amount of it displayed in this discussion. My experience is that we have ample laws in the country at the present time to give us a perfectly pure election if the electorate and the candidates observe them. Therefore, I have listened with great amusement to this discussion, because I do not think it makes a fig of difference whether we pass this law or a thousand others; it would not help the purity of elections a particle. So long as the candidates agree to suspend all ideas of morality during an election and go in for a general picnic, we shall continue to have all the expenditure of money that we have at the present time. Down in my part of the country we have the most moral people to be found in the world; but when an election comes around, they regard it as a splendid holiday, and the result is that while the candidates agree not to spend a dollar, the electors go in for a general picnic. They size up each candidate for what they can get out of him, and they generally run it up to the limit. We might as well be honest in this matter. I will tell you of a little experience I had which sickened me of the election law. Two or three years ago I was standing at a polling place during an election of a friend of mine. By and by I saw a young man who belonged to a strong Conservative family coming across the way. I waited for him. As he came his attention was attracted by a large poster containing a proclamation setting forth all the provisions of the law forbidding any man to take a bribe or do a corrupt act. This young man, in the full flush of youth and with all the ingenuousness of youth, was coming to cast probably his first or his second vote; and as I saw him reading this proclamation I was delighted, because I had heard men around me talking in mysterious words about 'stuff,' and about not being able to get along in this election without 'stuff.' When he had finished reading the proclamation he came over to me apparently filled with the enthusiasm and purity of youth, and I expected to have a satisfactory talk with him. When he came he said: 'Who gets up all these laws about elections?' I immediately fell into the trap, and endeavoured to insinuate that it was the Tory party who had got them up. 'Well,' he said, 'that is all I want of the darned Tory party. I got into a scrape the other day, and I cannot get any help from them if they make laws like this—I will go over to the Grits, who have always lots of 'stuff.' Then he went and voted. From that time I gave up any confidence in election laws. I have listened to this debate with pleasure as an academic discussion. If the electorate do not want money spent, it will not be spent; if they do want money spent, it will be spent in spite of all the laws you like to make. That is the honest truth in this matter.

Mr. CHARLTON. It may be that my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. Gourley) takes the proper view of the case. He informs us that laws are of no use, that you might just as well leave the door wide open and make no attempt to control except by appealing to the individual conscience of the elector. Be a good boy and do right. How-

ever, that is not the general impression in the public. It has not been the view accepted by our law-givers in the past, and our statute-book is proof of the fact that the legislatures of this country have realized that such an evil exists, and have tried to cope with it. Some little time ago we determined to allow section 2 to stand, and discuss the other sections of this Bill ; but the temper and disposition of the House seems to be to revert to section 2, and discuss the question of compulsory voting to the exclusion of everything else in the Bill. I had hoped that we would go through this Bill, and pass such portions of it as we consider right, and I think if the disposition of the House were to perfect this legislation, if there be anything lacking in it, we could make good progress. But the House seems disposed to question even the fundamental principles of an electoral purity, to challenge every feature of this Bill, to challenge the competency of the committee, to challenge the character of its provisions, to belittle the matter from beginning to end. This Bill, as the hon. Minister of Finance has said, was referred to a special committee, upon which were able men and eminent lawyers. As a layman and member of that committee, I can bear evidence to the truth of that statement. There were men of the most acute minds on that committee, and we had there a representative of the Department of Justice, who did not confine his functions to registering the decisions of the committee, but participated freely in its discussions, and gave shape to the action of the committee in many essential respects. He was very conscientious and painstaking in trying to keep the committee from making mistakes or entering upon courses that would have been inconvenient, improper, unconstitutional, illegal or unworkable. We went on with this work to the best of our ability. The committee has presented to the House a Bill. Certain circumstances prevented that committee from making its report at as early a date as could have been desired. There was some delay in naming the members of the committee, there was some delay in having the committee called together and organized, and what would have been a late date in an ordinary question, was reached before the committee met. But the committee did not proceed in a hasty manner with its work. It went through the work carefully in a painstaking manner. We had not the advantage of the presence of the Minister of Finance for a great length of time, but we had every valuable assistance from that gentleman. We had a representative of the Department of Justice always able to cope with the questions, and we reported a Bill which, in my opinion, requires but slight modifications, if at all, to make it workable. Many of the criticisms, I think, are not well placed. For instance, with regard to compulsory voting, the Minister of Justice says that the provisions of the Bill will defeat its own purpose, because a person can simply leave the riding, and thus become exempt from the provisions of the law. But the provision of the law is that if he absent himself in order to avoid voting, or left the riding for any cause not sufficient, he was liable to the consequences imposed by clause two.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Who is going to determine the reasons for his leaving ?

Mr. CHARLTON. That will be a matter to be determined on examination, like every other. With regard to the propriety of interfering with what some of our friends deem a right of conscience, which compels an individual to abstain from voting, what is the privilege of the franchise ? What is the right of the franchise ? What is the possession of the franchise ? It is the freeman's safety ; it is the freeman's weapon by which he can maintain his liberty and the free institutions bequeathed by his fathers, and which his fathers gained with great difficulties and struggles, for which men have gone to the stake, for which men have been decapitated, which has caused bloody wars and untold miseries. That is the heritage which has come down to him and which he scarcely prizes at its cost, but which it is his great duty to preserve. A great poet has said :

> The crowning fact, the kingliest act
> Of freedom is a freeman's vote.

We want to impress on the elector the gravity, the magnitude of the trust imposed on him. We want to arrest his tendency to carelessness or unconcern by saying to him : If you do not think enough of the great privilege of voting, you will be deprived of that privilege for six years. That will attract the attention of the elector to the importance of exercising the franchise. It will impress upon him the fact that this is a privilege, a great, inestimable, precious right, which he ought to exercise, and if he is so indifferent to the character of this privilege as to refuse to exercise it, in my opinion it is proper that for six years he should be debarred from exercising it, in order that he may be brought to a consciousness of its importance. And once he realizes its importance he will be careful not to commit an offence which would deprive him of that privilege. Hon. gentlemen say that voting is a discharge of a duty. Well, if a duty rests on a man, there is no impropriety in making some provision to induce him to perform it. If duty rests on a man, obligation goes with it ; and if the duty is not discharged, it is proper to impose a penalty of some kind in consequence of his failure to discharge it. If a very large majority of the electors of Canada were so indifferent to the franchise privilege as to abstain from voting, we might be governed by a minority. As

it is, with the proportion that abstains from the polls, we are not governed by the majority. There has not been an election held in the Dominion during the last three or four years, in which the party elected had a majority of the whole electorate. A sufficient number of voters have abstained from voting to put the control of our affairs into the hands of an actual minority on the voters' lists. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Demers) says that we ought to remove the obstacles that prevent voting. That is what we are doing. One obstacle is indifference, another is the corrupt practice of hiring voters to stay at home. These are the two obstacles we want to remove, and there is no way of removing them except by the adoption of some such measure as this. The hon. gentleman tells us that if a remedy could be found, everybody would be happy. How are we to find a remedy ? If there is an evil, are we to declare that it is not proper to attempt to apply a remedy ?

Mr. GOURLEY. Get your preachers to preach good sermons.

Mr. CHARLTON. Preaching ? Yes, that is a good thing. I like to hear preachers preach morality and patriotism and the obligations resting upon the citizen to discharge his duty. But I like also to see his duty discharged by the citizen, and, if he does not discharge it I am in favour of applying some remedy, some penalty, for not having done so. The hon. member for St. John (Hon. Mr. Blair) tells us that, so far as he is aware, money does not influence elections to any great extent, that it is a matter of very small consequence, indeed, that, in fact, there is a great cry raised about this matter and very little in the cry. I cannot agree with the hon. member for St. John. I know of ridings in this Dominion that are thoroughly debauched by the use of money. I know ridings where electors have lost all sense of honour, all sense of the sacredness of the trust reposed in them, who hold their votes for sale.

Mr. HACKETT. Name them.

Mr. GOURLEY. North Norfolk.

Mr. CHARLTON. North Norfolk is a remarkably pure riding. No influences of that kind have been used in North Norfolk. But I am patriotically desirous of doing good to other ridings.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). I desire, Mr. Chairman, to ask what section of the Bill we are considering at the present time ?

Mr. CHARLTON. There seemed to be a general discussion, Mr. Chairman. I am ready to drop at once any reply to criticisms of compulsory voting if——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The opinion of the committee has been expressed two or three times that they would like a general discussion.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand that there is a motion that the committee rise.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is a motion, I believe, always subject to discussion. Now, Sir, I do not think we are likely, at this stage of the session, with the temper that the House manifests, to accomplish very much with this Bill. I remember an old adage, in use among housewives when I was a boy, that the proper time to set a hen is when she is ready. The House does not seem to be ready to incubate the provisions of this Bill at the present time. That I fear is quite evident. But that being the case, while I am sincerely desirous of promoting this Bill and believe it is essential to the interests of the country that its provisions should be incorporated in our statutes, and while I believe that the Bill contains provisions that will tend very largely to correct the irregularities and corruptions that exist, perhaps it would be too much to expect to see this Bill put upon the statute-book this session. I am in the hands of the government. Through the courtesy of the leader of the government this Bill has been placed on the government Orders. Without the exercise of that courtesy it could not have been reached this session. Under these conditions, feeling that I am indebted as promoter of the Bill and chairman of the committee exclusively to the courstesy of the leader of the government, I will allow my own wishes and feelings in this matter to stand aside, if the leader of the government has any wishes or views to express as to whether we shall continue to press the Bill or be content with the general discussion we have had, and let the Bill stand over for consideration at some future period—probably another session, which, I think we are certain to have before we have another election. Of course, my own individual desire is to press the consideration of the Bill. I am ready to stay here to that end and press it to the last. It will suit me to do so. But I am not in the position to ask that that shall be done under the circumstances under which I have the privilege of discussing the Bill to-day. I am not in a position to ask that privilege from the leader of the government at this stage. Expressing my unbounded confidence in the provisions of the Bill and my sincere desire to see these provisions enacted and become law, I must realize that, in the present temper of the House, it would take some time to do that ; and I can do no less than return the courtesy of the leader of the government in placing the Bill on the government Orders, and leave the matter in his hands.

The PRIME MINISTER. There are in this Bill certain dispositions with which, for my part, I altogether agree, and which I think would be very valuable parts of our law. For instance, section 8, which is the next one, we would take up 'bribery of candidates,' 'bribery of employees by employ-

ers,' 'bribery by an officer of Canada, or any province'—all these, I think, are provisions as to which there can be no objection and that would improve the law. There can be no contention, possible, so far as I can see, with regard to some of these sections. The only part as to which there is a difference of opinion—and it seems to be a very radical difference of opinion—is as to what has been called and has even been called in the Bill, 'compulsory voting.' It has been remarked that this expression 'compulsory voting,' is not, perhaps, very accurate. What is proposed here is not, perhaps, compulsory voting, as we have understood it here, but, even this rather lenient disposition seems to be the subject of a very radical difference of opinion, not as between the two sides of the House, but as between hon. gentlemen on either side. We have had a very valuable discussion, and the time has not been lost. I would move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again. And I would ask the Minister of Justice to give this matter his attention, so as to keep the clauses which we think ought to be part of the Bill. Then, with regard to the second section, which is the most contentious one, perhaps we can think it over and have a further discussion upon it at a later day.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think that would be the best course for the committee to adopt. And, in this connection, I would make one or two further observations with regard to the remarks of the hon. member for St. John (Hon. Mr. Blair). That hon. gentleman seems to think that this Bill excludes from voting for all time those who do not see fit to exercise the right of voting. While this Bill is intended as a deterrent, it is not intended to take away the right of voting from the people as a general rule. It is thought, rightly or wrongly, by those who have framed the provision that the very fact that a man will lose his right to vote unless he exercises that right, will cause him to go to the poll. The observations of my hon. friend from St. John seem to be illogical in that regard. He made some reflections upon the gentlemen responsible for the drafting of the Bill. I think these gentlemen have done their duty very well. It would be impossible in the time at their disposal, to frame a Bill that would not be open to criticism. But my hon. friend from St. John and any members of the government who criticise this drafting may recall the fact that the railway commission Bill was, in the first place, drafted by a gentleman who was paid $2,500 for his work, and it then underwent the supervision of the law clerks of the Department of Railways and Canals. Yet, in Committee of the Whole there were 1,500 or 2,000 amendments made in it, besides a number made in the Senate. Had the hon. member thought of this, surely he would not have found fault, because the Bill now before us requires a few amendments. I desire to make an observation with regard to what the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) suggested. He suggested that the hon. gentlemen who desired to see a law passed against corruption were making a charge against the electors of Canada. He seems to have been singularly free from any knowledge of conditions of that kind. The hon. gentleman is very fortunate. Without the slightest intention of saying anything offensive to the hon. gentleman, I may remind him of the words of the poet, 'The Lady doth protest too much, methinks.' Be that as it may, we are not making a charge against the electors of Canada by seeking to make provisions of this kind. Provisions for this purpose are already on the statute-book.

When we pass laws against murder, we do not charge the people of Canada as a whole with being murderers; when we pass laws against various indictable offences we do not charge the people of Canada with being criminals; when we pass laws against electoral corruption we do not charge the electorate of Canada as a whole with being corrupt. Every one knows there are constituencies in which a certain number of people are capable of being influenced corruptly. In many of the constituencies I believe the number is very small, in others the number is greater. The Minister of Trade and Commerce some years ago said that in some constituencies which he named he, knew the people could be bought because he said he had bought them twice. There are testimonies of this kind found, not only in the mouths of public men, but in the court records, which show that in some constituencies there are a certain number of men who are capable of being influenced by unworthy considerations. When we pass laws seeking to minimize conditions of that kind, we are not charging the people as a whole with being corrupt. I believe in that regard Canadians hold as high a place as any people in the world who have representative institutions such as we enjoy. There is one observation I might make with regard to what is almost a precedent for this clause 2; namely, that in one of the branches of this legislature a member who does not attend to his duties for two sessions, ceases to be capable of performing those duties. That is very much in line with the principle of clause 2 of the Bill. As my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) very well pointed out while my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) was speaking, you create an electorate for the purpose of enabling them to exercise their franchise, just as you create a Senate or a House of Commons for the purpose of enabling them to perform the duties which devolve upon them. I would have been glad to see this Bill go a little further, I would have been glad to see some provision dealing with what is called 'saw-offs' in election petitions. It is a very

simple thing to saw-off election petitions to use a common phrase; it is a simple matter, because, under the provisions of the Election Act all you have to do to get rid of a petition is to leave it for six months, do nothing with it, and the petition lapses of itself. Certain other provisions of the Act declare that you cannot withdraw a petition unless you go before a court and make an affidavit that there has been no collusion. The result is that no one goes before a court to make such an affidavit. You can get rid of it in a much easier way by not taking any step for six months, then the petition drops of itself. I think it would have been wise to make some amendment in that regard. I agree with what has been said by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) as to the appointment of deputy returning officers, I think some provision of that kind might be well included. However, as my right hon. friend says there are certain provisions about which there seems to be no great difference of opinion. These will be put into a form more acceptable to the government, and the other clauses as I understand will remain open for consideration by the House. I think that is the best course to pursue under the circumstances, and I acquiesce in his suggestion that that course be adopted.

Progress reported.

MANITOBA GRAIN ACT, 1900—SENATE AMENDMENTS.

Amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 232) to amend the Manitoba Grain Act, 1900, (the Minister of the Interior) read the second time.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) has an amendment to make, and in order to make his amendment better understood, I will read the section which has been amended, together with the amendment made thereto by the Senate. This is the original section of the Bill :

4. Any applicant who fails to load a car so ordered by him within twenty-four hours from the time the car is furnished by the railway company, shall lose his right so far as concerns that car ; and the railway agent shall thereupon cancel the order, by writing the word 'cancelled' in the remarks column of the car order book, and award the car to the next applicant entitled to it. If the applicant fails or is unable to commence loading a car awarded to him within the twenty-four hours specified herein, he shall, personally or by agent duly appointed in writing, so notify the railway agent in writing, who shall thereupon cancel the order in like manner as aforesaid, and award the car to the next applicant entitled to it. Any applicant who fails to so notify the agent as herein directed shall pay car rental at the rate of twenty-five cents per hour for each hour that the car is held for him by the railway agent, and the railway company may decline to furnish further cars to such applicant until such car rental is paid to the railway agent.

That is to say, that the Bill which passed this House provided that if an applicant failed to avail himself of his privilege, he should lose his turn and pay a penalty. This was amended by the Senate, which struck out the section and substituted the following :

4. Each applicant, or an agent of the applicant duly appointed in writing (such agent to be a resident in the vicinity of the shipping point), on being informed by the railway agent of the allotment to him of a car, in good order and condition, shall at once declare his intention and ability to load the said car within the next ensuing twenty-four hours.

In the event of such applicant being unable to so declare his intention and ability to load the car allotted to him, the railway agent shall thereupon cancel the order by writing the word 'cancelled' in the remarks column of the car order book, and shall award the car to the next applicant entitled to it.

If the applicant, after declaring his intention to load the car, fails to commence loading such car within the twenty-four hours aforesaid, the agent shall thereupon cancel the order in like manner as aforesaid, and award the car to the next applicant entitled to it, and the applicant who so fails to load such car shall pay car rental at the rate of twenty-five cents (25c.) per hour for each hour that the car is held for him by the railway agent.

If the applicant, having commenced the loading of a car, is unable to complete the same within twenty-four hours as aforesaid, he shall pay car rental at the rate of twenty-five cents (25c.) per hour for each hour over the twenty-four hours aforesaid that the car is held for him to complete the loading. The railway company may decline to furnish further cars to such applicant until the car rental hereinbefore referred to is paid to the railway agent.

This amendment does not differ materially from the disposition of the Bill as it passed this House, but it has been put into four paragraphs. The burden of the amendment made by the Senate is to relieve the applicant who is in default of the penalty imposed upon him.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It would seem to me to be desirable, if these amendments from the Senate are of any importance, that we should have some notice of them upon our files.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) will find them at page 965 of the Votes and Proceedings.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In that case it would meet to a very considerable extent what I have said, although I think it would be wise to put amendments of this character on the files in the same way as our Bills are filed.

The PRIME MINISTER. The amendments appear in the Votes and Proceedings. The suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) might be a good one

to be adopted next session; that is, that these amendments should appear on the file with the Bills.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Since this amendment was made in the Senate a good deal of discussion has taken place in the city of Winnipeg and at other points in the west as to the nature of this penalty which is imposed upon the defaulter under these peculiar circumstances. I would like to point out to the House that the change we propose to make is one which we think is reasonable and right. The individual who has been notified by the agent of the railway company, either in person or by the agent who has been appointed to act for him, has to signify his intention to the railway company to make use of the car within twenty-four hours, but in that country it is quite possible that even under these circumstances, and with the best of intentions, he may be prevented from taking hold of the car at such a time as will enable him to finish the loading of it within twenty-four hours. If he exceeds the twenty-four hours he is liable to a penalty of $6 per day. The North-west members are in unison with me in making the statement that we object that a man living at a distance from the railway station should have this heavy penalty imposed upon him. It is a penalty largely in excess of that imposed on any person using a railway car under similar circumstances. Instead of 25 cents per hour, to be in keeping with the penalty imposed on other individuals using a car under similar circumstances, it should be something like 5 cents per hour. We think, however, that if he commences within twenty-four hours to load the car and he does not succeed in loading it within twenty-four hours he should be permitted by the railway company to complete the loading, subject to the general Railway Act of Canada in the matter of demurrage, and that the railway company should, instead of having it provided for in this Act, fall back upon the law as laid down in the general Railway Act of Canada, without imposing this extreme penalty. We are anxious to preserve for the railway companies the full benefit of their rolling stock, but at the same time we wish to protect the interests of those who may be prevented by the intervention of Providence, by a storm or a blizzard, or by distance, from being on the ground in time to finish within the allotted period given. There are men who live twenty miles away from a railway station. Then there is the consideration of the mail. In some places there is only a weekly, or a bi-weekly, or a tri-weekly mail, and these conditions might give rise to circumstances that would prevent him from being on the ground within twenty-four hours. The amendment which we propose simply contemplates leaving the matter under the general Railway Act of Canada, and we propose to strike out this penalty and allow the railway companies to apply the general Act in reference to demurrage in all such cases.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Suppose he does not commence to load at all, what means have you for collecting the demurrage?

Mr. DOUGLAS. If he does not commence at all he loses his car and it passes to the next applicant. His order is cancelled.

Mr. GOURLEY. And there is no claim for demurrage?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; in that case there is no demurrage. Then there is another hardship in connection with the matter. It may be said that this is not in the interests of the railway company. But we have to look at this point: Under the present condition of things, with an insufficient supply of rolling stock, many of these farmers are perhaps obliged to drive into town fifteen or twenty miles four or five times in order to secure a car. These men should be compensated for their loss of time when they are promised a car and it has not been placed on the ground, because they are sufferers to a great extent on that account. We think, under these circumstances, that where a farmer is prevented from completing his work within twenty-four hours on account of a storm or otherwise, he should not be obliged to pay such a large sum as $6 per day, when other people engaged in other businesses are only asked to pay $1 or $2 per day. We think that the amendment which we propose is in the interest, not only of the railway companies, but of the people of the country generally. I therefore beg to move that:

The House do not agree with the amendment to subsection 4 of new section 58, in section 21 of the Bill 232; but do alter the subsection by striking out all the words after the words 'entitled to it,' in the ninth line, to the end of the subsection, and substitute therefor the words 'and if the applicant, after declaring his intention and ability as aforesaid, shall not have commenced loading the car within the period of twenty-four hours from the time of the notice to himself or his agent, as herein directed, the railway agent shall thereupon cancel the order in like manner as aforesaid.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the demurrage now on a car?

Mr. DOUGLAS. From $1 to $2 per day, and in this case they propose to make it $6 per day.

Mr. GOURLEY. You do not object to the demurrage of $1 or $2 per day, as provided by the Railway Act?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. This amendment provides for the usual demurrage under the general Railway Act of Canada.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I rise to a point of order. A Bill has been sent from this House to the Senate, the Senate makes am-

endments to it, and it comes down to this House. Then this House may not concur in these amendments or may move an amendment to the Bill reaffirming the same thing as was contained in the Bill which was originally sent to the Senate. Can we then introduce entirely new matter ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not read very carefully the amendments or the Bill, but I understand that we passed subsection 4 of section 21 of the Bill. This subsection 4 has been struck out by the Senate, and the Bill has now come back to the House as amended. It is now proposed to accept a part of that amendment made by the Senate and that is in order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is the position.

Amendment agreed to.

On motion of the Prime Minister, the second amendment made by the Senate was concurred in.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PILOTAGE ACT AMENDMENTS.

Bill (No. 261) respecting the Pilotage District of Montreal and the Port and Pilotage District of Quebec was read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. BLAIN. This Bill, I understand, is to divide the pilotage system between Quebec and Montreal from that between Quebec and the gulf.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine). It is purely and simply to put the pilotage system between Montreal and Quebec under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, in accordance with the request made by the board of trade, the shipping conference, the corn exchange and the harbour commissioners themselves, who have had these pilots under their control, and also, strange to say, with the consent and at the request of the pilots themselves. The second clause of the Bill provides that the Department of Marine and Fisheries will take control of the pilotage on the Saguenay river. The pilotage on the Saguenay river is at present under the control of the harbour commissioners of Quebec. For one reason and another the harbour commissioners at Quebec have not been willing that the pilotage system on the St. Lawrence below Quebec should be under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but they do not object to the department taking charge of the pilotage system on the Saguenay river, because they have not been able to grapple with the situation. During the last two seasons there have been very serious accidents on that river, due entirely to the fact that there has been no understanding and organization between the pilots and the harbour commissioners of Quebec. Therefore, the harbour commissioners of Quebec are disposed to allow the control of these pilots to be handed over to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and the department will see that pilots properly qualified to pilot on the Saguenay river will be chosen for that purpose.

Mr. BLAIN. Why not take the control of the whole pilotage system at Quebec as well as at Montreal.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. These things must all be done by degrees; we cannot do this as rapidly as we would like, we have convinced the pilots from Montreal and Quebec that they will get fair justice from the Marine and Fisheries Department, but the others are not yet satisfied that they would get such justice, and we do not intend to force them. We had better make this experiment, and if it goes on well, I have no doubt that, in view of the result, the others will come around. If they do not we will then have good reasons to force the matter, but for the present we think it is better to take half a loaf than to have nothing.

Mr. BLAIN. Do we understand that the pilots as well as the commissioners at the city of Quebec oppose the government taking entire control ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I submitted this proposition to the pilots, as well as the harbour commission and shipping interests of Quebec. Unfortunately, they could not come to an agreement. I think the shipping interest would have been satisfied; but in the face of the opposition of the harbour commissioners and the pilots themselves, who constiute a corporation in Quebec, they came to the conclusion that it was better to defer action. In the meantime, this is satisfactory to every one concerned.

Mr. BLAIN. It seems to be a step in the right direction; but I am not sure that it would not have been better to wait until the whole system was ready to come under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend is quite mistaken. What we are doing now meets with the approval of the corporation in question, and also the approval of the British Board of Trade, who have from time to time recommended this improvement. If this is adopted I am sure that we shall be able to devise regulations which will be so satisfactory not only to the shipping trade, but to the pilots themselves, that they will be willing in a

year or two to come under the control of the department.

On section 2—Saguenay not included in port or pilotage district of Quebec.

Mr. BLAIN. What proportion of the pilots will that take in ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There should not be more than three or four pilots assigned to the River Saguenay. As the corporation of pilots of Quebec and the harbour commissioners of Quebec could not agree among themselves, the pilotage of the Saugenay river was assigned to six or ten pilots. Some of them did not know anything about the river at all, and very serious accidents happened. That is the reason they do not object to this provision, because they think that the Department of Marine and Fisheries will make the proper choice among the pilots of Quebec, and have the pilotage of the Saguenay river as safe as any other. Until about three years ago the pilotage in the Saguenay river was done by pilots who had no special knowledge, most of whom did not know how to read or write, but who knew the river well and scarcely any accident had happened during the time they were doing the work. But the harbour commissioners of Quebec and the pilots of Quebec represented that these people were not qualified as pilots, and asked that the pilotage of the Saguenay river should be put under the control of the harbour commissioners of Quebec. This was done, and only qualified pilots now perform the duty on the Saguenay river. It is now proposed, with the consent of the harbour commissioners of Quebec and the corporation of pilots, to make regulations for the special examination of pilots for the Saguenay river. When that is done, we hope that river will be piloted very safely.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that under a system which allowed a man who was not scientifically educated to act as a pilot, there were fewer accidents than there have been after the change took place and a scientific examination was imposed on the pilots.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. To my personal knowledge, as regards Montreal, where I was on the board of harbour commissioners for four years when I had the honour of being mayor—and I think that Quebec is no better off in this respect—the examinations of the pilots are not at present what they should be; so that what we are doing now is in the right direction. We want to have the pilots well educated, both technically and generally, and we intend to have better examinations than we have had in the past. It is also our intention to have the apprentices examined before they enter upon their apprenticeship, so that they will not lose five or six or seven years of apprenticeship and at the end be unable to pass the examination owing to bad hearing or bad eyesight or some other physical defect.

Mr. SPROULE. I have always thought the pilots ought to be under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and it seems to me that this measure will fail to accomplish as much as it would if the whole pilotage of the St. Lawrence were taken under the control of the deparment. We shall try this as an experiment, but I expect it will not be successful. I would suggest that you should take charge of the pilots from Quebec down, as well.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Really, I think we had better confine ourselves to the pilots between Quebec and Montreal for the present, and see how that works. If that experiment proves satisfactory, we may then take hold of the pilots from Quebec down.

Mr. SPROULE. You may find a conflict between the Quebec pilots and the Montreal pilots.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, because they are not in the same district.

Mr. SPROULE. You might as well go the full length at once, and have them all under the one control, and then lay down qualification examinations, length of employment, &c., which would apply to them all.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is rather a difficult question to deal with. When I was head of the Marine Department, I found great differences of opinion, and I think my hon. friend is taking the right way.

Mr. SPROULE. How many pilots in the three districts ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Between Montreal and Quebec, 65 ; but the limit is 75, and they complain that they are too numerous. In Quebec there are over 100, and they are too numerous. That is where the difficulty lies. The Quebec pilots cover the Saguenay at the same time, and they have appointed more pilots to the Saguenay river than they should have done. They sent to the Saguenay river some pilots who showed themselves perfectly ignorant of the currents and channels of that river. That was the cause of the accident there.

Mr. COCHRANE. Who controls the pilots now ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Harbour Commissioners of Quebec control the Quebec pilots. The Harbour Commissioners of Montreal control the pilots from Montreal to Quebec.

By this Bill we are taking control of the latter.

Mr. SPROULE. In the aggregate there are 175 pilots. I see no reason why the Marine Department should not take these 175 pilots under its control and allot them according to the requirements of each locality, and bring them up to a certain standard of efficiency. It seems to me that that would not be a very difficult task. All that is required is moral courage.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no lack of moral courage, but we are not dealing only with one special interest. And when the shipping interests of Quebec, those who are most interested in having good, safe pilotage between Quebec and the gulf, say that we had better not disturb the present arrangement for a year or two, I think I am perfectly justified in acting as I am doing.

Mr. SPROULE. I have heard a good deal about pilotage for many years. I had the same opinion many years ago that I have to-day, that if the government had been equal to the occasion and had taken control of these men and made the regulations for pilotage, and distributed the pilots according to the need of the service, the conditions would have been much better than they are to-day. This Bill is very well, but my complaint is that it does not go far enough ; and I confess that I cannot see any reason to deter the hon. minister, if it is not a lack of moral courage. That may not be the reason, but it looks to me very like it.

Mr. HENDERSON. Do I understand that when a pilot goes aboard in the gulf and takes charge of a vessel, he only brings it to Quebec and then another pilot has to be employed ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. It seems to me that that is too much of a tax to impose on the shipping interest, and that is the interest we are bound to protect. As has been suggested, the whole thing looks to me a case of lack of moral courage on the part of the minister. It looks to me like a case of the tail wagging the dog. I feel sure that the minister will find himself in a better position if he will show himself strong enough to deal with the whole question at once, instead of piecemeal as under this Bill. The minister is not showing himself in a favourable light. I believe he is strong enough, if he would but use his influence with these people to deal with this whole question at once, and it is in the interest of shipping, of marine insurance and everything connected with the shipping interest that there should be one system, and that system controlled by the government of the country.

Bill, as amended, reported.

Hon. Mr. PREFONTAINE.

SUPPLY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand the right hon. Prime Minister to say that we would go on with the Railway Bill. I am not objecting——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I was not aware that the Prime Minister had made that statement.

Mr. SPROULE. He did, but it is all right so far as we are concerned.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee.

Lighthouse and coast service—further amount required for agencies, rents and contingencies, including the establishment of a new agency at Montreal, $5,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What makes necessary the change in Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Strange to say the most important port in the Dominion has no station and no marine agency. It has been thought proper that the engineer in charge of the buoy service between Montreal and Quebec should have an office where he could meet the representatives of the shipping interests, and where those engaged in shipping could gain necessary information regarding the matters that concern them. Hitherto in Montreal there have been several officers scattered in the different parts of the city. The place, for instance, where the pilots meet was in one part. The cattle inspectors had a certain office. The inspectors of hulls were in another place. And so on. We have thought proper to concentrate these offices, so that the officer in charge of the lights and buoys between Montreal and Quebec should have an office where he would meet people connected with that shipping interest. We concentrate the other office in the same place, and we have there a place where investigations can be held. Hitherto they have been held sometimes in one place, sometimes in another. The amount provided, $5,000, is not at all extraordinary. In some other places, for instance, in Quebec, the cost of the employees of the Department of Marine and Fisheries exceeds this amount.

Further amount required for maintenance and repairs to lighthouses, owing to the proposed establishment of gas lights and buoys above Montreal $15,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What condition is the St. Lawrence in now with regard to lights ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is being improved every day. We shall have it in such a condition that I think it will follow that the rate of insurance will have to be decreased. This

extra amount of $15,000 is to cover expenses connected with the buoys on the St. Lawrence between Montreal and Kingston, including gas buoys for Collingwood, Georgian bay and Parry Sound districts, maintenance of new buoy depot, and lighting the river navigation. We propose to provide for the maintenance of additional gas buoys on the Georgian bay, also the maintenance of gas plant for Lake Erie and the Georgian bay. At the present time we are dependent on the courtesy of the United States government for keeping lights in Canadian waters. I think it is not creditable to the Canadian government that we should be dependent on the Americans for lighting our channels. We notified them that we were going to install these lights for our channel. The navigation companies have thanked us for these efforts to make business safer.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood some time ago there were some lights needed in the Parry Sound district.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We are providing them as fast as possible, that is why we want $15,000 more. We intend to put the whole system in such a shape that within the next two or three years there will be very little required except perhaps additional lights in some small ports. We are meeting all the demands made by the transportation companies.

Mr. SPROULE. Are you supplying all the lights asked for ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly, we are providing for all the demands which have been made.

Further amount required for construction and aids to navigation, including the purchase and equipment of boats for sweeping channels between Platon and Montreal and Montreal and Kingston ; and the substitution of compressed gas for oil as illuminant for lighthouses, increasing the power of the lights below Montreal, and the establishment of a buoy depot for the upper lakes, $180,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This is a large amount, and the committee will pardon me if I give a lengthy explanation.

The extensive improvements authorized in the lighting of the upper St. Lawrence comprise the introduction of compressed acetylene instead of oil in the lighthouses, and the use of acetylene for the buoy service instead of oil or Pintsch gas ; and furthermore, the use, as far as possible, of range lights instead of single lights and gas buoys.

The re-arrangement of the existing system of lighting will be considered as soon as possible by commissioners. The present lights were inaugurated for nine-foot navigation, and it is considered that they can be changed in places with advantage.

The following estimate of cost of converting the lighting of the river is given. The apparatus needed is not made in Canada, and it is procured from the Safety Car Heating and Lighting Company, of New York :

42 storeholders	$35,000
40 gas lanterns	12,000
3 gas lanterns with automatic bell attachments for Lake St. Louis lightships	3,000
Cost of piping, lights, labour	6,000
	$56,000

Estimate is made provisionally for ten new range lights at a cost of $3,000 each, although it may be found that to thoroughly light the river a larger number is required ; total, $30,000.

There is pressing need for a suitable buoy depot at a central point on the river between Dickinson's Landing and Prescott, where there should be ample storehouse space, dock room for buoy steamer, and land for storing gas, can, and spare buoys. The need of a suitable depot is more apparent when it is considered that it will be the centre for distributing charged gas buoys to isolated points and receiving and recharging the spent buoys. The Montreal-Kingston depot will also be the headquarters for assembling apparatus for the marine gas-lighting service, and, if desired, the gas lanterns may be repaired at this point. The sum of $35,000 should be provided for this purpose, total, $35,000.

To provide for additional gas buoys to replace those removed from this division to Quebec and Halifax (12, at $1,600 each), $20,000, and five additional gas buoys, $8,000; and moorings, below Montreal, $2,000, total $30,000.

To provide for generators, compressors and sundry gas apparatus for ' Scout,' $5,000.

Summary.

Storeholders	$ 35,000
Gas lanterns	12,000
Gas and bell attachments	3,000
Labour and piping, &c	6,000
New range lights	30,000
Buoy depot	35,000
Gas buoys and moorings	30,000
Gas apparatus for ' Scout '	5,000
	$156,000
Scows and appliances for sweeping channels below Quebec and between Montreal and Kingston	24,000
	$180,000

The ten new ranges of gas lights will require no keepers, saving an annual charge of $3,000, and the proposed conversion of the lights from an oil to a gas basis will enable the keepers to be dispensed with as opportunity offers, at a saving of $7,500 per year, or a total saving in cost of maintenance of $10,500 per year. It will also eliminate the cost of maintaining the keepers' dwellings, repairs to lighthouses, boat-

houses and boats. The steamer 'Scout' can serve and look after all the lights, and must be maintained for the buoy service alone. When a lighthouse is in a bad state of repair a gas-holder can be up-ended, and with a light iron superstructure and gas lantern a new lighthouse tower made. As the committee will see, on the recommendation of one of the most prominent officers of the department, Mr. Fraser, we have neglected nothing to make the channel between Montreal and Kingston as safe as it is possible to make it. Of course, this end has not been attained yet, but we are providing for it, and I think from the testimonials we have received from different trusted parties, we are on the right way as regards doing what should be done in the interest of the shipping trade. As regards the channel from Montreal to Quebec, I may say that we hope that before the 1st of November the portion of the St. Lawrence between Montreal and Sorel, covering a distance of 45 miles will be navigable by night as well as by day, and that it will be perfectly safe. Of course, we will not rest there. We hope to be able, within a short time, to make navigation as safe between Sorel and Quebec during the night as we think it will be between Montreal and Sorel. Of course, all this means a large expenditure of money, but I think it is money well spent and if we get the approval of those who are specially interested it is the testimonial that we require.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you any intimation from the underwriters that after doing all this you can effect a reduction in the insurance rates ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The shipping companies in the different interviews we have had with them have intimated to us that if these improvements are made, because all these improvements are made on their recommendation, they will be in a position, not to dictate probably, but to suggest to the representatives of the underwriters that something must be done to reduce the rate of insurance, and if it is not done it will be shown that an injustice exists, and some other means will have to be taken. As the committee will understand, the St. Lawrence has been labouring under difficulties for a number of years, not due, I am quite sure, to any want of exertion on the part of my predecessors, but due to the fact that these improvements cannot be accomplished in a day. Everybody knows there has been a great change in the tonnage of the vessels within the last few years, and this fact, combined with the difficulty that we have experienced in providing the necessary aids to navigation in the channel, has contributed to give a very bad reputation to the St. Lawrence. We hope that the good reputation of the channel will be restored.

Hon. Mr. PREFONTAINE.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Have any calculations been made as to what it will cost to place electric lights along the channel ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That question has been studied. Experiments have been conducted, which have shown that electric light is not a very safe light. It is not a continuous light. It is apt at certain moments to go out, and the consequences may be very serious. Up to the present time, it has not been found that electric light would offer the same security as gas light. At certain points it may be used, but it cannot be used generally. The Americans, who have tried it, have abandoned it, because their experience shows that gas light, and even oil light, offers more security.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Where have the Americans tried it ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. At many places.

Mr. SPROULE. You depend upon acetylene gas for all these lights ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Some of them.

Mr. SPROULE. Has acetylene gas been sufficiently tested to make it sure that it is a preparation that can be used ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We have had acetylene gas under test for a whole year on certain portions of the channel, and the system which we have used has given very good satisfaction, so much so that the engineer of the department recommends that Pintsch gas be replaced by acetylene gas at points where he thinks it will be advantageous to make the change.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice you are providing for some sweeping boats. What is their nature ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We have provided for the sweeping boats. We could not wait for the vote. It does not involve a very large expenditure. We have bought a boat and we are fitting it up with the necessary apparatus to sweep the channel. These sweeping boats have been recommended by the shipping interests and by the underwriters. There are two of them, one for the channel between Montreal and Kingston and the other for the channel between Montreal and Quebec and below Quebec. The boats are ordinary boats fitted with a frame which goes down to the depth of the channel and which extends to the width of the channel. It is an iron frame, and as the boat steams down or up it gauges the channel, and if it encounters any obstacle which should not be there, it is immediately noticed, a buoy is placed at the spot, and then the necessary dredge or rock-lifter is sent to remove the obstacle.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it proposed to do that several times in a year ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, it is proposed to do that as soon as possible after the opening of navigation, and then probably once during the summer or as often as it may be necessary to do so. Suppose there should be a heavy storm or something like that, it would be necessary, in the interests of navigation, to see that that was done.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you any accurate knowledge as to the present depth of the channel between Kingston and Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We are safe in saying it is fourteen feet. I must say, as regards the channel between Montreal and Kingston, that there are still some difficulties to settle between the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the Department of Railways and Canals. We have taken over from the department about fifty lights that used to be kept by the Department of Railways and Canals at the entrance to canals, but there are still a few kept by the Department of Railways and Canals and we are in treaty to take them over so that the whole system would be under the control of the same department and people would make inquiries only from the one department.

Mr. SPROULE. You are proposing to establish a plant in Montreal for the manufacture of some of these lights ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, not in Montreal. We intend to establish a buoy depot at some central point between Montreal and the lakes, but of course we could not say just where it is to be established or we would not be able to get property on reasonable terms. We will provide a depot of this kind and have competent mechanics to manufacture or repair much of this apparatus, holders, &c., so as to have them ready at any time when they are required.

Mr. SPROULE. You do not propose to absolutely manufacture them ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We will manufacture some things that we are now obliged to buy and we will keep on hand a supply of spare machines so that if one is dragged away we can replace it. This I think is a commendable plan and one that will meet the approval of the navigation companies in addition to reducing the cost of keeping up these lights.

Mr. SPROULE. Will you import experts for this work.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think we will be able to get suitable men here. I may say that our Canadian mechanics are as good as any in the world if they are properly directed.

Further amount required for signal service for telephonic communication between Port Atkinson lighthouse, British Columbia and the city of Vancouver, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It has been represented that it would be a great convenience to shippers and to the travelling public to have this telephonic communication made but there is not sufficient inducement for the telephone company to make this connection as there would be no business except government business.

To provide for the purchase of land and a wharf for buoy service in Halifax harbour, $20,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This matter has been under the consideration of the department for quite a while and we have now come to a point where we must get this extra appropriation in order to have our depot in Nova Scotia at a proper point where we can have dockage for our steamers. We are obliged to leave the wharf we are at present using. The department has been very much cramped for dockage at Halifax. We require dockage accommodation for three ships, the 'Lady Laurier,' the 'Lansdowne' and a fishery cruiser as well as storage accommodation for buoys, &c. Our present wharf is the property of the Railway Department and is required by them as terminal facilities for the Intercolonial Railway and we have received official notice to vacate the property. This, of course, will not be a public wharf at all; it is a wharf purely and simply for the use of the department.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They really have no wharf at present. They are using a wharf in connection with the Intercolonial Railway terminals, and the Railway Department for two or three years have been warning them to get out as they require the wharf for their business. But it has not been found convenient hitherto, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is now endeavouring to get independent accommodation. My own judgment is that the accommodation he is getting by this vote will only be partial, and that he will have to get more later. However, this will give him relief in the meantime.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there no government wharf at Halifax ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, except the wharfs at the railway terminus. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has been using one of these for several years at considerable inconvenience to the Railway Department.

Mr. BLAIN. Is this vote to buy a wharf or to construct one ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The design of my hon. friend is to buy an independent property.

Mr. BLAIN. Has he any property in view ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We have an offer.

Mr. BLAIN. From whom ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As I have not accepted the offer, I think I had better not mention the name.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think I know the property which has been offered to my hon. friend. Were he to announce the name he would rather tie his hands in purchasing, and I think he had better be free.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there an item in the estimates for commencing the wharf ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. The property which my hon. friend has in view has a wharf on it, though I do not think it is sufficient for his purposes. I think he would have to enlarge it.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the wharf in good repair, or will a further amount be required to put it in proper condition ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The property, from the description and plans which I have of it, is susceptible of very great enlargement and improvement. The present wharf will not be sufficient for the dockage of all our boats, but it will be possible to improve and enlarge it to give all the accommodation we require.

Mr. BLAIN. Will this amount of money do it ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not want to divulge the secrets of the department, but I think we shall be able to buy the property for $15,000, and $5,000 will be available for improvements.

For the equipment of wireless stations at Point Amour, Heath Point, Anticosti, Fame Point, Cape Race, Belle Isle, and Sable Island, $25,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This is a very important vote. It does not mean only $25,000. As the members of the committee are aware, there have been for some years interesting experiments made in wireless telegraphy. The present government have spent about $80,000 in establishing one or two stations. The experiment has proved satisfactory, not only in Canada, but almost all over the world. It is proposed, on the recommendation of the shipping interest, to establish four stations in the interest of navigation. There is already one at Belle Isle. We intend to make the necessary arrangements with either the Marconi Company or the DeForest Company to establish these stations, paying them a certain proportion, whatever is necessary to provide the machinery, and then to wait till the stations are completed and satisfactory to the shipping interest before paying the balance. We estimate that each station will cost from $10,000 to $15,000. Sable Island will be for further consideration. We do not provide for it at present.

Mr. SPROULE. The other night, when a somewhat similar question was under consideration, I asked what information the government had regarding the success of this system ; because it seems to me the House has never been given much information yet of a reliable character as to whether the system is a success or not. We see a great deal about it in the papers, but it is not definite.

Mr. RICHARDSON. From what information any of us who are watching the developments in connection with wireless telegraphy can gather, it seems to be yet in its experimental stage. It would be well for the government to make haste slowly in the expenditure of public money while this invention is in its present stage. It is found to be fairly successful for short distances, but, even for comparatively short distances, it is meeting with some unexpected difficulties, owing to the interruption of messages. I understand that there is a difficulty experienced in connection with the direction in which messages are sent. It is much more difficult to get satisfactory results for messages sent westward than for despatches sent eastward. It is commonly believed that the Marconi Company have got about as far as they can unless there should be further discoveries made that will enable them to overcome the difficulties with which they are meeting at present.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We are moving in the line advised by hon. gentlemen. Had we come to the conclusion that this system was perfect, we would have asked for a larger amount, but we think proper to recommend that four stations only be constructed for the present, and these stations will only be established on condition that if they do not give satisfaction there will be no pay.

Mr. POPE. Are these experiments being made by other nations ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, in the States the navigation companies are installing the apparatus throughout their steamers as fast as they can be manufactured. At present the invention is not a complete success, generally speaking, but it has been a fair success in many instances. For fair distances, such as between these points and the steamers. I believe it will work successfully.

Mr. SPROULE. What would you call a fair distance ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Fifty miles.

Mr. BLAIN. I remember that when we voted the $80,000 in the session of 1900-1 the Minister of Finance stated that, as far as he knew, the experiment was not satisfactory. If I remember correctly the $80,000 has been all expended, and the works constructed out of that money we handed over last session to a private corporation, the government only retaining some instruments purchased by it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Does the hon. gentleman refer to the main station ?

Mr. BLAIN. Yes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is hardly correct to say that it was handed over to a private corporation, because it was always in the hands of a private corporation, and the work was constructed by that company. Certainly up to this time, the station has not proved the success we hoped, but Mr. Marconi was here quite recently and is still full of hope and confidence. There is no doubt that for short distances the Marconi and other systems have proved successful, but for ocean telegraphy they have so far failed. Mr. Marconi claims that he can send signals one way, and he says occasionally he has sent them both ways, but not with the regularity necessary to commercial success. Although commercially it has not yet proved a success, I do not abandon it as hopeless. In the meantime we need not regret that we put that amount into the encouragement of a great invention which has gained Canada a great deal of credit and will give us still more credit if it should prove the success anticipated.

Mr. BLAIN. I am not complaining of the investment. I think the expenditure was one which received the endorsation of both sides, but I doubt whether it is in the best interests of the country that the government should appropriate $25,000 more for work of a purely experimental character.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is not an experiment, because they have offered to put the system up and not receive any pay unless it works properly. To show that this expenditure meets with the approval of the large business bodies, let me read a letter sent to the department by the Montreal Board of Trade, on July 30th :

> I have the honour to communicate the following resolution adopted by the council of this board with regard to the desirability of the government installing the wireless telegraph stations in the gulf and to ask for it your favourable consideration :—
>
> The council especially urges on the government, in the interests of the safe navigation of our national waterway, the great importance of providing for a speedy installation of wireless telegraph stations at the various lighthouse points in the gulf and the River St. Lawrence.

This is addressed to the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, First Minister. I have also a letter from the shipping federation of Canada, dated July 29th, strongly urging the establishment of these stations. It is upon these recommendations, and many others that I might read, that the department has acted.

Mr. SPROULE. Do the vessels require to be equipped with a plant before they can communicate with the station ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. At the present time, I am informed, there are sixty vessels on the St. St. Lawrence route equipped with the necessary apparatus for receiving messages.

Mr. SPROULE Are ocean vessels equipped generally ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Many are equipped and the number is being increased as fast as possible. The British navy are adopting this system, and forty vessels are provided with the apparatus. I believe that about 200 steamships of the British merchant navy are equipped.

Mr. GOURLEY. I am glad hon. gentlemen on this side are discussing this matter, because this is the class of information that should be brought out. I regard this discovery of Marconi as the most important, for Canada, of the last fifty years, or one hundred years, if it is workable. I believe that, for a distance of 150 miles, it is absolutely workable. I was aboard a British man of war, in Halifax, last year, that was equipped with this system. The apparatus did not look expensive. One of the masts is used, and, at the top, is the station, with the apparatus. The officer in charge told me that it was simply invaluable ; that they could easily speak with a vessel distant 150 miles.

Mr. SPROULE. In all kinds of weather ?

Mr. GOURLEY. He said that a storm made no difference. I had in mind a much more important case than that of the 'Kaiser Wilhelm.' An English man of war, operating in the north sea, probably in the same storm referred to by the hon. gentleman, was some 200 miles out. In the storm, she spoke to the people on shore, assuring them that everything was well, though the report had gone abroad that she was stranded. Now, if this is good for 200 miles in a storm, it must be invaluable on the St. Lawrence, where no distance greater than 100 miles will need to be covered. This discovery is of the greatest importance to this Dominion. The people of Canada must be a great sea people. We must get that into our minds. Unless we are a sea people we can never be a dominant people. Therefore, we must adopt every means to aid navigation. Now, it is a matter of the greatest regret that, for some years past, Lloyds,

of England, have treated the St. Lawrence route as dangerous. And, what is more unfortunate, the British papers, following the lead of Lloyds, have indicated that the St. Lawrence route is unsafe for commerce. That is a tremendous attack upon Canada. My province does not contribute to a very large extent, to the St. Lawrence, but, I feel this attack as keenly as though it had been made on the port of Halifax. The St. Lawrence is one of the great water-ways of Canada, and we should not allow it to be unsafe. In what I say, I am not seeking to lead the minister. I simply promise him my support, in any expenditure necessary to make the St. Lawrence one of the safest navigation routes in the world, I care not what it costs. The St. Lawrence route must be equipped with everything necessary to secure the safety of ships, so that the shipping companies in England and throughout the world, will have absolute confidence that this route is safe. I have no doubt that Canada has suffered enormously for many years from the ideas abroad that the St. Lawrence is an unsafe route. That must be got over. Last year we had before the Railway Committee a Bill for the purpose of forming a Lloyds Company for Canada. That was a measure of self-defence, because the Lloyds Company in England were going to drop the St. Lawrence, which would have been a fatal attack on Canada. I presume that the introduction of that Bill brought our English friends to something like reasonable terms. But there is no doubt that they have had reasonable ground for complaints. Ship after ship has grounded, and been destroyed in the St. Lawrence. That should not be. Speaking with a shipowner the other day, I was upbraiding him with the character inflicted on that St. Lawrence route, and asked why the shipping interests of Canada did not attempt to correct the view held in England? He told me that there was too much truth in their criticisms. We in Canada are strong enough to get over this system of making little trifling grants for such a purpose as this. When we had only a small revenue, little dribbling grants here and there, for lighthouses and other means of security, were the best we could do. We should grapple with the St. Lawrence as a system. Whether it takes $500,000 or $1,000,000, or $2,000,000, we should put that route in a condition of safety, to attract the commerce of the world. I am prepared to support the minister in wide expenditures of money for this purpose. The trouble hitherto has been that the political parties in Canada have suspected each other. Each has feared that money spent under the direction of the other would be directed into improper channels. That is the bane of our public life. Let us get rid of that. We should vote money generously, in sufficient sums to actually provide the services that are needed in a legitimate way. It is idle to spend $20,000 or $30,000 where $200,000 is required. The result of that is that we do not obtain the end desired. Accidents happen, in spite of these half-hearted expenditures; and, so, not only is our money lost, but the reputation of the country suffers. What I want, is to have this system of Marconi tested. We ought not to be left in doubt as to whether the system is workable, for the question can be tested and settled in a week.

Now if there is no doubt about the matter, that discovery is one of the most valuable discoveries that has been made for two or three hundred years in affecting a great seafaring country like Canada. We have splendid facilities for shipping, though we have a boisterous climate and tempestous weather. But all that can be got over, and a vessel can be just as safe in tempestous weather in the St. Lawrence river and gulf, as in a summer day. Mariners will tell you that a ship is just as safe in a storm, if the pilot knows where he is, as she is in a summer day. Therefore we can overcome these dangers and unfavourable circumstances of nature by spending money, and I want the minister to feel free to enter upon the new life of Canada as regards navigation, and to spend all the money that is required to put our navigation in the forefront on this continent, and he will be supported by every man in this House. We criticise his items but we criticise them as Canadians to find out whether they are going to be useful. If we can dominate the trade of this country, why we can make Halifax and St. John like Boston and New York, and we will find the United States dwindling as did the old world empires. I think that is possible, it is within our capacity, and we mean to do it by means of the sea. But we cannot do it by votes of $10,000 where we ought to have votes of $500,000. We are no longer children in Canada. Let our ministers come down here with the requisite votes to investigate this whole St. Lawrence route and to put it in perfect order, so that the Lloyds may have no more reason to complain. We have been going on in a niggardly way, and the consequence is that we have a poor protective service for navigation in the river and gulf of the St. Lawrence. Therefore, I sympathize to some extent with the Lloyds in their complaint, they are not so wrong as they generally are in regard to Canadian affairs. Let us therefore look this matter squarely in the face, and establish a system by which we will light the St. Lawrence in a most perfect manner, and if necessary establish these Marconi stations every five miles so that a ship may navigate the St. Lawrence just as safely throughout its entire extent as if she were being towed by a rope. I ask the minister to be sure he is right with regard to these Marconi stations, to employ the best men he can get to handle them, and I will do my best to assist the minister in accomplishing these results. If

we can capture the trade of the north Atlantic we shall then be able to dominate the trade of North America and become the imperial power on this continent.

Mr. RICHARDSON. We have been accustomed to hear wonderful tales about wireless telegraphy. I believe that it is yet in its experimental stage, and that the government has already made libeal contributions in aid of these experiments. Still, wireless telegraphy is at pesent little better than a scientific toy, and unless very important improvements are made in the Marconi system before long, it will be relegated to the toy department. However, wireless telegraphy is engaging the attention of electricians all over the world today, and it may be that before long important developments will be made which will materially change the present system. Therefore it would be wise for the government to go a little slow in expenditures in this direction. I am informed that application has been made during the present week for a patent to protect some important discovery in the direction of improving the Marconi system of wireless telegraphy. It may be that in two or three years these difficulties which at present exist may be overcome. At present I am informed that an attempt to communicate between one vessel and another on the ocean has been interrupted, showing that the vibrations may be intercepted by some unknown vessel which may have a responsive receiving apparatus, and that the message will not be carried to its destination. That is an important difficulty which must be overcome.

Mr. COCHRANE. I understood the minister to say that this vote was not going to be expended unless the plans proved satisfactory. He read a communication, but I did not find that it proved that the money was not to be expended unless the plans proved satisfactory. What company is going to put the apparatus into operation, and if successful, is going to get this money ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. At the present time there are two systems competing for public favour in Canada, the De Forest system and the Marconi system. I have sent Capt. Salmon to investivate these systems. I think it is established now that wireless telegraphy, for a distance of 50 or 100 miles, is just as safe and certain as commercial telegraphy. The two systems have been installed on several steamers, and are in working condition. The intention of the department is to have stations established at certain points, according to the recommendation of the shipping interests ; but we will not undertake to pay anything unless these stations prove perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is the government going to establish these stations ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, but we have made a c ntract by which it is stipulated that unless the stations prove perfectly satisfactory to the shipping interests we will not pay for them. That is well understood.

Mr. KENDALL. Has any provision been made to erect Marconi stations at Sable Island, Cape Race, and other well known points ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We contemplate establishing one at Sable Island and at some other points. But before these are established we will make a special study of the most favourable points, and have a conference with the shipping interests so as to make the stations as useful as possible.

Mr. GOURLEY. Have you one at Cape Sable ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The minister proposes to have one at Sable Island, but not at Cape Sable.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the minister to say that it would cost us $15,000. What percentage of the cost are we to pay ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are two propositions before the department at the present time, coming from De Forest and the Marconi companies of wireless telegraphy. They have proposed to the government to establish a station, and not to ask a penny until they have demonstrated that their system works perfectly well. That is why the department does not ask for a larger sum than $25,000. With that we think we can do the preliminary work necessary to have a contract made with the proper company, but there will be no money spent by the officials of the department except what may be necessary and no money will be spent in connection with the establishment of these stations unless they prove perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. SPROULE. If they do prove perfectly satisfactory how much are we committed to by the contract ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We will be liable for whatever amount each station may cost. It is calculated that each station may cost $5,000 to $10,000. There will be besides that the cost of maintenance which will amount to $2,500 a year.

Mr. KAULBACH. The three most important points on the Atlantic coast are Cape Sable, Sable Island and Cape Race. I think it will be admitted by everyone that these are points at which it is most important that the Marconi system should be established, in order to avert the shipwrecks that are occurring from year to year. There should be no hesitancy in providing sufficient money to make these

three points satisfactory to the mariner. In doing so you provide a complete guide for the fishermen in the summer time in foggy weather. Fishermen are a class who venture a very great deal. They have been very successful in moving around Sable Island. The water for a great distance around Sable Island is very shallow. At the north east there is something like thirty miles with only twenty fathoms of water, and the same condition exists at the opposite end. I certainly would urge in the strongest manner that an effort should be made to place stations at these three points.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is providing for two of the places that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kaulbach) has mentioned. These are Cape Race, which is in Newfoundland but which is in charge of the Canadian government, and Sable Island. The third place mentioned by the hon. gentleman is Cape Sable, which is sometimes confused with Sable Island but which is a long way from it. Cape Sable is the south-western point of Nova Scotia and forms a part of my own constituency. I hope that as this system is developed it will be found possible to have a station at Cape Sable, but the urgent need now is for the improvement of the St. Lawrence route and of the signalling stations on the St. Lawrence. Cape Sable and Scatarie, which have been mentioned, are good objective points but the need at these places is not so immediate as in the case of the St. Lawrence. Sable Island, though not connected with the St. Lawrence route, is a place which is particularly dangerous, and we have great difficulty in communicating with it. Sometimes in winter, vessels are wrecked there, and some weeks elapse before we can obtain any communication at all. Cases of wrecks have occurred in which a long time has elapsed before any knowledge of the wreck reached the mainland. The situation is so dangerous at certain seasons of the year that steamers are unwilling to approach the shore. Even the government vessels have to lie off and on waiting a favourable opportunity of landing. If there is any place where this system should be established I think it is Sable Island and I am very glad to know that even though the hon. minister is not providing at present for Scatarie and Cape Sable he is providing for the other points where the need is the greatest. The others, I am sure, will come in due course.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am very glad to hear the hon. Minister of Finance express himself in the way he does. I think it is in keeping for me to make a reference to Newfoundland. Newfoundland should be very grateful to Canada for the efforts she —Canada—has put forward from year to year in providing aids to navigation in the way of lighthouses, fog horns, and fog trumpets for the guidance of vessels around that island. In the past Newfoundland has not been as grateful as she might have been towards her sister colony, Canada. It is known that although we spend a large amount of money in keeping up these lighthouses on the island for the benefit of shipping, not particularly our own but for other shipping as well, we do not get that adequate return from Newfoundland which we should have. I will refer to it here and perhaps I will in a day or two refer to it at greater length. Our fishermen are compelled to pay heavy light dues in Newfoundland ports while they come into our ports and pay nothing except twenty-five cents for entry and clearance. They even charge us a duty on barrels. When our fishermen take empty barrels for fish, not landing them but returned to the port from which they took their departure, they charge them a duty of twenty-four cents each. This I consider an iniquitous thing.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). In the event of Sable Island being connected with the Nova Scotia shore where would the station be—at Halifax ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. At Halifax.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). In the event of a large passenger steamer going ashore on the island with a large number of passengers there will be no accommodation and it will be of the utmost advantage that the Nova Scotia shore could be communicated with immediately.

Mr. KENDALL. I do not wish to undertake to speak as an expert, but living down by the ocean and like most maritime men being more or less acquainted with the wrecks that occur on our coast, I endorse what the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) says as to the very great importance of having one of these stations placed at the entrance to the Bay of Fundy. The Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway have made the port of St. John the Canadian winter port for the purpose of the heavy freight traffic, and the steamers of the North Atlantic trade that come to Canada during the winter come into St. John. We know that that locality during the last three or four years has become unenviably notorious for wrecks. We have had a great many wrecks there and if by establishing one of these stations at this point we can do anything to reduce the number of wrecks, I think we might ask the hon. minister to consider the matter at once and to make provision for one of these stations at that port.

Steamboat inspection, $6,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It has been reported to me that the work has so increased in the Toronto district that a boiler inspector re-

quires to be appointed there immediately. For a number of years attention has been called to the very small salaries paid to inspectors, a number of whom were receiving less than engineers. It is proposed to have another inspector in Quebec. Out of this amount of $6,000, the salary of two inspectors, one in the Quebec district and one at Collingwood will be provided, and in addition to that I intend to look into the salary of each inspector now on the staff. I may say candidly to the members of the committee that some of the inspectors have tendered their resignations, because they thought that if they were to engage as steamboat engineers they would get better salaries than what they are getting from the department. As they were good officials, most of them were appointed by my immediate predecessors, who had done their duty carefully, I thought they deserved to be paid on the same scale as other men of equal ability would be treated, even if they were employed by the government.

Mr. LANCASTER. What salaries do they get now ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The salaries range from $1,900, which is paid the chairman of the board, down to $1,000 per year. The majority receive from $1,100 to $1,200 per year. This inspection service has been the source of a handsome revenue to this country, but the government has decided, during this session, that the inspection fees should be abolished. The revenue which we collected from steamboat inspection amounted to $38,000, and the total expenditure was about $27,000. The services will still have to be performed, but the fees have been abolished along with the tolls on the canals, because it was the unanimous opinion on both sides of the House that it would be in the interest of navigation to do so. The expenditure last year was $27,493, so that the revenue exceeded the expenditure by over $10,000. I may say that the two boiler inspectors at Toronto last year inspected 411 vessels in western Ontario. In eastern Ontario, one inspector at Kingston examined 167 vessels ; at Montreal two inspectors examined 183 vessels, and also inspected 436 vessels as regards tackles, loading, &c. At Quebec one inspector examined 159 vessels. He is also a hull inspector, and inspects at Montreal as well. In Prince Edward Island one inspector examined 109 vessels, in New Brunswick one inspector examined 116 vessels, in British Columbia one inspector examined 102, in the Yukon territory 144 were examined, and in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, 105.

To investigate matters respecting sardine, herring and oyster fisheries and coast close season, $10,000.

Mr. RICHARDSON. What are the objects of this investigation ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This vote is to meet the travelling and other expenses of the five commissioners who will be engaged in visiting the various points in the Bay of Fundy during 1903-4 to study and take evidence from fishermen, packers and others in the maritime provinces in regard to the matters which are mentioned in the item. They will finally make a report and recommendations regarding the best methods of preserving the herring and oyster fisheries, the best means of dealing with the waste of fish due to seals, the steps necessary to promote oyster breeding, the proper close seasons, and similar matters. I should say that this is not a new venture on the part of the present minister. For years past the Department of Marine and Fisheries have been inquiring into this matter, and I may say that if the lobster industry has been saved to this country it is owing to the work of a commission which was appointed a couple of years ago, and which made a thorough investigation and a complete study of this whole question. At the present time the lobster industry in the maritime provinces is improving very greatly and its improvement we may consider due to the methods that have been adopted in consequence of the recommendation of the commissioners, which have proved very satisfactory. We intend to do the same thing with regard to the other branches as has been done in regard to the lobster fishery.

Mr. POPE. What is the object of the investigation in regard to the herring and sardine fisheries ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. To ascertain the best regulations to be adopted in regard to close seasons, &c. It is a pretty difficult question to decide, and there are only a few people who can give to the department the information which will enable the country to reap the greatest advantage from this industry.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). I wish to call the attention of the minister to the condition of the fishing on the south shore of Nova Scotia. I have had letters in which it is stated that the sword fish and the dog fish have almost destroyed the fishing there; and I would ask the minister to take the matter into his consideration, and try to devise some plan by which these raiders on the fisheries may be exterminated or diminished. If something is not done, the nets and appliances of the fishermen which are put out will be destroyed. These pests seem to have multiplied at a great rate during this year, and the legitimate fishing along the coast is imperilled. Perhaps some bounty for the destruction of these pests in large numbers could be given ; or if some plan could be devised for utilizing the oil from them in some way, it would be of great advantage to the fishermen.

Mr. KAULBACH. I referred to this matter a few evenings ago and was asked to allow it to remain over until the estimates for the fisheries came up. In the early part of this last winter petitions, numerously signed, were sent in asking the Minister of Marine and Fsheries to see what could be done to remove this terrible nuisance, dog fish, that is increasing in numbers every year on the deep seas. It is only some two or three years that these pests have been a menace to the deep-sea fishing. Formerly they frequented shallow water, and only the shore fishermen suffered; but now both the shore fishermen and the deep-sea fishermen suffer inconveniences. They are really a tax on the fishermen, for they suffer the loss of their nets, head lines and other appliances. They are of the shark species which eat and destroy twine. Instead of being a tax on the fishermen, these fish could be made a source of revenue, for they are worth something like $16 a ton if utilized as a fertilizer. In the memorials or petitions sent to the government reference was made to the various ways in which they could be destroyed. Dynamite would not do, for the reason that it would destroy the other fish mingling with them in the waters. The only plan which I think would be feasible and practicable, and of benefit to the fishermen, would be to offer a bounty. It could be made a small one, and it would be some compensation to the fishermen for being deprived during a certain season of the opportunity of catching any other fish than dog fish; and the latter could be utilized, not only as a fertilizer, but as food for cattle. Cattle are very fond of these fish when dried. The fish are thrown into pickle, as the fishermen say, and afterwards dried and put into bundles and fed to young cattle in the winter time.

Mr. POPE. Wouldn't the bones bother the cattle?

Mr. KAULBACH. Not a mite. They eat everything; there is no need of separating the bone at all. The fish are chopped up by the cattle as finely as if put through a bait-cutter. A great deal of loss is also occasioned in the deep-sea fisheries by the offal or the trimmings of the fish. The fishermen will anchor in the deep seas or the grand banks or where the fish are found and will lie there for a day or two fishing, when they have to leave good fishing to get clear of their debris or garbage by throwing it overboard. As this becomes the food for the fish and impairs the fishing and polutes the water, it should be disposed of in a different way. I suggest that it could be disposed of in this manner. Let a steamer be subsidized, with bait on board, to supply the fishermen who would rendezvous on these waters, and bring in return the fresh fish that are caught and place them in cold storage for transfer to the west, which is greatly in need of that description of fish, and the trimmings as well can be preserved in lime and sand as a fertiliser. I also suggest that the oil, which is now dried out by the action of heat, and under a system of decomposition, which renders it worth little more than 25 cents a gallon, would, if brought in a fresh state and put through a certain process, bring $2.50 a gallon, which would be a great advantage to the fishermen. This, I think, could be accomplished by giving a bounty to a steamer which would be a medium for the supply of bait to the fishermen and also for the transmission of the freshly-caught fish to some point of shipment. For instance, Canso is one point. The fish, when caught and kept in bulk for a number of months or even weeks, suffer very considerably in quality, and are not worth as much in the market as they would be if promptly transferred by a steamer. The fishermen could then sell them fresh, and the purchaser could ship them fresh, or prepare them as shredded or boneless fish, and pack them in neat and clean boxes to be sent to any part of the world; or they could be shipped in cold storage. I therefore urge very strongly that the system of cold storage be adopted, and that Canso be made a centre of distribution, as it is midway between Cape North and Cape Sable, and is of easy access. Then, again, we want to make the fishing a success in the maritime provinces, and we want all the encouragement we can get for the fishermen. Unless they get that encouragement their industry must necessarily suffer. This year we suffered very materially for the want of bait. Had the deep-sea fishermen been able to obtain bait they would have secured valuable returns. Instead of that many of the fishermen, I am sorry to say, will be deprived of the valuable living they have hitherto been enjoying. The bait supply is a matter of very serious consequence, and I am satisfied that the government could aid our fishermen very considerably by assistance in the establishing a system of chemical freezers. Not only would the government thus serve the fishermen, but indirectly serve the treasury as well. Our fishermen like to live well, and when they have a good catch of fish they are prepared to live on the luxuries of the land, and would therefore consume articles on which the government would receive a large customs revenue. With regard to the dog fish, which is a menace to the whole of the fisheries, I would suggest that a bounty be given the fishermen for the capture of these fish, which are indeed a nuisance.

Mr. POPE. How much?

Mr. KAULBACH. I would say $4 per ton, that would not be a very great deal, and be a benefit to all concerned.

Mr. POPE. How much would that amount to?

Mr. KAULBACH. It depends entirely on what they capture.

Mr. KENDALL. What proportion would the fishermen be able to catch of dog-fish in the sea ?

Mr. KAULBACH. A large quantity. If they were to go out in the morning when the fish are plentiful, they could capture a couple of tons a day. They only last but a very short time, and everything depends on the weather. As we are on this matter, you will pardon me, Mr. Chairman, if I refer to the lobster question. A few days ago I showed how the lobsters were being depleted on the Canadian Atlantic as well as on the American coast. In consequence of their depletion, a shell fish, known as the 'sea urchin,' which is the favourite food of the lobster has largely increased. They have become so numerous that they cover the whole shore, which formerly was covered by a coating of vegetable matter that supplied food for the other fish, and also gave an excellent growth of kelp or sea-weed. This kelp or sea-weed was for the shelter of small fish what a forest is for birds. It gave them shelter and protection from the larger fish. But now kelp has all disappeared. These shell fish or little urchins, deposit a sort of saliva which covers the whole bed of the shore and becomes petrified matter, so that no vegetable matter will grow upon it. As a result the farmer must necessarily suffer. What I would suggest is to substitute the debris from the catch of the deep-sea fishermen, being the trimmings of the fish, which could be utilized as a fertilizer, and be worth about $16 per ton, when placed in a proper position as an article of merchandise, and I would strongly recommend that the government seriously consider this matter. I feel satisfied that in coming to the rescue of the fishermen they will not only benefit the fishing, but the farming industry in the utilizing of that debris, because it will then be removed from polluting the waters of the deep-sea to another sphere, so to speak, where it can be utilized as a fertilizer for the farmers, so that the farmers and fishermen may receive a benefit which otherwise they would not be the recipients of at all. Therefore I would urge very strongly on the government to give this matter its serious consideration, but by all means I ask, what I requested some three years ago, and have been asking for every year since, that a commission be sent to the shores of the Canadian Atlantic to investigate and see what can be done in the interest of the fishermen.

Mr. COPP. This matter is of great importance to the fishermen of Nova Scotia. We have not in Canada any sardine industry such as they have on the west coast of France. We have, it is true, what we call a sardine industry, but that is really a herring industry. You are aware of the fact, Sir, no doubt, that the fishermen, in order to fish, must have bait, and that question of bait is one which requires to be investigated. The fishermen of Nova Scotia, particularly of St. Mary's bay and the Bay of Fundy, secure the most of their bait from Grand Manan, Campobello and Passamaquoddy bay. A very peculiar state of affairs exists there. Looking at our reports, you will see that the sardine or herring industry of Canada is a very small one, whereas as a matter of fact, the herring industry, which is the sardine industry referred to in this item, should be worth millions of dollars to the Dominion. But instead every dollar of that or the large portion of it goes to the United States. The herring industry of the United States is wholly in Canadian waters. To-day at Lubec, a seaport right on the American border, between New Brunswick and the United States, there are invested between one and two million dollars in machinery and factories owned by Americans for the manufacture of sardines. These sardines are caught in Canadian waters, taken over to the American shores, and there sold to the American canners. They are nothing more or less than the small herring. The sardines or small herrings canned, measure from four to six inches. Any one who has studied the herring industry knows that it takes three years for a herring to mature in order to bear young. The value of the sardines put up in these cans amounts to something like $3,000,000, from which Canada gets no benefit, except what it realizes from the sale of these small herrings which are less than three years of age.

The fishermen are sending tens of thousands of casks of herring out of Canadian waters across to the American side to be manufactured and sent throughout the world. And they are nothing more or less than the small herring which belong to us and ought to be secured as bait for our fishermen. Now, the question of bait is becoming a very serious one. If you are going to deplete the Canadian waters of bait, our fishermen cannot carry on their business. A few years ago I brought to the attention of the government the fact that our fishermen are actually prevented from buying herring in Canada by a syndicate of American canners. The ordinary price for bait is from $2 to $4 a hogshead. But certain factories in the United States wanted all the herrings that were caught. They formed a syndicate and bound the weir fishermen of New Brunswick not to sell a single hogshead of bait or herring to any one except themselves, and they would take all that were offered. The consequence was that, when one of our vessels went to get bait, the weir fisherman said he was not selling any. Why ? 'Well, I have sold it all to Mr. So and So, of Lubec, and he is going to buy all we offer ; but, if we should sell you a hogshead of

bait he would take none from us.' Therefore, though they had been offered as high as $60 a hogshead and were getting only $4 from the American canners, our vessels could not get a single hogshead of bait. This is one of the conditions that the government, I am glad to see, are spending $10,000 to investigate.

These fish are caught in weirs. The government licenses these fishing sites and charges a license fee of $5 a year. I know of people living in New York who pay $5 a year license fee, and then sublet the site so secured for $2,500 a year. These weir sites are worth all the way from $1,000 to $4,000 a year, and they are nearly all in the possession of a few gentlemen—and I know of one lady, she being the one to whom I have just referred, as receiving $2,500 for the sublease—who do not reside on Grand Manan or near the fisheries, who are not interested in the fisheries except as holders of these licenses, which they sublet to parties who fish on these islands. This thing has been going on for years.

Mr. KAULBACH. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that these licenses are all held by Americans ?

Mr. COPP. Oh, no. But I do say that the parties do not reside where the weir fishing is going on.

Mr. HENDERSON. How long is one of these licenses good for ?

Mr. COPP. For a year, and the charge is $5 a year. Something should be done, and I am glad that the minister is investigating this matter in order that the license fee may be increased and the arrangement made different from what it is at the present time.

Now, the situation in regard to bait is becoming so acute with us that we have asked the government to erect bait freezers. I am glad to say that the government have voted the money to erect these freezers in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. These have proved of tremendous benefit to our fishermen. We have in the province of Nova Scotia, I think, something like 40,000 men engaged in the fisheries. For a period generally of about six weeks in the summer they are unable to procure any bait at all. And, the season when this condition exists is the very best fishing season. The government, by erecting these bait freezers, have placed the fishermen in such a position that they can store bait when it is plentiful, and take it out during the season when bait cannot otherwise be procured, and so continue their fishing, as they have not been able to do for some years past. The bait has to come from Grand Manan, where the sardines are caught. I congratulate the minister on deciding to have this question investigated.

The dog fish referred to by one hon gentleman has become a serious menace to our fisheries in Nova Scotia. If the problem is not dealt with in some way, it is going to seriously affect the fishery industry of the Dominion. I have here a copy of the Halifax 'Herald,' of October 3rd, which shows how the dog fish is helping to destroy this industry in Nova Scotia. This newspaper tells of 'Half a million shortage in our western fisheries.' 'It is estimated that west of Halifax'—that is, in the five counties of Lunenburg, Shelburne, Queen's, Yarmouth and Digby—'the fishing catch is $400,000 to $600,000 below the average this year.'

Mr. KAULBACH. It is all of that.

Mr. COPP. And this newspaper says that the dog fish and the scarcity of bait are the chief causes. If, in one year we lost in five counties a sum equal to $400,000 to $600,000 through the dog fish and the scarcity of bait, hon. gentlemen can see what this means to the whole fishing industry of the maritime provinces. The bait question, I am glad to say, is one with which the government is dealing. And I believe that they are dealing with it in the right way, and in such a way that, in a short time it will be satisfactorily dealt with.

Mr. GOURLEY. What is the size of this fish ?

Mr. COPP. From a foot to two feet in length.

Mr. HENDERSON. Why are they called dog fish ?

Mr. COPP. I do not know. They are a species of shark. They are very pugnacious and destroy everything that comes in their way.

Mr. KAULBACH. They are the most aggressive fish in the water.

Mr. COPP. By long odds. Formerly they visited us annually, but remained for only a week or ten days. They struck in about May and would remain in the Bay of Fundy St. Mary's Bay and adjacent waters for about a week or ten days and then would disappear. While they were with us, of course, no fishing was done. The moment they struck in, the fishermen came ashore and remained idle. Of late years they are remaining the whole year round. If they are to remain with us in the future the fishing industry will become almost a thing of the past. Last year, strange to say, they made their appearance on the banks for the first time in the history of the bank fishery.

Mr. KAULBACH. They appeared three or four years ago.

Mr. KENDALL. Fourteen years ago—in 1889.

Mr. KAULBACH. Not in any number, I think.

Mr. COPP. The suggestion I have to make is in line with that of the hon. member for

Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach). The only way in which to deal with this question of the dog fish is by a bounty from the government Whether it should be a bounty to reduction works or to the fishermen is a question we have to consider. Of course, I am in favour of a bounty to the fishermen. I think that a bounty direct to the fishermen would stimulate the fishermen to catch the fish, whereas, if the bounty were given to the reduction works they might take advantage of it, and the fishermen would get no benefit from it. In the county of Digby last year, I had the representatives of a Philadelphia firm come down and they went to Tiverton and Briar Island with a view to erecting reduction works. The only thing they were afraid of was that they could not secure sufficient fish to keep the works going. They told us that if the government would agree to give a bounty on the dog fish, so that the fishermen would catch them, they would at once talk business with us as to establishing the reduction works. If we had reduction works situated at three or four places in the province where they catch these fish and could sell them, it would be a profit to the fishermen and they would engage in that kind of fishing. As it is, dog fish does not seem to be worth anything. There is nothing we can get out of it unless we cut the liver out and extract the oil. But the oil that is taken from the fish is not sufficient to justify the fishermen in engaging in that fishery. I am going to ask the minister if it is not possible for him to add to the item now under discussion a clause that will enable the commission to investigate and report upon the dog fish nuisance. The sum of $10,000 is more than enough to pay all the expenses of investigation that is required in the Bay of Fundy, and all that is needed is to give the commissioners power to investigate the dog fish nuisance. Now, the lobster industry is referred to by the minister, and I must congratulate this government on taking that up and appointing a commission which has done this country immense benefit in the report they have made. It almost solves the lobster problem. Everyone knows that the lobster industry to-day is worth in the province of Nova Scotia alone $3,000,000, whereas thirty years ago there was nothing in it. I believe the same result in regard to dog fish can be accomplished through this commission that the minister now provides if it is properly conducted. Another thing I wish to refer to is the license taken out by American fishermen. Americans are taking fish in our waters, and before they can do so they have to procure a license and pay so much a ton. But they ton their vessels in the United States, and when they come to Canadian ports they pay a tonnage on the American register, that is not one-half as high as the Canadian register. Therefore a vessel that measures eighty tons by the Canadian register would only measure forty tons by the American register, and when they come into Canada and take out this license to fish they purchase their license on the American register, which only shows forty tons whereas they should pay a license on our own Canadian tonnage. I think the minister should make a regulation which will compel them to pay this license on the Canadian register.

Mr. KAULBACH. I feel satisfied that it is better to give the bounty to the fishermen than to give it to reduction works. Let the bounty be given to fishermen as an inducement to them to engage in catching this fish. The reduction works can then come in and receive their profit by utilizing the dog fish as a fertilizer. The difficulty is to bring the dog fish in to shore in a proper condition to be utilized, but that difficulty can be overcome by using lime. They can take out a few barrels of lime with them, and by its use prevent the fish from decomposing or becoming offensive to the sense of smell. They can do the same with the debris that is taken from the trimmings of fish. It can be cured in such a way that it will not be offensive, and become solid matter by placing with it quantities of lime. In that way the reduction works will get the benefit in the end without any bonus being given to them by this government. But let the bounty be given as I already stated, to the fishermen directly.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is the intention to look into this question, and I propose to amend the item by adding the words 'dog fish nuisance and settlement of the close season' as matters to be investigated.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

To pay His Majesty's government balance of divisible expenses in the Behring Sea arbitration, $629.46.

Mr. KAULBACH. What has been the expenditure so far in the Behring Sea matter ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In 1901-2 the expenditure was $2,956; last year it was only $87. The whole expenditure is somewhat between $50,000 and $60,000.

Towards providing for a steamer to replace the 'Acadia,' and one to replace the 'Petrel' on the great lakes, $75,000.

Mr. KAULBACH. The Acadia was offered for sale some time ago, was she sold ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, she was sold by tender, after all her fittings had been taken out of her, anything that was of any value. There were two tenders, one for $6,050 from St. John, and one for $6,000 from Halifax, the latter of which we accepted. She was sold about two months ago.

Mr. BLAIN. Was any money expended on her last year ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, to repair and put her in commission, but the vessel was perfectly useless. The vessel was condemned, and none of the officers would risk their lives on her. She had been kept up from year to year by repairs, until finally she became so old and useless that we thought we would get rid of her. I think what we took out of her was worth $5,000 or $6,000.

Mr. KAULBACH. I did not catch the hon. gentleman's remark with regard to the amount that was realized on her.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. $6,015.

Mr. SPROULE. What about the 'Petrel'?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The 'Petrel' will be put to the service of the buoys. She is not considered fit for the service which she has been doing for the last two or three years. She is not fast enough. We are the laughing stock of the Americans and our fishermen complain that she does not afford the protection that is necessary. We want to replace her with a 15 or 16 knot boat so that we can catch those Americans who are poaching in our waters.

Mr. SPROULE. You are going to use her for another purpose?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you bought any new boats to replace these?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, the 'Acadia' has not been replaced. The 'Petrel' is doing service. We are asking for $75,000, but this is only a preliminary expenditure. To replace the 'Acadia' by a 16-knot steamer we will require from $150,000 to $175,000. We can replace the 'Petrel' with a boat constructed in some of the ship-yards in Canada at a cost of from $50,000 to $75,000.

Mr. GOURLEY. Why do you not get a turbine?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I hope we may some day.

Mr. KAULBACH. Will the boat to replace the 'Acadia' be of steel?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, and she will be armed as well.

Mr. KAULBACH. Don't you think wood would suit as well to traverse the shore?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Then you are buying one and building the other?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We do not intend to buy either. We intend to have the boat to replace the 'Petrel' constructed here according to plans made by the department, and for which we will get tenders from Canadian firms.

Mr. SPROULE. And the other?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We will have it constructed on plans prepared by the officers of the department.

Mr. KAULBACH. Is it under the consideration of the government to grant a bounty to encourage steel ship-building in Canada?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That has been talked of a good deal, but I am not in a position to state whether the government has considered the question or not.

Further amount required for building and maintenance of fish breeding establishments and lobster hatcheries and securing seed lobsters during the fish season for distribution in depleted localities, $15,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he has come to any decision regarding the application made last year for the establishment of a fish hatchery on the Beaver river in the county of Grey near the Georgian bay. It is in close proximity to where the fish ova are caught and would in my judgment be a splendid place for a hatchery. I mentioned it last year to the hon. gentleman's predecessor.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We propose to establish eight new hatcheries which will be provided for out of this sum, and the one to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) makes allusion is provided for. The exact site has not yet been decided by the department. The conditions of the place mentioned by the hon. gentleman as far as they have been ascertained by the officials entirely meet the requirements.

Mr. SPROULE. I am sure the people of that section will be grateful for it as they have thought for a long time that this place was a very suitable one and a fish hatchery will be very useful there.

Mr. COPP. I wish to ask the hon. minister if it is the intention to establish a hatchery in the Bay of Fundy?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes. There are demands for thirteen new hatcheries, but. as I have stated, provision is made this year for eight.

Mr. KAULBACH. How many are there for Lunenburg

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is one for the district combining the counties of Digby, Annapolis and Yarmouth, but the exact situation has not yet been decided on.

Mr. KAULBACH. I would ask, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. minister does not think it is fair that the county of Lunenburg should have one? It excels any other county in the industry of fishing. We have

a number of canneries in the county and I think we certainly should have a hatchery. Would the hon. minister reconsider and give us one ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not an expert in these matters, because I am a new hand at it, and when you ask me about sites for hatcheries I will have to depend a great deal on the officers of my department unless I can go myself and visit the places. It is very hard for me to fix on one place or the other unless my officials advise me.

Mr. KAULBACH. If my hon. friend will consider the record we hold in regard to fisheries I think he will see that it warrants him in giving one at least to the county of Lunenburg. I think I have a knowledge of the matter equal to that of any commissioner or of any one else he can send to make inquiry.

Mr. GOURLEY. I would support my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach). He has succeeded in taking the fishing industry away from Halifax to Lunenburg and it is the head centre of the fishing industry in Nova Scotia to-day. Besides, it is near the county of the hon. Minister of Finance and some benefit might overflow into Queen's But. I think in deference to the fishing industry, there should be a station in Lunenburg.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In regard to the remark of the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) that Lunenburg is the centre of the fishing industry I would say that in one sense only that is correct. Lunenburg is the centre of the deep-sea fishery, but it is not the centre of the lobster fishery which is the subject under discussion. I think I represent more lobsters than any body else in this House.

Mr. HENDERSON. We think so on this side of the House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And I do not mean to call my constituents in all cases lobsters either. The lobster industry is a very important one in the counties that I represent. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has been too modest in his statement. He has recently made some experiments in the eastern part of Nova Scotia in regard to the propagation of lobsters which have been remarkably successful, so much so that I question whether in the future it will be necessary for us to do as much in the matter of lobster hatcheries as in the past. The experiments that have recently been made by Mr. Barker at Fourchu in Richmond county have been remarkably successful.

Mr. GOURLEY. What is the nature of them ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is the creation of the lobster pound into which seed lobsters purchased from the fishermen are thrown, and then, as the Irishman says, they let nature take its course. There were no special arrangements for conserving the seed lobsters and the fishermen were very apt to destroy them. Although the law forbids that, still you cannot always enforce these laws. The action recently taken by the minister was to offer a price for the preserving of the seed lobster. That was then taken to the pond and placed under proper supervision and the development has been very remarkable. Of course this work may be said to be yet experimental, but it has been so successful that I should think that in most parts of the country they would prefer this natural development of the lobster to the creation of lobster hatcheries. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is to be congratulated upon the great success that has crowned his efforts in that direction.

Mr. KAULBACH. I have been urging that suggestion for years, the use of natural pounds where there is a flow of clear fresh salt water at every tide. We have several of these in my county, one east of Chester—where there is now a cannery at the town of Chester—and one at the mouth of the La Have river, and both are admirably placed for the purpose. I am satisfied to allow the minister to have a claw on a portion of the claim, but I would rather not see him obtain the whole of it. I want him to be as a friend generous in this matter, and I think my request is reasonable, and one which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will see to be in the interest of the fishermen of my county. It is right for the fishermen there to have a claim to at least a portion of such benefits. The county of Lunenburg, from Queen's to the border of Halifax county is one continuous line of shore fishermen, and I will ask the hon. minister to look carefully into this matter and give me at least a hatchery for one of these pounds.

Mr. COPP. I am perfectly satisfied that Lunenburg should have the credit of representing the largest fishing county in Nova Scotia, but I wish to warn him of one thing, that he has so little advantage in this respect that it is not very much to brag about. In Digby last year the total catch was $1,438,942, whereas in Lunenburg it was $1,484,000, or a difference of only $45,000 in favour of Lunenburg. I wish to draw his attention to this, that while the yield in Digby has been going forward by leaps and bounds, Lunenburg has gone behind. Therefore, unless there is a change in Lunenburg very soon, I shall have the proud distinction of representing the largest fishing county in Nova Scotia.

Mr. KAULBACH. I can easily explain that and show very clearly the position with regard to the catch of lobsters in my county. The lobsters captured in my county are largely taken from my county into the adjoining counties of Queen's and Halifax and

are counted as a catch for these counties, when in reality Lunenburg is deserving of all that credit.

To increase the salaries of R. N. Venning, $150 ; F. H. Cunningham, $100 ; D. H. Fraser, $150 ; J. F. Fraser, $450 ; F. Anderson, $150 ; J. M. Lalonde, $150 ; C. W. White, $100 ; J. M. McCharles, $200, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $1,450.

Mr. SPROULE. Why do you require all these increases ? Have these men not been getting any increase in salary for some years ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Most of them have not got the ordinary increase, some of them for four years and some of them for less. I will enumerate the different officers. Take Mr. Venning. His salary is $2,050, and this increase makes it $2,200. He joined the service in 1869, and has been strongly recommended for the maximum of $2,400 for his special services in connection with the Behring sea arbitration and other international as well as intercolonial affairs. He is one of our most capable officers in the Fisheries Department. He has assisted at these different commissions and rendered most valuable services, and I do not know how it was that he remained at such a low salary, and it has been thought proper to increase his salary by $150. As regards Mr. Cunningham, I may say that his duties have been increased very largely. He is a first-class clerk in the department, and is also inspector of fish hatcheries throughout the Dominion, a very important and growing work, which keeps him travelling a great deal. He has perfected a device for carrying fish long distances which has been successfully employed, for instance, in stocking the waters of British Columbia with bass, where the fish were carried 2,800 miles. He has been twenty years in the service in all kinds of work, in connection with commissions and special inquiries, and I consider him deserving of the increase.

Mr. SPROULE. His present salary is how much ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. One thousand six hundred and fifty dollars. Mr. B. H. Fraser is a graduate and medallist of the Royal Military College and has been in the department since 1889. He was employed in the office of the chief engineer, and in 1885 he was appointed assistant engineer in the absence of the chief engineer. I may say in regard to some of these officers, that if they were in other departments in the outside service they could get much larger salaries than they are getting, and some of them have tendered their resignations, because, as the members of the committee are perfectly aware, engineers or experts, men with a certain technical knowledge, are at present being looked for, and it is in view of this fact that I have thought proper to make these increases. Mr. J. F. Fraser is in a similar position. He has charge of all the buoys and lights on the upper St. Lawrence and the lakes, and down as far as the gulf. He is a capable engineer and we cannot really keep him at a salary of $1,550. He will leave the service if he does not receive a larger salary. He is also a medalist of the university.

Mr. Anderson is a graduate of the Royal Military College. He has been engaged in the hydrographic survey since his appointment, in October, 1893. He is receiving $1,050, and it is proposed to place him at $1,200. He has charge of the survey in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Mr. Lalonde has been receiving $850 and it is proposed to place him at the head of his class. He has been highly recommended by the deputy minister and accountant for his increase. He received no increase for years and years, and is a very capable officer in the department. He is one of those who would certainly leave the service if he did not get better remuneration for his services. Mr. White joined the service in 1893. It is proposed to increase his salary to $900. For the past year he has had very important work to do in connection with the revenue, and is a very painstaking clerk. Mr. McCharles joined the service in 1893 and is receiving $700. It is now proposed to raise him to $900. He is a good stenographer and typewriter, and at present has charge of the work of despatching all mail matter, which was formerly done by a first-class clerk. He was strongly recommended for an increase by the deputy minister.

To promote Jules d'E. Clement from a second-class to a first-class clerkship, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $300.

To promote M. C. Doyle from a junior second to a second-class clerkship, $100.

To provide salary for A. M. Ross as a junior second class clerk, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $900.

To provide for the salary of F. H. Houde as a junior second-class clerk, $600.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As regards Mr. Clement, I may say that he is my private secretary. He had been in the service as private secretary to the Minister of Public Works before he became my private secretary. It is proposed to make him a first-class clerk, which is the rank of nearly every one of the private secretaries to the ministers. He writes both English and French.

Mr. SPROULE. What salary would that give him ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. $1,400 and the amount which is allowed to him as private secretary, $600. He is a stenographer in French and English, so that I save the salary of an English stenographer. Miss Doyle is an old employee of the department, appointed in 1892—I mean she has been employed for a long time. She is assistant private secre-

tary, being an expert stenographer, and typewriter, and I think an increase of $100 to her is not too much.

Mr. SPROULE. What is her salary now ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. $1,000. Mr. Ross has been in charge of the fisheries museum, and has also been employed in connection with fish-breeding. It is now proposed to put him in the inside service at a salary of $900, being the amount he now receives in the outside service. Mr. Houde is a young clerk who enters at the foot of the ladder at $600. He is a stenographer, and a useful young man.

Mr. SPROULE. There are two new clerks appointed, then ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. To fill vacancies. There was one pensioned and one transferred. The private secretary of the former Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Hunter, was transferred to the Department of Public Works. That is the only appointment that was made.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister did not tell us when these employees got the last increase.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. McCharles was kept out of his increase for four years. Mr. Venning was kept out of his increase for three years. Mr. Cunningham has $50 besides the regular increase. As I have stated, he is a technical officer.

Mr. SPROULE. How do you regard him as having technical knowledge, if he has been a clerk in the department steadily getting the regular increase ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Cunningham is from the old country. He has special work to perform, and the experience he has acquired in the department entitles him to a larger salary. He is inspector of fish-breeding establishments, having made a special study of that branch of the work. What I say for one is applicable to the others ; that is, that these increases are either to correct an injustice that has been done or to render justice to officials who, in any other department of the public service, would be entitled to the salaries that I have thought proper to allow them. I do not know them personally, except those with whom I come in contact, like Mr. Venning, Mr. Cunningham and Mr. Clement. The others have been recommended by the deputy minister ; and, after considering their cases, I came to the conclusion to recommend the increases.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not wish to be understood as objecting to these increases ; but I rise for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that we contended that great injustice had been done to many members of the civil service for several years after the hon. gentleman's friends came in, by depriving them of the statutory increases to which they were entitled ; and now the hon. gentleman proposes to make those increases up. We have had sharp arguments on this subject in previous years, and I am glad that the ministers now recognize that they were wrong in the past. If they had followed the practice of their predecessors, it would not have been necessary to make such large increases at the present time. Most of these employees would have reached the salaries they are getting by means of the ordinary annual increases instead of getting these increases in a lump sum.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not cast any blame on anybody. I found the cases to be as I have stated, and I tried to deal with them to the best of my knowledge and judgment.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman will not try to fix the blame on anybody, but it is our duty to fix it on the parties who are blameworthy, and that is the hon. gentleman's friends.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). I would ask my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), if he considers that the Liberal party have neglected certain officials for five years, what would he think of the former party, who neglected to give certain officials their statutory increases for eighteen years ?

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know of any such cases. I think the hon. gentleman is drawing on his imagination for his alleged facts.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). I beg to correct the hon. gentleman. I can give the names of the individuals. I know them perfectly well.

Mr. HENDERSON. Keep them till next week.

Some resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What work are we to take up on Monday ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We may take up first one or two Bills which stand in the name of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, and then go into Committee of Supply. If the Minister of Trade and Commerce is in his place we will give his estimates priority, as he is not able to be present in the evening. I would like to be free, however, from this time to take anything in the estimates, because they are narrowed down to small limits. I shall be glad to indicate those we prefer.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, October 12, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

REVISED STATUTES.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 265) respecting the Revised Statutes of Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). What progress has been made with the revision of the statutes and is it expected that the revision will be so far completed as to enable the law to be enacted by parliament next session ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am not quite sure that it will have progressed that far, but very substantial progress has been made. Over forty statutes have been completely revised and thirty-seven adopted. I expect that in December, more than one-third will be completed. I am not sure that the revision will be completed for next session but it will be in the interval between next session and the session after.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

NORTH ATLANTIC TRANSPORTATION COMPANY.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask my right hon. friend whether or not the contract with the North Atlantic Transportation Company has been laid on the Table ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Not yet. There has been no formal contract, but correspondence which we have assumed to amount to a contract will be placed on the Table perhaps to-morrow.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The right hon. gentleman promised to make an announcement with respect to further government measures.

The PRIME MINISTER. I shall make it to-morrow.

ALASKA BOUNDARY.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would ask my right hon. friend the Prime Minister whether or not he has taken any steps to verify the accuracy of the alleged interview with Mr. Aylesworth, one of the commissioners on the Alaska boundary question. I have not the telegraphic report at hand, but it contains rather extraordinary observations with regard to his duties as commissioner and also with regard to his views on matters now the subject of political controversy in the United Kingdom. It seems to me rather unusual, and I decline to believe that Mr. Aylesworth could have used the language attributed to him ; but inasmuch as the interview has been cabled cross the Atlantic—I am not sure whether by the New Canada Press Association or not—and has been commented on throughout the country to a considerable extent, it seems to me desirable that the government should ascertain whether or not it is accurate, and if not, inform the public and the country.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The government have taken no steps to ascertain whether this alleged interview has taken place or not. We assume that this interview had not the character attributed to it. Mr. Aylesworth is a counsel of very great eminence, and I would hestitate to believe—and I think my hon. friend would have equal hesitation—that he would have expressed any opinion on a matter which is sub-judice and in which he himself is one of the judges. The language attributed to him is very improbable and until I hear to the contrary and have some better ground for believing that Mr. Aylesworth has so expressed himself, I shall believe that this interview, like many others, was not an expression of the views of Mr. Aylesworth.

QUESTIONS.

THE CLERGUE WORKS.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario)—by Mr. Heyd—asked :

1. Did the government grant a contract to the Clergue works at Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, for the supply of steel rails for the use of the Intercolonial Railway ?
2. What quantity of rails was contracted for?
3. What quantity of rails was delivered ?
4. Why were not the full quantities contracted for taken ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) :

1. Yes, to the Lake Superior Power Company.

2. An Order in Council was passed authorizing the taking of 25,000 tons per annum for a period of five years on terms therein stated. A contract was entered into for the first year for 25,000 tons. The company were not able to supply any rails under this contract.

3. Subsequently it was agreed that the company should supply 10,000 tons, but all that they were able to deliver were 5,768 tons.

4. The full quantities authorized were not taken because the company were unable to supply them. The government took all that were offered.

IMPERIAL SERVICE DECORATIONS AND MEDALS.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. What system was followed by the government in selecting the members of the civil service who recently had the honour of receiving the Imperial Service decoration and medals ?

2. What are the names of the officials who have been recommended by the government, and on whom the decoration will be conferred ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I understand that my hon. friend is asking what recommendations have been made and what appointments are to be made. I can only give information regarding past appointments.

Mr. CLARKE. Will not the right hon. gentleman answer the second question, and give the list of names ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The second question refers to future appointments : 'What are the names of the officials who have been recommended by the government, and on whom the decoration will be conferred.'

Mr. CLARKE. The second question refers to the names of those who 'have been recommended,' and on whom the decoration will be conferred. The announcement has been made that it is the intention to confer this decoration on the day of prorogation, on those who have been recommended.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would ask my hon. friend not to rely on such information.

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY--MANAGEMENT OF THE HOSPITAL.

Mr. LEMIEUX by Mr. Talbot—asked :

1. Is the honourable the Minister of Justice aware that the grand jury summoned for the September criminal term of the Court of King's Bench, for the district of Montreal, made a report blaming the management of the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary for the manner in which the hospital of that institution is kept ?

2. Is it true that the hospital of the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary is conducted in a manner that conflicts with every law of hygiene ?

3. Has the inspector of the penitentiary made a special report to that effect ?

4. What is the nature of that report ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) :

1. No, but the minister has read the report as published in the newspapers.

2. No, quite the contrary. The hospital contains three wards. One isolated on the upper story for contagious diseases, one for ordinary patients, and one for convalescents to exercise in. All are well lighted, by large windows during the day, and by electric light at night. They are thoroughly ventilated, comfortably heated and scrupulously clean. There is not a trace of damp. The floors are of hardwood, the bedsteads of iron, white enamelled, with spring and fibre mattresses. None of the patients sleep on the floor, as stated in the report referred to.

3. No.

4. The hospital was renovated in 1900. That year the warden reported :

The old hospital, as improved, affords to-day the accommodation so much needed in the past by patients, and if they have not the conveniences accessible in the Kingston penitentiary, they have at least improvements which afford them the hygienic means necessary to the recovery of their health. The isolating hospital for contagious diseases has already rendered important services in preventing contagion. A convict has passed through the phases of typhoid fever of an adynamic type. The state of this patient has caused the physician great uneasiness, but, thanks to isolation, the contagion has not, so far, claimed any other victims. (Page 19, report of Minister of Justice, 1900).

The surgeon reported :

At last our old hospital has been repaired and improved, and has been at the service of the sick since the middle of May. (Page 40, same report).

In 1901 the inspector reported :

The hospital is inconveniently located, but has been improved by the addition of a ward that doubles its original capacity.

LIBRARIANS OF PARLIAMENT. REGISTRARS OF THE SUPREME COURT—SALARIES.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved that the House do to-morrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolutions :

1. Resolved, that the salaries of the general librarian and the parliamentary librarian of the library of parliament, and the registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada shall each be $3,500 per annum ; with an annual increase of $100, up to a maximum of $4,000 per annum.

2. Resolved, that for the purpose of determining the salary of the officers at present occupying the said positions, each shall be credited with his period of service ; and shall hereafter be paid such salary as he would by length of service have become entitled to, had the provision of the next preceding resolution been in force at the time of his appointment.

3. Resolved, that during the financial year ending June 30th, 1904, there may be paid, out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, such sums as are required for payment of the foregoing increases.

He said : His Excellency the Governor General approves of these resolutions, and recommends them to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—ALASKA BOUNDARY COMMISSION—OPINION OF BRITISH COMMISSIONER.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the government to a statement which I see in several of the morning papers with regard to the Alaska arbitration now proceeding in Great Britain. The item is as follows:

Toronto, Oct. 10.—The 'News' special cable from London says: 'I am informed on what may be accepted as high authority that a majority of the Alaskan commission will shortly give judgment adverse to the Canadian contention. It is understood that Great Britain's representative on the commission, Lord Alverstone, has privately intimated to diplomatic and colonial office officials that he is convinced that a stronger case is made out by the United States, and that he intends to give judgment accordingly. A majority of the commission will thus agree upon a verdict and the two Canadian commissioners will, if they register in the issue, be unable to affect the result.'

I have quoted from the Ottawa 'Morning Citizen,' but I have seen the same item in one or two other newspapers. I am sure that the House and the country will be very glad to learn if there is any information that the government can communicate to the House on the subject.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). I think this so antecedently improbable and almost impossible, that it does not require the slightest consideration at the hands of the government or any member of this House. I cannot conceive it possible that a person in the position of Lord Alverston could have committed himself in advance to delivering judgment in any such way as is stated in this despatch.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—PETITIONS AGAINST NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the motion for supply is carried, I would ask whether or not the Committee on Privileges and Elections has been summoned to meet. I mentioned this matter to the right hon. Prime Minister on Saturday. He said that he would have some intimation to make later on, after—I think he said—having consulted with the chairman of the committee. It is usual, I understand, to have the Committee on Privileges and Elections summoned immediately after any matter has been referred to them. That course does not seem to have been pursued in this case.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). I will call the attention of the Chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections to the matter.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He is absent from the city.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I understand that Mr. Wade, the chairman of the committee is absent, but I will call attention to the matter. I am not aware of the circumstances that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has alluded to. I supposed it was with reference to the petitions.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the motion for Committee of Supply is carried, I would like to say that there is a matter to be brought up by my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) on going into supply. But I understand that it is more convenient for the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) to proceed with his estimates this morning. We have every disposition to meet the right hon. gentleman's convenience, with the understanding, of course, that the House will be moved into supply later on.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I believe it will be agreeable to bring the matter up on going into Committee of Supply, at three o'clock.

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

Mail subsidies and steamship subventions—additional to service between Great Britain and Canada, $25,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). This is for the purpose of meeting any possible additional subsidy that may be required under our contract with the Allans. We pay by steamer, and the rates vary, therefore, it is not always possible to ascertain in advance exactly how much will be paid. Of late, I may say the service has considerably improved. The 'Tunisian' and the 'Bavarian' have been making, during the last three or four months, very fair rates of speed from Rimouski to Moville and back.

Mr. SPROULE. What is their general rate of speed?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The general rate of speed by the steamers I have referred to is about 14 knots; the others about 12½ knots.

Mr. SPROULE. The contract seems to be on a sort of sliding scale. Is it according to the number of trips made?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. According to the quality of the vessels employed. The 'Bavarian' and

'Tunisian' receives £750 in summer and £1,000 in winter. For the other steamers it is about £500 each way. The subsidy, as the hon. gentleman can see, varies a good deal according to the number of trips made by the superior class of vessels. For a considerable time we had only one. Now we have the 'Tunisian,' the 'Bavarian' and the 'Parisian'—the last named having been much improved and now able to make better passage than heretofore.

Mr. SPROULE. According to this, I assume that the minister has not made provision for the maximum outlay ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Heretofore there has been a sum which has been available for this service—about $25,000, under the head of service from St. John to Liverpool. That has been dropped. So, this is practically no increase, because, in the past we were able to use this $25,000 in addition to the $150,000 voted for this service.

Mr. SPROULE. Are we correct in understanding that the vote heretofore given to vessels by St. John via. Newfoundland to the old country has been dropped ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, there was no vote for exactly that service. There was another vote. That vote to which my hon. friend refers is a vote of $20,000, not from St. John's, if my memory serves me, but from Halifax to St. John's, Newfoundland, and thence to Liverpool. That vote remains. When that was originally granted there was no calling at St. John's. It remained for a considerable time, and was not nearly used, except for the purpose of supplementing the vote to the Allan service.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose it is through not clearly understanding the circumstances that I do not comprehend the necessity of the additional $25,000. Is it occasioned by putting on another boat, or is it occasioned by the fact that the sum paid to the Messrs. Allan is on a sliding scale ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, on a sliding scale, dependent on the speed and quality of the boat. Two of their boats receive a much better sum than the other. The 'Bavarian' and the 'Tunisian' are paid very much more than the inferior vessels employed. But of late they have been employing better vessels. The close of the South African war released a number of those craft, and we are now getting a better service.

Additional for steam service between St. John, N.B., and Glasgow, during winter of 1903-4, $7,500.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Hon. gentlemen will observe that a similar sum is in the main estimates for the service heretofore run. We propose to double that service, and give a corresponding sum, the total of which will be about $15,000. That service has been of considerable use in bringing us into communication with Glasgow and the population round about.

Mr. SPROULE. How many vessels are they giving ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We have a fortnightly service instead of a monthly service. They carry mails if any are tendered by the post office, but, of course, the mail service is not a very important portion. To all intents and purposes they are freight boats.

Mr. SPROULE. Have they cold storage apparatus ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They have summer accommodation. But the hon. gentleman will observe that this is a winter service. There is not much of a perishable nature carried by them during winter.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the character of the freight, and is there any return freight ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is of a very mixed character, all sorts of general cargo. They fill up with deals if they can get nothing else. They also carry large quantities of produce of various kinds. The return cargo is not large. It consists chiefly I am told of articles of iron and things of that kind. But the great difficulty we have to contend with, and the reason for giving more money in these subsidies, lies in the fact that the return cargo is generally very small. Still this service is of use in that it brings us into direct communication with a large and important centre of population in Scotland. In Glasgow and the surrounding district there is a population of a million and a quarter. It is a matter of considerable moment to us to have direct communication with these people for the purpose of facilitating the sale of Canadian products. I think the money has been pretty well spent.

Mr. CLARKE. Do American exporters make use of these ships to send their produce in competition with our own ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is chiefly in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I am sorry to say they are not very much overburdened with cargoes. They take what they can get.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there any contract made with this company which prevents them from discriminating in freight rates ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There is some regulation of that kind.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there any provision made by which the exporters of Chicago, for instance, shall not get better rates than those of Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton or any other points ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There is a provision that they shall not discriminate against Canadian shippers.

Mr. CLARKE. Can we see that provision before we adopt the item ? It is a matter of importance to the people of Canada, who are subsidizing these vessels, that greater facilities shall not be given American exporters by means of lower freight rates than are given to our own people.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will send for the provision.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like the item to stand until we get it.

Mr. COCHRANE. I think the regulation should provide that not only should there be no discrimination, but that we should have a preference. What is the good of Canada paying out subsidies to steamship lines if we do not get any preference in rates ? If the Americans can come in here and compete with us in using these lines, what is the use of paying out Canadian money to subsidize these vessels to carry American freight ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is difficult to get a cargo as it is. It would not help Canadian freighters if you prevented discrimination.

Mr. COCHRANE. I am talking about giving a preference. If we give a large subvention, why should we not have a preference ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is not a large subvention, it is an extremely small subsidy.

Mr. CLARKE. I think it would be better to give even a larger subsidy and to get a discrimination in favour of our own exporters.

Item allowed to stand.

Additional for steam communication during the season of 1903, between the mainland and the Magdalen Islands, $6,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is a provision to double the accommodation heretofore afforded to these islands. The service for a long time was run weekly, and we paid $9,000 for it. They are now running semi-weekly, and they receive this additional remuneration. The boats are the 'Amelia' and the 'Lunenburg.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What are the mainland ports ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Pictou and Souris.

Mr. SPROULE. Are we doing much trade with the Magdalen Islands ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. A fair amount. Of course, with a double service we may expect to do more trade.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the nature of the imports and exports ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The Magdalen Islands belong to us. They send their fish down, and whatever is required for the use of the Magdalen population goes to them by this route. They have no other means of communication whatever.

Mr. CLARKE. It is only fair that assistance should be given to the islands.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the population of the island ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. About 7,000 altogether.

Steam communication between Prince Edward Island, Cape Breton and Newfoundland, $8,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is for the purpose of encouraging communication from Sydney to Prince Edward Island and incidentally to Newfoundland. I may observe that this vote, which is for $8,000 is granted partly in consideration of the reduction of the subsidy voted for a service between Prince Edward Island and Great Britain. We were giving them $10,000 but it was found very difficult to get a sufficient number of steamers. The vote has been reduced to $5,000 and in lieu of that we are proposing a service between Sydney and Prince Edward Island. That will be practically $3,000 of an increase on the two votes.

Mr. HACKETT. From what points in Prince Edward Island will this service be maintained ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Between Charlottetown and Sydney.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How frequent a service is proposed between these two ports ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Our intention is to have a weekly service when the new contract is made.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the steamer been selected ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, we have not been able to conclude our arrangements until we got the money.

Mr. HACKETT. Would it not be possible to include Summerside in this arrangement ? The steamers that will perform this service will likely belong to some lines running between Montreal and Newfoundland. They pass Summerside and why not include Summerside ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I shall be very pleased to do so if I can obtain the service. This, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hackett) will observe is a new vote and we have not as yet been able to come to close quarters on the subject as to the number of places to be called at, but I will be very glad to include Summerside if I can possibly manage it.

Additional for steam service during the season of 1903 between Sydney, C.B., and Bay St. Lawrence and way ports, $500.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This service is being a little enlarged. We have a service at present and we now propose to run it as far as St. Anne's bay. The steamer is the 'Weymouth.'

Mr. SPROULE. How do you come to put that item in here? When does your financial year end?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is for the season. They have been giving the service on the understanding that we will put in the item.

Mr. SPROULE. It should be in the supplementary estimates for the year ending 1903.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, it is for the season and the season will not end until December.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How frequent will this service be?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is a weekly service.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where is Bay St. Lawrence?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is in Victoria county.

Steam service between Canada and Australia, $194,666.66.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there any provision made in this contract that as a condition of our giving this subsidy there shall be no discrimination in rates in favour of American exporters as to the goods which they send to Australia?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Would it not be well to supply the committee with that provision or arrangement?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think I brought it down. This is a repetition of the former vote we passed in the supplementary estimates for 1903, and I think, if the hon. gentleman will refer back, he will see that information was given.

Mr. CLARKE. The right hon. gentleman may be correct, but if there is a provision of that kind, it can easily be brought down.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, there is no objection. This formerly was a statutory vote, but the statute has expired and in place of making it statutory we are now putting it in the ordinary estimates.

Mr. CLARKE. What will be the amount of our contribution?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There was an addition made last year, partly paid by ourselves and partly paid by Australia and Fiji.

Mr. CLARKE. How much of the addition are we contributing?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. About £10,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Do these boats carry the mail?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any arrangement for cold storage or for special freight storage?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There are arrangements for cold storage.

Mr. SPROULE. In how many of the boats?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think in all. The boats are the 'Aorangi,' the 'Miowera,' and the 'Moana.'

Mr. SPROULE. There are three vessels. How many trips do they make in the season?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There are sailings once every four weeks. A pretty considerable trade is being developed with Australia and it is an increasing trade as far as our exports are concerned. The imports are not so large.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the trade of any considerable importance or is it increasing?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The total amount of our exports was $2,586,554 to Australia.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). And our imports?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They are very small. They amount to some $200,000 or $300,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I drew the attention of the minister some years ago to the fact, that while our Canadian commissioners in these countries are promoting the question of Canadian manufactures and products, they might devote some time to the question of getting imports from these countries for Canada. For instance, in the matter of hides, Australia is a large exporter, and I believe we could profitably import hides direct from our sister colony. We should, I think, have a monthly freight service established from eastern Canada —the ports of Montreal, Quebec, Halifax

and St. John—and I am satisfied that if we did so, millions of dollars worth of hides could be imported from these colonies rather than from foreign countries which have antagonistic tariffs against us. These hides are now taken largely to Holland and are then distributed to England and to Canada. I understand that at the present time, the Canadian service goes monthly, and the American service monthly also from the Pacific coast to Australia.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). The American service goes tri-monthly from San Francisco.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am satisfied that a large and profitable trade could be developed between Canada and Australia, even if we had sailing vessels plying from eastern Canadian to Australian ports. At present our exports have to be shipped across the continent to Vancouver, and the rail rates for such a long haul are absolutely prohibitive. If we could send vessels around the Horn from our eastern ports to Australia, it would be a great benefit to both countries. Has the minister given that his consideration ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have ; but I am afraid any subsidy it would be within our power to give, would hardly produce the results which the hon. gentleman desires. We are doing a very decent export trade with Australia, but our import trade is very small ; only $152,000 last year.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). A profitable trade could be done in furniture, if we could ship it direct to Australia, but it is impossible to send it by rail to Vancouver.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The journey from eastern Canada to Australia is nearly half around the globe; about 12,000 miles.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am aware of that.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It would be a very long journey, and would require, I am afraid, a very steep subsidy.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The distance from Australia to eastern Canada is not so great as from Australia and New Zealand to German ports, and yet I was able to give figures some time ago to show, that the rates from Sydney, Australia, to Hamburg, on hides were less than the rates on the same articles from Chicago to Bracebridge, or other ports in Ontario by rail. I should think that the rates from Australia to eastern Canada would be less than from Australia to German ports.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. When the Australian commonwealth begins to find its feet a little more, they may join with us.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Of course I do not expect it to come about in a minute.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I would expect more assistance from them than they have been hitherto giving, because that trade which the hon. gentleman speaks of would be to their advantage as well as ours.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Certainly.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have directed the attention of our agents to this matter, and possibly something may come of it.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). The great drawback is that our export trade has to be sent across the continent to Vancouver for shipment, and the railway freights must necessarily prevent anything like a large trade being done. You have either to send by rail to Vancouver or ship to New York, and when you ship to New York you cannot compete with the American exporters. If we had monthly steamers from Montreal, Quebec, St. John or Halifax, as the case may be, our trade with the commonwealth would be immense. I know of one firm that is ready to take a shipment of 3,000 tons of paper right away if they could only get it shipped direct from Canada. Ordinary furniture could be exported in what is called 'knock-down' shape to be painted and put together when it arrives in Australia. Carriages of different descriptions, window sashes and doors, and other Canadian manufactures would find a ready market in Australia, because the tariff on most of the articles which we could export to that country is only 15 per cent. This is a question which is worthy of all consideration. I should hope that the Australian government would supplement our grants to steamers. I am happy to say that the condition of Australia is improving very rapidly at present. The recent rains there have been most beneficial, and the reports are that there will be very large and profitable crops in the commonwealth this year.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the minister aware of the policy of the United States in respect to subsidizing vessels to different ports ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not think they grant any subsidies to the lines to Australia.

Mr. BLAIN. What is their general policy with respect to subsidies.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That matter has been under consideration in congress a good deal, but I do not think they have as yet formulated any policy. They have talked a good deal about granting subsidies, but unless it be to the Philippines, or some of their own possessions, I do not think they have granted them in the fashion we have granted them.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the minister any information with respect to the trade between the United States and Australia ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is considerably larger than ours ; it is perhaps $8,000,000 or $10,000,000. My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Clarke) asked what were the provisions as to discrimination. The terms are as follows :

All passengers or freight that may be offered, or that can reasonably be procured, at rates which shall not be in excess of such maximum rates as are fixed by the minister, should it be advisable so to fix such maximum rates. And in no case shall any discrimination be made as regards rates, or otherwise, directly or indirectly, against Canadian merchants, or shippers who shall always have precedence for their freight and goods over all other merchants and shippers.

And it is agreed and understood that the freight rates on eastbound trips sailing from St. John, N.B., as hereinbefore provided on bills of lading through to Glasgow, Scotland, from any place in the province of Ontario, or Quebec or from any Canadian points further west, shall in no case be greater than from the same place to Glasgow via any United States route or port; and on west bound trips the rates from Glasgow to any point in Ontario or Quebec or other Canadian points further west, shall be as favourable as by any United States route or port to the same place.

Mr. CLARKE. If I apprehend the meaning of what the minister has read that makes provision that the rate collected from any point in Canada via this route shall not be greater than via New York or Boston.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Or any other United States port.

Mr. CLARKE. What we are aiming at is to prevent discrimination as between Toronto or Hamilton or London or Stratford and Chicago or Detroit or any points west of these cities.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not think that can be met under this contract.

Mr. CLARKE. Complaints have been made again and again that rates are given via Montreal, Quebec or St. John from Chicago——

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. By this line ?

Mr. CLARKE. By lines running from Montreal and St. John—that rates are given from Chicago to Liverpool that are much lower than the rates charged from Stratford, Hamilton, Toronto, or other great industrial exporting points in Canada, and there is no provision in this contract, if I apprehend the meaning of the words, to prevent such a condition of things. In the item which we are discussing, the steamship service to Australia, it is an indisputable fact, and the United States returns will establish it, that the exports of American products to Australia are increasing by leaps and bounds. It would surely be bad policy on our part to give these enormous subsidies to establish a line of steamers from Vancouver to Australia if it is found that the owners of these ships make better rates for goods going from American points, Chicago and points in the eastern states, than are given to our exports from Quebec and Ontario ? We are actually paying a bonus to these companies to give an advantage to our competitors.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) will send me any detailed instance in which that has occurred, I will inquire into it at once.

Mr. CLARKE. I think it is the duty of the right hon. gentleman to see that this is not done.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not know that anything of the kind has occurred.

Mr. CLARKE. I believe it can be established.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Well, then establish it.

Mr. CLARKE. I am not prepared to establish it at the present time, but I think that we should be sympathized with instead of being attacked for asking for information.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman has a perfect right to ask for information.

Mr. CLARKE. Is the right hon. minister, in asking this $200,000, prepared to say what the rates are from any New England point, say Boston or New York, as compared with those from Toronto or Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have not that information with me but I can get it.

Mr. CLARKE. Perhaps it would be well to let the item stand until the right hon. gentleman is prepared to give that information. I have heard again and again that goods from Boston are shipped at a lower rate via this route to Australia than goods from Montreal or Toronto.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If the hon. gentleman will produce any evidence on that point we will have the matter investigated at once.

Mr. CLARKE. Surely if the right hon. gentleman is as jealous and zealous as he should be to guard the trade of Canada he should have all these particulars at his finger ends.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is the business of parties who have complaints to make, to make them and to give their evidence. They have not done so in this case.

Mr. CLARKE. The right hon. gentleman admits that he has no information on the matter and is not prepared to say what the freight rates are between these points ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I did not say that.

Mr. CLARKE. He made that admission a moment ago.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I have repeatedly in this House, even during this session, called attention to this matter and the right hon. gentleman promised across the floor of the House that he would look into it. I did not bring up the Australian case but I did bring up the fact that goods are shipped via Canadian steamboat lines to Liverpool at cheaper rates from western United States points than from the town in which I live and other Ontario points. The minister promised to look into these rates, to have them printed and laid before the House.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman had nothing to say about the Australian rates.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I brought up the rates to England from Canada and the fact that the American farmer, who has never contributed one cent in bonuses to these railways and steamship lines, sends his freight by them to England and lands his grain there at a cost of five to ten cents a bushel less than what it costs the people of the county from which I come, who have taxed themselves hundreds of thousands of dollars to pay for these railway and steamship lines.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The agreement which the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce has been good enough to place in my hand provides that the steamship line is to handle :

All passengers or freight that may be offered, or that can reasonably be procured, at rates which shall not be in excess of such maximum rates as are fixed by the minister should he deem it advisable so to fix such maximum rates ; and in no case shall any discrimination be made as regards rates, or otherwise, directly or indirectly, against Canadian merchants, or shippers who shall always have precedence for their freight and goods over all other merchants and shippers.

I would suggest that the difficulty raised by my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Clarke) would hardly be met by that clause, for it simply deals with discrimination against Canadian merchants or shippers and not with rates from points in Canada as distinguished from the United States.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Read a little further.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then the contract proceeds as follows :

And it is agreed and understood that freight rates on eastbound trips sailing from St. John, N.B., as hereinbefore provided on bills of lading through to Glasgow, Scotland, from any place in the province of Ontario, or Quebec or from any Canadian points further west, shall in no case be greater than from the same place to Glasgow via any United States route or port; and on west bound trips the rates from Glasgow to any point in Ontario or Quebec or other Canadian points further west, shall be as favourable as by any United States route or port to the same place.

The remaining portion of the clause relates altogether to cargoes of lumber or timber and prescribes the proportion which can be carried. So, it seems to me, that this portion of the clause will hardly cover what my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Clarke) has spoken of, because it merely provides that the rate from any place in Ontario or Quebec shall not be greater by this route than by a United States route. What my hon. friend from Toronto is dealing with is this. He alleges that he has been credibly informed that rates from Chicago or other United States points in the west via these lines are lower than from corresponding points in Ontario and the west via the same lines. That is quite different from anything specially provided for in the contract. Do I make myself clear ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Quite clear.

Mr. CLARKE. When the question of transportation was discussed whole pages of rates were presented to the House by hon. gentlemen who were familiar with the question. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Maclaren) gave the schedules of rates from his own district points, Stratford, and, I think, Listowel.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I rather misunderstood the point my hon. friend is taking. The point he is now taking, I understand, is that in fixing through-rates from Chicago the railway or steamship company might charge less than from Canadian points. He is aware that that is an excessively difficult question to deal with. He is also aware that these vessels, as a rule, go out of St. John scarcely ever with full cargoes. They are obliged to fill up with deals and other commodities of that kind. How far it would benefit us to interfere it is a very difficult question to answer.

Mr. CLARKE. I admit that, but I submit that the situation is a peculiar one, to say the least. The people of Ontario are willing that we should vote reasonable subsidies to assist the shipping trade in the maritime provinces, but we are being handicaped in the matter of exports, if the allegations I have made are correct. If we desire to transport cattle, cheese or butter by these subsidized vessels, we have to pay greater freight rates from points in Ontario to Liverpool than are given to our competitors who reside in the United States and bill their products from Chicago. In the clause which the right hon. gentleman read to us, there is no provision to guard against

this discrimination. We not only pay a subsidy, but higher rates are charged our shippers than are charged our competitors in Chicago. The same condition applies with regard to exports from the New England states to Australia and the east. Lower rates are charged than our Canadian shippers have to pay. This should be remedied. If we subsidize these lines, Canadian exporters should not have to pay higher rates, but should be treated with at least equal consideration with those of the United States.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is quite right. The point he makes is one worthy of serious consideration, but I would point this out to him as a business man. Here we are endeavouring to build up this export trade from the maritime provinces. These people complain of the low subsidies given. They state with truth that a great deal of this trade from St. John is carried with a loss. If there was the slightest disposition to give a preference to American goods over ours, we have taken power in the contract to prevent that. But does the hon. gentleman think that we would benefit by prohibiting the shipping of American goods by that route and sending them to United States ports instead of St. John or Halifax ? We can easily prohibit the export of American stuff through our lines and over our railways, but I fail to see how that would benefit us.

Mr. CLARKE. According to the hon. gentleman these ships do not take full cargoes, so that there is room in them for Canadian and other exports. It is an anomalous condition that we should subsidize steamers, and then find these steamers utilized by our American competitors at lower freight rates. That condition should not be continued.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. What would you suggest ?

Mr. CLARKE. I would suggest a larger subsidy and prevent discrimination in rates, or cut off the subsidy.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That might be done, but the House would have to go to a far heavier expenditure than we are now making. Take a steamer 2,000 tons, and suppose she has 1,200 tons of cargo from Canadian shippers. If she has not more than the 1,200 she will be obliged to charge the Canadian exporter with heavier rates in proportion than if she were filled up from other quarters. And while you can compel American products to be sent by their own ports if you like, still, I am bound to say, unless we undertake a very much larger expenditure than we have undertaken, and larger, I think, than my hon. friend contemplates or would approve, we shall find it very difficult to deal with that particular question. He knows that the matter of the through-freight from competitive points—Chicago, for instance—is one of the greatest problems that are presented for consideration in connection with this whole transportation question. Now, if we desire that our people shall have the preference if they have stuff to sell, I am not clear, though the matter deserves consideration, that we can well help ourselves.

Mr. CLARKE. If we have a steamer of 2,000 tons burden and only 1,200 tons of Canadian produce offers for her cargo, surely the people of Canada are paying the subsidy to have that 1,200 tons carried to market. If the vessel carries a full cargo what is the balance made up of ? It is made up of products which are to enter into competition in the common market with the Canadian products. And this American freight is sent to our ports only because the rate is lower than the rate by American ports. Surely this is an anomalous condition of things—that the people of Canada should pay, in the first place, a subsidy to a vessel to take our products across the Atlantic, and then pay a higher rate than those who have products to sell in competition with ours, and who are not called upon to pay any share of the subsidy.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Well, to continue the illustration of my hon. friend, how would the people of Canada benefit if we compel this 800 tons of American products to go by New York ? They would enter into competition with Canadian products just as much as they do now, and the shipmaster would be obliged to charge a higher rate on the Canadian products than he now charges. I do not deny that the position is awkward and anomalous. But I point out the very great difficulties in the way of solving the problem which the hon. gentleman speaks of unless by undertaking a very heavy expenditure, and, in any case, preventing competition.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I think the Minister of Trade and Commerce has misunderstood the position of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke). The hon. member does not want to prohibit the carrying of American freight, but I think he desires that the freight rates on the American goods shall not be less than on the same class of goods sent from Canada. In other words, we should not bonus the steamer to take Canadian goods to foreign ports and then allow that steamer to call at American ports and take similar commodities at lower rates.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. None of these steamers call at American ports.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It would be well for the minister, I think, to look into this matter of the freight rates. I believe there is a good deal in the contention that our sub-

sidized lines are carrying American products at lower rates than they give to Canadians. Of course, they say that when they take freight at Chicago to be carried through, they have to take it at what rates they can get, and that it does not hurt the Canadian shipper whatever those rates may be. But, at the same time, if they can carry American products at 20 cents per hundred pounds I do not see any reason why they should carry Canadian products at 30 cents per 100 pounds for the same class of freight. I find also that subsidized lines running from Canadian to other ports are very loath to meet competition. I would instance the Pickford & Black lines from Halifax to the West Indies. They are obliged to meet competition from New York, but they do not meet it until the last protest is entered. They do meet it finally, but they are a long while about it, and as soon as an excuse offers, they raise the rates again. They may carry flour for the Americans for 20 cents a barrel and there is no reason why they should not do the same for Canadians. If they receive a subsidy from this parliament, then, we shoud make it a condition that they shall carry Canadian produce at as low rates as those they give to the Americans. If the minister would inquire into this and see that such a condition is carried out, I believe it will be only fair and would be in the interest of Canadian trade. But I advise him that it takes a good deal of vigilance, to have such a condition carried into effect. They are very wary and you have to be constantly ascertaining what the freight rates are at Chicago and you have to be always on the alert.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The rate is made by rail and water. The steamships themselves do not carry freight for the round rate.

Mr. CAMPBELL. They 'divvy up' with the railways. There is an understanding between the railways and the steamship companies. This would be a matter well worthy of the minister's careful consideration.

Mr. FOWLER. The discrimination in freight rates does not necessarily affect the Canadian shipper in the market to which the goods are sent. Of course, if the American shipper undersells the Canadian by reason of the discrimination, then of course the discrimination is a matter that very injuriously affects the Canadian. But if that is not so, I do not see how the Canadian shipper is very much injured by reason of American freight going through the Canadian channels. On the other hand, it helps us to get the service of a less subsidy than we should get it for if American freights were not allowed.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) has hit the exact difficulty of the situation. I have made inquiries and, so far as I can learn, competition on the other side of the water is not affected by what goes through by these steamers. Everybody knows that the amount of American produce which goes to England is enormous; and it is so enormous that the comparative trifle that goes by those lines does not affect the prices.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There is another point that should not be lost sight of, and which goes to benefit our friends in the maritime provinces. There is, for instance, a rate from a western Canadian point to St. John. There is a through-rate from that western Canadian point to Liverpool. In that case, the through railway rate to St. John would be less than the direct railway rate to St. John. On reaching St. John, an arrangement is made with the agent of the steamship company by which, for some trifle, these goods are not taken across the water but are taken out and disposed of to the merchants of St. John and other places. In that way the merchant profits by the difference between the through-rate and the local rate to St. John, which amounts to something considerable. I understand that this practice is carried on to a very considerable extent not only in our Canadian seaports but in American seaports as well. I think the minister could make his department, if he intends remaining in it, one of the most beneficial in the whole service to the public, if he would take hold of these freight rates, both through-rates and rates in bond and make comparisons, and publish them to the shippers of the country.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice in the contract which was read that the minister has the right to make a maximum freight rate. Has he done so?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. As a rule these people have all been complaining that the route is not a profitable one, and that the rates they maintain are so low that they can hardly make the two ends meet. From inquiries I have made I think that for some time, until a trade is built up, it will hardly be advisable to exercise that power. I have made careful inquiry into the question. Hon. gentlemen will understand, without dwelling on the subject, which is one of some delicacy, that to attempt to build up our winter ports has its difficulties. They are at a longer distance from the Canadian centres of production than the American ports, and we must make some considerable concessions in order to draw trade of that nature. Take the case of goods going from Montreal. If they go to Portland, it is scarcely 300 miles; if they go to St. John by the Canadian Pacific Railway, it is 500 miles; if they go from Halifax I think it is about 750 miles by the shortest possible route from Montreal. These are geological difficulties, and can be palliated by legislation but cannot be removed. Up to the present time I think there has been a gratifying increase in trade from

the maritime provinces, particularly from St. John. Still, trade has to be conducted under a good many difficulties, some of which we hope to remove. Some of those difficulties are discrimination in the matter of insurance, which is higher than it ought to be. Still we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that we are working to some extent, I must say, against natural obstacles, and therefore we have not attempted to cut down the rates that they can obtain.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that if it be found that less rates are charged to American shippers than to Canadian shippers the government would be justified in making a maximum rate above which they should not charge Canadian shippers, because we pay a portion of the cost of running those lines, whereas the Americans pay no portion.

Mr. CLARKE. I make bold to say that if the right hon. gentleman will instruct the officers of his department to make inquiry as to through-rates from the New England states, and the through-rates from Chicago to Liverpool and Glasgow, he will find that the statements made here are fully borne out by his officers. If that is found to be the case, I think it deserves the serious attention of the right hon. gentleman and that he should see that such discrimination no longer continues against Canadian shippers.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That will be a matter for the House seriously to consider. But absolutely to refuse American goods coming to our various ports is a thing I would hesitate to recommend to the House.

Mr. CLARKE. I point out the anomaly, that we continue to pay these subsidies when they are practically used against us.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is quite true that from such points as Chicago, where there is a vigorous competition for European trade, the anomaly does exist.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The question is not without difficulties, some of which have been pointed out by the right hon. gentleman. But I should hardly think they point to the necessity of a prohibition of the vessels from carrying American goods at those rates. The position of the right hon. gentleman seems to be this, that if you fix rates from Chicago equal to those which are paid from corresponding Canadian points, the result would be that having strong competition from Chicago, you would not get the cargo which is now procured. That would seem to be the position of the right hon. gentleman. No doubt many complicated matters have to be considered, to some of which he has alluded, that is to say, that if you do not take this freight which is offered from Chicago you increase the cost, it may be argued, to Canadian shippers, because you take that much away from the net earnings of the vessels crossing the Atlantic. However that may be, it certainly does seem an anomaly that while the Canadian government is paying a certain subsidy to these steamships—in this case it happens to be about $15,000 a year, but the same principle would apply to cases where the subsidy is much greater—it does seem to me an anomaly at least, whether it can be corrected to the advantage of the country or not, that Canadian shippers should pay on that line subsidized by their own money a higher rate of freight than that which is paid from corresponding points in the United States. I think my right hon. friend recognizes that as an anomaly.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I admit it, but my hon. friend will also recognize the difficulties that I have pointed out. You are between Scylla and Charybdis, very often, in matters of this kind.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Something like it is presented in the transportation problem which has been investigated by the United States Railway Commissioners. This subject has also evidently been under the consideration of this government in drafting the Railway Commission Bill which we had this year, because it is obvious that certain provisions in that Bill contemplated circumstances of this kind. I think the right hon. gentleman should take the representations of my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Clarke) into careful consideration, and ascertain whether it is possible to remove this great anomaly, one which must be considered a grievance by Canadian shippers, because they naturally feel that there is no reason why they should pay higher rates on these lines subsidized by their own money than are paid by United States exporters.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is quite true, and the matter deserves consideration. But my hon. friend has incidentally struck on the real difficulty which besets, both the Interstate Commission in the United States, and which will beset our own commissioners when they come to deal with the question of deciding what is to be done with the rates charged from competitive points. You see at Chicago you are within 800 miles of the ocean via New York, and a little longer to Boston, and not much longer to Baltimore. You are at the same time, if I recollect right, at a distance of 1,250 miles to St. John. I am not quite certain of the distance, but it is several hundred miles longer to St. John; and if you turn away the freight which you can get from that quarter, you produce results which I have pointed out to my hon. friend from Toronto—we will have to pay a much larger subsidy if we deprive ourselves of the chance of getting a certain amount of freight from competitive points.

Mr. SPROULE. Coming back now to item 95—steam service between Canada and Australia—is that subsidy practically payable to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is a separate company which runs these vessels. The New Zealand Steamship Company is subsidized by the New Zealand government and by the Fiji government as well as by ourselves.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems to be a new item.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The reason is that heretofore it has been in the statute, but the statute expired last year, and we have not renewed the statutory provision.

Mr. CLARKE. You are making an increase of $50,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Why ? Are you getting any improvement in the service ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We are getting a little better service, but the fact is that we could not have the service performed for the amount formerly given. The parties refused to perform the service for the old subsidy.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the improvement in the service which justifies the addition of $50,000 to the subsidy ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They are giving us a better class of vessels than formerly, but the chief reason is that they distinctly declined to go on with the service for the old subsidy. We had either to pay more or to drop the whole thing. As the trade is increasing very largely, I did not feel justified in refusing, particularly as the Australian government, who are in favour of maintaining amicable relations, strongly advised us to pay a little more, and intimated their willingness to pay more.

Mr. CLARKE. What portion did the Australian government pay before and what do they pay now?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They are paying £4,000 additional and we are paying £10,000.

Mr. CLARKE. What does Fiji pay ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Fiji pays some £2,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Is that a new subsidy to the line ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, they always paid a little.

Mr. CLARKE. Is their contribution increased ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There is a trifling increase.

Mr. CLARKE. Does New Zealand pay anything ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. New Zealand was paying something, but we dropped that subsidy, because the New Zealand service added a very considerable length of time to the trips.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Are the boats not calling at New Zealand ports ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Not at present.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Why not ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Because they were not willing to pay the subsidy.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If they were getting no advantage out of it, I do not see why they should pay, but if we were getting any benefit out of it we should have the boats call at New Zealand ports.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Calling at New Zealand ports added considerably to the length of the trip.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I have had the privilege of travelling over the route two or three times, I know all about the distance, and I know that it would not take very much time to call at New Zealand ports. Do boats call at Brisbane ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I venture to say that the extra distance would not be so great that it would add very much to the length of the trip. A very large trade can be worked up with New Zealand. New Zealand is going to be in the near future the British island of the southern hemisphere and I would be very sorry if any action were taken on the part of this government, even if the New Zealand government do not see their way clear to contributing towards this subsidy, which would result in taking these steamers off the New Zealand line.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It would take a couple of days to go to New Zealand, and that is a matter of considerable importance.

Mr. SPROULE. How is it that this subsidy is not payable to the Canadian Pacific Railway ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Because they do not own the boats.

Mr. SPROULE. I see here in their statement the 'Empress of India, the 'Empress of China,' &c., for the service of which steamers they receive a subsidy.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is the Japan subsidy. That is under the statute. It has nothing to do with this service.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What boats perform this service ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The 'Aorangi,' the 'Miowera' and the 'Moana.'

Mr. SPROULE. What number of trips do they make? Do they make a trip every month ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Every four weeks.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are they provided with cold storage

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN Halifax). Of an efficient character ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am told so.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The right hon. minister said a moment ago that they were going to provide newer and better steamers.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They have some better steamers than they had before.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What ones ? They have the same old steamers.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The 'Warimoo' was on before, and they have put another vessel in her place.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The right hon. minister told us a moment ago that the 'Warrimoo' was still on.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, I said the 'Moana.'

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Would the right hon. minister read the names over ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The 'Aorangi, the 'Miowera' and the 'Moana.' The 'Warrimoo' was withdrawn, and a larger vessel took her place.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I see a report in the papers that the Canadian Pacific Railway were proposing to take off the Japan steamers, the 'Empress of Japan' and the others, that they were going to put a larger class of boats on that route and that they were going to place the present Japan boats on the Australian route.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not think so. Unless they make some agreement with the New Zealand Steamship Company they cannot very well do that.

Mr. CLARKE. Two of the three vessels named by the right hon. minister have been performing that service for years. There has only been one vessel put on.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, it was simply because they refused to perform this service unless we increased the subsidy that we have made this addition.

Mr. CLARKE. We had to increase the subsidy or the service would be dropped—is that the situation ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Steamer service between Paspebiac and Gaspé Basin during the months of December, 1903 and January, 1904, $3,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is an attempt to give a winter service to that section of the country for a couple of months longer. The original grant is $12,500, but we only paid $11,500 to the end of November, so that now, although I am asking for $3,000 more, it will only really cost us $2,000 more. It will give an additional service during December and January.

Mr. CLARKE. The experience in navigating these waters in November and December will be of some value in determining whether it is possible to navigate the lower St. Lawrence during the entire winter ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, this is a tentative vote, and I hope it will prove useful in that respect.

Additional for steam service between Victoria and west coast of Vancouver Island, $2,500.

Mr. CLARKE. What about this ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is a service which we are giving along the west coast of the island of Vancouver. We are getting a larger and better steamer and we are proposing to give the company $2,500 more for it.

Mr. SPROULE. How much do they get now?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. $2,500. They go along the west coast as far north as Cape Scott, and call at a variety of ports along the coast. The people have no other means of communication except by steamers.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the right hon. minister recollect the name of the new steamer?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have not the name of it, but they have agreed to have a larger steamer placed on the service.

Mr. SPROULE. Then the aggregate subsidy will be $5,000?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Additional for steam service during the year 1903 between St. Stephen, N.B., Ste. Croix river points, Deer Island, Campbello, Passamaquoddy bay and L'Etete or Black bay, $1,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We have heretofore been paying $2,000 for this service, but it has been represented to me very strongly for some years back that it cannot be done at that rate, and we have agreed to give $3,000 in the future.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any improvement in the service or in the frequency of the service ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, the service will not be increased in frequency, although the steamer will call at two or three more places. But they really could not perform the service for the sum that was provided before.

Mr. FOWLER. You are increasing the subsidy ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, from $2,000 to $3,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there going to be a more frequent service ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, I cannot say it will be much more frequent, although they have done more than their contract provides for.

Mr. CLARKE. How many trips does the contract provide for?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They are semi-weekly.

Mr. FOWLER. Is a better steamer being put on ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They have a somewhat better steamer, but the real fact is that they were going behind all the time. We could not expect them to perform the service for the same subsidy. They represented to me that they have been running the steamer for the last three years at a dead loss, and, from the best evidence I could obtain, I found that their statement was true.

Steam service between St. Catherine's bay and Tadousac during the winter of 1903-1904, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There is a good deal of settlement going on now along the north shore of the St. Lawrence, and heretofore they have had nothing but a canoe service.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where is St. Catherine's Bay ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is on the St. Lawrence, on the eastern entrance to the Saguenay river.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this an experimental vote ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the distance between St. Catherine's bay and Tadousac ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The distance is not very great. Quite a number of new industries have been established and quite a number of complaints have been made as to the means of communication, and it is said that this ferry across the mouth of the Saguenay is indispensable.

Mr. CLARKE. How many trips will be made ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They will make as many trips as they can in a day. The distance is about a mile or a mile and a half.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What county is St. Catherine's bay in ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Chicoutimi and Saguenay. The people who are on the east side of the Saguenay, when going to Quebec, have to drive up on one shore to St. Alphonse, cross on the ice there, and come down the other shore when they are going to Quebec. It is hoped that this ferry will save about 70 miles of a journey. Messrs. Price Brothers have an important lumber industry at St. Catherine's bay, and they are willing to make the experiment this winter with their steamer, in consideration of this subsidy.

Mr. FOWLER. It would seem that this is a service which should be performed by the government. The ferries are not run by the Dominion government.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Ferry licenses are under the control of the federal government on navigable waters.

Mr. FOWLER. On the St. John river, the ferries are subsidized not by the Dominion government but by the local government. There is a ferry in my own constituency at Milledgeville and that is entirely kept up by the local government. It does seem to me that the province which the Minister of Justice represents, is singularly favoured inasmuch as these services are performed by the Dominion government in that province, which have to be performed by the provincial governments in other provinces. I quite understand how important it is to the people of this section to have this ferry; I have no fault to find with that, but it does seem to me that it is a service that should be performed by the provincial government of Quebec rather than by the federal government.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The question of the ferry at Quebec was under the consideration of our courts and it was decided—and no one has disputed it—that that service was strictly under the control of the federal government, and that we could give licenses for ferries to cross the St. Lawrence on the same principle that we give

authority to construct a bridge. Quite recently the question has come up in Ontario—

Mr. CLARKE. With regard to Sault Ste. Marie.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The provincial government issued a license, and it was found to be of no value.

Mr. SPROULE. That was an international matter, and there is no comparison.

Mr. FOWLER. I should certainly think that no ferry, such as this at St. Catherine's should have a subsidy.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The ferryman has as good a right as any one else to use navigable waters as a public highway, and the only question remaining is, who should assist him. The ferry from Halifax to Dartmouth, crossing navigable waters, is established altogether under provincial enactments. We have various ferries throughout our province, over navigable waters, and those that are assisted at all are assisted by the provincial government.

For services of the steamer 'Lord Strathcona' and wrecking plant on the St. Lawrence for the year ending June 30, 1904, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is for the maintenance of a steamer which is held in readiness to be called to the assistance of any vessel that gets into trouble on the St. Lawrence.

Mr. CLARKE. In how many cases were steamers assisted ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Some four or five vessels were assisted.

Mr. CLARKE. How does the record of the present season compare with the previous season, so far as accidents are concerned ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Within the last two or three months it has been better, but in the early part of the season the number was quite up to the average, I am sorry to say.

Mr. CLARKE. Might I ask the right hon. minister, what steps are being taken to improve the situation ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has been exerting himself in that direction, in the way of better lighting, better telegraph communication and other things which I hope will have a beneficial effect.

Mr. CLARKE. Have there been any reductions in insurance rates as a result of these exertions ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Not as yet. Unfortunately this spring there were a considerable number of disasters in the lower St. Lawrence and they have made that an excuse for keeping the rates up.

Mr. CLARKE. I notice considerable correspondence in the London 'Times' from Lloyds and others, respecting the St. Lawrence route, and suggesting that it is not at all satisfactory. It is rather humiliating to Canadians to read such statements, and I am quite sure that if any reasonable expenditure were asked by the government, to improve the system of pilotage, and lighting, and for wrecking apparatus, it would be most cheerfully granted by this parliament.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. All these things are being attended to at the present time by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He is extremely anxious to make the navigation of the St. Lawrence as perfect as it can be, and I hope he will succeed in doing that to a very great extent; but it cannot be done at once.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to say that he had some information from Lloyds, that if the aids to navigation were improved they were likely to consider a reduction in the insurance rates.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I would be in hopes, that result would come.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is the minister taking any steps to have pilots who know their business, placed on these steamers ? I have no hesitation in saying, that as a rule these pilots do not know their business, and I think that is the universal verdict of shippers and every one else.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has taken over the pilots between Montreal and Quebec, but not between Quebec and below.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). And below too.

Additional for salaries of inspectors, deputy inspectors and other employees under the General Inspection and Manitoba Grain Acts, $12,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMI may state briefly that this demand arises simply from the fact that the business of inspection has increased very largely, but, on the other hand, the receipts have also increased. We had an expenditure of $66,000 but collected fees to the extent of $88,000 so that the revenue will not be any the worse for the additional expenditure which is now asked for.

Mr. CLARKE. Have the official weighers been appointed and the grain standards decided for the year ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We have now before the House a Bill for extending the provisions of the Inspection Act and providing official weighers for the district east of Manitoba. We

cannot appoint any weighers in Ontario until that Bill is passed.

Mr. CLARKE. But action has been taken in the matter.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There is a Bill on the Order paper which I introduced.

Mr. CLARKE. The grain standards have been fixed before this.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Some resolutions reported.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

SUPPLY—COST OF CENSUS.

The PRIME MINISTER moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. RICHARD BLAIN. (Peel). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I wish to move an amendment which reads as follows :

That all the words after 'that' to the end of the question be left out and the following substituted therefor :—The expenditure in connection with the taking of the census for the year 1881 was $511,550 for a population of 4,324,810 ; that the expenditure in connection with the taking of the census for the year 1891 was $549,991.76 for a population of 4,833,239 ; that the expenditure in connection with the taking of the census for the year 1901 is $1,198,268.99 for a population of 5,371,315 and the accounts for the census year 1901 have not all been paid.

That in the opinion of this House the said expenditure for the year 1901 is excessive and extravagant.

You will notice by the figures contained in the resolution that the increase in the population, as shown by the census of 1901 over that of 1891, was 538,076 and the increase of the cost of taking the census for 1901 over that of 1891 was $648,277.23. You will observe by these figures, Mr. Speaker, that it cost considerably more than twice as much to take the census in 1901 as in 1891. In looking over the debates of parliament I see that when the items for the payment of the accounts of the census of 1881 were up for discussion the Reform party, who were in opposition at that time, strongly condemned the Liberal-Conservative government then in power because of what they called the extravagant expenditure. In 1891 when the census of that year was up before parliament for discussion the same thing occurred. Some hon. gentlemen who now occupy government positions were then sitting on this side of the House and they used very strong language in condemning the Conservative government for the extraordinary expenditure and the inaccuracy of the census taken in that year. On looking over that debate we would naturally expect that if the time should arrive when these gentlemen should come into office, as they did in 1896, a new condition of things would prevail. We naturally expected that when they came into office some of the pledges they gave to the people of Canada in respect to economy of administration would certainly be put in operation. In so far as expenditure in taking the census of 1901 is concerned the manner in which the promises were fulfilled was very disappointing to the people of Canada and it is for that reason and some others, that I propose to move the resolution that I now place in your hands. We would naturally expect, Mr. Speaker, that some advancement would be made by the Parliament of Canada during ten years of Canada's prosperity. We would naturally expect that this government in 1901 would be able to apply some new rules in advance of those adopted by the Liberal-Conservative government in 1891. As you know, a great many changes have taken place during these ten years and it would be expected that the Minister of Agriculture would be able to take advantage of some of the municipal advancement that has taken place in the different provinces and apply these rules to the taking of the census in 1901. I wish to give an illustration in this respect. In the county I have the honour to represent there is a township called Toronto township. It was assessed by the municipal corporation in 1901 at a cost of $135 which was paid by the municipal council. Two assessors were appointed for that municipality in the year 1901, and I wish to point out, Mr. Speaker, what the assessors' duties are in the province of Ontario—I am not so familiar with the other provinces—the instructions are very complete the assessor on entering a house enumerates everything that is there. Let me read for illustration some of the schedules in the assessors' roll for the municipalities in Ontario. In column 22 he takes down the number of cattle upon the farm ; in column 23, the number of sheep ; in column 24, the number of hogs ; in column 25, the number of horses ; in column 26, the number of births.

I could go through a large number of colmuns put into the assessor's hands as he commences his duties in the spring of each year. If you look over the schedules placed in the hands of the enumerators, when the census was taken in 1901, you would see a very large number of columns like those I have read. When I remember that in that very spring of the year 1901, the people in every municipality of Ontario were called upon to pay their assessors for taking down these items, I find it strange that the hon. Minister of Agriculture did not take advantage of their services, and thus cheapen the cost of taking the Dominion census. I would not venture so far as to say that a complete copy of the assessment rolls would be sufficient for the Dominion census ; but what I do say is that if every ten years the Dominion

government were to place the additional schedules in the hands of each of the assessors in Ontario, each assessor would be able to give the government a complete and accurate census of every municipality in that province for a great deal less money than was spent in 1901. I repeat that it cost the municipality $135 to assess the township I refer to in 1901. That assessment was done by two assessors; but when the Minister of Agriculture went to take the census in that township he put on nine enumerators, where two did the work for the municipality, and it cost this government, not $135, but $433.45. The increase in the number of enumerators was seven, and the increase in the cost was $298.45, and the population in each was the same, 5,208. I throw out the suggestion for the benefit of whoever may fill the position of Minister of Agriculture when the time comes to take another census. I think that some of the assessor's work, in the province of Ontario at least, should be utilized in the taking of our census. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture made a statement, during the discussion of these census items last session, that a great many more questions were asked in 1901 than at the previous census. That may be true, but many of those questions were altogether unnecessary. There were questions that did not bring out any valuable information, and some very important questions were omitted. For instance, in the columns which the enumerators had placed in their hands, there was no column for fallow land I asked the hon. minister why there was no such column, and he replied because there is not much fallow land in Canada. Surely that must have been a reply made in haste, for if he is at all conversant with the agricultural interests in Ontario, if he knows anything of that interest in other parts of this country, he must know that there is a very large quantity of fallow land. You cannot travel through any part of the province of Ontario, but you will find that on almost every hundred acres there are from ten to fifteen acres of fallow land each year. Let me ask my hon. friends from Ontario, who belong to the legal profession, what they find when drawing up leases. They will say that there is generally a clause providing that the tenant, when the lease expires, must have ten or fifteen acres fallow land. Why is that put in? Is it because there is no fallow land in Ontario? No, but because there is a large quantity of fallow land in that province. I asked my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) the other day what about fallow land in Manitoba and the Territories. He said: We fallow a great deal of land in Manitoba and the Territories; it would be difficult for us to seed it down, because we do not want hay, as we have more than we can use, and no market particularly for it. Therefore the only possible way by which we can clean our land from weeds is to leave it fallow. Any gentleman who has travelled through Manitoba and the Territories will see thousands of acres which are under fallow. Yet, notwithstanding that, my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture tells us that the reason he put no column for fallow land in the census of 1901 was because there is very little fallow land in Canada. He may say that is not important, but to my mind it is. If it is important to put a schedule in the hands of the enumerators, showing the number of acres of wheat and oats, why is it not equally important that we should have a record of the number of acres in fallow? If a gentleman who wished to engage in agricultural pursuits in Canada were to take up the census returns, and if he were an advanced agriculturist, he would ask whether the farmers of the Dominion were forgetting what is the best means of cleaning the soil of weeds, not finding any fallow land in the census columns, he would conclude that the Canadian agriculturist did not know his business. Everybody knows that it is important for the farmer who wants to keep his farm in good condition and clean from weeds to have some fallow land. I wish now very briefly to give a table of counties in Ontario, so as to make a comparison between the cost of taking the census of 1891 and that of taking the census in 1901. I take six counties in the well-settled portion of the province. In 1891, the figures with regard to these counties were as follows:

SIX COUNTIES—CENSUS OF 1891.

County.	Population.	Cost.	Number of Enumerators.
Halton..	21,982	$1,444 98	16
South Perth ..	19,400	1,332 40	24
Peel..	15,466	1,102 03	18
Cardwell	15,382	1,102 94	16
Prince Edward.	18,889	1,390 25	23
Bothwell	25,593	1,767 74	27
	116,712	$8,140 34	124

In 1901 the figures were as follows:

SIX COUNTIES—CENSUS OF 1901.

County.	Population.	Cost.	Number of Enumerators.
Halton..	19,545	$2,488 94	32
South Perth ..	17,861	2,469 30	33
Peel..	13,687	1,967 31	24
Cardwell	13,060	1,956 88	27
Prince Edward.	17,864	2,402 16	36
Bothwell	25,223	3,539 81	48
	107,240	$14,824 40	200

A comparison of these figures will show that in every case there has been a decrease of population, and yet an increase of cost of taking the census and an increase in the number of enumerators employed:

SIX COUNTIES—COMPARISON OF 1891 AND 1901.

County.	Decrease in Population.	Increased Cost.	Increased Enumerators.
Halton..	2,437	$1,043 96	16
South Perth ..	1,539	1,136 90	9
Peel..	1,779	865 28	6
Cardwell	2,322	853 94	11
Prince Edward.	1,025	1,011 91	13
Bothwell	370	1,772 07	21
	9,472	$6,684 06	76

So it will be seen that under the Liberal-Conservative government, the wickedness of which, in always finding offices for its supporters, hon. gentlemen opposite are never tired of dwelling upon, offices to the number of 124 were filled in connection with the taking of the census of 1891 in these six counties. But under the present government, and in connection with the census of 1901, the offices were increased to 200, or 76 more than under the Liberal-Conservative government. I see my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Heyd) in his place. Let me give the figures with regard to his riding. In 1901 the cost of taking the census there was $2,683.52, the population being 26,707. In 1891 the expenditure was $1,488.78, and the population 23,357. It will be observed that in this case the population increased by 3,348 and the cost of taking the census by $1,194.74. I am one of those who believe and expect that the cost of taking the census in 1901 would be more than it was in 1891. But I do not quite understand that any of these central counties in the province of Ontario—and the same applies to almost every county in Canada—where there are fewer people, it should cost so much more, in some cases nearly double, to take the census. I am a little suspicious that there has been some political influence at work. This is not always charged against my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture, but I rather think that in this case he is guilty. In looking over the returns for the county of my hon. friend from East Peterborough (Mr. Lang), I notice some explanatory correspondence. We would naturally expect that a business government, proposing to take a census, would carefully prepare a statement of the enumerators' duties, have it put in the form of a circular and sent to all the parties interested; and that, having made a careful arrangement as regards the duties of the enumerators, they would be able to decide the basis on which those enumerators should be paid. But this is not the case in the county of my hon. friend. The commissioner in East Peterborough put in his account and payment was refused. Some vouchers were not forthcoming. They were not very particular about vouchers in many cases, I must say. There was some little difficulty about the items in East Peterborough, and my hon. friend (Mr. Lang) wrote some letters to the department. And in the statement given by the department of the Minister of Agriculture the following memorandum appeared: 'In view of the letter from Mr. Lang, a revision of the account has been made. The accountant has used his discretion in allowing board items, and this might be explained to Mr. Lang in writing to him.' That looks like political influence, does it not? The Minister of Agriculture says: I discharge my duties without regard to political parties. Yet, when an account comes into the hon. gentleman's department and the payment of it is refused, my hon. friend (Mr. Lang) writes on behalf of his supporter, and, as soon as the letter is received, the word goes, 'pay the account.' Why? Because it was a just account? Was that the reason? If so, why was it not paid without my hon. friend's intervention? The Department of Agriculture prepared the statement laying down the duties of the enumerators and giving full instructions, so that accounts might be put in correct. But my hon. friend interceded, all that was necessary was some political interference, and as soon as my hon. friend wrote a letter to the department it was all right, and the account was paid.

Mr. COCHRANE. That was for board.

Mr. BLAIN. In looking over the items, I find one for over $2,000 for telegrams sent out to the enumerators. Why was it necessary, within a month after the instructions were given, to pay $2,000 for telegrams? Was it because the minister had taken pains to prepare and issue correct instructions? No, it was because the instructions that were sent out were in some cases incorrect, and the minister had to telegraph all through the country to the commissioners in the different counties, at a cost to the people of Canada of over $2,000, in less than six weeks. But that was not all, for when these enumerators were called together they were in some cases kept from two and three and five days awaiting their instructions from the government under this hon. gentleman. Let me read a paragraph that will throw some light upon it. In the county of East Peterborough, John Kerr, was commissioner. In writing to the department about his account, he makes this statement over his own signature:

> You will see that considerable expense has been incurred for which neither the enumerators or myself were responsible, on account of the necessary books and papers not being received on time.

Who would be responsible for that? Surely that could not be blamed upon the hon. gentleman who represents the county, nor upon the enumerators or commissioners. These men were called together at central points from different parts of the county, and when they got there they were kept in the leading hotels at the cost to the country

because the papers had not been sent out on time. Another item in that letter says :

James Pengelby and Charles O'Reilly of Norwood should each be allowed six days. They were both here for three days the first week. But as the papers had not been received and they had to return the next week for two days.

That is, they waited for three days for instructions after being called together. I wish to make the statement that in my opinion there has been some negligence—shall I say some political interference ? I leave the House to judge on that point. Now, I wish to refer to the county of North Hastings. Mr. Kelly was commissioner for that county, and he had a very large bill, amounting to $653.14. He put in his bill, but there was some little dispute about it, and it was not paid at the moment. So Mr. Kelly says : 'I will get after this government.' Of course he understood what kind of ammunition was required to reach the minister, and he says : 'My plan would be to get a leading Reformer in my county.' And he sought out the nominee of the Reform party for the local legislature in that county, Mr. Lott, and Mr. Kelly and Mr. Lott came down to Ottawa after payment of the account had been refused, Mr. Speaker—these gentlemen came down, and Mr. Lott used his local political influence with the Minister of Agriculture. The two gentlemen came down together, and interviewed the minister. Here is Mr. Kelly's letter to the Minister of Agriculture, I will only read one paragraph :

When I met you in the House of Commons on Thursday last in company with Mr. Lott.

It is proved over this gentleman's own signature that he came down to Ottawa in company with the Reform nominee for the local legislature for that county, and they interviewed the Minister of Agriculture. With what result ? That is the important point. No one can complain of that gentleman coming down to interview the Minister of Agriculture, that of course would be part of his political duty ; but when the country has to pay for this interview, then the opposition have a right to complain. Now what was the result? Listen to the letter written after he went home to the Minister of Agriculture, dated at Marmora, 24th March, in which he says :

The Ontario elections are coming off the end of May or the beginning of June. Mr. B. O. Lott is the unanimous choice of the Liberal convention. I have made up my mind to do some hard work in this north riding of Hastings. Mr. Lott is the best canvasser and the hardest worker ever went into a political contest.

I have the honour to remain, your old servant,

WM. KELLY.

He seems to have had a good deal of political familiarity with the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Now what was the result of the interview ? As soon as the minister gets that letter from Mr. Kelly, the account is rectified, and a letter goes forward from the department to pay him. When was it rectified ? is the question I would like to have answered. If the account was a correct one put in by Mr. Kelly for $653.14, the commissioner for the county, if that account was in accordance with the schedule of prices laid down by the minister in giving his instructions to the commissioner and the enumerators, then my hon. friend should have paid the account at once, there should have been no dispute, Mr. Kelly had a right to his money. But let the House take note—just as soon as they brought this political influence to bear, indeed, almost before that hon. gentleman reached his home, a letter went out from the department to pay the account and Mr. Kelly got his money.

Mr. CLARKE. The Minister of Agriculture threw up his hands.

Mr. BLAIN. Well, he threw up the purse of Canada for the amount I have mentioned. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is about all I have to say. I could go on and give many more instances, because I have made an extended investigation of the different counties. What I have to say is, in the first place, that the people of Canada expected better things from the hon. gentleman.

Mr. COCHRANE. They don't know him as well as we do.

Mr. BLAIN. Well, they will know him better soon, I suppose. The complaint we make is that when these hon. gentlemen were sitting on this side of the House in 1881 and 1891, they strongly denounced the Liberal-Conservative government for taking the census at such an extravagant cost, and we are surprised now, as the people of Canada must be surprised, to find that after these economical gentlemen get into office and come to take the census, they pay for it double the price that the Conservative government paid, although there is but a small increase in the population. We complain that the census taken by this government, so far as the agricultural interests are concerned, is an incomplete census, and it does not come up to the requirements of the country. We make this charge moreover against the hon. gentleman, that in regard to some of these accounts at least, the hon. gentleman has weakened, and has yielded to political influence, and has done what otherwise he would not have done, and should not have done in the interests of the country. We charge that political influence has been exercised upon the department, I do not know how far it has been carried. But we have found some instances where political influence was brought to bear, and I suppose if we carried our investigations further we would find many other instances. We say that we condemn this government for this excessive expenditure. We say further that some more advanced methods should be adopted, that these hon.

gentlemen should have learned something during the ten years from 1891 to 1901, that they should have profited by the advanced methods that have been adopted by the different municipalities in Canada and that they should have applied them to the taking of the census. In this country the functions of government overlap. Assessors are employed in every municipality in the province of Ontario, and they take the municipal census. This government came forward and they increase the number of men employed even in those counties where the population has decreased, but the time has come when the people expect the government shall make some advance in the matter of the taking of the census. I am not quite sure that the hon. Minister of Agriculture will occupy that position at the end of the next decennial period.

Mr. HOLMES. Oh, yes, he will.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) says 'yes he will.'

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand). And he is quite correct.

Mr. BLAIN. I congratulate these hon. gentlemen upon their opinion. Well, we differ about that. I would like my hon. friend from Haldimand and Monck (Mr. Thompson) and my hon. friend from West Huron to go back to their counties and try to give an explanation to the electors how it is that this so-called economical government found it necessary to expend so much more money to take the census in 1901 than was expended in 1891.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand). We will be there.

Mr. BLAIN. If the hon. gentleman applies the test of municipal government to his county he will find that the methods of this government will meet with general condemnation from the electors. I would expect that hon. gentlemen opposite would vote for this resolution. It is a mild condemnation of the extravagance of the government in connection with the taking of the census in 1901 as compared with the cost of the taking of the census of 1891. I beg therefore, Mr. Speaker, to move the amendment which I have read.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). Mr. Speaker, I must compliment my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) on the shortness of his speech at all events and I will try and emulate him in that respect. At this late date of the session, I do not think it is necessary for us to thresh out and repeat the discussion that took place in the earlier part of the session on this question. My hon. friend has made a serious reflection upon this government on the ground that the expenses in connection with taking the census of 1901 is excessive in comparison especially with the cost of taking the census of 1891. In general terms I would have to very shortly state that if the expense was very much greater the work of taking the census was also very much greater in consequence of two or three facts which nobody can dispute. The expense of doing the same amount of work in the year 1901 was more than in the year 1891, because, in the former year, the cost of labour, the cost of living and of everything in connection with all kinds of work in Canada was decidedly greater. I am not able at the moment, speaking from memory, to say what the proportionate cost of labour and living would be in each of these respective years, but, without going into the details, I am safe, I think, in saying that the tariff of rates established for the payment of the census workers in 1901 was fixed on a basis which was comparatively fair in order to give the people employment in taking the census, a fair amount of pay for the same amount of work they performed in 1891. In 1891, the enumerators of the census were paid at the rate of three cents for each name they took, three cents for each death they enumerated, fifteen cents for each farm the details of which they enumerated, and twenty cents for each factory, the details of which they enumerated. In 1901, we established the following rates: Five cents for each person enumerated, five cents for each death enumerated, twenty-five cents for each farm and thirty cents for each factory.

Mr. HENDERSON. How much for each farm?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Twenty-five cents.

Mr. CLARKE. That is an increase of 60 per cent?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Roughly speaking, between 70 and 60 per cent. I may say that this schedule of rates was carefully considered before the work of taking the census was commenced. It was discussed with those who seemed to have knowledge in such matters and it was agreed upon as a fair rate to be paid for the work to be done. It was agreed upon without any reference as to how it would work out or as to what the totals might be when the census work in toto was paid for. It was established on the ground that a fair day's work should be got and a fair day's wages should be earned by the person doing the work for the country, and, I may say here, at once, that to a large extent the increased cost of enumeration was due to the increase in the schedule of rates.

Mr. CLARKE. What proportion of the total cost does the cost of enumeration amount to?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The enumeration of the census of 1901 up to the present time has cost $878,000. Had the rates of pay been the same in 1891 as the tariff in 1901, the census of 1891 would

have cost $767,000 making allowance for the increase of population or only $111,000, while the information obtained in 1901 through the 657 questions as compared with the 216 questions in 1891 is infinitely greater and well worth this $111,000 extra expense.

Mr. CLARKE. What about the other expenditures ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That was in the schedule of rates, but in addition to that we found it was necessary to make an allowance for horse-hire and days of instruction. We paid for the days of instruction, which was entirely apart from the pay under the schedule rates, and which was exclusive of the time occupied in the direct taking of the census. The horse-hire was due almost entirely to the desire to have the census taken more rapidly, and the work put through so as to get the returns in with greater speed. That object was also aimed at by the rule that we should take a census enumerator for each polling sub-division instead of for a larger area. That of course involved a greater number of persons to be instructed, and consequent increased cost. The result was a much more rapid taking of the census and we believe it was worth some sacrifice to attain that end.

Mr. CLARKE. Is the work of the census completed yet ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am speaking now altogether of the enumeration, and that was completed long ago. We had also the fact that certain unorganized districts were enumerated in 1901, and were not taken into the count at all in 1891. That is not only the case with regard to the far off Yukon and the northern parts of our territory, but it also refers to districts in organized territories, and even in the old provinces of Ontario and Quebec, which were counted in 1901, but which in 1891 were simply estimated in the office here at Ottawa. In the census of 1901, the whole country, whether thickly or sparsely settled, was taken into the actual count, and the census of 1901 is a de jure count of the population of the Dominion, whereas the census of 1891, with respect to a large area of our North-west Territories, a considerable area of partially organized territory, and a considerable area of the province of Ontario, was merely an estimate made in Ottawa, and was no census at all. This added materially to the cost of the enumeration in 1901.

Mr. CLARKE. How much ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot say exactly how much, but the hon. gentleman will understand that the taking of the census in the older portions of Canada was easy and inexpensive, compared with the counting of the population in these remote districts. The fishery enumeration in 1891 cost $2,245, and in 1901 it cost nearly $14,000. As a matter of fact the fishery enumeration in 1891 was so inefficient that the figures were thrown aside and no compilation made of them, whereas in 1901 the information is carefully compiled and will be valuable for future reference to the people of Canada.

Mr. CLARKE. Can the minister tell the difference between the cost of taking the census in Prince Edward Island in 1891 and in 1901 ? There are no remote or sparsely settled districts in that province ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not the figures at hand with regard to Prince Edward Island, separately. In consequence of the desire to get earlier returns we had to employ a larger number of enumerators which involved, of course, greater expense.

Mr. SPROULE. What urgency was there for an earlier return than in the case of the previous census ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The answer is obvious, that the sooner we can get these statistics the more valuable they are. If we are to drag along for nearly the whole time between the two censuses without getting these returns, they are of comparatively little value.

Mr. SPROULE. Were the returns available for the public use earlier than they were in the case of the previous census ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. If the hon. gentleman has patience I will give him that information. The enumeration was to be completed within thirty days from the 31st of March. It was the duty of the commissioner to revise all schedules before transmitting them to the central office. Ten per cent of all the schedules were in before the end of April ; fifty-eight per cent before the end of May; eighty-three per cent before the end of June and ninety-five per cent before the end of July, and those that were not received before that date were in connection with the most remote districts of Canada. In 1891 only one per cent of the schedules was received before the end of April; forty-one per cent before the end of May; eighty-three per cent before the end of June and ninety-six per cent before the end of July. This shows a very considerably increased efficiency and a quicker return of the large bulk of the schedules in 1901 over 1891.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the minister repeat what percentage was returned at the end of July in 1891 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The return in July in both cases was practically the same, but that includes the ones that were sent in almost immediately, as well as those that were sent in in July, and if you take the earlier months you will find a much larger percentage in 1901 than in

1891. Naturally, at the end there are always a large number that cannot be brought in earlier, those dealing with the outlying parts of the country, but in both cases the ones that could be brought in early were brought in earlier; they were brought in early in 1901 and not so early in 1891.

Mr. CLARKE. Might I ask the minister if the schedules containing the statistics respecting manufactures are included in the schedules, the date of the return of which he has just given?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No; in all cases, both in this and the other census, there was a special enumeration with respect to manufactures.

Mr. CLARKE. Have you the dates there when the schedules with respect to manufactures were finally received by your department?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTCRE. I will inquire about that. The first volume of the census of 1891 was issued March 26th, 1893, or two years later; it comprised 424 pages. The first volume of the census of 1901 was issued in December, 1902 and comprised 561 pages, including a great deal more information and a larger number of tables than were included in the first volume of the census of 1891. The second volume of the census of 1891 was issued on November 25, 1893; the third, dealing with manufactures, on February 20th, 1895, and the fourth, including agriculture, forest products and miscellaneous, appeared February 11, 1897. Now, the second and third volumes of the census of 1901, dealing with agriculture, which was included only in the fourth volume of the census of 1891, with forest products, which was also the fourth volume of the census of 1891, and with fisheries, manufactures and mining, are now just about complete and will be in the hands of the printer next month. They include all the information that was in the second, third and fourth volumes of the census of 1891. The second volume of the census of 1891 was issued in November, 1893, about the same period as the second volume in the present census, but the third volume did not come out until two years after that, in 1895, and the fourth, dealing with agriculture, forest products and miscellaneous, not until 1897.

Now, as to bulletins. The first bulletin of the census of 1901, containing the population of some cities and towns, and also the populations of census districts for the years 1881 and 1891, is dated in August of 1891. The first bulletin of 1901, which is dated August also, gave the population by census districts, and in addition to what was given in the census of 1891, contained the number of families and the number of dwellings in each census district, together with the population of towns and cities according to their municipal boundaries. It appeared about the same date as the first bulletin in the other census, but it contained double the amount of information.

Mr. CLARKE. The first bulletin was issued about the same date?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It was issued about the same date, but it contained double the amount of information.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that the census return for 1891 did not give the families at all?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The families were not included in the bulletins; they were in the subsequent volume, which was not issued until much later.

Mr. CLARKE. The first information received was issued about the same date?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A certain proportion, about one-half of it. The bulletins of 1901 stated that in a few districts the records were incomplete.

Mr. CLARKE. You changed some figures?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Some figures were changed in both cases; the bulletins were never absolutely complete when they were issued in either case. They were compiled and issued for the information of the public from time to time, subject to revision, and in some cases subject to change. It was stated in the bulletin that they were not complete, because there were outlying districts of which the population and details were not contained in the bulletins, but that was the case in the bulletins both of 1901 and of 1891.

Mr. CLARKE. Several bulletins were issued, if my memory serves me?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Several bulletins were issued. The first bulletin of the census of 1891 was issued in August; the second, which was issued in October, gave the population of Ontario; the third, which was issued in November, gave the population of the maritime provinces by districts and sub-districts; the fourth, which was issued in December, gave the population of Quebec by districts and sub-districts; the fifth, which was issued in February, 1892, gave, by districts and sub-districts, the population of Manitoba and the North-west Territories; and the sixth, issued in February, contained a summary of the dwellings of the people.

In 1901 the first bulletin of the census was issued in August and gave the population, the number of families and the number of dwellings by census districts, together with the population of cities and towns. It contained information which was included in the sixth bulletin of the former census. The second bulletin, issued on January 20th, 1902, was delayed a little while for the full details of the information from the outlying territory.

Mr. CLARKE. When was the second bulletin issued in 1891 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In October.

Mr. CLARKE. Two months after the first ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. How many months elapsed between the first and second bulletins in 1901 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. From August to January—six months.

The second bulletin of the census of 1891 gave the population of Ontario by sub-districts, just the population of Ontario. The bulletin of the census of 1901 gave the whole population of Ontario and Manitoba, classed as rural and urban ; the population of all incorporated cities, towns and villages, situated in one census district, together with the details of population of all cities, towns and villages situated in two or more census districts.

Mr. CLARKE. Repeating what is in the first bulletin.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, it does not. The third bulletin was issued January 22nd, and gave the same details of population as the second, but gave them for Quebec and the maritime provinces.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the date of the issue of the third bulletin ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Several days later than that of the second bulletin, practically they were issued at the same time, the one dealing with Ontario and Manitoba and the other dealing with Quebec and the maritime provinces. They were issued a week apart, giving information which was not contained in any of the bulletins that were issued in the census of ten years before.

Mr. CLARKE. You struck a new line ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Quite a new line ; we struck quite a number of new lines ; if we had not, our census would have been a poor one.

The fourth gave the same information for British Columbia and the North-west Territories and the unorganized districts ; it was issued one week later. Practically those three bulletins were issued together, although they were a week apart.

Mr. CLARKE. How do the dates compare with the bulletins of 1891 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In 1891 the date of those bulletins were October, November and December, but they did not contain the information to be found in the bulletins of 1901.

Mr. CLARKE. What were the dates in 1901 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. December and January, but containing information which the other did not. No. 5 was issued on February the 21st and another two weeks later, giving the religion of the people by provinces and territories, including 142 different specified religions, together with a comparative table of the two censuses. That was not given in any of the bulletins of the former census. The seventh issued in March gave the population of the Dominion by origin, which is not to be found in any of the bulletins of the former census. Bulletin eight issued on the 30th of April, gave the immigration and birth place, which was not included in any of the bulletins of the former census. Number six gave the population of the Dominion by sex and coniugal conditions on the 24th of February. These bulletins were issued one after the other as rapidly as they could be obtained from the printer. Number seven was issued on the 12th of March, and number eight on the 30th of April. Number nine, issued on the 16th of April, gave the infirmities, also not given in any of the bulletins of the last census. Number ten, issued on the 25th of July, gave the census of the people by ages, which is not given in any of the bulletins of the former census. Number eleven, issued 24th of November, gave the agricultural statistics of Prince Edward Island—information which did not reach the people, in the census of 1891, until 1897, when four volumes of the census were issued, or six years after the information was obtained. But in the last census this information was given to the people by the bulletin of the 24th of November, 1902, or only eighteen months after it was got from the people. On the 20th of December, the bulletin was issued giving the agricultural statistics of British Columbia. The bulletin of the 13th of December gave the agricultural statistics of Nova Scotia. On the 14th of December was issued the bulletin giving the agricultural statistics of the North-west Territories. On the 15th of December we had the agricultural statistics of Manitoba, and on the 16th those of New Brunswick. We now have ready the agricultural statistics of the whole Dominion.

Mr. CLARKE. Are those of Ontario issued yet ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, nor of Quebec, but they are just going to the printer. This information was not given until after the issue of the fourth volume of the census of 1891, which was issued in 1897, or six years after the census was taken, whereas in the present instance we are giving the agricultural statistics of the Dominion within a little over two years from the time of taking the census.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman gave us the date on which a certain number of the first bulletins of the census of 1901 were

issued. He did not give the dates of the others.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I gave you all. There were six. The hon. gentleman has spoken about a compilation. A few months ago, in discussing this matter, I said that there was a considerable amount of money spent in both these census on the fishery schedules. In the census of 1891 there was a considerable amount of money spent in taking information of that character, but when it was brought into the office here, it was found so incomplete and inaccurate that it was thrown aside and never compiled. We, however, compiled the information we got. While the census of 1901 has cost double as much as that of 1891, in the census of 1901 we have got information which is valuable and accurate, whereas in 1891 we did not get much information, and what we did get was largely inaccurate, owing to the careless and cheap way in which it was taken and compiled. Those things have to be taken into consideration when we make a comparison between the two censuses.

Mr. CLARKE. Did not the hon. gentleman invite the officer who had charge of the census of 1891 to assist in the completion of the census of 1901 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, because I found that the results of the census of 1891 were so inaccurate and incomplete that I did not want the census of 1901 under the charge of that officer. Let me give an instance in confirmation of what I say. It is well known that in the province of Quebec, they use the measure of the arpent and not the acre, a difference of about one-sixth, five acres being equal to about six arpents. It is also well known that in the province of Quebec the farmers measure their grain and other products by the minot and not the bushel. The minot is thirty-six pounds, while the standard bushel is thirty-four pounds. Well, in the taking of the agricultural census in the province of Quebec in 1891, the enumerators were instructed to take their information from the people as given in arpents and minots, and the change would be made in the office here, but I found that the figures of the census were exactly those given by the enumerators. What is the result ? It is that a farmer of the province of Quebec, who had say 100 arpents of oats which would give say about 5,000 minots at 50 minots to the arpent was credited with 100 acres giving only 5,000 bushels, thus losing both ways for he had only 83 acres which gave nearly 5,300 bushels or nearly 64 bushels to the acre. Our farmers in the province of Quebec are thus discredited before the world, and it is shown that their crops are smaller though the area is larger; that their land is poorer, and so that they are but indifferent farmers. And that is a specimen of the way in which the compilation of the census of 1891 was made in the statistical bureau of my department. This was before I became Minister of Agriculture. I did not wish to see that repeated in the census of 1901. I took care that the officer who allowed that to be done was not in charge of the census of 1901. Let me give but one or two items to show that the details in the schedules of 1891 did not correspond with the tables issued to the world. We have found many such cases, but I have not the details at my fingers' ends. Nor do I wish to occupy the time of the House in giving a mass of details when a few citations will suffice. The first case to which I would refer is in the county of Addington in Ontario. The statistics with regard to this district show products in 1891 largely in excess of those shown by the schedule of 1901. In this, as in so many other cases, we were obliged to go into details in order to account for an extraordinary comparison and to learn why the figures showed lack of progress in parts of the country where we knew the progress had been phenomenal between the last census and this one. We first revised our own figures to see if errors had been made there. Finding no error, we went back to the schedules of 1891. And what did we find ? We found the case of one flour mill alone credited with an output of $560,000 in 1891. This was one single flour mill. We found that, whereas the schedule of the enumerators showed that this mill had two employees, the table made in the department showed six. The amount paid in wages, according to the enumerator's schedule, was $750, but this had been changed to $3,750 in the office here in Ottawa. The value of raw material was changed from $45,000 to $420,000—a trifle of nearly ten times. The value of the product was given as $600,000, the product being entered in the enumerator's schedule in written numbers as three million pounds. Now, three million pounds of mill products, as everybody knows, is not worth $600,000. The value of it could not reasonably exceed $60,000. No doubt, a larger sum was given by error of the enumerator. The owner of the mill states in a letter that for eighteen years his product has been about 60 barrels of flour per day. The revision failed there in not going back to the original source of information. We did go to the original source of information and made corrections in the case of manifest and obvious inaccuracies of the schedules. Now here was another case. In 1891, Montreal Centre is credited—at page 88, vol. 3 of the census of 1891—with a cartridge factory having a working capital of $175,000, employing 90 persons, paying $30,000 in wages per year, using $100,000 worth of raw material, and having a total output of $200,000. Now, there never was a cartridge factory in Montreal Centre. A certain cartridge factory, situated in Brownsburg, in

the county of Argenteuil, has its office in the city of Montreal. But that office was credited with the factory and all the details, and all were repeated in Argenteuil county, all counted double.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. And all paid for.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. And paid for double. Now, I will not go at greater length into these matters, but I will say a few words as to the accusation of my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) that we have departed from the rate of pay and the rules of payment.

Mr. SPROULE. If the minister will excuse me, I think he has forgotten to show the number employed in compiling the census in 1891 and 1901.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can give that now——

Mr. SPROULE. I think it would be better; the comparison can be given with greater convenience.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not certain that I have the number employed, but I have the cost of compilation for the two years. The salaries which were paid, independent of the enumerators, for the census of 1901 amounted to $236,731. That includes not only the compilers, but the chief officers of the census and all the salary connected with the census apart from the enumeration in the country. For the census of 1891 the same items amounted to $121,000—here again a little over half what it was in 1901. I think I have already given evidence how it was that it could be done for that amount at that time. My hon. friend (Mr. Blain) spoke about the expense of telegraphing. I have not the figures in sufficient detail to show the expense of telegraphing by itself. But I have the figures of 'sundries,' which includes telegrams, travelling expenses of the head office staff, and things of that kind. In the census of 1901 this item cost $9,300, and in the census of 1891 the same item cost $17,000, or nearly double. So, in that respect, at all events, we were not extravagant.

Now, I wish to say a few words on the subject on which I had begun to speak when the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) interrupted me. My hon. friend (Mr. Blain) has accused me of departing from the schedule of rates and making payments extraneous to the proper payments. I plead guilty to that quite frankly. I say freely that the schedule of rates was fixed for ordinary circumstances, there were cases in which the circumstances were extraordinary and called for special consideration, and which were given special consideration, and in which an exception was made in order to make payments larger than the ordinary schedule of rates would permit.

Such conditions as the peculiar enlargement of the work which a man had to do, and over a greater territory; peculiar conditions where he had to do the work over again in consequence of something for which he was in no wise at fault; peculiar conditions such as the one mentioned in the House before, where the papers in a whole district were lost by accident to a ship, and the work had to be done all over again; other peculiar conditions where the increased expenditure was vouched for as being proper and legitimate, and it was shown clearly by vouchers that the officer had really expended the money. In this connection I would like to draw attention to the fact that the Auditor General has not objected to the passing of a single account coming from my department. I think therefore we may fairly conclude that the accounts were subjected to a proper audit and a proper scrutiny. Now my hon. friend would leave the House and the country to suppose that in the other census the schedule of rates was absolutely adhered to, whereas we have departed from it. He has assumed that it was impossible, under the holy and good Conservative party, that anything of that kind could have been done, but that as soon as the horrible Grits came into office we were guilty of all these naughty things. Well, Sir, I am charitable, I wish to believe that my predecessors in office found the same kind of difficulties that I found, and found that there were peculiar conditions and circumstances——

Mr. POPE. Not so many of them.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Perhaps not, but I have found that while the schedule of rates under my predecessors applied to the whole work, there were a great many exceptions, and there were cases where, in justice to an efficient officer, they had to make allowance and give greater pay. I plead guilty to having done that thing in a good many cases. But I want to give a few instances in which my predecessors did the same thing in the census of 1891, and I think my hon. friend will acknowledge that if they were justified in departing from the schedule of rates in 1891, I may have been actuated by equally proper motives in desiring to do justice to the employees of the government. I will take the county of Addington, Ontario, as being first on the list. I find that out of twenty enumerators, there were no less than five who were paid considerably higher than the schedule of rates would allow. For instance, there was one man who was entitled by the schedule to $37.15, and who was paid $54, a flat rate of $3 a day for eighteen days, contrary to the law, and contrary to the schedule of rates. But I have no doubt that some good reason for that expenditure appeared which justified the department. By the next item I find that where the schedule of rates would have given a man $12.72, he was paid $27, a little

more than double. Another man should have got $51.30, he was paid $69. Another man should have got $24.75, he was paid $42.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the minister give us the cost of taking the census of Addington on the two occassions.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Speaking roughly, I suppose it was about double on the last occasion, I will assume that for the sake of argument, and plead guilty to it. In the county of North Bruce, for which I have the list here, I find that, contrary to the schedule of rates, men were paid by the flat rate of $3 a day, contrary to law, contrary to the accounts they ought to have supplied and sworn to. The first case I find is where a man should have been paid $28.64 by the schedule of rates and he was paid $45; in another case he should have been paid $41.58 and he was paid $54. So on down the list every one of them was paid contrary to the law and more than the schedule of rates allowed. Now take the county of Frontenac here I find the same thing. One man ought to have got $48.31, and he was paid $3 a day for eighteen days, $54. Another man ought to have got $21.45, and he was paid for eight days at $3 a day, $24. Another man ought to have got $5.45, and he was paid for eight days at $3 a day, $24. In the county of Peterborough East I find the same kind of thing. Ten of the enumerators were paid more than the tariff of rates allowed them, were paid contrary to law, for so many days at $3 a day. The same was true, to a certain extent, in North Renfrew. Also I find that in Simcoe East—where is my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) ?—all the enumerators in 1891 were paid a flat rate of $3 a day, contrary to law and contrary to the tariff of rates which was then issued. In North Renfrew nearly all of them were paid in the same way. The hon. member who then represented South Renfrew seems to have had a little more influence with the minister than the hon. member for Simcoe, because he not only got $3 a day for twenty-five days for the enumerators of his county, but he also got an extra five cents on every farm they enumerated, an extra ten cents over the schedule of rates on every factory and industrial establishment they enumerated. The same is true of South Waterloo, where every one of the enumerators, contrary to the law, contrary to the tariff of rates, was paid $3 for more days than the tariff would have allowed them to get. The same in North Waterloo.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I need not go further into details, as I could if I had time. While I admit that the census this time has cost double as much, I believe we have got returns for the money spent. I believe we have got an accurate census, giving information that will be much more valuable to students of economics in Canada. I believe that we can show a census by which every part of the Dominion is fairly represented, unlike the census of 1891 where the province of Quebec was misrepresented, to the detriment of that province, to the discredit of the people of that province, to the discredit of a large number of industrious agriculturists and inhabitants throughout this Dominion. We have got reliable information, and I venture to say that the information which is given in the census of 1901 will be found accurately to tally with the totals and the compilations which have been made up from it, because in addition to the compilers, we have had a staff of revisers who have been going over the work once, twice and in many cases three times, so as to insure perfect accuracy. My hon. friend has complained of the increased number of employees engaged on this census. It is true we have had more employees, it is true we have been spending more in the compilation, but, as I have shown, when our compilation is finished it is correct, it is absolutely right and complete, instead of being left incomplete and unfinished as is was in 1891.

Mr. POPE. It was because your work was badly done.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, my hon. friend (Mr. Pope) is entirely mistaken. If he would go to the schedule of 1891 and compare them as we have been comparing them with the compilations he would find that the schedules of 1891 did not tally with the compilations in many instances and that the work was done in a slovenly and incomplete manner; whereas, under our arrangement the work has been revised and checked and gone over so as to make it absolutely accurate and correct. I venture to say that in statistical work there is one thing that is absolutely necessary and that is accuracy. Statistical work without accuracy is absolutely useless and unfortunately the statistical work of this census will lose to a certain extent its value by reason of the fact that comparisons between the results of the census of 1891 and the results of the census of 1901 are not fair or proper comparisons because the census of 1891 was so inaccurate and incomplete. I venture to think that in the census of 1901 we have made a new departure, that we have done some new thing, that we have done a thing which I hope and believe will be the beginning of accurate statistics in the Dominion of Canada and that as a result of the taking of this census the people will be able when the time comes to take further statistics to make proper and accurate comparisons with this census, the deductions from which will be of value in the economic study of the condition of the country. Believing this and believing that I have made out a case which cannot be impugned in any way I will rest satisfied that the House will vote down the resolution of my hon. friend.

Mr. THOS. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, I only desire to occupy a few moments to consider the question which has been handled by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) and I want to take up the last statement that he made first. He said: We got thorough and reliable information while the census of 1891 was entirely unreliable and inaccurate. What evidence have we of the statement that we have reliable information? We have simply his bare statement unsupported by any proofs. We might just as well believe from the knowledge we have that the census of 1891 is correct as that the census of 1901 is correct. If the hon. Minister of Agriculture cannot support his statement by any better proof than that which he has presented then I say the country can fairly be allowed to judge how far it should give credence to such a statement. In reference to the census of 1901 he admits that the same work cost more than double what it did in 1891. What explanation does he give of that additional cost and what justification has he given for it? We know that as a party economy was always their cry but as a government extravagance was always their practice. This is another illustration of it and it is as good a one as we have had for quite a length of time. To what does he attribute the increased cost? First, the increased cost is attributed to the increased cost of labour and secondly to the increase in the amount of work done. He says that the census of 1891 did not entail as much work as the census of 1901, that labour was higher, that the cost of living was greater; therefore it is natural that the census would cost more. First then in regard to the cost of labour, what evidence have we of it? I endeavoured to satisfy myself upon that and I took up the figures which the labour bureau has compiled in regard to the cost of wages in 1901. It is true that you cannot very readily make a comparison as to the cost of this class of labour because it does not give a statement regarding the cost of labour in this line, but one line that would serve as a comparison is the cost of labour. The cost would be proportionately about the same in the two lines. I take the cost of labour according to the 'Labour Gazette' in 1901, and I will compare the wage of the ordinary labourer in 1901 with what it was in 1891 because that is the only class of labour for which I can find a statement in both years. I find that the ordinary labourer in 1901 got from $1 to $1.25 per day. The average of that would be $1.12½ a day. I take up the report of the Bureau of Statistics for the province of Ontario and I find that the ordinary farm labourer received in 1891, boarding himself, $25.81 a month throughout the whole province. The farm labourer cannot work every day in the month so that $25.81 is really more than $1 a day for every day he worked, so that if we credit him with the additional earnings he would have received, he must have got at least $1.12½ a day, while the average rate of wages in 1901 was $1.12½ a day. Is that an evidence that there was much difference in the price of labour in both decades? It is an evidence that the price of labour was comparatively the same, that there was very little difference and that therefore the increased cost of labour could not account for the increased expense of taking the census. Then, in the next place the hon. minister says: We did a great deal more work. Well, it is true that there was a little more work done but I find that in giving an answer to the hon. member for Peel as to how much more work was done the hon. minister said that the number of questions that were asked in 1891 was 2,111,136, while the number of questions asked in 1901 was 3,034,000, or practically not quite one-third more questions asked while there was double the expense. The wages were practically the same in both decades but the work was done by one set of men in 1891 and by another in 1901. Is there evidence that the increased cost of labour or the increase in the amount of work can fairly account for the increased cost? I say that neither accounts for it. While we would naturally expect that the census of 1901 would cost a fraction more than the census of 1891, I say that the additional expense is out of all proportion to the additional work that was done. That cannot account for it, and I say that nothing does account for it except extravagance and blundering as far as I can see. The hon. Minister of Agriculture says: We have done this work over two or three times. It was only because they were not satisfied in the first place that it was correct, which compelled them to do their work over and over again in order to make it presentable to the public. It required to be examined and checked by some independent authority and therefore I would not be disposed to take the hon. minister's statement as satisfactory evidence of its accuracy without examining it itself. I will take the work that was done in my county. In two ridings of Grey there was a decrease in population as between 1891 and 1901. Take the east riding of Grey which I have the honour to represent. In 1891 there was a population of 26,225 and in 1901 a population of 25,387 or a decrease of 838. In the first instance 26 enumerators, the commissioner and all, were required to take the census while in the second instance 59 were required to do the same work; or in other words 29 more men were employed in 1901 to do the work that was done in 1891.

In 1891 the census in that riding cost $1,834, and in 1901 it cost $3,592, or nearly double. That shows that the men employed by this government in 1901 were incompetent, or extravagant, or unbusinesslike, and perhaps all three combined. They can impale themselves on which horn of the di-

lemma they like. The officials in 1891 did the work as accurately as the officials in 1891, and they did it for $1,659 less money. In 1891, in North Grey, twenty-six men were employed, at a cost of $1,665, to take the census, and in 1901, with a population of 1,000 more than 1891, fifty-one men were employed, at a cost of $3,000, or again nearly double. In South Grey, in 1891, twenty-three men took the census of a population of 23,672 people at a cost of $1,647, but in 1901 it took thirty-nine men to take the census of 22,171, or 1,500 fewer of a population, and it cost $2,591, or $844 more than in 1891. This shows that the same work was done much more economically in 1891, than in 1901, and in every respect the work was as well done. It is true that perhaps one-third more questions were asked in 1901 than in 1891, and if the increased cost had only been one-third more, there perhaps would be no serious objection ; but the fact remains that the cost of the census in 1901 was nearly double the cost of the census of 1891 in every instance. The Minister of Agriculture told us, that he wanted more men employed because he wanted the returns within a shorter time, but the truth is, that in the main the census figures of 1891, were got out as early as those of 1901. The minister did not supply the census to the people of the country very much earlier in 1901 than they were supplied in 1891. I asked the Minister of Agriculture for a comparison between the number employed in compiling the census in 1891 with the number employed in 1901. He dare not give the figures, because the difference in number is so much greater in 1901 that he was ashamed of it. Although I honestly believe that he had the information under his hand, he dared not give it to the House notwithstanding that I asked him three times for it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPROULE. I am perfectly in order.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. What does the hon. gentleman refer to ?

Mr. SPROULE. I said that the hon. minister dare not make a comparison between the number employed in compiling the census in 1891 and the number employed in 1901, because the difference was so great in the latter year that he was ashamed of it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I gave the hon. gentleman the cost. The numbers vary from time to time. There was a certain staff in the beginning on both compilations, and that staff was reduced from time to time. So that it would be very difficult to give any figures.

Mr. SPROULE. Would it be difficult to give the number of days they were employed ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would have to make a calculation as to that, and that calculation I have not under my hand, and the hon. gentleman has no right to say I have.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not desire to make any charge against the minister that I cannot prove, but I do say, that if he wanted to make a fair comparison he could have given us the number of days of work. Although I have asked for this information several times during the session, I have never been able to get it, and I have the right to assume that for some reason or other unknown to me, he desires to keep that information to himself. I say that from the first to the last, an examination of this census proves that the government have done the work in an extravagant fashion. I shall not say that it was done incompetently, because I would require more detailed information to justify that statement, but I do say that no reason has been given to this House, to show that the census of 1901 is any more correct than the census of 1891. I do know for a fact, with regard to my own locality, that the census was not accurately taken in 1901.

Mr. HEYD. Give us the facts.

Mr. SPROULE. I am stating the fact from my own personal knowledge, as to my own locality, and I may fairly draw the inference that the same remark applies to other localities. I therefore say that the minister cannot justify the claim that he has given us an accurate census. When we endeavoured to bring these schedules before the Public Accounts Committee, the minister dared not allow them to be presented before that committee. I leave the country to draw the inference why that was the case. The Minister of Agriculture took the responsibility of instructing his officers to keep from the committee the information which the committee was entitled to by precedent and practice, and I can only reach the conclusion that that was done to prevent us from making the facts known to the people of the country. The hon. gentleman has no reason to congratulate himself upon the magnificent work he has done in taking the census. He has done the same work as his predecessors, but it has cost the country twice as much money and the country has secured nothing that will compensate it for a fraction of the difference in cost.

Mr. C. B. HEYD (South Brant). One would have thought that after seven months our friends on the other side would have been able to make out a stronger case than they have done. They have been endeavouring to deceive the people, not only in this House, but throughout the length and breadth of the country, on this great question of the census. They have been issuing from the parliament buildings here, franked to all parts of the country, charges against the government with respect to the census which convinces me that they will try to

make this an issue before the people. A document with respect to the census which they have circulated, and which has come into my hands, is absolutely misleading and untrue in almost every particular. I have looked over it with a considerable degree of care and have put on the Order Paper three questions in order to give the census authorities an opportunity of answering three charges which are made in the paper. I will read them to show the House the character of the matter they are supplying to the people, and that absolute worthlessness of what is contained in their literature. It says :

> At one time a staff of thirty men worked for months on enumerators' accounts. Then a new basis was applied and all their work thrown away.

The answer of the Census Department to this is :

> The statement is absolutely untrue in every particular.

They make a further statement :

> A year's work was done by a large staff on mortality tables which were all condemned and burned ; after which the work was done over again. The same thing happened to other compilations.

The Census Department say, in answer to this :

> The work on the mortality tables has been done by four clerks and no part of the work has been condemned or burnt. The statement is wholly untrue.

And I will say what the commissioner would not dare to say, that it is an absolutely false statement, calculated to deceive the people. The third statement contained in this sheet, and these are specimens of the work, is this :

> For about two years a staff of about thirty persons have been engaged in altering and amending enumerators' returns, changing forest land to pasture land, fallow land to pasture, and making other alterations.

The reply to this statement is that it is absolutely untrue in every particular. The word 'fallow' brings to my mind the fact that the only charge against the census that is made here to-day, after seven months' work, is that there is not a column in the schedules for fallow land. I think the opposition ought to have prepared a better attack. We have had two or three fallow years in which these gentlemen could have prepared themselves to make some real attack against the government and the quality of this census. We have the work, we can analyse it for ourselves, and we can see whether the census for 1901 was a good census and whether it was an improvement on the census of 1891, yet the only suggestion that our friend from Peel threw out was that the municipal assessors should make this census. This, he said, would be a great saving to the people. In the city of Brantford we have two assessors and it takes them six months to make an assessment of the city of Brantford. How long would it take the two assessors of the city of Brantford to take the census, when it took twenty-two men thirty days ? It would take them two years at the least, and the whole advantage of a census is that it is taken quickly and covers a great deal of ground.

But the principal charge is that this census is too expensive, and they try to prove that by the statement that the census of 1891 cost less than that of 1901. The fact that the census of 1901 cost nearly $1,200,000, is no evidence at all of extravagance, nor is there any evidence of economy in the census of 1891, because it cost only $550,000. If I was to say that I built a house in 1891 for $1,000, and that I built another in 1901 and it cost me $3,000, and then claimed that there was economy in the building of 1891 and extravagance in 1901, every one would see the absurdity of the position. If a man said : I ran my factory in 1891 for $500 per annum, and last year it cost me three times as much, the first question the ordinary man would ask is : Have you the same character of work and the same quantity of work in 1901 as you had in 1891 ? For purpose of comparison we must have things that are similar. A man who would compare the census of 1891 with the census of 1901 would thereby show that he had not looked into the character of the census. There is no comparison in the completeness of the two, or the amount of labour involved in securing the information. Let us take the number of men engaged. In 1891 there were only 4,324 while in 1901 there were 8,800, more than double the number of men to take census. But it is not the same census. It is a much more complete census involving a great deal more labour, and for that very reason——

Mr. BLAIN. Wherein is the census of 1901 more complete in respect to Ontario than that of 1891 ?

Mr. HEYD. I understand that the remuneration per name was 3 cents in 1891 and 5 cents in 1901. It seems to me that 5 cents is very cheap for the work done. It has been said in this House that it cost a certain newspaper in Montreal more than 5 cents a head to get the signatures attached to certain petitions to this House. Now whether they got 3 cents or 5 cents does not prove anything.

Mr. POPE. Do you know that ?

Mr. HEYD. There are a good many things I know that I cannot say here, and there are certain things I ought to say which, being what I consider myself, a gentleman, I would not say. Now let us compare the work that the enumerator was expected to do for 3 cents in 1891 with what he was expected to do for 5 cents in

1901. We have the evidence of that in the number of questions there were asked. I have certain schedules here; I took them up indiscriminately, and they do not cover the whole work, but they will illustrate my point. We have the great factor that the enumerators in 1901 had eleven schedules besides four specials, while in 1891 there were only nine. The population has also increased, so that there is a greater amount of work. But leaving that aside, let us take the schedules dealing with land and farms, one of which would be in the hands of almost every enumerator. The number of questions asked in 1891 was seventy-five, while in 1901 it was 127. We could hardly expect one man to take as many names when he had to ask 127 questions as he would take when he had to ask only seventy-five. Let us take the schedules dealing with manufactures of clay. In those the number of questions is not so material as the statistical work that is afterwards involved. In 1891 there were ten columns, while in 1901 there were thirty-one columns, and the necessary clerical work of classifying this additional number involved the expenditure of an exceedingly large sum of money.

Take the question of minerals, which is a very important part of the exports of this country and deserves exceptional treatment. In 1891, the exports of our mineral products only amounted to $5,748,000, while in 1901, they amounted to $40,000,000. That certainly justifies the hon. Minister of Agriculture in spending a little more money to secure a proper return upon the mineral resources of the country. In the census of 1891, there were only twenty-three questions on this subject, while there were 224 in 1901. How could you expect the census enumerators in British Columbia to take down for the same price the answers to 224 questions which their predecessors charged, who only had to answer 23. Could you expect the department to compile, separate, analyse and compute the figures and put them in suitable shape in the case of the returns to 224 questions as you would in the case of the replies to 23. Yet we have the government charged with extravagance because the work in each case was not done at the same price. Take the question of manufactures; manufacturing in Canada has grown to enormous proportions. In the schedule of 1891, there were only 23 questions, whereas in that of 1901 there were 63. How could you expect the work to be done in both cases for the same price, more especially when you consider the additional work involved in the collation and compilation of the returns and the additional number of enumerators who had to be employed. In 1891 our exports only amounted to $6,000,000 whereas in 1901 they amounted to $18,000,000. Any information that shows the development of our agricultural, mineral and manufacturing resources, the people will not begrudge paying for; and if the census of 1901 has cost $1,250,000, as compared with $500,000 for 1891, the people have got good value for their money. Take the articles of butter and cheese; in 1891 the exports of cheese amounted to $9,000,000, and in 1901 to $19,886,000. Butter in 1891 was exported to the value of $602,000, and in 1901, the export amounted to $5,600,000. In 1891 very few questions were asked regarding this industry, whereas a great many were asked in 1901. Take the schedule on population, there are on it thirty-four questions compared with sixteen in 1891, or eighteen new ones. That involves additional work in compiling the returns and the engaging of additional clerks. Take clay, thirty-one questions were asked in 1901 against ten in 1891. Then take minerals, in 1891 the questions were twenty-eight, and in 1901, 200. I need scarcely allude to the subject of fisheries, concerning which there are over 200 questions. There are over 100 more in 1901 than in 1891. And the fishery industry is an important one in this country, one in which a large number of men find a livelihood, and the government, in spending money to gain information for the people with regard to that industry, did just what they ought to have done under the circumstances. Hon. gentlemen on the other side are comparing two things that are entirely dissimilar, the census of 1891 and the census of 1901. I have here two books, one the first volume of the census of 1891, and the other the first volume of the census of 1901. An examination of these two will show that hon. gentlemen opposite are not properly informed and are simply indulging in a little captious criticism. There is no comparison of the quality of the information contained in the two volumes. If you take the first volume of the census of 1891, you will find 105 pages taken up with this class of information, as shown by the headings:

Houses—wood, brick, stone; houses—1 story, 2 stories, 3 stories, 4 stories and over; houses—1 room, 2 rooms, 3 rooms, 4 rooms, 5 rooms, 6 to 10 rooms, 11 to 15 rooms, 16 rooms and over, uninhabited, in construction.

The last two are of importance. But for 105 pages out of 375 we have information of the class indicated by the headings I have read. What do the people of this country care how many houses of one storey, or two stories, or three stories there are? What do they care how many houses there are of one, two, six or fifteen rooms? That is not information of any particular value to the people. When you come to the heading 'civil condition of the people,' they use 104 pages, but the information is woefully incomplete as compared with the census of 1901. Then when you take religion, you find 105 pages devoted to it. A great many of our people attach a great deal of importance to religion, and in this volume of 1901 there are 140 pages devoted to the subject. Then take the division 'place of birth.' We take a great deal of interest in

the question of where our people come from, and are spending large amounts of money every year to bring into our country the best class of people. The census of 1891 has 31 pages devoted to origin and nationality, while in 1901 we have 190 pages. And yet our friends on the other side say that this 190 pages of high class statistical work is to be done at the same rate as the 31 pages of the census of 1891. Why, the thing is absurd on the face of it. In the first volume of the census of 1891 there were only 89 subjects dealt with, while in 1901 there were 201, or nearly three times as many. There is exactly three times as much information, judging from the number of columns. Then take the matter of quality. There are seven schedules here or heads covered in 1891, while in 1901 there were 18. There are about only 215 questions to answer in 1891, while in 1901 there are over 523 questions. And yet our friends accuse us of extravagance because we cannot get up such an elaborate census as this at the same cost as that of the census of 1891. If you show that a man spent $3,000 in running his factory in 1891 and $10,000 in 1901, you do not show that he has necessarily failed in economical management. It may be that he has more employees and is turning out more work. The only fault I find with the Minister of Agriculture is that he did not pay the claims of these men who put in good hard work and did not get enough for it. I say that at 5 cents per name it was impossible to get that information and cover long distances and earn fair wages. And while the census of 1901 did cost more, the men were not as well paid and did not earn as much money as ten years before. If the Auditor General's Report shows that they got $3 a day, they never received it. Those in my constituency were not paid $3 a day. The number of names they took was divided by 60 and that gave the number of days, and each of them were short from two to as high as fifteen or twenty days. That is where the trouble comes in for us, and trouble in which our hon. friends opposite are not interested. We will have to settle that with our enumerators. Some of them grumble, but they are too loyal to the country to be seduced from allegiance to their own party, though they were not so well paid as those who were appointed ten years before. When you look at the quantity of work, as shown by the two volumes I have here, you will see that the census for 1901 might as well have cost three times as much as that of 1891. In the census of 1891 there are only 83 columns, while in that of 1901 there are over 200 devoted to statistical work. If hon. gentlemen opposite have more to say on the census, let them adduce facts. It is no argument to tell us that the cost is greater or that more men were employed. The question is what did the men do in 1901 and what did they do ten years before? Let them compare the result, and we shall be in a position to judge whether there has been any unwise expenditure or not. It does not prove anything for the hon. member for Peel to show that it cost more to take the census in his county in 1901 than it did in 1891. It cost more to run a hundred-acre farm in his county in 1901 than it did to run a fifty-acre farm ten years ago. You must compare things that are similar. Having given some attention to the question of the census, and having studied the American census, I devoted a little of my time since Saturday to looking into this matter, and I have found facts that satisfied me that the government were not extravagant in taking this census; while, on the other hand, I find that the census will answer the requirements of the people and give useful information. The charges made are not in accordance with the facts. And that is true of the charges contained in the campaign document of hon. gentlemen opposite which has been sent out from this House by the carload, by the train load. And I hope that those gentlemen of honour and respectability who sit on the other side—and there are many of them—instead of allowing such documents to go out by hundreds of thousands—and some destroyed because they are not untruthful enough—will take only ten minutes to look into the matter, and that will convince them that nearly every statement made in this campaign literature with regard to the census of 1901 is absolutely untrue.

Mr. D. HENDERSON (Halton). I shall not detain the House long. The case has been so well presented by my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain), who has given a good deal of consideration to the question, and who, I think, has made out a very strong case for the resolution he has placed in your hands, that I need not dwell upon the matter at length. With reference to the leading argument of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd), I find that he does not agree with the Minister of Agriculture. The minister was candid enough to tell us at the outset that the main reason for the increase in the expense of taking the census was the higher cost of living. But the hon. member for South Brant, not being satisfied with that, endeavoured to show by a series of quotations from the various schedules of the census that there was an increase in the amount of work, that the volumes issued were larger and contained more information, and that this was the cause of the increase in the cost of taking the census. I will leave these two hon. gentlemen to settle this matter between themselves. The hon. member for South Brant instances the taking of the censuses in cheese factories as a reason why there should be an increase in the expenditure. Now, if I understand it right, the mode of

taking the census of a factory requires the manager of the factory to be supplied, with schedules that he fills up, and practically the enumerator would not be employed for three minutes, much less for one day, in taking that census.

Mr. HEYD. Would it not involve more expense in the statistical branch ?

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, I will explain that. If a cheese factory turned out 100,000 pounds of cheese in 1891, and in 1901 it turned out 200,000 pounds, I would like to know by what course of reasoning my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Heyd) arrives at the conclusion that the cost of taking a census of 200,000 pounds should be double that of taking the census of 100,000 pounds. I fail to see that the cost even of making the totals, of adding up these various reports of the cheese factories, would be any more in 1901 than it was in 1891. Possibly there might be a few more factories, but that would not account for doubling the cost of taking the census, which the Minister of Agriculture has confessed to.

The Minister of Agriculture tells us that one reason for the increased cost of taking the census on this last occasion was the employment of a larger number of enumerators, and consequently there was a larger number to be instructed. I think he is quite correct, and that is just what we complain of. He employs two or three times the number of people to take the census, these men all have to be instructed, and every one has to be paid his day's wage during the course of instruction—not only his day's wage, but I find, in some instances, that he is actually paid for his board. Some enumerators are given lunches when they meet together, as they were in Verchères and Chambly, down in the province of Quebec. Why were not the enumerators treated to lunches in my county as well ? I do not know why there should be any partiality shown. It goes to show the extreme carelessness with which these accounts are made up, when I found that in one county a man is allowed for an item that in another county another man is not allowed for.

Now, the Minister of Agriculture complains that in the census of 1891 the law was not complied with, and that enumerators were paid on a flat rate instead of by the day. I want to draw attention to this, because I think that in making that argument the minister was not as fair as he generally attempts to be. He took for example the county of Addington, the county of North Bruce, the county of North Renfrew, and the county of Frontenac. Now, we all know that these are counties where the population is sparse, where the enumerator in many instances would have to travel long distances between settlements in order to find the people living in that section of the country. But the Minister of Agriculture did not mention a county like Peel, which is more thickly populated; like the county of Halton, which is well populated ; he made his reference entirely to counties that are sparsely settled, and where it would be an absolute necessity, to be fair to his enumerator, that some other plan should be adopted than that which would apply to counties with more dense population. I would not be surprised, if he analysed his own pay-sheets, if he found the figures to bear out my contention. Therefore, I think his argument in that respect was somewhat misleading. However, I fail to see that there is much in it, because he has told us that the cost of taking this census is practically double that of taking the former census, and I presume that it was doubled in those counties that he mentioned as well as in other counties.

Now, the Minister of Agriculture tells us that the cost of taking the census per name was three cents in 1891 and that was not enough. In 1901 he allows his enumerators five cents, an increase of 66⅔ per cent for taking names. For taking farms, in 1891, the cost was 15 cents, and in 1901, 25 cents, still maintaining the same rate of increase, 66 per cent. Then, for taking the census of a factory, 20 cents was paid in 1891, and 30 cents in 1901, an increase of 50 per cent.

Now, he tells us that this increase was all owing to the extra cost of living. I wondered, when I heard him say that, where the boasted preferential tariff came in. Why, these hon. gentlemen were going to make everything cheap, they were making this a cheap country to live in, giving us cheap clothing, cheap food, cheap boots and shoes, everything the people have to buy was going to be cheap on account of this preferential tariff. Yet they tell us that they have had to pay their census enumerators more because the cost of living has been increased. What is the increase ? Did the Minister of Agriculture, before he made that statement, look at the facts ? I doubt very much if he has; I think he has just spoken in a random sort of way. The Minister of Justice told us the other day that the salaries of the judges had to be increased because the cost of living had increased, and they had to pay more for clothing and other requisites. But this preferential tariff, they told us, would make clothing cheap, that it would make boots and shoes in this country cheap to the consumer. I cannot reconcile the two arguments. Let me take some particular item and ask where the cost of living has been increased. Let me take as a basis of the whole thing the price of what. I look upon wheat as being a fair index of the respective cost of living in 1891 and 1901, because, to my mind, as the price of wheat varies so would the price of butter, so would the price of eggs and other articles that we consume. If the cost of wheat was less in 1891 than 1901 than would

be in 1901, and there would be something in the argument of the hon. gentleman. But what do I find? Since the hon. gentleman made that statement about the cost of living being increased within the decade, a statement that almost staggered me, I went into the library and looked up the 'Globe' newspaper to see what wheat sold for under the Conservative regime of 1891, when the farmers of this country enjoyed good government, when their interests were carefully looked after by the government of the day. I find that in 1891 wheat was selling for $1.08 per bushel, whereas in 1901 it is selling for the miserable price of 77 cents, 30 cents less. Yet the hon. gentleman tells us that he has had to pay his enumerators more because of the increased cost of living, a difference of 60 per cent, while the cost of wheat was reduced by 30 per cent. Does that not mean extravagance? Is that not evidence sufficient to condemn the hon. gentleman out of his own mouth for the large amount that the census has cost? I contend that the facts do not at all bear out his contention that the increased cost of living is the reason for the increased cost of taking the census. We may take other articles just as well as wheat. Take woollen goods. Under the preferential tariff hon. gentlemen opposite told us that the people were going to get their woollen goods cheaper. The complaint of the woollen manufacturers is that their industry has been destroyed by reason of the preferential tariff, which makes clothing cheaper, but it appears that the preferential tariff does not give the benefit to the consumer at all. It must give it to the importer or middleman. I do not think they have reduced the cost to the consumer, because, the Minister of Agriculture tells us, the cost of living has increased. Therefore, the preferential tariff is not at all what the people expected it would be and does not result in the benefits that we hoped would accrue from it. Until the hon. minister has given us a better reason than the increased cost of living to justify this enormous increase in the cost of taking the census, this extravagant cost of taking the census, I shall be compelled, for one, to vote condemnation of his action, of the policy that he adopted and of the result of what he did in 1901.

Mr. R. HOLMES (West Huron). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) who has just taken his seat has made a somewhat laboured argument to try and prove that the cost of living has not increased and that there should be no additional expense connected with the cost of taking the census. Whether the cost of living has kept up to the price of wheat or not, I think that the hon. gentleman will admit that the cost of labour has increased. I venture to make the assertion, that, taking his own personal expenses as a criterion he will admit in private conversation, if not publicly, that the cost of living has very materially increased. If he will take up the volume of the census he will find an explanation of some of the reasons for the increased cost of taking it. The explanation was given by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher), and it was enlarged upon by him, so that it is not necessary to go into that. But, I simply want to allude to the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite can be all things to all men. They can adapt themselves to any condition of circumstances. It is not necessary to bring the tariff question into the discussion at the present; but we have heard a good deal in this House in the past from hon. gentlemen opposite as to there being no advantage under the preferential tariff. We have been told by hon. gentlemen opposite that the preference was a delusion and a snare, and that we were imposing upon the people of the motherland as well as upon our own people in trying to convince them that there was some advantage in the preference. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), by his extravagant language, and extravagant manner has admitted what the Liberals believe and have always contended, that the preference has been a decided advantage to the people. However, that is neither here nor there, as far as the census is concerned. We, on this side of the House, are prepared to admit that the cost of the census of 1901 has been greater than the cost of the census of 1891, and that was the only point made by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain). Without being disrespectful to him at all, I would like to say that I think the mountain has conceived and brought forth a mouse. The charges which he has made against the government do not amount to very much. I should also like to refer to the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). Our friends opposite are willing to swear to the accuracy of the census of 1891. They say that there were no inaccuracies in connection with them, and the hon. gentleman made the statement——

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to say that I made no such statement at all?

Mr. HOLMES. I did not say you did. I said that hon. gentlemen opposite said so, that they said this upon the other side of the House. However, the hon. member for East Grey said that he knew——

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend (Mr. Holmes) says that it was not the hon. member for East Grey who said that, but it was some other hon. members on this side of the House. Would the hon. gentleman be kind enough to say who it was?

Mr. HOLMES. I alluded to the hon. member for East Grey as referring to his own riding and as stating that the census of 1891 in that riding is much more accurate

than the census of 1901, but I said that hon. members on the other side of the House were willing to swear that the census of 1891 was fairly accurate. However, I happen to have before me the report of the Bureau of Industries of Ontario, in which is given, of course, the results of the census in every municipality, and I find, that, taking the Dominion census of 1901 and comparing it with the municipal census of the same year, and taking the Dominion census of 1891 and comparing it with the municipal census of that year, the last census is much more accurate than the previous one. For instance in the township of Glenelg, in Grey county, I find the difference between the municipal census of 1901 and the Dominion census to be 53, while in 1891, the difference between the local census and the Dominion census is 281. In Osprey, I find the difference in the first instance 44, and in the second instance 133. Do hon. gentleman opposite consider that the census of 1891 was an accurate census when there is such a disparity? Do they not agree with me that the census of 1901 is much more accurate? I do not want to weary the House with too many details. The hon. member for Peel is the mover of this resolution, and I propose to devote a little attention to a series of questions which were asked by him in the House some time ago as to the questions asked by the enumerators and the information returned in connection with the present census. One of the hon. members on the other side of the House, in the course of this discussion, has stated that the cost of the census of 1901 is double that of the census of 1891 for the same work. This has been contradicted time and again, and merely to show that our contention is the correct one, I will quote a few figures for the benefit of the hon. member for Peel. The hon. member for Peel asked certain questions in the House in reference to the questions that were asked in Cardwell, Halton and Peel. In 1891 the number of questions asked in Cardwell, as far as population is concerned, was 384,000, in round numbers, in 1901, 444,000; Halton, 1891, 549,000, 1901, 664,000; Peel, 1891, 386,000, 1901, 465,000. In the matter of agriculture, taking real estate, orchard products, nurseries, vineyards and market-gardens, the number of questions asked in Cardwell in 1891 was 66,000, in 1901, 88,000; Halton in 1891, 96,000, in 1901, 111,000; Peel in 1891, 70,000, in 1901, 71,000; the total number of questions asked in the three counties in 1891 was 1,320,000, while in 1901 it was 1,500,000. The number of questions was much greater in 1901 than in 1891, and this is conclusive evidence of the number of questions asked. Continual reference has been made to the accuracy of the census of 1901. The hon. minister dwelt upon the desirability of having accurate statistics in the census. In order to show that the census of 1891 was not as accurately taken as it should be let me call the attention of the House to one or two points.

For example, in 1891, the area of land in crops as published in the second volume of the census (Table XVI) was ascertained, not by addition of areas under crops as recorded in the schedule, but by an abstracting process which consisted in taking from the area of improved land the areas of land in forest, in pasture and in orchard and garden—the remainder being land in crops. The total area of the land under crops is in this way shown by volume II of the census, to be 19,904,826 acres; but when the area is reckoned up by the details of crops as given in volume IV (published in 1897) it is found to be only 16,139,295 acres, which is 3,765,531 acres less than the area shown in volume II. The excess in the maritime provinces is 627,522 acres, in Quebec, 966,894 acres; in Ontario, 2,233,957 acres; and in the North-west Territories, 4,421 acres; but in Manitoba there is a deficiency of 2,270 acres and in British Columbia 64,993 acres. Our friends opposite are convicted out of their own mouths as to the inaccuracies in the census of 1891, and I only give these facts in order to show that while they charge that the present census is inaccurate and unreliable, there is no doubt at all that the census of 1891 in which they place so much confidence is without question inaccurate. In order to show the difference in the number of questions, I may point out that in the census of 1891 there were only 216 questions asked, while in the census of 1901 there were over 600 questions asked or nearly three times as many. I have under my hand here the schedule relating to farm values upon which there are a series of twenty-seven questions. A good many of these questions involve considerable labour in getting information with respect to them, and that schedule was not used at all in the census of 1891. The department showed its wisdom in taking these statistics in connection with the last census, because I need hardly point out that information as regards our agricultural standing amongst the nations of the world, is of very great importance indeed to the community. It is apparent on the face of it, that a great deal more work was required from the enumerators in 1901 than from the enumerators in 1891, and that additional work is a complete explanation for the extra cost. If gentlemen on the other side of the House have no greater grievance against the government than they have charged in this campaign, or, than they have charged in this House to-day in connection with the census; then the Liberal party has nothing to fear when they appeal to the electors of Canada. I am satisfied that when the intelligent electors of the Dominion look at the importance of the census of 1901, and its superiority over the census of 1891, they will conceive that the additional money has been spent wisely and well. I may say in

conclusion sir, that the Liberals are quite willing to go to the people of the country on this issue, as on any other issue which has been raised by the Conservative party.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. JOHN SHERRITT (North Middlesex). Mr. Speaker, I do not purpose at this late stage of the session detaining the House very long, but I feel that it is my duty to make some comparisons of the expenditure of the census of 1901 as compared with that of 1891. Before recess the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Heyd) was reading from a newspaper which he claimed had made some erroneous statements and had misrepresented the expenditures of the government in this matter. I was somewhat amused when listening to him reading from that paper; I thought that the man who printed that paper was putting himself in the position of the boy who would tell a lie although the truth would serve a great deal better. My own opinion is that there was enough that could be truthfully said in criticism of this expenditure without resorting to any false statement. Like any other business men we on this side of the House would not expect that the census of 1901 would be taken as cheaply as that of ten years ago. We all know that new parts of the country have been settled, that there are difficulties in taking the census in certain localities that would entail more expense than was required ten years ago. Some progress has been made by the country. When listening to the statement of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) I did think that he had a bad case. Notwithstanding his ability to handle such a question the only excuse that he could advance for this enormous expenditure, compared with the expenditure under the Conservative rule, was that the cost of living had increased. It has been argued by the hon. member for Huron that the extra expenditure would be accounted for by the fact that there were more questions to answer, and that there were one-third more questions to answer, and that therefore it should cost one-third more money. I do not agree with that; I should think that in taking a census the most difficult and tedious part would be getting from house to house, as we have to-day very large farms and a good deal of time is lost in this way. However, for argument sake we will allow that it is good logic to say that because there are one-third more questions to answer we should except an expenditure one-third larger. That and the argument advanced by the hon. minister as to the additional cost of living are the only two arguments that have been put forth to justify the fact that this census cost twice as much as the other. I will take for illustration my own riding of North Middlesex. In 1891 East Middlesex had a population of 25,569 and the cost of taking the census in that year was $1,646.85. In 1901 we had a population of 26,609 and the cost of taking the census was $3,380.09. You will notice that there is an increase in population of 1,040, but it would not be fair to assume that that would be sufficient to offset the additional cost entailed by the one-third extra questions. That being the case the only argument that is left is that of the increased cost of living which my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) has exploded fairly well. But the difference in the cost of the two in this census riding is $1,733.24. As the hon. gentlemen from Brant and from Huron have failed to advance any argument to justify this fact it will be necessary to put forward some one else, and they may have to call on the hon. member from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who could possibly advance the best excuse in defence of this expenditure. Allowing that there are one-third more questions to answer and that this should entail an expense one-third greater, and allowing the extra cost of living, on which the Minister of Agriculture has based his argument, there is still a discrepancy which, as I have said, the hon. member for North Norfolk might be able to explain, but I do think he will have a difficult task. We have in North Middlesex a number of independent men. Prior to the election of 1896 the hon. gentleman who leads the House and his colleagues went up and down this country decrying the Conservative party and declaring that an expenditure of $38,000,000 was bleeding the people white, and that Canada could not stand it. So much was said about this expenditure that the people in my riding really came to the conclusion that there must be something wrong with the Conservative party, and in the election of 1896 they returned a supporter of the government. But, Sir, what did they find? As soon as the present government got into power it was found that none of the pledges which the people conscientiously believed would be carried were carried out, and they found that the expenditure was not $38,000,000 alone, but it went up and up and up, and the result was that when they came to cast their ballots again in 1900 they sent your humble servant to represent them. That I think is sufficient evidence to show that you cannot hoodwink the people of North Middlesex, so I think that we must have a better explanation of what has become of that extra amount of money that has been expended.

Then let us look at South Middlesex. In 1891 South Middlesex had a population of 18,806, and the cost of the census under Conservative rule was $1,389.53. In 1901 South Middlesex had a population of 18,803, practically the same population, a difference of only three; but what was the cost of the census under Reform economy? It was $2,982.84, or in other words

$203.78 more than double what it cost under Conservative rule. I do think that this is a state of affairs which requires some explanation; and although the hon. member is not in his place to-night some other hon. minister, I hope, will get up and explain how the expense came to be so heavy in this instance. I notice that the arguments have been chiefly of a rather lame character, and I should like to have some hon. member on the opposite side get up and endeavour to make some kind of a frank explanation. When looking into the Auditor General's Report, I did expect some explanation from the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, to account for this increase of $1,593.31, or more than double what the taking of the census cost in the particular riding under Conservative rule, other than the extra cost of living. I have no doubt that the cost of taking the census was big enough under Conservative rule, but it has been doubled by hon. gentlemen opposite. Next I come to North Middlesex, which, in 1891 had a population of 19,090. Under Conservative rule the census there cost $1,299.92, whereas in 1901, when the population was 17,455, it cost $2,428.55. In other words, there was a decrease in population of 1,535, and an increase of expenditure of $1,128.63, or almost double that under Conservative rule. That certainly demands explanation. Then in West Middlesex, which in 1891 had a population of 17,288, the cost under Conservative rule was $1,302.31; and in 1901, when it had a population of 15,843, the cost under the Reform regime was $3,113.37, being a decrease in population of 1,445 and an increase in expenditure of $1,811.06. In other words, the cost was more than double under the present regime what it was under Conservative rule. No doubt the majority of us in this House are men who had a good deal of experience in municipal life, and I ask those hon. gentlemen how long would they expect to be returned by the different municipalities if, once they got into office, they were to raise the salaries and increase the expenditure more than double and have nothing more to show for the increase except the rise in the cost of living? How many hon. gentlemen have known of an assessor in a rural municipality, whose salary has gone up in the last ten years 20 pen cent? I do not know of any such case. How many directors of insurance companies are there whose salaries have been increased, or school teachers or other men in public employ? I do not know of any increases corresponding to those in the taking of the census. I do not intend to take up much more time, but I have here the figures from South Huron, the riding in which I now live. The cost of taking the census in South Huron, under Conservative rule in 1891, when it had a population of 19,144, was $1,255.59, and in 1901, when it had a population of 17,448, the cost was $2,090.41. So that there was a decrease in population of 1,696—an increase in the expenditure of $838.82. I think that hon. gentlemen opposite will find it hard to justify that increased expenditure in the county of South Huron. In that county the people are getting a little awake to the condition of things, for they have had the extravagance of this government brought home pretty closely to them in the matter of the dock as well as in the taking of the census. I have no doubt that they will insist on more satisfactory explanation than that we have had here before they will condone these items of expenditure by a party which they have looked upon so long as the champions of economy, working in the interests of the country. I think it is due to some of the members belonging to rural municipalities to offer some explanation on these particular items, and I have not selected any particular counties. I took the ones that first caught my eye, and I find by the statements of other gentlemen that in the other counties we have a similar record. We should have something else to justify this extravagance besides the increase in the cost of living. Some time ago the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) asked why there was no record of summer fallowing in the census records, and the Minister of Agriculture replied that that was a thing of the past. Surely he could not have been sincere in such a statement? I must say that in our part of the country the farmer who does not summer-fallow is not considered up-to-date.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). This question of the census, Mr. Speaker, has naturally attracted particular attention, both because it has proved very expensive and because a great many opinions have been expressed reflecting on its accuracy. The public have certainly not that confidence in its results which the Minister of Agriculture has sought to prove to exist. In the first place, as to the cost of the census, it has been very much larger than that of any previous census in Canada. I find that, according to the resolution submitted, the census of 1881 cost $450,000, that of 1891 almost exactly $550,000, and that of 1901, though not yet completed, $1,200,000. How much more work is to be done upon it, of course, the House cannot learn at this time. The fact remains that the last two censuses, those of 1881 and 1891, together cost $1,000,000 completed, and the census of 1901 has cost $200,000 more than the two censuses that preceded it, and it is not yet completed. It will be clear at once to any one who looks at the census returns that the increase in the population does not account for this increase of cost. The population of Canada has increased at the rate of about 10 per cent for each decade. Therefore, while the increased cost of the census of 1891 over that of 1881 was just about in agreement with the increase of population, that is, about 10 per cent,—it really was 20

per cent more. In the case of this last census, where there was an increase of 10 per cent in the population—there has been an increase in the cost, of considerably over 100 per cent. Now, it is natural, it is inevitable, that the members of this House and the people of this country would seek to learn why the census has cost so much. The Minister of Agriculture has set up a plea that is not, in one respect, an unfair one—that the census has cost more because it is necessary to pay more to employees now than before. He has argued that the cost of living has increased in Canada to such an extent as to account for the increased remuneration, and I presume that the concluding part of his argument would be that this would account for the enormous increase in the cost of the census. As the increase in the cost of the census has been over 100 per cent, if the hon. minister is right in his argument, the cost of living must have increased over 100 per cent in Canada. If that were precisely correct, I suppose we should find an increase of 100 per cent in the wage or remuneration paid to employees by persons, corporations and governments over what was paid ten years ago. But, as a matter of fact, even with the employees of the government themselves, there is nothing to show that those outside the census bureau are receiving 100 per cent higher salaries than they did ten years ago. If it be true that in the Census Bureau they are receiving 100 per cent increase that Bureau must be the envy of all the departments in Ottawa. I know that the men employed on railways in Canada are receiving 15 or 20 per cent more than they were receiving in 1891. I think the employees of the post office are not receiving, in many cases, any more than they were in 1891. Of course, it must be remembered that, in some cases, these employees are complaining that they are not paid enough. But the government of which the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fisher) is a member, for many years did not act at all upon this principle that we should give increases of remuneration to employees of the government. He, with the others, is responsible for the fact that for many years they persisted in refusing to give the civil servants even the statutory increases which, I think, might be properly looked upon as part of the salaries of those officers. So, it seems to me, the minister will need to suggest to the House some better argument than the increased cost of living and the increase of salary that is being paid, and justly being paid, by the departments of the government to civil servants, in order to account for the increased cost of the census which we are now considering. That argument, to a certain extent, is an ingenious one ; I think that even on a cursory examination it will be found to break down completely.

Now, it is very evident that, while the Minister of Agriculture has some ground for saying that there is an increase in the wage rate being paid for work in Canada, and that he could not get enumerators to work for the department if he did not give an increased wage rate, yet, taking the figures, he fails to account for the increased cost by developing that idea and showing that he had paid more for the enumerators. I took down the figures given by the hon. gentleman as to the cost of enumerators. Those figures show that the enumeration in 1891 cost $682,000, while that for 1901 cost $878,000. Of course, there must be some mistake, because the whole cost of the census for 1891 was only $549,000. I must have taken the figures down wrongly or the minister must have read them incorrectly from his notes. It is not necessary to labour the point. There is evidently some discrepancy. The great increase in the cost of the census is, to a certain extent, accounted for by the increased number of the enumerators employed. That would come about in this way : It is true that two men ought to do in half the time what one man did before. But if the government pays, and pays so liberally as I think we can show they did, for the time occupied in instructing the enumerators—fairly enough—every additional enumerator would add to the cost of the census. If gentlemen are paid $2 or $3 a day during the time they are receiving instruction, and the number in 1901 is double the number in 1891, that portion of the cost will be doubled. It is not hard to show that the cost of instructing the enumerators has been very considerable. I think it has been unjustifiably large. We find, from the testimony given before the committee of this House, that enumerators who came to meet the commissioner of their census districts were allowed $3 a day during the time they were receiving instruction from the commissioner. Moreover they were allowed their expenses, though the testimony given may show that they were at home at the very time they were receiving instructions. They received $3 a day though the sworn testimony of an officer of the government shows that in some cases they spent only one hour on some of the days they were receiving instructions. So, a man running away from his office or the factory in which he was employed to meet the commissioner appointed by this generous, large-hearted, large-souled administration, received for his well-spent time of one hour, $3 as remuneration and $1.50 or $2 for 'expenses.' Now, if you multiply that by the 8,888 enumerators who were employed by the government in making up this census, I think it will be seen that I have got at a very much more satisfactory reason to account for the enormous increase in the cost of the census than the suggestion made by the Minister of Agriculture that it is owing to the increased cost of living in Canada, or to any increased rate paid to the enumerators for doing their work.

But not only are the enumerators paid

very handsomely, paid for almost nothing, but in some cases in which they failed to receive a sufficient amount of information in the course of the days spent in the company of the commissioner and were unable to do their work at a later period, they were allowed to visit the commissioner at his home or in the neighbourhood; and these gentlemen who had been paid at the rate of $4 or $5 for one hour on the days on which the commissioner was giving the enumerators information, were paid at the same rate with expenses at an enormous advance over the actual cost, for attending the commissioner again at his home. So that it is quite easy to see that this practice of allowing unreasonable prices, unreasonable remuneration, to the enumerators during the period in which they were receiving their instructions, would account for a great part of the cost of this census. Now, who is responsible for this increase ? Clearly I think the Minister of Agriculture must be held to be entirely responsible. The Minister of Agriculture had ample time in which to prepare his work, he had ample time in which to arrange all these details, he had ample time in which to provide for everything that might transpire ; and if the result goes to show that the Minister of Agriculture, or the gentleman to whom he entrusted this work, did not anticipate all possible sources of loss, all possible chances of increasing unduly the cost of this census, then clearly, to my mind, the Minister of Agriculture must devise some far better defence than suggesting flaws in the preceding census before the people of Canada will acquit him of responsibility for the unduly increased cost of the census of 1901.

But the enumerators are not the only persons who have been paid very liberally. We have it on the sworn testimony of an official of the government that a commissioner who was a particularly favoured gentleman—I do not know that all the commissioners who were employed in taking the census were equally favoured—but we know that in the case of one gentleman at least he was allowed to make an addition of $50 to the bill of costs which he prepared to submit to the department, and that account was passed. There was no audit in the case at all of a satisfactory character, and there was no warrant, no justification, for the increased expenditure. After the commissioner in question had charged for every day upon which he had been employed, even in writing a letter, or sending a telegraphic message, or receiving a parcel, it could only be shown that he had been employed some fifty days. But he was a generous man, and he added fifty per cent to the fifty days and charged the government for seventy-five days. He made up his bill, and having made it up, on subsequent consultation with some other commissioners appointed by the government, he discovered that he had failed to realize all the advantages that might be derived from his position. He realized that he was far in the rear of what had been attained by some others of his brother commissioners, and he coolly added to that bill $50 more. He charges in the first place for every hall he had occupied, he charges for every moment of horse-hire, and he deliberately adds a lump sum to this bill later on. Charges for hall rent, for horse-hire, and for stationery, by which he adds something like $50 to that which was already a most liberal bill, and the whole amount is paid.

Now, if the people of Canada want to find out how the census has cost so much, all they have to do is to take the few occasions in which it has been possible to get at these accounts, and they will see why this census has cost so much. It is simply because the only limit to the size of the bills rendered by the commissioners and paid by the government, was the idea of what the government would stand on the part of the commissioners. The measure of the bite was the appetite of the man, and there is no evidence to show that in any case was there any restriction or control exercised, but throughout all the census accounts, so far as they can be understood by a cursory glance, and particularly so far as they can be better understood in view of the evidence taken before the committee, the man asked and received what he pleased. That accounts very easily for the enormously increased cost of the census, and it goes to show that the government did not exercise any particular control. They certainly started off in the most liberal fashion; they increased the cost of taking the census by their own act, in the first place, by advancing the remuneration from three cents per name to five cents per name; from fifteen cents per farm to twenty-five cents per farm; from twenty cents per factory to thirty cents per factory. There is an increase all round averaging over fifty per cent; and still, in addition to these enormous charges, all the accounts throughout, in the eyes of men who were familar with the locality and with the circumstances, go to show that after being paid these enormously high rates, the enumerators and the commissioners as well, were allowed to make irregular additions to their bills and these bills were honoured.

Now, a good part of the census commissioners may not have been quite as highly favoured as was the gentleman whose conduct was investigated before the committee. The facts were brought out that he was already an official of the government, employed, but I do not think very busily employed, in a different class of work altogether under different departments. In the case of Mr. Hurley, of East Hastings, it is seen that during the period in which he was engaged in taking the census he drew from his work under the Fishery Department, $441, and for his work under the census commissioner, $330 more, or a total

payment of $771. Now, why was this gentleman favoured so much ? I suppose the reason was that he was a defeated candidate. He had been a candidate at the preceding election, and although defeated by the people, not only is the whole patronage of his riding placed in his hands, but he is also appointed to supervise the officials of the provincial government in connection with the fisheries, and on top of that he is appointed a census commissioner, and above all he is allowed to pass accounts of the liberal character described, in which he is paying a man $3 a day for one hour's attendance, and is allowed to add fifty per cent to the lump sum claimed on his own account, and the whole thing is paid by the government. Under these circumstances, if it is necessary for the minister to raise the question of increased cost, of increased remuneration, of increased wages, the whole thing is, it seems to me, quite clear, it is an occasion in which the spoils system was in full operation. No man need apply for a position who was not a good staunch party supporter, and having become a good staunch party supporter, he could depend upon getting the most favoured nation treatment when he came to do business with the government. There was no question whatever as to his account—simply present it and have it paid. I find in my own county, the county of Pictou, in one comparatively small polling section, a compact section in which the houses are all along the main roads, one man is allowed twenty-four and a half days horse-hire for taking the farms in that one polling section. There were no factories, simply a farm settlement. Well, I would think it a very pleasant pastime to visit on foot every house in that polling section in two or three days; still a man is allowed to get twenty-four days and horse-hire.

Now, the criticism which has been addressed by this side of the House generally against the census, has been to the effect that it has been enormously costly, unreasonably costly; and, in the second place, we are inclined to believe that it will prove to be not only a very costly census, but when the whole matter is completed and all the accounts are closed, it will be found to be not a very satisfactory census. In reply to that the minister goes on to show that there were some errors in the census of 1891. He says that in some cases in 1891 the enumerators' schedules were not very carefully made out. He refers in particular to the schedules in connection with the fisheries, which he says were not available and which were not produced by the compilers. That may be. A further statement of the hon. Minister of Agriculture is that in some cases in 1891 exceptions were made by the commissioners in favour of the enumerators. That may be. The hon. minister read a list in which he said that in North and South Waterloo, Frontenac, East Simcoe and elsewhere, the commissioners, or managers, in 1891 departed from their rule of paying three cents per name and allowed $3 per day. It struck me while listening to that statement that in most cases where this had occurred, the sections were comparatively small, and the probability was that it was impossible to get any men to do the work of enumerating the census in these districts for three cents a name. It was likely that the population was so small that it was necessary to make some concessions. But admitting that there were irregularities in 1891, that simply increases our surprise at, or perhaps our admiration of, the fact that in the case of the census of 1901 the Minister of Agriculture is enabled to distance the performances of the bureau in 1891 by over 100 per cent. But admitting that there was a possibility of some irregularity in that case, we are led to believe, from the very statement made by the hon. minister, that there must be some enormous irregularities connected with the census of 1891. There is one difficulty about the form of criticism that the hon. gentleman has employed. It will be remembered that last year this same matter was brought up in the House in connection with the discussion on the budget, and a great many different parcels of census returns were laid upon the Table. It was charged that irregularities had occurred, and in fact it was insinuated that worse than irregularities had occurred. It was practically stated that the census of 1891 was padded. The impropriety of introducing any such evidence into this House lay in the fact that it was an ex-parte statement. It was a statement made by the parties who had possession of all the documents, which were withheld from those who were opposed to them, and there was no possibility for those thus opposed availing themselves of that evidence. The hon. Minister of Agriculture has referred to some persons in different counties in Quebec, a lot of schedules to have them examined there by persons who were friendly to the census of 1901 and hostile to the census of 1891. This was giving an unfair advantage, and there could be no satisfactory outcome from such a decision unless the government were prepared to grant our request that there should be a full inquiry made into the position of the census of 1891 and the census of 1901 by some disinterested and competent party.

Mr. SPROULE. They would not allow the Public Accounts Committee to see the schedules, but they would cart them all over the country for others to examine.

Mr. BELL. That being the case, it is very clear that the hon. Minister of Agriculture cannot expect to secure the assent of this House to the course which he has followed. He cannot expect to bring conviction to the mind of any hon. member on this side of the House by the criticism to which he has resorted. It is very evident from the

defence which the hon. minister has put up that he has devoted a certain portion of the staff which is employed by him in the census staff not to the work of making the census of 1901 as perfect and complete as possible, but to the work of criticising, examining and seeking to find flaws in a census that is ten years old.

Mr. CLARKE. Trying to discredit it.

Mr. BELL. Trying to discredit the census of 1891. That is the work to which the officers of the census bureau have been devoted, and it is not so hard to understand how a considerable addition has been made to the cost of the census of 1901. Not only has the hon. Minister of Agriculture engaged in taking a census, but, recognizing the fact that his census does not have the confidence of the people of Canada, recognizing the fact that it has been exposed to a great deal of hostile criticism, and realizing that he must make some defence, it is very clear that a great deal of industry has been devoted, not to perfecting the census of 1901, but to an endeavour to make it appear better by pointing out defects in the one that preceded it. That would be a perfectly fair and legitimate comparison if it could be made from both sides. If the friends of the census of 1891 were in the position to join the hon. minister in the investigation and compare these two censuses. If we were in a position to go and see what was good and what bad and to judge for ourselves, then it would be perfectly fair, but the hon. minister comes forward and produces this evidence which has been collected by him, but which—and I do not assume that he has not been perfectly honest in the matter, or that he is making statements that he does not believe true—is entirely ex-parte. He is simply playing the game with loaded dice, and he cannot expect that any such defence as he is making is going to satisfy the House or the country as to the merits of the census of 1901. The hon. minister has said a good deal about the comparative time in which the work of compilation and enumeration has been completed. He has drawn a great many comparisons very much to the advantage of the census of 1901 and very much to the disadvantage of the census of 1891. This all comes under the same category as that to which I have referred. We must leave these matters for full and satisfactory consideration until the time has arrived when the two censuses have been completed and can be compared as completed. It is impossible to judge them any sooner than that. If the hon. minister has succeeded in having a perfectly satisfactory census made in 1901, we will be glad to know it when we have had time to study it fully. At this moment, after two and a half years have elapsed, only the first volume of the census has been published, and the schedules which relate to the industries of Canada, and the schedules for which the hon. minister claims a great deal of credit as having been taken in addition to those prepared in 1891, have not been compiled or submitted to this parliament, and we are not in a position to judge of the advantages of the census in that respect. It appears from the claim made by the hon. minister that a great many more questions were asked in the census of 1901 than in the census of 1891. That is, I suppose, up to a certain point, in the right direction, but, when the census bureau undertakes to collect more information than can be reduced within a reasonable time into tabulated form, it is submitting the country to an expenditure from which the country is not likely to derive any substantial benefit whatever. Although the questions in the schedules have been increased from 216 in 1891 to 561 in 1901, the fact apparently remains that we have not at this moment derived any more advantage whatever from this large number of additional questions, because they have not been compiled, and if the answers are permitted to remain in the forms of schedules uncompleted and uncompiled and inaccessible to the public, of what value is this large number of questions? It would have been better far for the country, if the government had been satisfied with a smaller number of questions, and if they had collected the information in such a manner as to enable them to have it in tabulated form at the earliest possible moment. We are at a disadvantage in not having the two censuses completed, because we cannot compare them. I was rather amused at the criticism of my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Heyd), who apparently found a great deal to excite his criticism in the fact that the census-takers of 1891 had devoted a good deal of time to ascertaining how many rooms were in the homes which were occupied by the people of Canada, and particularly when he came to tell the House about the statistics relating to those who only occupied one room, he seemed to look upon that as the most idle and improvident, and ridiculous thing that could be imagined. The idea of spending time over these poor people who could only afford to live in one room. Was that the idea he had in his mind?

Mr. HEYD. No.

Mr. BELL. Then, I would like to know what was in that great mind possibly like the judge who shook his head, there was nothing in it. There is nothing more important in the census forms, as a portrayal of the condition of the country than a return showing how many families have to live in one room. There is no greater indication of the need of social reform, and occasionally of governmental and municipal interference, than that anything like a large percentage of the people of the country should have to live in one room. There is nothing that marks more distinctly the progress of the people and their advancement, than that the number who live in one room is diminish-

ing. There is perhaps no feature in that census to which the reformer of a future day, who is trying to get an idea of what Canada was in 1891, would attach more importance than to that very statement. He would want to know how many of the people of Canada were obliged to live in such a poor condition, that they were compelled to live in a dwelling of one room. These facts relating to our population, are to my mind of high importance. They give us a picture of our country as it is ; they show what the requirements of our country are at a given date, and they measure the progress of the people more correctly even, than the statistics relating to the creation of wealth and its development in industrial pursuits. I cannot understand why my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Heyd) should criticise the census of 1891 on the ground that it had devoted a great deal of attention to the humbler classes of the people. It seems to me that a census could not be better employed, than in that very work. We have the fact remaining then, that the census of 1901 has been an enormously expensive census ; that it has cost us at least $500,000 more than it should have cost, and so far as I can judge, there is no prospect of its being completed within the very near future. An enormous part of the figures secured by the enumerators have not been compiled yet, and judging by the amount of money voted this year, it is not unreasonable to say that it looks as though that census would never be completed. I believe that when two or three years have passed, and we have ascertained more closely what the census of 1901 have brought forth, we will be able to say that it has not only been a most costly census, but a most defective one as well. My hon. friend (Mr. Heyd) treated with a great deal of scorn, certain criticisms which he found in a broad sheet, on the compilation of this census in the department. The hon. gentleman ought not to be too quick to pledge his word and his standing in this House, in the positive assertion that these statements are absolutely unfounded. He may have to swallow a good many of these statements before he is much older. So far, it has not been possible to secure evidence on some of these points. But the day is not far distant when evidence will be secured.

Mr. HEYD. Why make the statement before you secure evidence ?

Mr. GOURLEY. You would never make any statement if you followed that rule.

Mr. BELL. The time will come when these statements will be verified.

Mr. HEYD. There are three deliberate statements made in that sheet, which on the authority of the census commissioner are absolutely untrue. What are you going to do about it ?

Mr. BELL. We are going to prove it.

Mr. HEYD. Go on and prove it. I would rather take the word of the census commissioner.

Mr. BELL. We know, although we cannot prove it to a demonstration yet, that the schedules, in the Census Department have been changed ; that in some cases figures have been altered by the compilers ; that the returns as compiled are not the returns as received in the census office from the enumerators ; that the census compilers have corrected what they thought to be errors, and in some cases they committed errors in altering what was actually correct. I do not know exactly to what extent this has gone. We did not know until recently to what extent the government had gone in allowing enumerators and commissioners to pay themselves. We only succeeded in getting one or two witnesses before the committee but so far as it went, I never heard of any lead or vein that seem to give better promise of great returns, if it could be worked out. There can be no doubt that it will be worked out. The manner in which the government have tried to discredit the census taken ten years ago ; the manner in which they have done it in the dark to a certain extent ; the manner in which they have made use of their position to take census documents out of the custody of the department and to distribute them in the hands of partisans in order to discredit the census of ten years ago, is a sufficient warrant that the moment the opportunity arises a complete investigation into the census of 1901 will have to be made in order to satisfy the people of the country. The cost of this census, let it be borne in mind, is not paid by the members of this House alone, but by the people of Canada, and if the census is not satisfactory, the people of the country will demand an investigation. They will want to understand how it is possible, that whereas the census of 1891 contained a large number of questions in excess of those asked in 1881, it entailed a comparatively small increase of cost. They will want to know how it is that the census of 1901, containing in the same way an increased number of questions no man can possibly account for the increased cost. A large number of these questions apply only to those engaged in certain trades and avocations, like the fishermen, and the enumerators are not required to visit every man in the country in order to get these questions answered. All the factories in Canada are comparatively few, and all the fishermen of Canada are few compared with the whole population. The great cost of enumeration must manifestly be in visiting, individually, the people who are enumerated. You may increase questions by the hundred and not add much to the labour of an enumerator.

The addition of 100 per cent to the number of questions could not possibly, under a fair and honest management, add anything like 100 per cent to the cost. It might

add only a very limited amount to the cost of the census. All these things being taken into consideration, the fact remains that the census has been enormously costly and there is a grave suspicion on the part of those who looked into it most carefully that it will prove to be an unsatisfactory census. The government refused to employ a man of recognized ability, I might say of eminence, as a statistician ; they passed him over to take into their employment a man whom they selected, simply on the ground of his party allegiance. They passed over a trained statistician, a man who has a continental, a world-wide reputation, and they took an untried man, with the result that might have been expected. Then in regard to the work of enumeration, instead of employing the old enumerators who had had experience, they employed an altogether untrained and inexperienced body of enumerators. No man who was employed in the previous census was employed in this one.

An hon. MEMBER. Shame.

Mr. BELL. My hon. friend says shame. He is pleased with that act and why is he so gratified with the fact that not one of the men employed in 1891 was employed in 1901 ?

Mr. HEYD. We wanted a better quality.

Mr. BELL. Wanted a better quality ; if the measure of quality has been the cost of the service, then evidently the qualifications were very high. Not one of the old enumerators was employed, no matter how competent he might be, because he was of the wrong party stripe. Members of the House of Commons who are saying to me across the House that this was quite right are simply proclaiming that they took advantage of their position here to make a present to their party supporters throughout Canada of $750,000, on the good and satisfactory ground that they were good party supporters and would vote the Liberal ticket. The result goes to show the people what it costs them to have in power a government that views matters in this way. If the government had taken the experienced census manager whom they had at their call and had employed the experienced census enumerators whom they could have found throughout the country, there can be no doubt that the census would have been better taken and taken at a much reduced cost. I would not have thought it proper on my part to enter into any defence of the Dominion statistician from the charges that were made against him by his minister to-day ; I thought that when the Minister of Agriculture said so positively that the officer who took the census of 1891 had committed such blunders and done such bad work in that census that he would not allow him to take this one, it was no part of mine or of any member on this side of the House to say a word in condemnation of the minister's action. However, the very errors in the census of 1891 which the minister was using and advancing as the reason why he should not employ the statistician to take this census were discovered by him after the present census had been taken. He could have had no knowledge of these errors up to the time and until long after the time he commenced taking the census of 1901.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman forgets the errors that were pointed out in this House in 1893 and 1894.

Mr. BELL. Those were not the errors cited by the hon. minister on this occasion.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They were quite sufficient.

Mr. BELL. The only errors pointed out on that occasion were errors not on the part of the head of the census bureau, but on the part of some enumerators, particularly I think of one in the county of King's, N.S.; no charge was made against the head of the statistical department. I think it would be admitted that a very much better and more satisfactory defence will have to be made by the Minister of Agriculture and his supporters before they will convince the people of Canada that this has been a cheap or economical census. And yet we are perfectly willing to be reasonable and fair and wait until time gives us the opportunity to know exactly what the present census is. I think they will require to produce some very valuable volumes and excellent results before they can persuade the people that it is a good and well-taken census. There is one little fact by which we can judge of the comparative merit and ability of the men managing the two censuses ; that is the fact that while the first results were given to the people of Canada by the census bureau at about the same length of time after the enumeration in 1891 and 1901, I think in the month of August in each case, the census department in 1891 gave the population exactly almost, with an error of only 560, less than 600, while in the case of the census taken in 1901, the first returns of population, made about the same period, were in error to the extent of 44,000 ; the error in the census of 1901 was nearly one hundred times as great as that of the census of 1891. We know that ; we can only guess at what may be revealed by the publication of the later volumes of the census. But we know that so far as the census returns of the population of Canada are concerned, the head of the census bureau in 1891 came within less than 600 of what was found in the end to be the exact population, and that in the present census the error is somewhere in the neighbourhood of 40,000 or 50,000. That is a simple fact, but it is a test case, and goes to show that there was more accuracy and speed in compiling the returns in 1891 than in 1901, and I will

be agreeably surprised if it does not prove true as to all the succeeding volumes that there is the same measure of inaccuracy to be found in 1901 as compared with the census of 1891, in every other respect as there was evidenced in that first estimate of the population made in the two successive censuses. I think enough has been proved to show that in every part of the census work there has been an enormous increase of cost, and it has not been shown, so far as I can discover—and I am sure I approached the subject with an open mind—that there was any increased efficiency to compensate the country for the increased cost. Therefore it strikes me that Canada has every reason to be dissatisfied with a census whose only merit is that it has put an enormously large sum of money into the hands of the good supporters of the party now in power.

Mr. G. McEWEN (South Huron). I had no intention, Mr. Speaker, of addressing the House on this subject, and consequently have not followed the example of hon. gentlemen opposite and collected material for a speech, I shall not trespass on your patience to any great extent. The only reason why I do obtrude myself into this debate is because the county which I have the honour to represent has been referred to by the member for North Middlesex (Mr. Sherritt), in such a way that I can hardly afford to allow his remarks to go unchallenged. The hon. gentleman, in comparing the labour of taking the census of 1901 with the work done in 1891, argued that as the population was less in the later period, the work of taking the census must have been correspondingly decreased. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that does not follow at all. I find, on looking at the census of 1901, that in some cases over 400 more questions were asked than in the previous census. In the farmers' schedules 127 questions were asked in 1901 as compared with 75 in 1891. In those of the latter are included four questions relating to farm buildings, twelve to classified areas of farm land, twenty-two to orchard trees, vines and fruits, thirty-seven to field crops, twenty-six to live stock and animal products, and twenty-three to values of lands, buildings, field and fruit crops and labour. And no system of agricultural enumeration is satisfactory which does not take account of the areas devoted to agricultural purposes, the schedules are framed to procure as far as practicable the acreage as well as the production of every crop. That shows that the work done in 1901, in this particular item, is over three-quarters more than what was done in 1891. To my mind, that certainly, supposing the cost is more than double, fully justifies that expenditure. I find also that with reference to the forest industry, fifty questions were asked in each case in the census of 1901 as compared with twenty-two in the census of 1891, or more than double. There was more than double the work done in 1901, than was performed in 1891. It has been suggested that the enumerators had only to take down the replies to these different questions when they were at the house when making each visit. Besides not only did this entail extra work at each house visited, but it also entailed a great deal of labour, and that where the extra work came in was not in travelling the distances between those different places. Well, with regard more particularly to the section to which I belong, the distances between the houses are very trifling. The concessions are all occupied, and when you go up one and down the other, you do not have to go more than one-quarter of a mile between each house on the same side, and when you cross from one house to the other opposite, the distance is not more than forty rods, consequently the travelling between the houses does not amount to nearly as much work as taking down the answers. I find that there are three inquiries in the special form for obtaining the record of persons temporarily absent, twenty-nine in the one for manufactures of clay products, and thirty in the one for manufacture of butter and cheese. These, added to the inquiries contained in the regular schedules, make a total of 623 or 407 more than the number of inquiries contained in the schedules employed in taking the census of 1891. That I think shows good justification for the extra expense. Again in the unorganized territories in the west, 129 questions were asked in 1891, as compared with 192 in 1901, or a difference of 63, or just about double. Now I may say that there has been a large increase in the last decade as I can testify by experience with the labour I employ, it costs me twenty five per cent more now than it did ten years ago. So you will see that there was good ground for the extra expense.

The hon. member for North Middlesex made reference to a harbour which was erected in my part of the country, and which has been pretty well discussed in this House. I am afraid that hon. gentlemen opposite will not get very much comfort out of that harbour, for it was well known that it was the hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) who was the cause of its being built. It was he who came up there and ordered the expenditure. For my part, I am very much pleased that he has gone over to the other side, where these hon. gentlemen are now harbouring him in their arms, and I think in him they will find a kindred soul. My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) says that the census will never be completed. That remark hardly comes with good grace from the other side, and it would have been just as well for them had my hon. friend left it unsaid. I find that the late government did not complete its census until this parliament was elected, in 1896. The last

volume was published in 1897, so that we on this side have got a few years yet to wait before we will have reached the length of time taken by hon. gentlemen opposite to complete their census. They are therefore a little premature in saying that our census will never be completed. As regards the total cost of the census, I think any increase in the expenditure is amply justified by the much more complete and accurate information obtained and by the greatly increased work that had to be done at headquarters to compile and collate all that information, and we have the satisfaction of knowing that we have a census upon which we can rely, and not, as in the case of the last one, a census in which much of the information given was absolutely unreliable. And we have, in addition to that, the fact that the population has increased very much, which, of course, added to the cost as compared with 1891, not only in the enumeration, but in the work of compilation here at Ottawa.

Mr. J. CLANCY (Bothwell). I should at any stage of the session despair of bringing hon. gentlemen to vote for the motion of my hon. friend from Peel——

Mr. CAMPBELL. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLANCY—and I still further despair of convincing my hon. friend who says: 'Hear, hear'—but I especially despair on this occasion of hon. gentlemen opposite doing what is right. I am not going into the discussion of this question generally——

Mr. CAMPBELL. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLANCY—and I am glad to have the approval in advance of my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Campbell). I promise the hon. gentleman I will be only a few minutes. I want to deal mainly with one constituency, and I choose that of the whip of the Liberal party (Mr. Calvert) certainly a distinguished gentleman to occupy so distinguished a position. I think that constituency would be a fair sample of Liberal morality. It would be an abomination to suppose that there was anything worse in the riding of the whip of the Liberal party in connection with the taking of the census than in any other constituency. That hon. gentleman recommended all the officers and knew all about them, and I say that no one would imagine that any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House could maintain a higher standing with regard to these appointments than the whip of the party. I need hardly say that every hon. gentleman on the other side who recommended the commissioner in his riding and even went so far as to recommend that every one of the enumerators must be held responsible. Now, the constituency represented by the whip of the Liberal party is West Middlesex. The population of that riding in 1891 was 17,288, and it costs $1,302.21 to take the census that year. In 1901, the riding did not have so large a population. It will be remembered that the Liberal party were in opposition during a very considerable part of the decade, and it will be remembered also that they were among the most active immigration agents of the United States during that period and lost no opportunity of assuring the people that Canada was not a country fit to live in. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) made the statement in this House a session or two ago that the London 'Advertiser' had within that period some 900 subscribers in the United States, all of whom had left Canada. This kind of thing may account for the population of the riding having shrunk from 17,288 in 1891 to 15,543 in 1901. But what does the House suppose it cost to take the census during this year of lower population? Instead of $1,302.31, the cost was $3,113.37. Let me give you some instances of Liberal economy. I am not quoting from mere hearsay. We had an examination into this matter before the Public Accounts Committee and I have before me the evidence taken in that examination. Take the case of the village of Glencoe, a little place of about 1,000 inhabitants. The recording in that village cost $57.40 and the horse-hire was $63. Then, take the little village of Newbury, the population of which is about three or four hundred. The recording there cost $29.50 while the horse-hire in the village cost $27. Then, take the town of Strathroy, the town in which the Liberal whip resides. The recording in the town of Strathroy cost $173.50 and the horse-hire $186. Putting it all together the recording cost $260.15, and the horse-hire $276 of these places. Let me give you some of the evidence. I am sorry that my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Heyd) is not in his place. But, as I have said, I shall not give mere hearsay, but shall quote from the evidence given before the Public Accounts Committee. Of course, it will be understood that we have merely touched the fringe when we have investigated West Middlesex. Here is the evidence of Mr. McDougal, the commissioner for the riding:

Q. Do you know Mr. Alex. Leach of Strathroy?
A. I do.
Q. What does he do?
A. I do not know what he does.
Q. Never inquired I suppose. Does he live in the town?
A. He lives in the town.
Q. How old is he? Seventy?
A. I would judge that he was probably more, he is a good age, an old gray-haired man.
Q. Is he a delicate man?
A. He is.

My hon. friend from South Brant said they had selected the best men.

Q. Do you think he would be able to walk from house to house to take the census?
A. I could not say, although he is very crippled.
Q. Does he use crutches?
A. No sir, not that I am aware of.
Q. But would you feel bound to allow him horse-hire on account of his age?

A. If he put it in his account I certainly would allow it.

Q. Well, you seem to have allowed Mr. Leach twenty-two days' horse-hire ?

A. Yes.

Q. Aggregating $33 ? and you say if he put it in, you would have allowed it to him on account of his age ?

A. Not altogether on that account ; I would have allowed it because he had it in his account.

Q. All you had to do was to find it in his account and you allowed it ?

A. I allowed that part of it.

Q. Is Mr. Duncan Patterson an old gentleman seventy years of age?

A. He is quite an old man.

Q. Does he reside in Strathroy ?

A. I think he does, or very near it on the town line.

Q. What is he—a healthy rugged man ?

A. I would not call him so.

Q. He is able to go about from house to house?

A. I would judge so.

Q. Is he old enough now to elicit your sympathies ?

A. I did not have any sympathies.

Q. You have none. ?

A. No, sir.

Q. If he put in horse-hire, you allowed it because it was in there ?

A. Yes, sir, because it was in there.

Q. Do you know Mr. John R. Clarke ?

You see, Mr. Speaker, I take them in consecutive order.

A. I do, sir.

Q. How old a man is he ?

A. I could not say, probably more than sixty.

Q. Is he a vigourous man ?

A. I would not call him so.

Q. Delicate is he ?—A. Fairly healthy I think, although he has a delicate appearance, but I could not say whether he is delicate or not.

Q. You would think he was able to go about at sixty taking the census in a place like Strathroy?—A. In part of it.

Q. Now he is allowed fourteen days' horse-hire, $21. You allowed the others partly on account of age ?—A. I beg pardon, I did not say so.

Q. Well, because Mr. Clarke was fortunate enough to put it in there ?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is the reason ?—A. Yes, sir.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could read pages of that kind of history in West Middlesex. I shall not detain the House further than to say that Mr. McDougal—and I take it as a fair sample—declares in his evidence that he did not make any declaration nor did he receive any declarations as to the accuracy of his accounts ; all he had to do in every instance was to put in the account and it was paid.

Mr. BROCK. And to vote right.

Mr. CLANCY. And to vote right. We have there in evidence that whatever account was put in it was paid, although the law requires that a declaration should be made in every case, the commissioner stated upon oath that he took no declarations, contrary to law, and contrary to a statement made by the Minister of Agriculture who, in his place in this House, when he was defending the cost of the census, declared that in every instance the solemn declaration of the parties was taken in regard to the matter. Yet we find in that single sample selected, that the commissioner states that in no case did he take any declarations from the parties who had been employed on the census. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have said enough to make it perfectly clear that the most wretched conduct prevailed throughout the whole of Canada in the taking of this census, and one evidence is the fact that the census of 1891 cost $449,991, while that of 1901 cost $1,198,268. I have given you a fair sample in the only case which I had occasion to examine, and it was a fair sample of the system that pervaded the whole thing from start to finish. Is it any wonder that this alarming cost should be saddled upon the people of Canada for useless purposes ? Why, Sir, the census in many cases are utterly useless, they are crowded with the most useless tables, and these are given as a reason for having such an enormously increased cost. But you can see the folly at once. These are mere pretexts for that condition of things. I have given you a fair sample of how the accounts have been padded out. It was stated by some gentlemen that the census have been altered. If any hon. gentleman now is prepared to dispute that I will read from the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee, that they were altered, that the schedules were changed, that slips were put in, and that this was of general occurrence. There is no use for hon. gentlemen to deny these facts, they are here in evidence and can be produced, and they know it perfectly well. Now I have nothing more to say in conclusion but this——

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLANCY. Well, I know my hon. friend is impatient. I sympathize with my hon. friend. I am astonished at his moderation, under such circumstances, that he did not say ' hear, hear ' long ago.

Mr. BOYD. Read him the evidence.

Mr. CLANCY. Well, I will not weary the hon. gentleman, I will not put such a strain upon him. I can only tell him that the record of the government in taking this census is a perfectly scandalous one, it is one over which the hon. gentlemen opposite should hang their heads in shame. I shall have much pleasure in supporting the amendment of my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain), and I shall expect that our friends opposite will do the same. If there ever was a motion brought up in this House that invited the courage of hon. gentlemen, it is the motion of my hon. friend to censure the conduct of the government in making this census. Not only have they cost this enormous sum, but they are of little value in many respects. They were made in some cases by men declared to be so old that they could not walk about the streets, men as stated by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr.

Bell) who were mere voters and were nearly past the voting age. I repeat that I shall be astonished if hon. gentlemen opposite do not support my hon. friend's motion.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Blain):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Hughes (Victoria),
Avery,	Kidd,
Birkett,	Lancaster,
Blain,	LaRivière,
Borden (Halifax),	Lavell,
Boyd,	MacLaren (Perth),
Brock,	McGowan,
Calvin,	McIntosh,
Carscallen,	Northrup,
Clancy,	Richardson,
Clare,	Robinson (Elgin),
Clarke,	Roche (Marquette),
Cochrane,	Sherritt,
Fowler,	Sproule,
Gourley,	Thomson (Grey),
Hackett,	Tolton,
Halliday,	Wilson.—35.
Henderson,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bazinet,	Lovell,
Beith,	Loy,
Belcourt,	Macdonald,
Bernier,	Mackie,
Blair,	McCool,
Brown,	McCreary,
Bruneau,	McEwen,
Bureau,	McGugan,
Campbell,	McIsaac,
Christie,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Copp,	Matheson,
Davis,	Mayrand,
Demers (St. John),	Mignault,
Desjardins,	Morrison,
Douglas,	Mulock (Sir William),
Emmerson,	Paterson,
Erb,	Préfontaine,
Fielding,	Proulx,
Fisher,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fitzpatrick,	Roche (Halifax),
Fortier,	Ross (Ontario),
Gallery,	Rousseau,
Gauvreau,	Russell,
Geoffrion,	Schell,
Gibson,	Scott,
Gould,	Stephens,
Grant,	Stewart,
Heyd,	Sutherland (Essex),
Holmes,	Talbot,
Kendall,	Tolmie,
Lang,	Tucker,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Turgeon,
Laurier (L'Assomption),	Wallace,
Lavergne,	Wright.—69.
LeBlanc,	

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Calvert,	Taylor,
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Hyman,	Gilmour,
Johnston (Lambton),	Simmons,
McColl,	Ward,
Fraser,	Bell,
Guthrie,	Porter,
Cowan,	Pringle,
Parmelee,	Pope,
Costigan,	Hale,
Tobin,	Ball,

Mr. CLANCY.

Ross (Victoria),	Wilmot,
Oliver,	Culbert,
Harwood,	Maclean,
Champagne,	Casgrain,
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Kaulbach,
Lewis,	Vrooman,
McCarthy,	Barker,
Sifton,	Kendrey,
German,	Ganong,
Ethier,	Morin,
Lemieux,	Lennox,
Thompson (Haldimand and Monck),	Ingram,
Cartwright (Sir Richard)	Tupper (Sir C. H.),
Dyment,	McCormick,
Charlton,	Tisdale,
Harty,	Reid (Grenville),
Wade,	Smith (Wentworth),
Riley,	Earle,
Marcil (Bagot),	Monk,
Maclaren (Huntingdon),	Rosamond,
Sutherland (Oxford),	Haggart,
Delisle,	Johnston (Cardwell),
Borden (Sir Frederick),	Osler,
Hughes (P.E.I.),	Bennett,
Eickerdike,	Roddick,
Macpherson,	Kemp,
Ross (Yukon),	Bruce,
Smith (Vancouver),	Robinson (Northumberland),
Archambault,	Seagram,
Power,	Broder,
Girard,	Léonard.

Amendment negatived, motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

To cover cost of the extension of the coast service and surveys on the northern coast of Canada, $100,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Do I understand that the government are still carrying on their expedition to ascertain the navigability of Hudson bay and straits?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is going on.

Department of Indian Affairs—contingencies—further amount required, $3,500.

The PRIME MINISTER. This item of $3,500 is divided under two heads. The sum of $2,500 is required for printing the treaties which we have made with the several bands of Indians. These treaties have been collected in book form, but the edition is exhausted, and it is for the purpose of supplying a new issue of these treaties that this vote is required. Then there is the sum of $1,000 for printing and stationery generally. The amount provided for it at the present time is insufficient, and this additional amount has become indispensable.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I correct in understanding that the right hon. gentleman proposes to collate all the treaties in book form?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that would be a very convenient and a very proper thing to do.

North-west Mounted Police—salaries—to pay A. V. Joyce, junior second-class clerk, for one optional subject, $50.

The PRIME MINISTER. This Mr. Joyce has passed the examination in one optional subject, and is therefore entitled to an increase of $50.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why is he paid a certain sum for one optional subject ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Under the Civil Service Act, if one of the clerks passes an examination for a subject which is optional, such as typewriting or stenography, he becomes entitled, not as a matter of course, but in the discretion of the government, to an increase of $50.

To provide for the salary of a second-class clerk, E. F. Drake, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $1,200.

The PRIME MINISTER. The circumstances under which this vote is required are as follows : Mr. Drake is a staff sergeant in the mounted police. He enlisted on the 14th August, 1888. He has done work in the inside service, and is a very good officer. At the present time he receives $1,131.50, and it is proposed to give him an additional salary, which will raise his salary to $1,200.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What service is he now in ?

The PRIME MINISTER. He is in the inside service. He enlisted formerly as a constable and then became a sergeant, after which he was transferred to the inside service at Ottawa. He performs clerical work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does he take the place of any other clerk in the inside service, or is he an additional clerk ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, he is taking nobody's place. He has been transferred. At the present time he is not permanent. We intend to make him a permanent officer and give him a salary of $1,200. The increase will be the difference between $1,131.50 and $1,200.

Mr. SPROULE. Where did he get $1,131 ?

The PRIME MINISTER. At Ottawa. He has been in Ottawa for seven years.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is not the appointment of an additional officer at all ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And only a trifling addition in salary ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Department of the Interior—salaries—amount underestimated in two junior class clerkships, $212.50.

The PRIME MINISTER. This $212.50 is to provide for increases in the salaries of Mr. Beauchamp and Miss Mary Guthrie. Mr. Beauchamp was appointed a junior second-class clerk on the 1st July, 1902, at a salary of $600 per annum. He had passed, prior to his appointment, in two optional subjects, stenography and typewriting, and therefore it was decided to grant him $50 for each optional, in accordance with the rule of the service. That will raise his salary from $600 to $700. Then, the same explanation applies to the case of Miss Guthrie. Miss Guthrie was appointed by Order in Council on the 1st April, 1903, as a junior second-class clerk, vice J. P. Dunne, promoted, and as she then had passed in two optional subjects, stenography and typewriting, her salary was fixed at $700 per annum. When preparing the main estimates for the next fiscal year provision was made to fill the position left vacant by the promotion of Mr. Dunne by a second-class clerk at a salary of $600, and it is necessary to ask for $100 to be voted to cover the amount of her salary. Miss Guthrie will, on the 1st April, 1904, be entitled to the statutory increment of her class, and in three months from the 30th June, 1904, she will be entitled to an extra amount of $12.50. This makes up the amount of $212.50.

Mr. SPROULE. You are starting with pretty good salaries.

The PRIME MINISTER. The statute provides that the initial salary should be $600, and the statute gives her $700, she having passed two optional subjects. It is a statutory right.

Four additional second-class clerks, one at $650, and three at $600 each, $2,450.

The PRIME MINISTER. This amount is required as follows : S. W. Hobart, who has been on the temporary staff since January, 1900, and who has passed in one optional subject, $650 ; J. B. Duhamel, employed as temporary messenger and clerk since September, 1903, $600 ; M. P. Morris, appointed February, 1900, $600 ; Wm. Bailey, new appointment, $600.

Mr. SPROULE. How many of these are new appointments ?

The PRIME MINISTER. There is only one who now comes into the department.

Mr. SPROULE. But the rest have been appointed quite recently ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose as the business of the department increases the number of clerks will have to be increased, but it is desirable that we should know exactly what additions have been made during the past six or seven years.

The PRIME MINISTER. We will allow the item to stand for a moment, and perhaps the deputy minister will be able to furnish me the information.

Item allowed to stand.

Salaries and expenses of mines branch, $10,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. The general and immediate object of the work of this branch to be the collection and publication

of data regarding the economic minerals of the country, and of the processes and activities connected with their utilization. This to be accomplished under the following heads: (A.) statistics, covering the investigations into: The production, consumption, exports and imports of the economic minerals of the country, the collecting of figures, relating to cost, freight, markets, and so forth. These tabulated on a proper system of classification, the discussions as to the causes of variation of production, exports and imports, fluctuations of markets, &c., to be published annually, or at any such frequent intervals as may be found practicable.

(B.) Technological: Covering the preparation and publication of the bulletins and monographs giving information in a concise form regarding: 1. The location, mode of occurrence, extent and character of the various economic mineral deposits. 2. Assays, analyses of ores, and in the case of building material, tests of strength and endurance of pressure, &c. 3. Description of the method of exploitation, treatment for extraction of metallic contents, for resultant products. The information to be obtained from material already published, but scattered in a great measure inaccessible, to be supplemented wherever necessary by visit of officer in charge to the respective localities. A separate monogram for each mineral, as coal, iron, copper, nickel, gold, &c. (except building materials which may be written up as a class). To be published, giving all available information in reference to them. the publications specially framed to meet the needs of the public commercially interested in these matters and annually bound in one volume, entitled 'The mineral resources of Canada.' The separate monograms to be distributed as widely and freely as possible to bring the mineral wealth of Canada prominently before the investing public and thus aid in bringing capital into the country, necessary for the development of its resources. To accomplish this object it will require a staff of experts to collect data, make reports, and furnish reliable assays, analyses, of the economic minerals of the country. The staff will consist of technical officers (mining geologists). In other words this is to establish a mining bureau on the pattern of a similar bureau in Washington.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it proposed to avail of the present staff of the department for this branch?

The PRIME MINISTER. I think it is to be an annex of the Geological Department. This is the memo. placed in my hand by the minister before he left for England. To accomplish this object we require a staff of experts to collect data, make reports, and furnish reliable assays and analyses of the economic minerals of the country. I presume the staff would assist the technical officers, but I also presume it will require some addition to the present staff.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this branch to be under the head of the Geological Survey?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, Dr. Haanel, superintendent of mines, will be at the head of this branch.

Mr. SPROULE. This is the creation of a new branch. Will the right hon. gentleman tell us how many will be employed in that branch and the salaries they will get?

The PRIME MINISTER. Not more than two or three besides the superintendent, all experts.

Mr. SPROULE. And next year you will require two or three more.

The PRIME MINISTER. Possibly, but although this is a growing time, it is our intention at present to limit it to the superintendent and not more than two or three experts.

Mr. SPROULE. What salaries do you propose to pay these experts?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know, but it is calculated that the whole expenditure should not exceed $10,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Who will be the man in charge?

The PRIME MINISTER. Dr. Haanel, the superintendent of mining.

Mr. SPROULE. What is his salary to be?

The PRIME MINISTER. The vote now asked will not go to pay his salary. He is already employed in the department, but it is proposed, in addition to the duties he now has to perform, that we shall establish such a bureau and place under him two, and perhaps three experts and no more.

Mr. SPROULE. What is his salary now?

The PRIME MINISTER. $3,000.

Mr. SPROULE. How far is it permissible to establish a branch like that without any amendment to the law? Have you the right to establish all the branches you think it wise to establish without the authority of law, simply making it a departmental matter?

The PRIME MINISTER. There is no doubt that with this amount of money voted by parliament the government has perfect authority to create such a work, but it will last only one year. Unless it is provided next year it will lapse, ipso facto; it cannot be continued from year to year as it could if it were established by statute.

Mr. SPROULE. I take it that the more proper way would be to establish a branch by statute.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think it would be preferable to establish it this way. It is experimental and may not prove conclusively satisfactory and therefore I think it better to do it in this way. If it works well perhaps the idea of my hon. friend will then be adopted but at the present time I think my hon. friend will agree that it is better to have it as it is.

Mr. SPROULE. We already have a statistical branch and as this is simply collecting statistics along another line I do not see why this should not be added to the statistical branch.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is collecting statistics on another line of a very special character, and as it is stated in the memorial I presented to the House it is proposed to issue a volume to be entitled : 'The Mineral Resources of Canada.' I doubt very much if we would have in the Department of Agriculture a staff of such special knowledge and competence as to collect the information which is to be included in this volume. It will require the services of expert mineralogists to perform this work.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me it would be the easiest matter in the world to appoint an expert on this subject to the statistical branch.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not say my hon. friend may not be right.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems to me that if you are to create a sub-department of the Department of the Interior called the mines branch, it would be necessary to have a statute eventually; I think the hon. member for East Grey is perfectly correct about that. I would like to know what Dr. Haanel's position is at present; what are his duties in the Department of the Interior, how long has he been in the department and what have been his duties up to the present time ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Dr. Haanel has been in the employment of the government as superintendent of mining for three or four years, my impression is four years. He has been performing duties, an account of which will be found in the report of the Minister of the Interior, he has been collecting material, looking after the different interests in mining, looking after the establishment of an assay office in Vancouver and cognate subjects. He has made an annual report of his work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As far as mining in my own province is concerned I have not heard of any efforts on his part; it may be that he has done something about the assay office at Vancouver. My hon. friend's description of his duties seems to be rather vague; the mere fact that he is superintendent of mining does not convey much information unless we know his duties and what he has accomplished. Has he superintended the construction of the assay office or what has he done in connection with it ?

The PRIME MINISTER. He established the assay office, bought the machinery, had charge of the work of construction and has carried on everything in regard to the establishment of the office. I am sorry to say that I am not as familiar with his report as I might be.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I quite understand that it is very hard to become familiar with the work of the assay office at Vancouver. I tried to gain admission to it, and although I disclosed my identity as a member of this House I was refused admission.

The PRIME MINISTER. That I suppose was under regulations.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I do not know that there should be any such regulations.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the condition of your office at present, is it in operation ?

The PRIME MINISTER. It has been in operation about two years.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What has Dr. Haanel been doing during the two years since the office was completed ?

The PRIME MINISTER. He has full charge of it and superintends its management. The duties of Dr. Haanel are certainly more important than my hon. friends opposite are disposed to believe. The mining development of this country is increasing very fast and Dr. Haanel, as I am informed, is very often communicated with by people from all parts of the country to examine samples and mines, and his labours I understand, have been of great value and assistance.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not finding fault with his labours ; I am trying to find out what he really has done, and I realize that my right hon. friend is not familiar with the department as the Minister of the Interior would be, but he has the information at his hand and possibly we can succeed in getting at something. I have not heard anything that this gentleman has done in my province, but he may have done a great deal somewhere else, and I would like to know what it is. The work which my hon. friend has described has, so far as I am aware, hitherto been done by the officers of the Geological Survey, and I do not know that this gentleman had taken any part in it. Will my right hon. friend tell us what the qualifications of Dr. Haanel are for the work ?

The PRIME MINISTER. He was at first professor in the University of Victoria at Cobourg and then at Syracuse, N.Y. The report of Dr. Haanel will be found on page 17 of the Sessional Papers of 1902, No. 25.

Mr. SPROULE. What impresses me is the fact that you have no authority for the organization of this branch.

The PRIME MINISTER. The office of superintendent of the mining branch was established three or four years ago, and we are not creating a new office.

Mr. SPROULE. If I remember correctly, the office established was that of superintendent of the mines, which has no connection with this.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am informed by my deputy that Mr. Pearce was for many years superintendent of mines. It is not a new office. Mr. Pearce, who has a very wide range of knowledge of the geology of the territories, has been made chief inspector of the surveys there, and Dr. Haanel was appointed in his place.

Mr. SPROULE. I know Mr. Pearce very well and he appears to be a sort of itinerant in his duties, as he has held many offices. He has now assumed the dignity of head of a branch office, and no doubt he will soon be surrounded by a dozen clerks.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems to me that the head of a branch of this kind should have practical knowledge. I would ask my right hon. friend what practical experience or training Dr. Haanel has had ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My recollection of Dr. Haanel is that he is a distinguished graduate of a university in Germany and was professor of mineralogy and geology in Victoria University, when that university became affiliated with Toronto University, it ceased to maintain the chair of mineralogy and geology, and in that way it lost the services of Dr. Haanel. I have heard the late Chancellor Nellis of Victoria University speak in the highest terms of Professor Haanel.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know anything thing about Dr. Haanel. I do not think I have ever heard of him before, and that was why I was anxious to find out what were his qualifications to preside over this mines branch. What you require in that position is a man that has not only theoretical but practical knowledge, and a man, in the prime of life at least, and I would prefer a young man. We should not be satisfied with selecting some gentleman who has occupied a theoretical chair at some university, but who would not be likely to give the practical service which a branch of this kind demands. If we are to spend money for this very important service, it is, of course, desirable, as my right hon. friend will recognize, that we should have the very best man we can procure at the head of it. It is of no use to establish it otherwise. This is the reason I make these inquiries. I shall be very glad to recognize Dr. Haanel's ability when I understand that he possesses the qualifications necessary for the office. But it is our duty to find out something about him as this vote contemplates a very important addition to the service, and that is the reason why I think we should have a little more knowledge as to his qualifications than has been given to us this evening.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am obliged to my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) for giving information which I had not myself. I know Dr. Haanel, having met him once or twice. As things go, he is in the prime of life—I think about fifty-five or thereabouts. According to the Postmaster General, he has a good record. All the information I have of him is that he is an excellent man for the place, that none better could be found.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that he was not even a British subject, but a naturalized citizen of the United States.

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Mr. SPROULE. He has been in the United States a long time.

The PRIME MINISTER. He is a Canadian.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He lived here for many years.

Mr. SPROULE. But he lived in the United States afterwards.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I know nothing about his career since he separated from the University of Victoria. But for many years he was one of their strong professors, as I have stated.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose my hon. friend (Hon. Sir William Mulock) is a graduate of the University of Victoria ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. SPROULE. I graduated from that university, but I never heard of Dr. Haanel. Of course, that was many years ago.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) suggests the flight of years.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the employees in this branch come under the provisions of the Civil Service Act ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Mr. SPROULE. That is just where the trouble comes in. It seems to me that when you establish an additional branch, it ought to be established under the law, and its employees should come under the Civil Service Act, and be in every sense a branch of the civil service.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) knows that in the Railway Department and in the Public Works Department there are officers, engineers especially, who have been in the department

for fifteen or twenty years and do not come under the Civil Service Rule. We know Mr. Douglas, engineer of the Railway Department is one of these. Such officers do not contribute to the pension fund, and do not belong to the civil service regularly.

Mr. SPROULE. The Civil Service Act provides for technical branches.

The PRIME MINISTER. These officers are provided for from year to year.

Mr. SPROULE. My recollection is that such officers are included under the Act.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, I am satisfied that more than half the engineers of the department are appointed from year to year or from half year to half year.

Mr. COCHRANE. When was the report made from which the Prime Minister quoted ?

The PRIME MINISTER. This report was submitted to the minister on the 1st of December, 1902.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is this the first report he has made ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Four additional junior second-class clerks, one at $650 and three at $600 each, $2,450.

The PRIME MINISTER. With regard to the question put by my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax), I am informed by the deputy minister that the number of permanent appointments made to the service in the Department of the Interior during the last four years is between fifteen and twenty.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What are the duties of the officers appointed—are they entirely clerical ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Entirely clerical.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the cause of so great an increase in the mere clerical work ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I am informed that the work has doubled up in the last three years. I am satisfied that in the lands branch alone the business has more than trebled, more than quadrupled.

Mr. COCHRANE. Where has the Prime Minister located his new officers ? He used to tell us years ago that the departments were full.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am very sorry to say that we have been obliged to rent a great many buildings in the city.

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes, unfortunately—we know that.

Geological Survey—to provide for the salary of one second-class clerk, $1,100.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is to provide a salary for a second-class clerk, Mr. McKinnon. He has been fourteten years in the department and was engaged until three years ago in a clerical capacity, though officially of lower rank. He was promoted to second-class clerk, July, 1900. For the last three seasons he has been assistant to Mr. Hugh Fletcher in surveys in Nova Scotia, and during the winter compiled the work done in the field. Mr. Fletcher recommends him as a good surveyor and draughtsman. This item is to provide his salary.

Mr. SPROULE. This is promotion for him. Who takes his place ?

Mr. COCHRANE. Some greenhorn, I suppose.

The PRIME MINISTER. Nobody, that I know of—unless some greenhorn, as the hon. gentleman suggests.

Mr. SPROULE. I presume his place will be filled. What was his salary before ?

The PRIME MINISTER. He was at the maximum of his class, and was receiving $1,000. This will give him an additional $100. He is transferred from one class to another which necessitates the voting of his salary. I am glad to say it will not be necessary to put even a greenhorn in his place, as he simply continues with a higher salary.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the office he occupied abolished ?

The PRIME MINISTER. He is not abolished.

Mr. SPROULE. But the government have already provided in the estimates a salary for this position. The Prime Minister says that is not to be filled, yet another salary is being provided.

The PRIME MINISTER. The salary will not be paid if the place is not filled.

Mr. SPROULE. But why vote money that is not wanted ? That is not a business-like way of making up the estimates.

The PRIME MINISTER. I admit that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). According to the facts given by the Prime Minister, we should be asked to vote only $100.

The PRIME MINISTER. That seems a fair objection. Let the item stand.

Item allowed to stand.

To pay A. P. Low, a technical officer, 12 months from July 1st, $2,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Low was formerly attached to the Geological Survey, and resigned some years ago. He has recently been reengaged, but his engagement was subsequent to the date that the main estimates were approved of, and his salary could not then be provided for. He was for twenty years employed in the Geological Survey, and resigned in June, 1901. In

February last he returned to the Survey in order to take charge of the Hudson bay expedition.

Mr. SPROULE. I have here the Civil Service Act, and I am inclined to think that the First Minister puts a strained interpretation on it. It says that the 'Civil Service Act shall include and consist of all classes of employees in or under the several branches of the executive government and in the office of the Auditor General,' and included in subsections A and B. Subsection A mentions deputy heads and officers who have special qualifications, including in that term, I suppose, draughtsmen and civil engineers. But I understood the right hon. gentleman to say that half the men employed in the public works do not come under the Civil Service Act.

The PRIME MINISTER. They can come under it, undoubtedly, but what I had in my mind was the regular service, in which all the officers are admitted to the responsibilities and advantages of the Act, participating for instance in the retirement fund. I repeat that there are many officers, engineers, in the Public Works Department and in the Railways Department, who do not contribute to the pension fund, and who properly do not come under the terms of the Civil Service Act. A good many do, but quite a number do not.

Mr. SPROULE. They come under it so far as promotion and salaries go, though they do not participate in the retirement allowance. But as I always understood the Act, it does not say they 'may.' It says that all classes of the employees in the government of Canada or in the office of the Auditor General, appointed by Order in Council, 'shall' come under it. Schedule A mentions the deputy heads and officers who have special technical qualifications, chief clerks, first, second and third-class clerks, and messengers. Then, going on, schedule B mentions the officers in the Customs and Inland Revenue. I always understood that not only they must come under it, but all the promotions must be made under the Act.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, the Civil Service Act, as my hon. friend knows, is full of mysteries, and for my part I have never had time to undertake to master it. There are a certain number of engineers who do not come under the terms of this Act so far as salaries, promotions, and pensions are concerned. They are technical officers so-called, who have been appointed long ago, some of whom to my knowledge have been in the service for more than 35 years, and are still there, and have to be appointed every six months.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose the reason my right hon. friend put in so many of these expressions 'Notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act,' is that he has always regarded that Act as a mystery. That is an explanation of it that I never quite appreciated before. In regard to this item for Mr. Low, was not provision made for these technical officers in the vote for the Geological Survey?

The PRIME MINISTER. No. The estimates were prepared before Mr. Low returned to the service. He came back to the service for a special object, that is, to take charge of the expedition to the Hudson bay. His salary was not provided for in the main estimates, and that is the reason we ask for it now. As to this there is no mystery.

Additional amount required to meet the salary of one technical officer, $350.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is Mr. Joseph Kelly, who has been employed in the department since 1897. This increase, with the $50 voted in the main estimates, raises his salary to $1,500.

Office of the High Commissioner for Canada in England—to increase the salary of C. J. Taylor to $1,700, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $100.

To pay E. Churchouse, a junior second-class clerk, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $750.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is to carry out a recommendation made to me by the High Commissioner. One of the officers, Mr. Reynolds, has been superannuated, and this is to promote Mr. Taylor. The High Commissioner writes me that Mr. Taylor's salary last year was $1,550, and Mr. Colmer, before his resignation, recommended him for an addition of $50, making his pay $1,600 for 1903-4. But in consideration of his becoming assistant secretary, the High Commissioner recommends that his salary be made $1,700. He also recommends that Mr. Churchouse be appointed. Mr. Churchouse has been in the office for eleven years, and is expert at shorthand and typewriting. The government think it well to carry out these recommendations of the High Commissioner. We could not do so unless we made use of this expression 'Notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.' If we followed the Civil Service Act, we could not give an increase to Mr. Taylor of more than $50.

Mr. SPROULE. Why do you use the same expression in regard to Mr. Churchouse?

The PRIME MINISTER. Because he has passed the age of 35, at which he could be appointed under the Civil Service Act. He is now 36 years of age. We appoint him on the recommendation of the High Commissioner.

Dominion lands chargeable to income—further amount required for salaries for outside service, $10,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What are you doing in the Dominion lands service this year? Is

it intended to send out as many surveyors as last year or more ?

The PRIME MINISTER. More. When the estimates for the next fiscal year 1903-4 were framed in October last it was thought, according to the then existing condition, that the sum of $105,900 would be sufficient to pay the salaries of the Dominion lands outside service officers for the fiscal year 1903.

Since then a great many changes have taken place owing to the large number of settlers coming into the North-west. New clerks were appointed to the several land offices to enable them to keep pace with the increased work and sub-agents were placed at the different points to facilitate government transactions with settlers. I can give the detailed information, but perhaps I shall not be required to do so. I have a statement here showing the amount that is required to pay salaries of the Dominion lands outside and inside service for the fiscal year 1903-4 according to the pay-list as it existed on the 25th June last. It is as follows :

J. G. Turriff, commissioner.. ..	$3,000 00
T. R. Burpee, chief clerk.. ..	2,300 00
F. F. Dixon, clerk..	1,500 00
S. Maber..	1,200 00
A. Kemeys-Tynte..	800 00
A. C. Kelly..	480 00
Miss L. May..	527 00
Miss J. Orme..	467 50
Mrs. M. E. Mullhall	497 50
Miss Mabel Campbell..	467 50
Dr. E. Haanel..	3,000 00

Mr. SPROULE. Is not that the gentleman we have been taking the vote for in connection with the mines branch ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, the salaries of all these officers have been voted in the main estimates, but I am giving the details in order to show that beyond the amount in the main estimates we require $10,000 which is necessitated by the increased work in the department.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This is the outside service ?

The PRIME MINISTER. This is all outside service.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My right hon. friend was reading the salaries of a number of ladies. What have they to do with the outside service ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I was giving to my hon. friend the salaries which had been already voted in the estimates, but to give a full explanation of what is required I would have to read about three pages of statistics showing item by item all that is required for the inside and outside service. What we require now for the outside service is $10,000 more, but I was giving the total expenditure which is to be made in the department for both inside and outside service. The outside and inside service will require this year $115,000 instead of $105,000 which was at first estimated. This is necessitated by the additional work that has to be performed in the Department of the Interior chiefly on account of the increased development in the lands branch.

Mr. SPROULE. The right hon. Prime Minister in reading that list gave us the name of Dr. Haanel who is provided for as the head of the mines branch. I drew attention to the fact that in the mines branch we voted his salary but the right hon. gentleman said 'no.' I understood the list of salaries which the hon. gentleman read was for the lands branch.

The PRIME MINISTER. The salaries, the list of which I was reading are not at all salaries to be voted. I was giving the salaries which had been voted in the main estimates. In order to make this letter intelligible I commenced to read the list but it would take too long to give all the details of the expenditure which is to be made in the Department of the Interior upon this special branch of work. The amount which was estimated for this branch was $105,000 but it is now found that the branch will require $115,000.

Mr. SPROULE. The right hon. Prime Minister mentioned amongst those that are in that branch the name of Dr. Haanel and his salary is voted in the main estimates. Now, he is transferred to the mining branch and we have voted his salary again.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, no.

Mr. SPROULE. We voted $10,000 for the mines branch and Dr. Haanel is at the head of the mines branch for which we voted salaries.

The PRIME MINISTER. That $10,000 is to cover the salaries and expenses in connection with the mines branch, but it does not provide for the salary of Dr. Haanel. Dr. Haanel is already provided for.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think the right hon. gentleman must be a little in error in his figures. We have an increase of $10,000 for the outside service. It would not be unreasonable to ask for information as to how this money will be applied. I think we should know for what purpose this money is to be expended. I would gather from what the right hon. gentleman said that the vote this year is to be only $10,000 more this year than last year. If my right hon. friend will look at the main estimates he will see that there is an increase of $12,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. Possibly.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). So that by adding that to his further $10,000 we have an increase of $22,000 for this service of the Department of the Interior. If you go back to last year you will find that the amount voted was $168,782, and you have increases aggregating $53,000 for Dominion lands chargeable to income. I am not including

Dominion lands chargeable to capital. It seems to me that an increase of $53,000 upon an expenditure of $168,782 is one that demands more explanation.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am sorry to say that I cannot give more information than I have given already as to why this amount is required. I am informed by the department that the increase of business has been such as to require this additional service. I am sorry that the information which has been placed in my hand has not been placed perhaps in such a manner as I would have liked to have had it. I have here information with respect to the total vote of $115,000, whereas I should have had the detailed information with regard to this $10,000. I can give the names of the gentlemen and all the details.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That would not afford much information, because we would not know whether these gentlemen were additional officers or whether their salaries are increased. What we want to know is: To what purpose are you going to apply the $12,000 that has already been voted in addition to the vote of last year, and also details as to the additional vote of $10,000? My right hon. friend would not add anything to the information given by the Minister of the Interior on the previous vote. The officers of the department must know what they are going to do with the money.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no fault to find; we will let the item stand and I will get the information.

Item allowed to stand.

Further amount required for protection of timber and tree planting, $15,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We have already voted this year an additional sum of $10,000. Last year the total vote was $15,000; this year we have already voted $25,000, and we are now asked for $15,000 more. The purpose of this vote commends itself to most hon. gentlemen in the House, but we would like to have details of the increased expenditure. I saw some of the work which is being done in the west last year, and I was much impressed with it.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will let the item stand to get the information.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad that the right hon. the Prime Minister is disposed to give the details. On Friday night one of the ministers refused to give us any details as regards the expenditure of a vote. I claim that the minister should tell us what he expected to do with the money, but he absolutely refused.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think he was so much to blame, because I think he did not know.

Item allowed to stand.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax),

Further amount required for surveys, examination of survey returns, printing of plans, &c., $320,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would remind the right hon. gentleman that we have already voted $430,000, and now we are asked for $320,000 more. The vote last year was $360,000, so that the total increase this year is $390,000, or about 110 per cent more than was voted last year.

The PRIME MINISTER. When the main estimates were prepared last fall, it was thought that $430,000 would be sufficient, but the great influx of settlers from the United States and Europe, has made it imperative upon us to provide homesteads, and it was decided that this $320,000 should be inserted in the supplementary estimates, to sub-divide a sufficient number of townships to meet the wants of immigration. It is proposed to survey 500 new townships during the next fiscal year. At present, in south-eastern Manitoba there is one party under daily pay; in the Yorkton district, one party under daily pay, renewing surveys; between Lake Winnipeg and Manitoba one party under daily pay; north of Battleford, two parties under daily pay; in the Edmonton district, one party renewing surveys; in the Red Deer district, one party; McLeod district, one party; Rocky mountains, one party; in British Columbia, two parties; and on unforeseen surveys, five parties. In the division of townships between Fort Perry and eastern Assiniboia and Edmonton, there are 60 contracts at $8,000 each, making $612,000 in all. The balance is for the following purposes: Inspection of surveys, $10,000; irrigation surveys, $20,000; Yukon surveys, $45,000; employees at Ottawa, $60,000; miscellaneous, $10,000. The total, $750,000. During the last twelve months 120,000 immigrants have gone in, and I think all will agree that this expenditure is absolutely imperative.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How many immigrants did the right hon. gentleman say have gone in?

The PRIME MINISTER. Over 120,000 during the past fiscal year.

Mr. SPROULE. Are these sixty contracts let on schedule prices.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Are they subdividing, or just blocking out townships?

The PRIME MINISTER. Subdividing. The pay varies according to the country, from $7 to $25.

Mr. SPROULE. You have raised the minimum pay $2.

The PRIME MINISTER. I dare say, but it is a growing time.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is that immigration which the right hon. gentleman speaks

of in the territories alone, or in Manitoba and the territories, or in the whole of Canada ?

The PRIME MINISTER. That is for the whole of Canada.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any estimate by the officers of the department as to how much of this immigration went to the territories ?

The PRIME MINISTER. About and over 110,000 for Manitoba and the North-west Territories.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is no estimate, I suppose, as between Manitoba and the North-west Territories ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Mr. SPROULE. I have a very distinct recollection of some animated discussions in this House with regard to the extravagance of using less than $300,000 for surveys. It was then said that lands were being surveyed that were not occupied and that it would be necessary later on to hunt up the lines; yet now we are doing exactly the same thing. The salaries are apparently higher than those then paid and there are now sixteen government parties out and sixty contracts, seventy-six all told.

Mr. SCOTT. And more are called for.

Mr. SPROULE. And more are called for; well, it is a very good thing the hon. gentleman is so well satisfied now; his friends were not so easily satisfied a few years ago.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend would admit that we would be liable to be accused of being remiss in our duty if we did not provide facilities for incoming immigrants so that they may at once locate on homesteads. It may be that we have some divided lands that are not occupied, but I do not think we can very well cease surveying. All of the lots divided are not fit for settlement and the immigrants have a right to choose their land ; but on the whole we cannot go back on this work and I think my hon. friend will admit on reflection that it is a work of imperative necessity.

Mr. SPROULE. We have practically no information with regard to the salary or as to the value of the contracts. They are from $7 to $27. That is a sliding scale which is practically equivalent to no information at all and on which you cannot make any calculation. What do you give your surveyors now for a day's work ?

The PRIME MINISTER. $6.50.

Mr. SPROULE. And found ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I noticed in a western paper the other day an allegation that the iron stakes which are used to mark the corners of the lots for settlement were being used for certain culinary purposes by parties who are camping out; they were being used for the purpose of hanging camp kettles and things of that kind and, if as my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) says, the stakes are sometimes pulled up, attention should be given to this by the department. I do not know that the officers of the department have had information or not.

The PRIME MINISTER. They have had information and have been obliged to give notice of prosecution if this is not stopped.

To provide for engraving, lithographing, printing, &c., to bring out maps of work already done, $10,500.

The PRIME MINISTER. This item is explained by the words of the resolution; it is to cover the cost of engraving and lithographing maps, some of which are now in the hands of the engraver and others yet to be sent. These maps are chiefly of the Haliburton district, the country around Pembroke, Brockville, Sudbury, Copper Cliff, Boundary, the Klondike, and so on, different parts of the country of which maps are prepared.

Mr. SPROULE. Where are your maps made ?

The PRIME MINISTER. They are lithographed here by the Federal Press Company.

Mr. SPROULE. Are any of these made in the United States ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I am not aware of any and I do not think so, but I can inquire.

Mr. SPROULE. I heard a remark to that effect; I know the Minister of the Interior got out some of his maps in Chicago and it seems to me we should have brains enough to get them out here in Canada.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think so, and this vote, so far as I know, contemplates Canadian and not American work.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the right hon. Prime Minister be good enough to ascertain whether it will be so ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I will.

To pay for metallurgical, petrographical and clerical assistance. (Salaries greater than $400 per annum may be paid from this vote, notwithstanding the Civil Service Act), $5,300.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is to pay the salaries of the metallurgist and the assayer, Mr. Connor, and Mr. O. E. Leroy, the petographer. Both of these gentlemen do technical work. The balance of the vote is to meet sundry clerical work in connection with the department.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where is the assayer employed ?

The PRIME MINISTER. He is here in the Geological Survey.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has he anything to do with the assay office ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Who is in charge of the assay office at Victoria ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. McCaffrey.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes. The next item is $600, to pay the expenses of an inquiry into the cause of the disaster at Frank. Messrs. Connell and Brock made this inquiry.

Indians—Ontario and Quebec—to provide an amount for the repair of roads, $2,100.

Mr. SPROULE. Why are these roads being built ?

The PRIME MINISTER. To explain that, I must explain also the next vote :

To provide an amount for squatters' improvements, Doncaster reserve, $11,325.

The township of Doncaster, in the county of Montcalm, district of Terrebonne, was set apart as an Indian reserve in 1853, for the Iroquois, of Oka and Caughnawaga. But, strange to say, the Indians never took possession of the reserve. They have never lived there, never made any settlement—have not even exercised the right of hunting there. As the country developed, squatters settled on the lands. These squatters applied for a title to the government at Quebec. When the matter was looked into the government at Quebec were obliged to inform these applicants that they could not give them a title, as the township was an Indian reserve. So, the squatters applied to the government at Ottawa for a title. We applied to the Indians at Caughnawaga and Oka to see if they would surrender their rights and take another reserve. But the Indians would not grant a transfer of the land. They insisted upon their rights, even to the extent of the dislodging of the whites. We made several applications to the Indians and the question was the subject of several conferences. We offered them land in some other parts of the country. Still, they insisted that the land belonged to them and would not surrender it, but called upon the Indian Department to dislodge the white settlers. We came to the conclusion that we were helpless in the matter, and would have to dislodge the whites. We could not do so without compensating the settlers. That is why we ask this appropriation of $11,325—to compensate the settlers for their improvements. This item with regard to the building of roads arises out of the same difficulty. The condition of things is particularly unfortunate, because there is a settlement all around the reserve as well as in the reserve itself. To keep faith with the Indians we must dislodge the white settlers in the township and to do that we must compensate the settlers, and also we must cut roads across the reserve for the benefit of the people around the reserve.

Mr. SPROULE. Who valued these improvements ?

The PRIME MINISTER. We sent first an officer of the department who made a valuation ; then sent another officer to review the work of the first. The second officer we sent was Mr. Samuel Bray, chief surveyor. I have here a total statement of the valuation as follows :

Israel Thouin.—Lives at the north-west angle of the reserve. The boundary line is indefinite. It is quite probable that all the buildings and a great portion of the clearings are not on the reserve. Log house on stone foundation, clapboarded in front and one side plastered and well finished ; driving shed. House and shed together..	$1,000
Barn 65 x 42..	400
Butter factory building	100
Sixty-two acres cleared and well fenced.	930
Orchard..	75
Clearing on range 5..	100
Allowed for moving butter-making machinery..	150
Allowed for water conduit and special fencing..	245
	$3,000

This is the amount Mr. Israel Thouin gave Mr. McKenna, and it appears to be a very fair valuation.

Isidore Legault.—This claim is now occupied by ex-Councillor Frank Tirez from Caughnawaga. The owner was absent. He has returned ; Tirez refused to let him have the building. The improvements are on lots 33 and 34, range 5 :

Log house and small outbuildings.	$130
Barn and shed..	100
42 acres cleared..	570
Total..	$800

This is the same valuation given to Mr. McKenna.

Napoleon Constantineau.—Improvements are on lot 36, range 6 :

Log house and small addition.. ..	$100
Barn..	100
Land, 15 acres, well cleared.. ..	180
12 acres, clearing..	320
Small clearing at the rear of lot..	40
Total..	540

The valuation given to Mr. McKenna was $700.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think we get a great deal of information from that. The valuation for clearing land would be about so much and the buildings would be valued according to their quality.

The PRIME MINISTER. I was giving this information to show that the department has taken every precaution, the first valuation having been confirmed with very slight variations by the second valuator. As I said a moment ago, there is nothing else that we can do but what we are doing. We

have to keep faith with the Indians. The land is theirs. On the other hand the settlers have gone in on good faith, and, if they have to be removed, we have to ask for an appropriation to compensate them.

Mr. SPROULE. Could you charge anything to the Indian Department for the improvements made ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I am afraid not. these Indians have but a very small fund.

Mr. SPROULE. The Prime Minister told us that the Oka Indians were interested in this land. Are these the Indians of Oka, whom the government have been removing to another locality for the last twenty years ?

The PRIME MINISTER. A number of them were removed to a reserve on the Georgian bay, but they have all returned to Oka.

Contribution on behalf of the Rama Indians towards expenses on roads and bridges in the township of Rama, $2,000.

Mr. SPROULE. This is the old settled municipality—it has been settled for forty or fifty years. Does the government still keep up roads there ?

The PRIME MINISTER. This is one of the cases where we have to keep up roads. It so happens that the reserve is not a compact block, but separate blocks, with intervening blocks settled by white men. Where alternate parcels of land are occupied by white settlers and Indians, the municipality have no control over the reserve, and it is found impossible to maintain the regular system of roads. The same influence operates against a regular school system, as the children of the whites have to cross part of the reserve to reach the school, and this makes it difficult, practically impossible to maintain the schools on account of the inconvenience and extra expense.

Mr. SPROULE. I know the locality very well, and, no doubt, the difficulty with regard to the road is very considerable.

Nova Scotia—to provide an amount for the purchase of lands for reserves, $800.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is for the purchase of 76 acres of wood land in Colchester county which the Indians require for cultivation and for fuel.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think more attention might be given to some of these matters in Nova Scotia. I informed the department two years ago that certain lands reserved for Indians in the county of Halifax, and which were not used by the Indians, could be disposed of for a fair sum, but in the meantime they were being cut over by lumbermen and no precautions were being taken to prevent it. It seems to me that it would be better for the department to look after lands of that kind and see that they are not used for lumbering operations by other people. If it is considered too expensive to provide safeguards for that purpose, it would be better to sell the lands. For example, you are buying land in Colchester county and paying a certain sum of money for it, and if I am correctly informed, there is land in the county of Halifax reserved for the Indians but which is not used by them, and the value of which is being materially depreciated. It is better to do something with it, exchange it, sell it, dispose of it, but do not let it be ruined.

The PRIME MINISTER. The department would like to follow the suggestion of my hon. friend, but he knows that the first condition is to obtain a surrender of the land from the Indians. They are always averse to surrendering anything they have. I understand they are scattered all over the territory, and it is difficult to get them to agree. The question has been taken up several times by the department and they find that difficulty.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is that the case with regard to the lands that are not occupied by the Indians, and are not actually in use ?

The PRIME MINISTER. It applies to all reserves. The land cannot be disposed of without their consent.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is an awkward state of affairs, because in the meantime the land is useless and is deteriorating.

Indians—New Brunswick—to provide an additional amount for salaries, $100.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is to provide an increase of salary for Mr. W. B. Carter, who has charge of a large number of Indians. He is an active and competent officer.

To pay for damages by fire on the Indian reserve, Edmundston, $100.

The PRIME MINISTER. While clearing lands the Indians started fires on three occasions, in 1893, in 1894 and in 1895, which spread on to the property of Mr. Bernier, and destroyed his farm-house and fences.

Indians—Manitoba and North-west Territories—to provide an additional amount for implements, $1,500.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is to purchase seed drills for the Touchwood Hills agency, and one threshing machine for the Duck Lake agency.

Mr. SPROULE. In the main estimates that vote was reduced by $4,288 and there was some jubilation in consequence. The amount of agricultural implements there was $7,540, instead of $12,237 the year before. Now you come again in the supplementary estimates and ask for an additional amount. This has occurred so many times that I think a little more common sense and business methods might be exercised in the

preparation of the main estimates. We have to take a vote over twice, both in the main estimates and the supplementary estimates, that ought to appear in the main estimates alone, and then we would know the full amount we are giving. It would save time and make the book-keeping much more simple.

The PRIME MINISTER. I agree with what the hon. gentleman says, and I shall report it to the minister.

Mr. SPROULE. What I am complaining of is that we make the work double for ourselves. The main estimates ought to contain all that is required for the year. The main estimates this year must have been made up from the experience of last year, they were all submitted to council some time last winter. Surely it ought to be known from the experience of last year about what was required in every one of these lines? I could understand that accidentally something might be overlooked. But I find with regard to these items in Manitoba and the North-west Territories that the very same lines, agricultural implements, seed, livestock, clothing, cattle, surveys and schools, all appear in the main estimates.

The PRIME MINISTER. The explanation is that the demands come early in the fall when the main estimates are prepared, but other demands come in afterwards. In the case of these agencies at Touchwood Hills and Duck Lake, I understand the applications came in too late for the main estimates. But we cannot leave them unprovided for, and hence the necessity for the supplementary estimates.

Additional amount for triennial clothing, $1,200.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is provided for under treaty No. 8. This estimate came after the main estimates had been prepared. They were made after the inspector's return and could not have been provided for earlier.

Mr. SPROULE. You give the Indians a supply of clothing every three years. Can the minister say what Indians have been supplied each year, because they are not all supplied the same year? Surely it would have been as easy to take those who have not been supplied and send them in altogether?

The PRIME MINISTER. The deputy commissioner informs me that it would be impossible to know the number of outfits that have to be provided until the inspector makes his report.

Mr. SPROULE. But he makes two reports.

The PRIME MINISTER. The inspector leaves in the spring and does not return to civilization until late in the fall. That is the reason why we cannot obtain his report earlier.

Mr. SPROULE.

To provide an additional amount for surveys, $2,000.

Mr. SPROULE. For surveys?

The PRIME MINISTER. Owing to the large amount of survey work being done in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, the vote in the main estimates, $5,000, will be completely exhausted at the close of the year's operations. It is proposed to use the $2,000 to get the surveyors into the field early in the spring of 1904, so as to make the best possible use of their services.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are not the reservations all surveyed before this?

The PRIME MINISTER. The reserve is set aside in a general way and we may not be required to make a survey for a long time until approaching settlement makes it necessary. That is the reason why surveys have been made from time to time.

To provide an additional amount for schools, $3,736.

Mr. SPROULE. Where are these schools that require an additional amount?

The PRIME MINISTER. To provide an amount to build a laundry at Rupert's Land Industrial School to replace the one destroyed by fire, one thousand dollars is required. To provide for the rebuilding of the laundry at the Battleford Industrial School lately destroyed by fire, $1,500 is required. To provide a grant towards the maintenance of a boarding school at Albany, on James' bay, $300. To provide for eight extra pupils at $75 at the Isle a la Crosse boarding school. $576; and to provide for five extra pupils at Thunder Child boarding school, $360, making altogether $3,736.

To provide an additional amount for general expenses (from which payments may be made to Dr. C. H. West, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act), $2,200.

Mr. SPROULE. Why do you put it in that way? Dr. West does not come under the Civil Service Act, does he?

The PRIME MINISTER. Dr. West is an inspector of the North-west Mounted Police in charge of the Athabasca district, and as such receives a salary of $1,000 per annum. It is proposed to continue his services as medical attendant to the Indians of Treaty No. 8, and to pay him a salary of $1,200 therefor. Dr. West accompanies Inspector Conroy on his trips and gives medical relief to the Indians attending the treaty payment. Being a resident of the district he also attends all cases of sickness which are brought to his attention amongst those Indians.

Mr. SPROULE. Does that cover medicines as well as attendance?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, the $1,200 covers all services.

British Columbia—to provide an additional amount for salaries, $200.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why is this necessary ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Vowell was appointed Indian superintendent on the 4th November, 1899, but before that date he had long been in the service of the provincial government in the province of British Columbia, which renders his knowledge of the country especially valuable to this department. Since his appointment he has received no increase of salary and as there has been during the past few years a very considerable increase in the volume of work at the Victoria office it is thought that the proposed increase is merited.

To provide an additional amount for medical attendance and medicines, $9,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. Medical attendance and medicines are provided for Indians who cannot afford to pay for it themselves. The physicians are either on salaries which represent a fair remuneration for their services and the medicine supplied, or when paid by accounts, they are allowed the lowest possible charges made to poor white patients. Medicines are supplied to medical missionaries to distribute them to Indians under their charge.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There has been $11,000 voted for medicines already. It seems a curious thing that you nearly double that amount by a supplementary estimate.

The PRIME MINISTER. The sum which has been voted already is for medicines only.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No, it is for both. If my right hon. friend will turn to page 67 of the main estimates, he will see that the item is :

Medical attendance and medicines, $11,000.

Mr. SPROULE. How many medical attendants have you employed, and what do you pay them ?

The PRIME MINISTER. We have medical men in different parts of the province. British Columbia is a very large province and the Indian population of British Columbia is larger than that of any other province. In the Babine agency there is a medical attendant at Hazleton, Kishfyak and Hagincyet. In the Comox agency, Chemainus, Nanaimo, Cowichan ; Fraser agency, Vancouver, Harrison, Hot Springs and New Westminster ; Kamloops and Okanagan, Fair View, Yale and Cariboo district, Kefowun and Cariboo district, Vernon and Cariboo district, Spallumcheen, Nicola, Kamloops, Dead men's Crest, Thompson and Shushwap. In the Kootenay : St. Mary's and Tobacco Plains ; on the west coast, Uculelet, Clayoquot ; on the north-west coast, Bella Bella, Port Simpson and vicinity, Port Essington, Williams Lake, Quesnelle and Alexandria, Alkali Lake, Kenim, Soda Creek, Clinton.

Mr. SPROULE. What salaries do you pay ?

The PRIME MINISTER. They vary ; $300, $500, $400, $700, $1,200 at Westminster and Vancouver.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Two months ago we voted $11,000 as sufficient for this purpose, and why should we require $9,000 more now ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The estimates were prepared last fall on the reports in the department at that time, but new demands have been since made.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That does not seem to be a very satisfactory explanation. Unless there is some sudden outbreak of disease amongst Indians, surely the officers know the number of Indians in British Columbia, and they ought to be able to calculate within 20 per cent of what medical attendance they will require ; but this is double the vote of last year.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am informed that the total vote last year was $20,000, the same as this year.

Mr. SPROULE. In the main estimates it says that last year's vote was $11,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. Perhaps it would be better to set out the total amount voted, but as a rule you will find that was only the amount voted in the main estimates last year.

Mr. SPROULE. Under what kind of a contract are these medical men working ?

The PRIME MINISTER. There are 1,000 reserves in British Columbia, and as we have not a doctor for each reserve some of the doctors have to travel a good deal. They are appointed on a salary which is calculated upon the probable amount of work they will have to discharge.

Mr. SPROULE. I have heard it said out there that if a doctor wanted a holiday trip, he goes round with the parties distributing the money and vaccinate some of these Indians, and makes a charge for it.

The PRIME MINISTER. Oh, that was in the olden times.

Mr. SPROULE. I heard it last fall, and I do not think it is so very ancient.

To provide additional amount for schools, $12,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. This vote is distributed as follows : Grant for rebuilding and equipping of the girls home, Metlakahtla, destroyed by fire $3,200 ; to provide for an increase in the per capita grant to the Clayoquot school, $3,500 ; grant to-

wards the erection of boarding school at Ahonsaht, $1,500; to provide for repairs and addition to St. Mary's boarding school, $3,200.

Additional amount for steam launch, $2,500.

The PRIME MINISTER. This agency includes 91 reserves, and to visit these the agent has to travel from 1,000 to 1,400 miles by canoe. If provided with a launch, the time at his disposal for visiting the Indians would be more than doubled, and his transportation expenses would not be materially increased.

Mr. SPROULE. Do they confine the use of the launch to that purpose, or do they make a ferry boat of it?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know what he does with it, but I presume it remains idle when it is not being used for the purpose indicated. I do not think it would be used as a ferry boat.

Grant towards hospital at Hazelton, $1,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. The Methodist mission board, which has applied for this grant, states the cost of the building will be about $6,500. It is proposed to apportion it as follows: Local subscriptions, $1,000; grant from Methodist mission board, $2,500; provincial government, $2,000; Indian Department, $1,000.

Government of the North-west Territories, $255,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars of this is voted under circumstances with which the House is already familiar. The other $5,000 is required for registrars consequent upon the increased immigration.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What further facilities are to be provided?

The PRIME MINISTER. It simply provides for more clerical work and more assistance in the different registry offices.

Mr. SPROULE. It says:

Additional grant for schools, clerical assistance, printing, &c.

Why is the grant for schools made?

The PRIME MINISTER. That item of $250,000 has been discussed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This was discussed in connection with the Bill to make an advance to the North-west Territories. In connection with that Bill it was pointed out that we had increased the ordinary grant last year by $250,000 and this item is to make corresponding increase this year.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think you gave any detailed information as to how this money was to be spent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is a general increase, equivalent to an increased subsidy to the North-west Territories.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this the vote in regard to which there was some discussion as to whether it should be on capital or revenue account?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is on account of ordinary revenue. We added a quarter of a million last year under precisely the same conditions and we are now adding a quarter of a million dollars. The advance on capital account was made by a special Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. How is it that everything has to be doubled? There has been no material increase in the population that would necessitate additional schools or anything in the last year. In fact there has been a great reduction in the population?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the North-west Territories?

Mr. SPROULE. I was thinking of the Yukon.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this to be expended by the government of the North-west Territories?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Some resolutions reported.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Might I ask the right hon. gentleman what business will be taken up to-morrow?

The PRIME MINISTER. To-morrow we will take up the Civil Service Bill and some other Bills and then go into Supply.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). When we go into Supply I will move the resolution with regard to granting provincial autonomy to the North-west Territories of which I have given notice.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.25 a.m., Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, October 13, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

REPORT OF INSPECTOR OF BINDER TWINE.

Mr. JAMES M. DOUGLAS (East Assiniboia) moved:

That the House do concur in the eighth and final report of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization and especially that 40,000 copies of the evidence of the inspector of binder twine be printed forthwith in pamphlet form in the usual numerical proportions of English and French as advance sheets

of the committee's final report for distribution to members of parliament, less 100 copies for the use of the committee.

He said: I may remark that this number is in excess of what has been asked on other subjects, but the report of the Dominion inspector has been of special interest. He provides information of vast moment in protecting the farmers against fraud in the quantity and quality of the twine they purchased as indicated in the consumption of the year 1902, valued at $3,500,000. The inspector stated in his evidence that in fourteen cases he imposed fines amounting to $518 for shortage in the quantity indicated by the labels, and had $275,000 worth deported to the manufacturer in the United States, and that a quantity was confiscated to the Crown. These violations of the Binder Twine Act of 1902 were almost wholly found with the imported article. The consumption of binder twine in Canada for 1902 is estimated at 14,000 tons, of which 6,500 was of home manufacture, making over 50 per cent supplied by importation. Here again is evidence of the large expansion awaiting the output of twine factories in Canada.

Mr. SPEAKER. May I call the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Douglas) to the fact that this motion cannot be adopted without suspending rule 94, which provides that a motion for printing any paper shall first be presented to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I move that rule 94 be suspended.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I do not actually oppose the adoption of the motion, but this report has been but a short time before the House and many of us have had no opportunity of seeing it. I do not know what the statement read by the Chairman of the committee purports to be, whether it is a report from the committee or part of the general report, or observations of his own. In any case, I must take exception to it because I think it is somewhat out of place or, at least, that the conclusions are still the subject of controversy. My judgment in connection with the discharge of his duties by the inspector of binder twine is that there was very strong evidence before the committee that the inspector misunderstood his duties and acted a part he was not justified in playing either by the statute under which he acted or any other authority, I think it would be well to allow this to remain for a day until we look into it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This report was presented last Friday, and notice of motion was given to the House that to-day I would move concurrence. Besides, the body of the report is in the Votes and Proceedings, and, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) has not seen it, that is not the fault of the convener of the committee or the committee itself. I may say that I have voiced the consensus of opinion of the committee in making the remarks I have made. The report was adopted by the unanimous consent of the committee and we thought it would be well to made a few remarks in connection with the presentation of the motion for concurrence so that it might be fully before the House.

Mr. SPROULE. This report has been before the House since Friday. On Saturday we sat all day, and the same yesterday. So, it is very hard to keep up with every portion of the work. Consequently I for one, have had no opportunity to see the report. I do not know whether the observations made by the hon. member (Mr. Douglas) were the result of the deliberations of the committee or not. If they were it seems to me they were improper. I think this should be allowed to remain over to another day to give us an opportunity to examine it. Surely there can be no such urgent demand for forcing it through. Saturday is an unusual day for the sitting of the House, so that this is pressing the matter through at practically one day's notice To allow it to remain for another day will not prevent the work being done, and will be quite in keeping with the needs of the House and of the country.

The PRIME MINISTER. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. It will then go to Public Bills and Orders.

The PRIME MINISTER. Better withdraw the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. gentleman have leave to withdraw his motion?

Motion agreed to, and motion withdrawn.

THANKSGIVING DAY ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER moved:

That when this House adjourns to-morrow it shall stand adjourned till Friday next.

He said: I take advantage of this opportunity to say that the business that the government intends to present to the House yet is as follows: Some resolutions regarding the Quebec bridge, some further supplementary estimates, chiefly relating to the Transcontinental Railway; and, perhaps, a purely departmental Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. I assume from that statement that the other items appearing on the Order paper are intended to be pushed through by the government?

The PRIME MINISTER. I think so.

Motion agreed to.

YUKON TERRITORY—DOMINION LANDS —APPROVAL OF REGULATIONS.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that the House go into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that the regulations made by the Governor in Council, under the authority of section 47 of the Dominion Lands Act, applicable or relating to the Yukon Territory, and set forth in the Orders in Council of which the dates are respectively as follows, and of which copies have been laid before this House, are approved by this House, in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of chapter 34 of the Statutes of 1902 :—

Order dated the 15th April, 1902, P. C. No. 633 ; Orders dated the 19th May, 1902, P. C. Nos. 573, 597, 749, and 825 ; Orders dated the 21st May, 1902, P. C. Nos. 898, and 899 ; Orders dated the 31st May, 1902, P. C. Nos. 938, 941, and 960 ; Order dated 4th June, 1902, P. C. No. 619 ; Order dated the 31st October, 1902, P. C. No. 1606 ; Orders dated the 22nd December, 1902, P. C. Nos. 1890, and 1899 ; Orders dated the 7th March, 1903, P. C. Nos. 323, and 325 ; and Orders dated the 31st March, 1903, P. C. Nos. 472, 473, 474, and 475.

He said : The reason for this motion is to be found in the Act passed last session to amend the Yukon Territory Act. Section 5 of that Act provides as follows :

Every regulation made by the Governor in Council under the authority of section 47 of the Dominion Lands Act, applicable or relating to the Yukon Territory, shall remain in force until the day immediately succeeding the day of prorogation of the then next session of parliament, and no longer, unless during such session of parliament such regulation is approved by resolution of both Houses of parliament.

Then section 47 of the Dominion Lands Act reads as follows :

Lands containing coal or other minerals, whether in surveyed or unsurveyed territory, shall not be subject to the provisions of this Act respecting sale or homestead entries, but shall be disposed of in such manner and on such terms and conditions as are, from time to time, fixed by the Governor in Council, by regulations made in that behalf.

Several regulations have been made which were laid on the Table of the House a few days ago, in terms of that section 47. I need not perhaps go into the details of each one of them ; a synopsis of the details of some of them will give a general character of the whole. The first Order in Council which was passed on the 15th of April, 1902, provides in substance that three miners owning adjoining claims, may unite to work one claim. The reason of that is that under the old regulation, every miner owning a claim is bound to do a certain quantity of work on it, under penalty of forfeiture, and it has been found convenient to permit a group of miners to work together ; that is to say, when their claims are adjoining each other it might be advantageous to allow them to club together and put their work upon one claim instead of distributing it upon all, and by so doing they would avoid forfeiture. Another Order in Council passed on the 19th of May, defines a miner's inch. The miner's inch is a new expression with which we in the east are not familiar, but which in mining territories is now well known, and we propose simply to make it legal and give it a proper definition. Another Order in Council of the same date enacts that all applications for mining locations and for work by the hydraulic mining process, shall be filed with the Commissioner of the Yukon Territory, and recommended by him, and so on.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). In connection with that, I presume it would be necessary to bring up the whole subject of the controversy and investigation into the Treadgold concessions, because some of those Orders in Council affect the situation there. One which the Prime Minister just read would apply to that, namely, that one giving them the privilege to group together a number of claims, of which they become possessed perhaps through the abandonment of others, or through taking up others and jointly working them. I see they have had a public meeting out there and protested against the mode of the inquiry that was conducted by the commission, and are memorializing, it seems, the Governor in Council against the way the inquiry was conducted. Could the Prime Minister give us any information regarding the situation, and has he any report from the commissioners on the work they have undertaken ?

The PRIME MINISTER. If my hon. friend will look again at these resolutions he will see that they do not in any way affect the Treadgold concessions. With regard to the subject of the commission itself, I have seen what my hon. friend has seen in the public press, but I may say that the government have received no official communication upon the subject from any one. The government has not yet received any report from the commissioners.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the right hon. gentleman any idea as to when the report will be received? With respect to the hearing, of course, we do not know anything officially, but a majority of the public and press in the Yukon seem to find fault with the inquiry, because they think it was unduly restricted, even under the terms of the commission. One grave circumstance is the allegation in more than one newspaper that the commissioners directed the stenographers not to take down certain portions of the evidence, certain things that were said. If that is the case, all that it would be proper to say at present, is that such a matter demands careful consideration, and might make necessary a commission to investigate the conduct of the

commissioners; because, while the commission was restricted very much, more restricted than a good many gentlemen in this House thought it should have been, inasmuch as it denied the people of that country an opportunity to investigate the circumstances under which those concessions were granted—nevertheless in the restricted form in which it was issued there was no reason why the commissioners or any one of them should have interfered in the slightest way to prevent the taking down of the testimony which was given. I do not admit this to be the fact at present, for the commissioners have not yet been heard. Nevertheless this particular circumstance is openly stated in more than one newspaper in the Yukon, newspapers which I have received myself.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend will admit himself, interested as he is in the subject, that it would be very unfair to the commissioners, until their report is before the House, to accept any statements of that nature that may appear in the press. The commissioners have not made their report yet, I have no information when it will be made, I suppose it cannot be long delayed, for I think they are at work on it at this moment. But in the meantime I think there is no reason to suppose that the commissioners did not discharge their duties in an able, satisfactory and impartial manner.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee on the resolutions.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the right hon. gentleman should go further and give a little explanation in regard to each one of the orders mentioned in the resolution.

The PRIME MINISTER. The first order, of the 15th of April, 1902, as I have explained, allows three miners owning adjoining claims to club together and put their work on one claim. That is the tenor of the order.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think there should be no objection to that.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then the second order, of the 19th of May, 1902, defines a miner's inch as being an orifice which shall discharge one and a half cubic feet of water per minute. This is a purely mechanical order. Then the third order, of the 19th May, is that:

The Governor in Council is pleased to order that the Order in Council of 31st day of October, 1901, authorizing the Minister of the Interior to dispose of any mining claim which may be forfeited under the provisions of section 41 of the regulations governing placer mining in the Yukon Territory, established by Order in Council on the 13th day of March, 1901, shall be and is hereby rescinded.

Mr. SPROULE. That is just one of the orders that come in under the Treadgold concession. It is contended that once claims were abandoned and the government had power to dispose of them, the persons interested in the Treadgold concession had arranged their affairs so that they could either by themselves or by others get hold of these claims, in order that they might be corralled under one management. While they might not be under one name, they would still practically be under the Treadgold concession. That was one of the claims set forth by one gentleman who wrote to me from Dawson in regard to this matter.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think the right hon. gentleman has not stated the effect of this order. It provides that the Order in Council, the effect of which he has already mentioned, is rescinded.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, I see I was mistaken. It provides that it shall be rescinded.

Mr. SPROULE. We cannot object to that.

The PRIME MINISTER. If we cannot object to that, let us pass on.

Mr. SPROULE. Then the next is 597.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is 749, and I now pass to No. 825. That order provides that:

Section 7 of the regulations governing placer mining in the Yukon Territory, established by Order in Council dated 13th March, 1901, which provides that a person or joint stock company, and every person in his or its employment, except house servants, shall have a free miner's certificate unexpired, was amended by leaving out the words 'and every person in his or its employment, except house servants.'

The effect is to restrict the application of the regulation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before we pass from this, it seems to me that the existence of such an Order in Council as is now rescinded is the best possible reason why the statute should have been enacted. I cannot conceive any possible reason why the mere fact that a person was in the clerical employment of a joint stock company should entitle him to a free miner's certificate in competition with actual miners, who have to pay a fee for the purpose and who have to devote their attention to the occupation of mining. It would be well to know the reason why this Order in Council should have been passed in the first instance.

The PRIME MINISTER. I could not give this information to my hon. friend at this moment, but I will get it later on.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think my right hon. friend will recognize that it is a very strange regulation that any person in the employ of a joint stock company should be entitled to a free miner's certificate. It is time it should be repealed, and it is strange that such a regulation should ever have been enacted.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is repealed as far as my hon. friend has any objection to it.

Mr. SPROULE. The dangerous feature that suggests itself to my mind is that a regulation was made some years ago to provide for people getting control of timber lands, and after a certain individual had got control of a very important section of timber land the Order in Council was immediately rescinded.

The PRIME MINISTER. At all events, if we have rescinded it, so far so good.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). While it was not rescinded, so far so good.

The PRIME MINISTER. Order No. 973 provides that:

> The Governor in Council is pleased to order that clause 3 of the regulations for the disposal of mining locations in the Yukon Territory to be worked by hydraulic mining process made and established by the Governor in Council on the 3rd of December, 1898, as amended by Order in Council of 2nd March, 1900, which provides that an application for a location shall be filed in the Department of the Interior at Ottawa, was amended so as to provide that the application shall be filed with the commissioner of the Yukon Territory at Dawson; and that no lease be issued for a location unless it is recommended by him.
>
> And further, the exemption of royalty on $25,000 of the annual output of a location, provided for in section 5 of the aforesaid regulations, was rescinded on, from and after the date hereof.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the meaning of the provision that no lease shall be issued for a location unless recommended by the commissioner?

The PRIME MINISTER. It was to avoid a conflict, as far as I remember, between the applications which might be made at Dawson and the applications which might be made here, under which circumstances the same location might be granted to two different parties. The department came to the conclusion that all applications should be made at Dawson to the commissioner and forwarded by him for approval to the department here.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems to go a great deal beyond that. It seems to vest in the commissioner of the Yukon an absolute discretion as to whether a location shall be granted or not. I do not regard that as a fair provision of the law. In the province of Nova Scotia we have certain laws governing this matter. A man who applies for a gold or a coal area is entitled to it as a matter of right. If it is open, if no other person has covered it by his application, and if he has made his application in the usual way, he is entitled to certain rights under the law over the area. But here you do not have that. You have an applicant going to the Commissioner of the Yukon, and finding that it is absolutely necessary that the commissioner should recommend his application before he can have it granted. I do not understand why a discretion of that kind should be conferred upon the Commissioner of the Yukon or on any one else. It seems to me there should be a mode of defining the rights of public property so that any citizen of this country, conforming to the regulations, should have the right to make an application in respect to lands not already covered by some one else. Neither the Commissioner of the Yukon, nor the Minister of the Interior, nor any one else, should have the right to say: You shall not receive this, because I do not see fit to recommend it. I cannot attach any other meaning to the language of this Order in Council than that which I have just expressed.

Mr. BELCOURT. The reason of this is that in the case of these applications, the applicant has to submit for consideration evidence of certain facts; for instance, the fact that the ground for which he applies is capable of being worked in the manner which he describes, that he has a sufficient dumping ground on which to deposit his tailings, and that there is a sufficient supply of water to provide for the working of the claim in the manner applied for. These matters have all to be verified by affidavit or evidence sufficient to satisfy the Commissioner of the Yukon. Evidence having been submitted to him, it became necessary under the old regulation to have the evidence sent down here, though the commissioner had, in his discretion, to decide these matters. That is the reason the regulation was passed some time ago. As everything has now to be decided there, the regulation has no longer any raison d'être. The case would be entirely different in regard to an application for coal lands in the province of Nova Scotia, where the applicant is entitled to the land from the simple fact of having prospected, located and made application. In the Yukon something else is required. Not only must he have discovered the ground, prospected and located it, but he must have satisfied the commissioner as to the conditions as to water, dumping ground and so on.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why should he be obliged to do so? Are not these matters as to which he must take the risk? If there is no water, he perhaps cannot work the area, but that is his own matter. If there is no dumping ground, perhaps he cannot work the area. Why this paternal care on the part of the Department of the Interior with regard to these matters? In the province of Nova Scotia you might have the government interfering with a gold mining area, and pointing out that there are certain conditions which render it impossible, perhaps, to work it at a profit. These are matters as to which the applicant

takes his own risk, and, provided he pays his fee, he is entitled to take that risk.

Mr. BELCOURT. The complaints which we have heard in this House would be sufficient reason for the enactment of this legislation. I have not discussed the matter with the minister, but I would imagine that it is felt that in order to entitle the person to get a larger area than the area fixed for the ordinary placer claim, and, to facilitate his working it by hydraulic means, this regulation is necessary.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But this is dealing with an application for an ordinary location, and not an application for a large territory.

The PRIME MINISTER. This refers to hydraulic process mining alone.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is an ordinary application to work by hydraulic process. There is nothing in this Order in Council about a large location.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hydraulic process requires capital to carry it on, and everybody cannot procure the means; but in the case of an ordinary location you require nothing but strong arms to work it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I know; but all that can be covered in an entirely different way. In our Nova Scotia mining laws we have the provision that unless the person works his claim in a particular, effective way it will be forfeited. You could cover everything my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) has said, by making a provision, that unless effective work of a certain character is done within a specified time, the location shall become forfeited. Thus you get rid of the disagreeable feature of having the right to this location depend upon the opinion of an officer of the department, which I regard as a very vicious kind of legislation, which should be avoided, because it will always give rise to more or less suspicion on the part of those whose locations have been denied. It is not desirable that power of that kind should be vested even in the most capable and upright officer of the government.

Mr. BELCOURT. There are regulations in the Department of the Interior with reference to placer mining, hydraulic mining and dredging, and these regulations differ one from the other. The placer mining regulations require nothing but staking, and an application for the grant; dredging leases require certain conditions and the payment of a certain rental, and in the case of hydraulic leases, the regulations provide that the applicant must satisfy the commissioner that the ground applied for is suitable for the work, on a large scale; that it has sufficient water to enable it to be worked, and that there is sufficient dumping ground. These conditions are imposed for the protection of the miners generally. If my hon. friend's suggestion were adopted, any one could go to the commissioner and make an application for one mile, or two miles, or more, and though he would not be able to work it, this large area would be tied up. In the meantime the prospecting miner would complain that this large area was tied up without any advantage to the community, or even to the applicant himself. It is to prevent the tying up of large areas of land, to the alleged detriment of the miners, that these regulations were passed, and they are still in force. It was no doubt felt by the department, that it would be more in the public interest for the commissioner himself to have the whole discretion, and that the matter should not be brought to Ottawa to be pronounced upon by the department here. It is no doubt easier for the officer who is on the ground to verify the accuracy of the facts and to pronounce upon the matter. I take it, that there is no other reason for the cancellation of the Order in Council, than to leave it for the proper officer in the Yukon to decide. I would again point out to my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) that the regulation itself is not abolished. It may be that the hon. gentleman thinks that the regulation itself should be changed, but I am of opinion that the granting of hydraulic concessions on a large scale should be subject to the conditions which are at present imposed. However, the only effect of the cancellation of the Order in Council is to leave the decision under the regulations in the hands of the commissioner, rather than in the hands of the officer here.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the Order in Council provide that no lease shall be issued for a location unless it is recommended by the commissioner ?

The PRIME MINISTER. That is in the hydraulic mining regulations.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But on whose recommendation is it ?

Mr. BELCOURT. I think it is the gold commissioner, but I am not quite sure.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman himself is not sure about that.

Mr. BELCOURT. I am not sure whether it is the gold commissioner or the commissioner of the Yukon.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is a substantive condition, that no lease shall be issued for a location unless it be recommended by the commissioner of the Yukon Territory. What my hon. friend from Ottawa has suggested as the meaning of this, may be a better provision, but it is not what is stated in the regulation at all. It does not provide that the commissioner shall not issue

a location until he is satisfied that there is sufficient dumping ground and sufficient water for working the location; it simply states, baldly, that no lease be isssued for a location unless it be recommended by him, leaving it absolutely in the discretion of the commissioner. That is what I object to. I think that everything my right hon. friend has mentioned could be covered by some such provision as I have suggested. You could make your regulations as to dumping ground and as to sufficiency of water, and you could provide that unless the regulations were complied with within a reasonable time, the location should revert to the Crown. That would cover everything that my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) has said, and would remove this objectionable element of testing this absolute jurisdiction in an officer of the department, however capable and upright.

The PRIME MINISTER. The next two orders are Nos. 898 and 899. They refer to the same subject, namely, the royalty to be paid upon gold. Instead of the former royalty of 10 per cent, they substitute a royalty of 2½ per cent. No. 898 contains the ordinance fixing the royalty at 2½ per cent, and No. 899 summarizes this, and proclaims the ordinance. No. 938 is as follows :

The Governor in Council, in virtue of the provisions of clause 47 of the Dominion Lands Act, as enacted by section 5 of chapter 15 of 55-56 Victoria, and of section 8 of the Yukon Territory Act, as enacted by section 3 of chapter 34 of 2 Edward VII., is pleased to order and doth order that clause (a) of section 41 of the regulations governing placer mining in the Yukon Territory established by Order in Council dated 13th March, 1901, shall be amended by adding the following paragraph thereto :—

If a claim is not rerecorded within three months subsequent to the date up to which it was recorded, the claim shall then be deemed to be abandoned and open for occupation and entry by a free miner, even although the required amount of work may have been done within the year for which the claim was recorded or the commutation fee paid in lieu thereof, and the certificate called for by the regulations obtained.

No. 941 enacts :

That clause 38 of the regulations governing placer mining in the Yukon Territory, established by Order in Council dated 27th November, 1901, be amended by providing that the fee of $2 therein mentioned be the fee for the registration of the instrument therein referred to for one claim, and $1 for each additional claim or fraction of a claim described in said instrument.

The next Order, No. 960, enacts as follows:

That the third paragraph of clause (d) of section 6 of the Order in Council of 8th July, 1898, be cancelled, and that the following be substituted therefor :—

Every entry made in any of the mining recorder's books shall show the date upon which such entry is made. A fee of twenty-five cents shall be charged for obtaining information, either verbally or in writing, from the mining recorder with respect to each claim, and documents filed shall be open to public inspection upon payment of a fee of fifty cents; but for copies of any documents the fee shall be two dollars and fifty cents up to two hundred and fifty words, and fifty cents for each extra one hundred words.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). To whom do these fees belong ?

The PRIME MINISTER. They belong to the government. The next Order, dated the 4th of June, 1902, No. 619, is as follows :

Whereas section 75 of the regulations for the disposal of quartz mining claims on Dominion Lands in Manitoba and the North-west Territories and the Yukon Territory, made and established by Order in Council dated 21st March, 1898, as amended by subsequent Orders in Council, provides as follows :—

'If the mining recorder or gold commissioner decides that it is necessary to a proper decision of the matter in issue, to have an investigation on the ground, or, in cases of disputed boundaries or measurements, to employ a Dominion land surveyor to measure or survey the land in question, the expense of the inspection or remeasurement or resurvey, as the case may be, shall be borne by the litigants, who shall pay into the hands of the mining recorder or gold commissioner, in equal parts, such sum as he may think sufficient for the same before it takes place ; otherwise it shall not proceed, and the party who refuses to pay such sum shall be adjudged in default. The said mining recorder or gold commissioner shall subsequently decide in what proportion the said expense should be borne by the parties respectively, and the surplusage, if any, shall then be returned to the parties, as he may order ;' and

Whereas the question has been raised as to whether or not this section may be acted upon in the case of placer mining claims, and it is deemed advisable to settle this question ;

Therefore, the Governor General in Council is pleased to order and doth order that the Ordinance governing the hearing and decision of disputes in relation to mining lands in the Yukon Territory, made by the Governor General in Council on the 18th of March, 1901, shall be and the same is hereby amended by adding thereto section 75 above quoted of the regulation for the disposal of quartz mining claims on Dominion Lands in Manitoba, the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory.

The next Order, dated the 31st October, 1902, No. 1,606, is as follows :

The Governor General in Council is pleased, in virtue of clause 47 of the Dominion Lands Act, as enacted by section 5, of the Act 55-56 Victoria, chapter 15, and of section 8 of the Yukon Territory Act, as enacted by section 3 of the Act 2 Edward VII., chapter 34, to order that the Order in Council of the 15th April, 1902, amending sub-clause (d) of clause 41 of the regulations governing placer mining in the Yukon Territory, established by Order in Council of the 13th of March, 1901, be amended by adding the following paragraph :—

The same provision may also apply to any number of claims which can be worked by dredging, or by any other extensive method satisfactory to the government mining engineer, and this provision may cover any claims worked in this manner on and after the 1st of July, 1902.

The next Order, dated the 22nd December, 1902, No. 1,890, enacts :

On a memorandum dated 12th December, 1902, from the Minister of the Interior, stating that by an Order in Council dated the 20th of July, 1900, provision was made that a free miner may renew his certificate within ninety days from the date of its expiry by paying an additional fee of $5, and such renewal shall be in force for one year from the date the certificate expired, and the holder of such renewal shall be entitled to all the rights of a free miner holding a certificate unexpired.

The minister further states that on the 11th of June, 1902, the free miner's certificate issued in favour of Mr. J. Bigelow expired, but as he was engaged in prospecting on Sulphur creek at a distance from any mining recorder's office, he decided to take advantage of the provisions of the above Order, but failing to note the difference between ninety days and three months, he did not appear at the office of the mining recorder to obtain a renewal of his certificate until the 11th September last, which was after the prescribed period of ninety days had expired, but it was decided by the officers of the Department of the Interior at Dawson, in view of the circumstances, to date his certificate back to the 11th of June, 1902.

This is to confirm his certificate.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). On the very highest authority in the empire, the House of Lords and Privy Council, I would be prepared to say that that Order in Council is absolutely ultra vires. Where you have a statute, the Governor in Council or any one else can only act within the terms of the statute ; and if the statute says that application must be made within a particular time, and it is not made within that time, neither the Governor in Council nor the officers of the department have the slightest power to make it a good application by affidavit and certificate.

The PRIME MINISTER. The concession ought to be granted unless in the interval somebody has made application himself. If a third party had come in and made application for the same lot, then I have no doubt the point would have been decided in favour of the new application, but if no application had been made I think we could very well waive the technical point.

The next one, of the 22nd of December, 1902, No. 1899, provides :

1. All unappropriated Dominion lands in Manitoba, the North-west Territories and within the Yukon Territory shall be open to prospecting for petroleum by an individual or company desiring to do so. In case there should arise any dispute as to whether lands are or are not unappropriated, the question shall be decided by the Minister of the Interior whose decision shall be final. Provided, however, that the minister may reserve for an individual or company who have machinery on the land to be prospected, an area of 640 acres of such shape as the minister may approve of, and that the reservation may be made for such period as he may decide.

2. Should oil in paying quantities be discovered by a prospector on any vacant lands of the Crown, and should such discovery be established to the satisfaction of the Minister of the Interior, an area not exceeding 640 acres of land, including the oil well and such other land as may be determined by the Minister of the Interior, will be sold to the person or company making such discovery at the rate of $1 per acre.

The next one, dated the 7th day of March, 1903, Order No. 323, provides that :

Whereas section 1 of the regulations governing the administration of Dominion lands in the Yukon Territory containing coal, established by the Order in Council of the 21st January, 1901, provides for the collection of a royalty on the gross output of the mine at such rate per ton as may from time to time be specified by the Governor General in Council.

Therefore the Governor in Council is pleased to order the amount of the royalty to be collected shall be and the same is hereby fixed for a period of ten years from the date hereof at the rate of 10 cents per ton of two thousand pounds and that the right of altering said rate after the expiration of such period of ten years be reserved.

The next one provides for a special case, and I shall read it in full. It is as follows :

Extract from a report of a committee of the Honourable the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency on the 7th March, 1903.

On a report dated 23rd February, 1903, from the Minister of the Interior, submitting that a deep shaft was sunk by Mr. A. R. Thompson, of Dawson, on placer mining claim No. 3a, on Eldorado Creek, in the Yukon Territory, with a view of ascertaining whether or not a second strata of gold-bearing gravel existed at a considerable depth below what has generally been supposed to be bed rock ; that at the depth of about 220 feet a very considerable flow of water was struck which filled the shaft and overflowed to the extent of from 900 to 1,000 gallons per minute ; that owing to the very low temperature this water formed a vast glacier which threatened to envelop the town of Bonnaza and all mining claims below the mouth of Eldorado Creek ; and that your government incurred very considerable expenditure in successfully capping this flow and so insuring the safety of the property situated below it on Eldorado and Bonanza Creeks.

The minister states that Mr. Thompson has now applied to the Department of the Interior for the right to the water from this shaft together with the right to dispose of the same for mining and other purposes. That by an Order in Council of the 3rd of August, 1898, provision was made for the diversion and use of water for mining purposes in the Yukon Territory, but the right to dispose of the water acquired under the provisions of these regulations was rescinded by Order in Council, dated the 7th of December, 1901.

The minister, however, recommends that he be authorized to grant to Mr. Thompson the right to the water flowing from the shaft referred to, in accordance with the provisions of the regulations established by the Order in Council dated the 3rd August, 1898, and the amendments thereto, together with the right to dispose of the whole or any portion thereof upon such terms and under such conditions as may be approved by the commissioner of the Yukon Territory.

The minister further recommends, as the government, however, has incurred very consider-

able expenditure in arresting the flow of water from this shaft, and as it would appear to be reasonable that a certain portion of the revenue which may be derived from the sale of the water should be paid to the Crown on account of such expenditure, that the grant to Mr. Thompson be made subject to the payment to the Crown of a royalty of not less than ten per cent of the gross amount received for the sale or use of the water, until the royalty collected equals the amount of such expenditure, together with interest on such amount at the rate of five per cent per annum. Sworn returns on a form to be furnished by the commissioner to be made monthly by the grantee to the gold commissioner showing the quantities of water sold or disposed of, and the amounts realized therefrom, and payment at the same time to be made of the royalty thereon at the rate fixed. The grantee shall keep a book in which shall be entered all sales and which shall be submitted for the inspection of the gold commissioner or other officer of the Crown for the purpose of verifying his returns aforesaid. Default in making the said returns, in producing the said book, and in payment of the royalty, if continued for thirty days after notice has been posted to that effect in the vicinity of the shaft by the gold commissioner, or by his direction, to be followed by the cancellation of the grant, in which case the works shall be taken possession of and operated by the Crown and the revenue derived from the sale of the water shall be applied to the repayment of the amount expended by the Crown in capping the flow and operating the works until the whole amount, with interest, has been repaid.

The next order, which is dated 31st March, 1903, Order No. 472, provides :

Whereas section 6 of the regulations governing the issue of leases to dredge for minerals in the beds of rivers in the Yukon Territory, established by the Order in Council of the 18th day of January, 1898, provides that the lessees shall pay to the Crown a royalty of 10 per cent on the output in excess of $15,000 as shown by sworn returns to be furnished monthly by the lessee to the gold commissioner during the period that dredging operations are being carried on; such royalty, if any, to be paid with each return ;

And whereas at the time these regulations were approved the royalty on gold mined under the provisions of the placer mining regulations was 10 per cent of the gross output, but it has since been reduced to 2½ per cent on the value of the gold exported without any exemption ;

Therefore the Governor General in Council is pleased, in virtue of the provisions of clause 47 of the Dominion Lands Act, as enacted by section 5 of chapter 15 of 55-56 Victoria, and of section 8 of the Yukon Territory Act, as enacted by section 3 of chapter 34 of 2 Edward VII., to order that the portion of section 6 of the regulations governing the issue of leases to dredge for minerals in the rivers of the Yukon Territory, above quoted, and also section 6a of the said regulations shall be, and the same are hereby rescinded and the following substituted therefor :—

The same royalty shall be paid upon the output of gold as is provided, or may hereafter be provided, in the case of placer mining claims, such royalty to be paid in the maner provided in the regulations governing placer mining.

The next one of the same date, No. 473, provides that :

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Whereas section 41 of the regulations governing placer mining in the Yukon Territory, established by the Order in Council of the 13th March, 1901, provides that any free miner having duly located and recorded a claim shall be entitled to hold it for the period for which he received entry, and thence from year to year by re-recording the same, provided, however, that during each year and each succeeding year such free miner shall do or cause to be done work on the claim itself to the value of $200, or he may at his option in lieu of the work required to be done thereon each year pay to the mining recorder in whose office the claim is recorded the sum of $200 for each of the first three years, but for the fourth and succeeding years the sum of $400 must be paid in lieu of work done on the location or in connection therewith ;

And whereas the commissioner of the Yukon Territory reports that it would be in the public interest if the amount of work done in each year on a placer mining claim could not be commuted by payment of a fee in lieu thereof ;

Therefore the Governor General in Council is pleased, in virtue of clause 47 of the Dominion Lands Act, as enacted by section 5 of the Act 55-56 Victoria, chapter 15, and of section 8 of the Yukon Territory Act, as enacted by section 3 of the Act 2 Edward VII., chapter 34 to order, and it is hereby ordered, that the provisions contained in the several sub-clauses of section 41 of the regulations established by Order in Council of the 13th of March, 1901, for payment at the option of the free miner, in lieu of assessment work shall be rescinded on and after the 1st day of August, 1903.

The next order is also of the same date, No. 474. It provides :

Whereas section 2 of the regulations governing placer mining in the Yukon Territory, established by the Order in Council of the 13th March, 1901, provides that for a free miner's certificate issued in favour of an individual the fee shall be $10 and sections 20 and 34 of the regulations in question provide for the payment of a fee of $15 for entry for a placer mining claim, and the payment of a like amount for renewal thereof each year ;

And whereas the commissioner of the Yukon Territory now recommends that the charge for a free miner's certificate be reduced to $7.50 and that the fee for a grant of renewal of a placer mining claim be reduced to $10 ;

Therefore the Governor in Council is pleased, in virtue of clause 47 of the Dominions Lands Act, as enacted by section 5 of the Act, chapter 15 of 55-56 Victoria, and of section 8 of the Yukon Territory Act, as enacted by section 3 of the Act, chapter 34 of 2 Edward VII., to order that section 2 of the regulations established by the Order in Council of the 13th of March, 1901, above referred to, shall be and the same is hereby amended by striking out the fee of $10 for which provision is made therein as the charge for a free miner's certificate to an individual and substituting therefor $7.50 ; and that sections 29 and 34 of the said regulations shall be, and the same are hereby amended, by substituting a charge of $10 for entry or for renewal of a placer mining claim in the place of the present charge of $15.

Then, another order of the same date, No. 475, enacts :

The Governor General in Council is pleased, in virtue of the provisions of clause 47 of the Dominions Lands Act, as enacted by section 5 of the Act 55-56 Victoria, chapter 15, and of section 8 of the Yukon Territory Act, as enacted by section 3 of the Act 2 Edward VII., chapter 34, to order that Form 'N' of the regulations for the disposal of the right to divert and use water from any stream or lake and the right of way through and entry upon any mining ground for the purpose of constructing ditches and flumes to convey such water for mining purposes in the Yukon Territory established by the Order in Council of the 3rd August, 1898, shall be, and the same is hereby rescinded, and the following form substituted therefor.

Form N is then printed, but I presume it is not necessary for me to read it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the resolution is adopted, I would like to suggest to the Prime Minister that it would be advisable to have all the regulations relating to the Dominion lands and matters of that kind in the Yukon revised and put in intelligible shape, and printed, so that members of the House and others interested might be able thoroughly to understand the meaning and scope of the regulations.

The PRIME MINISTER. And laid before parliament at the beginning of the session—issued as a Blue-book ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think so.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think so. I shall make that recommendation.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time, and agreed to.

OFFER OF JUDGESHIP—POLITICAL REPORT.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to call the attention of the government to a paragraph in the Montreal 'Star' of last evening. It read as follows :

Rumours that would seem strange to the uninitiated came from Ottawa this morning. It seems the Liberals have become somewhat disturbed about the apparent reaction in public sentiment. It is said, on authority that seldom errs in statements of fact that the Liberals have offered through Mr. Dansereau, a judgeship to a somewhat prominent Conservative politician in the province of Quebec, if he will carry out a programme arranged by Mr. Dansereau to create and perpetuate a split in the Conservative ranks.

I desire to ask if there is any truth in the rumour contained in the Montreal 'Star.'

The PRIME MINISTER. I have been in the city of Ottawa pretty constantly for eight months, and I must say that I never heard such a rumour ; nor do I believe that anybody in this House ever heard it. I do not know what may be reported in Montreal, but I am sure that this is news to every body in this House. I can tell my hon. friend (Mr. Logan) that there is no truth in the statement. No judgeship has been offered to any body, especially to the hon. gentleman who is not named but well indicated. The whole thing is a pure fabrication.

Mr. CASGRAIN. And there is no truth in the rumour of a split.

ALASKA BOUNDARY ARBITRATION—CABLEGRAM FROM LORD ALVERSTONE.

The PRIME MINISTER. The subject we have just discussed is another illustration that we must not always take what the newspapers tell us as gospel truth. And, on that point I may say that I have received a telegram from Lord Alverstone, Chief Justice of England :

London, October 13, 1903.

There is not the slightest foundation for statement attributed to me in Reuter telegram from Ottawa dated 12th October, as to question in House of Comomns on that date. I have made no communication of any kind to any diplomatic or colonial officials, or to any person respecting the case. The report is an absolute fabrication.

(Sgd.) ALVERSTONE.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am sure this is what might have been expected from Lord Alverstone. I suppose the right hon. gentleman has no telegram from Mr. Aylesworth with regard to——

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

RURAL MAIL DELIVERY.

Mr. EDWARD HACKETT (West Prince). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to call the attention of the Postmaster General to a statement which appears in the editorial column of the Charlottetown 'Patriot,' of the 9th instant :

RURAL MAIL DELIVERY.

As soon as the consolidated school is established at Hazelbrook, we understand it is the intention of the government to inaugurate a rural mail delivery service in that part of Prince Edward Island. Mr. D. A. MacKinnon, M.P., brought this matter to the notice of the department and suggested that the mails could be carried by the same vans to the houses, when conveying the pupils to and from school. In this way the service could be performed very economically and satisfactorily. Thus a rural mail delivery will have its initial movement in this province. In the event of its proving a success the system could be extended to other parts of the country.

I desire to ask the hon. Minister if there is any truth in that statement, and, if, while he is considering the question of mail delivery in Prince Edward Island, he will establish mail delivery in the city of Charlottetown, the town of Summerside and other urban centres, instead of commencing in a rural district.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. McKinnon) has, from time to

time, pressed upon me the advisability of establishing rural mail deliveries. But, up to this moment, the department has arrived at no conclusion upon the subject. I may say that many other members have made similar demands, in fact, they are constantly being made from all parts of this Dominion. But this is a subject of very serious moment, one that the government could not undertake except after the most careful consideration ; and, for my part, I think that Canada is not ripe for any such movement. I am quite satisfied that the people of Canada would not bear the cost that such a service would involve. It is at present beyond the resources of the people of Canada to attempt to establish a rural mail delivery over a country so sparsely inhabited as ours and as large as all Europe, for Europe even with its four hundred millions of people, has not yet, to any great extent, adopted the system.

INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT—GRAIN INSPECTION EAST OF MANITOBA DISTRICT.

House went into Committee to consider the following proposed resolutions :

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the General Inspection Act, and to provide for the appointment of weigh-masters for the weighing of grain in any inspection district east of the inspection district of Manitoba, and for their remuneration by fees or otherwise.—The Minister of Trade and Commerce.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). I would say to the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) that this resolution is introduced merely for the purpose of submitting a Bill which I have here in detail. The object of the measure is to extend the inspection law applying to grain in the district of Manitoba to the country east of Manitoba. Of course, every discussion can be had on the Bill that can be had on the resolution. If hon. gentlemen wish to discuss the resolution I will withdraw it, as I do not want to interfere with the business to be proposed by my hon. friend the Postmaster General.

Mr. TAYLOR. What territory does the Bill include ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwrigt) informs me that there is some other matter which the government desires to go on with, and I agree that it would be convenient to reserve any discussion with regard to the measure now proposed until the Bill is introduced. I do not think there is any objection, if it meets the approval of my hon. friends on this side.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time, and agreed to.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 266), further to amend the General Inspection Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENTS.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 257) to amend the Civil Service Act.--The Postmaster General.

On section 1,

Mr. BARKER. I would like to call the attention of the Postmaster General to another officer who, I think, might well be provided for under this section. There are provisions here for three of our deputy heads, the Deputy Minister of Justice, the Deputy Minister of Finance and the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals. There is a provision by which their salaries may be increased to $5,000, in certain events. The Deputy Minister of Justice, when appointed, must have had ten years' service at the bar. I can hardly imagine any man obtaining the position of Deputy Minister of Justice if he had served less than ten years at the bar, it would be very unusual ; and it looks to me as if this were rather a means of enabling this gentleman, and in the same manner these other two gentlemen, to get an exceptional allowance. Now I do not object, but I wish to bring forward the case of another official, the Auditor General. I am aware that there has been friction between the gentleman who holds that position and some of the other departments, but it seems to me that we should deal with the office, and that there should be no distinction made between the salary of a deputy minister of one of the departments and the salary of the Auditor General, at all events to the disadvantage of the Auditor General. I do not think there is any deputy head in the whole service whose position is so important and so valuable to the country as that of the Auditor General. I cannot imagine that there is any sufficient reason why there should be any distinction between the salaries of the deputy heads I have named and that of an officer so important in the interests of the whole Dominion as the Auditor General. As I said before, I know there has been friction between the present incumbent of that office and other departments, probably I might more correctly say with the deputy heads of other departments. Well, I can only say that I doubt whether you will ever have an Auditor General, who attempts to do his duty, who will not have friction with the various departments. It is inevitable that it should be so. He is the criticiser, he is to a certain extent a fault-finder, and every time he attempts to scrutinize the acts of the department he will meet with resistance ; if he persists there will

be more than resistance, there will be opposition. Now those of us who have read the correspondence in the Auditor General's Report know that he has come into conflict with deputy heads on matters that were likely to cause serious friction between them. Under those circumstances I think it is the duty of the government, instead of giving exceptional treatment to the deputy heads which will put him in a somewhat unfair position as regards rank, that they should protect the department of the Auditor General, whatever view they may take of the gentleman who occupies that office for the moment. I therefore suggest to the hon. the Postmaster General that it would be only proper, now that the salaries are being dealt with, to make provision in this section for the department of the Auditor General. He is not a deputy head, he has not by statute the rank of deputy head, and he is apparently to be left out simply because he has not D. H. after his name.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I appreciate what my hon. friend has said as to its being the duty of the government to strengthen the hands of the Auditor General, to stand by him in the proper discharge of his duties, and to give proper weight and dignity to his high and responsible position I do not controvert anything the hon. gentleman has said as to the salary that should attach to the office, and if to-day I am not able to include his name in this list, it is not because of any decision to the contrary, either by the government or in my own mind. It may be that his case was not presented when the cases of the deputy heads were under consideration. This Bill has grown, it has assumed proportions in excess of those that were contemplated when I introduced it. Therefore if the Auditor General is not being included with the others who are being given extra salaries, it is not because of any adverse conclusion we have come to, and no inference of that kind should be entertained. Perhaps my hon. friend would be good enough not to press the subject at this late date in the session. I think I can say on behalf of the government that, notwithstanding the supposed friction that has been referred to, the Auditor General enjoys the confidence and respect of the government, and we would be quite as ready as any hon. gentleman in the House to recognize his claims, both for increased emoluments and for support at the hands of the government in the discharge of his very embarrassing and responsible duties. Leaving the matter over for future consideration will not in any wise prejudice his claim. If we do not include him to-day it is simply because his case has not been under consideration. The Bill has grown, as I say, new clauses have been introduced from time to time. Under the circumstances this case might very properly come up for consideration at a later date.

Mr. BARKER. I should be quite content with that decision, speaking for myself. But I would be better pleased if the Postmaster General would say that the case will be taken into consideration at an early date rather than at some future date. Some future date might be very far away. If it be that the Auditor General's case has been overlooked, I hope the hon. gentleman will promise the House that it will be taken up at an early date, for consideration at all events. I am very glad to hear that the Auditor General has the confidence of the government. I believe the Auditor General has the confidence of the whole country and I am glad to hear now that the government do not disagree with the country in regard to him.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In asking that the matter be not pressed at this point, it was not for the purpose of shelving it indefinitely, but simply out of regard for the manifest desire of hon. members for an early prorogation. I wished to avoid anything that might interfere with that much desired end.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I see that the clause in regard to a civil engineer says that he must be a civil engineer of ten years' standing. What is the qualification of a civil engineer under that clause ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The title of 'civil engineer' may be acquired, I suppose without one having the diploma of an educational institution, but I think the construction that would be placed upon these words 'civil engineer' in this case would be that they would apply to some person who had acquired the legal status of a civil engineer in a technical sense.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the legal status.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Perhaps it may be necessary that any one who sets himself up as a civil engineer is required to have a diploma from some college or university in civil engineering. There is a department of civil engineering in McGill and one at the School of Practical Science, Toronto. No government would consider a man as coming within the meaning of this section and being a civil engineer simply because he chose to call himself a civil engineer and sought to work in that way. He would have to be a civil engineer of standing and professionnal qualification evidenced either by the practice of his profession or by the diplomas of educational institutions. It seems to me there would be no difficulty in determining the meaning of the words 'civil engineer.'

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Of course, I can understand that if he gets the diploma of a college or institution, such as the School

of Science, he would come under this clause, but the great majority of those who are practising their professsion in this country have no diploma or anything beyond the fact that they are working at this profession. I think it ought to be defined.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think that any government would recognize a man as a civil engineer under this section unless he had professional attainments and education to entitle him to such recognition.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This is making the government the interpreter of what a civil engineer is. The standard should be defined.

Mr. BELL. In reference to the matter raised by my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) as to the position of the Auditor General, I really feel as if the hon. minister in charge of this Bill has not given any satisfactory reason why the question should not be dealt with at this time. The hon. minister stated that this Bill had very largely developed in the course of its passage through the different stages.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not say so for the purpose of provoking discussion, but the very contrary. If my hon. friend (Mr. Bell) will reserve his observations to a later stage, I will let the Bill stand after the second reading, and then I will have an opportunity of consulting the government and perhaps be able to make an announcement.

Mr. BELL. All right.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I wish to add a few words to subsection (b) of section 2 of the Civil Service Act. The Clerk of the Privy Council is Mr. McGee. He is supposed to be the deputy head. He is called the deputy head, and he was supposed to come within the meaning of this section, but I cannot find any place in which he has been made deputy head by the statute. He is always included as a deputy head in the Civil Service list. Therefore, I propose to make the Civil Service Act meet the case by adding to this the following :

Subsection (b) of section 2 of the Civil Service Act is amended by inserting in the third line after the word 'department' the words 'also the Clerk of the Privy Council.'

The committee will find by reference to subsection (b) of section 2 of the Civil Service Act, which I am now proposing to amend, that it says :

The expression 'deputy,' 'deputy head,' or 'deputy head of the department,' means the deputy of the minister of the Crown presiding over such department, and also includes the 'Auditor General,' in all cases in which such meaning is not inconsistent with his powers and duties under the 'Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act.'

Hon. Mr. HAGGART

I propose to add after the words 'head of the department,' a provision that it also includes the clerk of the Privy Council.

Mr. BELL. I would suggest that there are other officers, not perhaps of the government, but of this parliament, who fill positions apparently very similar to that of the Clerk of the Privy Council. I refer to the Chief Clerk of the House of Commons and to the Chief Clerk of the Senate. There are also the Librarians of Parliament.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are going to be dealt with in another way.

Mr. BELL. I observe that, but it seems to me that provision should be made when we are passing this measure to see that the officers of the House of Commons do not receive worse treatment than those who fill other positions in the civil service. Since the hon. minister is making the amendment he is now making in favour of the Clerk of the Privy Council it would seem a simple and easy matter to include the Clerks of the House of Commons and the Senate.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think that the fact that the Clerks of the House of Commons and Senate are officers of parliament should be a reason for their not being embraced in the Civil Service Act. They are outside of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. BIRKETT. I understand the hon. minister to say that the Chief Clerk of the Senate and the Chief Clerk of the House of Commons are to be dealt with in another way. Will other officers of parliament be dealt with in the same way ? Is it the intention to deal only with the Chief Clerks of the two Houses or is it the intention to deal generally with the officers of the House of Commons ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is a section dealing with deputy heads. Would it not be advisable to dispose of this before we embark upon a general discussion upon another question ? I think we would make more progress.

Mr. BIRKETT. I understand that this does not deal with the members of the staff of the House of Commons, but the hon. minister having referred to the Chief Clerk, I thought it was an opportune time to inquire about the balance of the staff of the House of Commons.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My remarks in reference to the Clerk of the House of Commons would apply to all officers of parliament. They are under the control of parliament in a different way from members of the civil service. They are not members of the civil service. This is a Bill to deal with the civil service, and if it is proposed to deal with the officers of parliament it should be done in a measure independently of the civil service.

Amendment agreed to.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Chairman, I move:

That section 2 be amended by striking out the words 'at the time of the coming into force of this Act' in the 29th and 30th lines.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the meaning of the words in this section :

Either as deputy or in some other with capacity in the department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The word 'with' is a typographical error.

Mr. LANCASTER. It must mean 'such' capacity, or 'like' capacity.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No. It is only dealing with those in the public service at present, and if you strike out the word 'with' it is all right.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. This clause refers more particularly to the case of Mr. Gerald. He was for many years assistant commissioner, and for five or six years he discharged the duties of commissioner, Mr. Miall being ill. This is inserted in the Bill in order that Mr. Gerald may have the benefit of the increase the same as other deputy ministers.

Mr. COCHRANE. It is retroactive ; giving him the benefit of the salary for five years past.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why didn't you come out and say so straight ?

Mr. BIRKETT. In future, Mr. Gerald instead of being known as the commissioner, will be known as the deputy ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. It only affects the salary henceforth.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. He will be entitled to rank as deputy minister for five or six years past, so that he may get the increase of $100 a year, as the other deputy ministers get.

Mr. COCHRANE. This clause is put in to give this gentleman a salary that he was not entitled to.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, it gives him a record. He was acting practically as deputy minister during the illness of Mr. Miall for several years, and this is in order that his service for such should count.

Mr. COCHRANE. Then you are paying two deputy ministers for some years.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We could have superannuated Mr. Miall.

Mr. COCHRANE. You could fly if you had wings. You appear to have more consideration for these gentlemen than for the tax-payers. If any of these ministers were running their own business they would not do such a thing. This deputy minister was ill, and we all sympathize with him, and this other gentleman was not hurt at all by doing his work, but four or five years afterwards we have this kind of legislation coming down. The ministers do not give us an explanation that any ordinary mortal can understand, and we have to ply questions at them in order to grasp the situation. Now we are to pay two deputy ministers concurrently.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. COCHRANE. What are you doing then ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Does the hon. gentleman wish me to answer ?

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes, if you give us some straight information and not mystify it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will try not to do that. We are not paying any back salary at all. We have here the case of one deputy who has been in the service for a great many years, but prior to his appointment as deputy he had been performing the duties of the office, though not occupying the legal status of a deputy. It is now proposed to recognize his services to the extent of allowing his increase to commence at such amount as his length of service will entitle him to, instead of postponing it for some length of time.

Mr. BARKER. He does not get any arrears ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No. His increase will come in the future. If this session should ever come to an end, and this Bill becomes law, then this deputy minister will be eligible for this increase, so that every day we are protracting the session we are keeping that increase back.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would suggest to the ministers that they should give plain explanations and not be constantly mystifying what they say.

Mr. BARKER. The word 'with' in the clause has no meaning.

Mr. SPROULE. It must have been intended for the word 'such,' so as to read, 'some other such capacity.'

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think that is necessary at all.

Mr. SPROULE. It certainly is necessary if you read the context.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am afraid the Auditor General might hold that although acting as deputy and not having the status of a deputy, it would not be such capacity as would entitle this officer to come in under the terms of the section. So

far as I know, there is only one deputy in the service to whom these words apply; the whole section is limited to men who are in the service and who are well known. Therefore no great grievance can grow out of it. Every person who has now the legal status of a deputy will come in under this section, if you pass it.

Mr. SPROULE. I cannot see how anyone would be affected injuriously if you added the words, 'or some such capacity.' Under the Bill, a man might act in some other capacity. He might be a messenger.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no such case.

Mr. SPROULE. But if there were such a case, this would apply to it, and it would make it absurd, because service in such a capacity would certainly be of no value in determining the man's salary.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Suppose we adopted the hon. gentleman's suggestion, the Auditor General might say that as a matter of law he could not recognize that Mr. Gerald, who was serving in the capacity of assistant commissioner, was taking the place of the deputy; and therefore he would not come within this provision.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 4—certain salaries not affected.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL moved that after the word 'salary' in the first line, the words 'or emolument' be inserted.

Mr. COCHRANE. What does that mean?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It happens that some of the deputies receive something outside of their salaries. For example, Mr. Parmelee, Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce, gets an allowance as controller of Chinese, and Mr. McDougald, Commissioner of Customs, besides his salary of $2,800, receives $800 as Chairman of the Board of Appraisers. These extra fees may be considered as emoluments, and it is not proposed to take them away. We want to allow the officers to retain whatever they have now.

Mr. COCHRANE. We have here an example of legislation brought down by a minister of the crown in such a crude state that the time of this committee has to be taken up whipping it into shape. There has hardly been a Bill introduced by the government this session that has not had to be amended over and over again before it has been in a shape to carry out the intention. This proves to me as a layman that the legislation is not properly considered before it is brought to this House. I think the country might better pay a competent draftsman to find out what the ministers mean, and then to put their legislation in such a shape as to carry out their intention. We have a provision here in regard to Mr. Parmelee, an official in a department which the minister who presides over it used to say was a sinecure and should never have been created. The hon. minister's soul is not now harassed by the fact that the farmers are being bled white. The hon. gentleman's deputy minister is receiving the same salary as he did in those days and now the minister proposes to increase it or rather to have the obnoxious word 'emolument' or 'allowance' removed and have it made a salary so that when the minister leaves his present position the deputy will have the full salary. The hon. minister we know is idle and the deputy must be idle too and he wishes to leave him in a secure position.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I understand that my hon. friend wants to have a law clerk appointed to do this work. That is a subject worthy of consideration but we would not care to add to the burdens of the taxpayers now.

Mr. COCHRANE. I know how much you are concerned about the taxpayers, when you have all the offices loaded with officials and the taxpayers are not considered at all. If you had officials that had some brains to do this work that would be a benefit and we would not be detained here as we have been. The hon. gentleman brings down a measure and the moment a section is read he says he will have to amend it. How could a layman like myself understand that Bill?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. COCHRANE. I am serious about it. I do not think it is anything to laugh at that we are here from day to day.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I hope that 'Hansard' will not include the speech of my hon. friends as part of my own.

Mr. COCHRANE. They have been deceived enough, with what you said in parliament without transferring anything I said to your credit.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think it would be fair to take away the allowances which these old officers have had and to reduce them; that is the point. We want to protect them in their rights. Whether it was right or not in days gone by to make these allowances is another matter, but I think the committee will agree that we should protect them in their rights.

Mr. COCHRANE. I have no objection to protecting them in their rights. I said nothing about their rights. The Postmaster General should not put in my mouth words that I did not use. This would not excuse the Postmaster General for what he said year after year when we proposed to give anything to the civil service. He was one of the first on his feet with the Minister of

Customs denouncing the extravagance of the Tory party. The Minister of Trade and Commerce used to wax eloquent and his soul was torn with the burden we were placing on the farmers and now we are voting millions of money.

Sections as amended, agreed to.

Progress reported.

At one o'clock, Committee took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

On section 5,

This Act shall not apply to the present Deputy of the Minister of Justice until the conclusion of his present engagement as one of the commissioners for the revision of the Statutes of Canada.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is because the Deputy Minister of Justice gets an allowance in connection with the revision of the statutes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Besides his salary as deputy minister and the allowance in connection with this revision of the statutes, I think he has another allowance, though I have forgotten what it is.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know as to that. At all events he has recently been appointed commissioner for revising the statutes for which he will get an allowance. It is not intended to give him the benefit of this Act until his commissionership ends.

On section 6,

Section 13 of the Civil Service Act is repealed and the following section is substituted therefor :—

13. The deputy head of each department shall, subject to the directions of the head of the department, oversee and direct the officers, clerks and employees in the department, and shall have general control of the business thereof, and shall perform such other duties as are assigned to him by the Governor in Council. He shall give his full time to the public service and shall discharge all duties required by the head of the department, or by the Governor in Council, whether such duty is in his own department or not ; and no deputy head shall receive any pay, fee or allowance in any form in excess of the amount provided for him in section 12 of this Act.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This section is to exclude claims for any other service.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The preceding section makes it clear, I suppose, without any exception being mentioned in this section, that the Deputy Minister of Justice is not included ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

On section 7,

7. In addition to the class of chief clerkships referred to in sections 15 and 16 of the said Act, another class, to be known as that of 'chief clerkship, grade A,' is hereby created.

2. The minimum salary paid to a chief clerk, grade A, shall be two thousand four hundred dollars per annum, with annual increases of one hundred dollars up to a maximum of two thousand eight hundred dollars per annum.

3. A chief clerk in any department may be promoted to grade A, by an Order in Council passed after—

(a.) The deputy head has reported that the duties devolving upon such officer are of special importance, and that the officer recommended for such promotion is specially qualified for their performance ;

(b.) The concurrence of the head of the department in such report ; and

(c.) The salary has been voted by parliament.

(d.) If a person on appointment to a chief clerkship, grade A, is at the time of such appointment in receipt of a salary greater than the minimum salary of such chief clerkship as above provided, he may be appointed to such chief clerkships at the salary he is then in receipt of, provided it does not exceed the maximum salary of such chief clerkship as above provided.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I move to amend subsection 3 so as to read: 'A chief clerk in any department may, without being required to undergo any special or other examination be promoted to grade A' &c.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BARKER. Is a clerk promoted to a chief clerkship, grade A., to have his salary increased over whatever he may be receiving ? For example, if his class entitled him to a maximum of $1,800, but his actual salary is $2,000, would you make the increases to $2,100, $2,200 and so on ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This section is limited solely to chief clerks in grade A, and does not cover all chief clerks. A man promoted to grade A enters the class at a minimum salary of $2,400. If he had been in receipt of $2,400 for a year before that promotion, he would be eligible for an increase of $100. But if he had been in receipt of $2,400 for less than a year, his increase would not begin until the expiry of a year from his last increase.

Mr. BARKER. Suppose he had been receiving $2,600 instead of $2,400. Would he then receive $2,700, being an increase of $100 over his then salary, or $2,500, being an increase of $100 over the minimum of his class ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Such a case could not arise. A man will be transferred from a lower class to grade A, and at promotion he would receive $2,400 as a minimum.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How many did you intend this to apply to ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Nothing has been settled in that way. I do not think the ministers have gone through their departments with that view. I have not gone

through mine. When a law like this is to apply generally, it is impossible in advance to go through and make your selection.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It cannot apply until next session, because parliament has to vote the money.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, it is not arranged in that way. If you would allow me, Mr. Chairman, to direct the attention of my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) for purposes of explanation to section 26, he will find that after referring to moneys voted by parliament, it provides :

> And during the financial year ending on the thirtieth day of June, 1904, there may be paid from out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada such sums of money as have been voted by parliament but are required for payment of such salaries and increases of salaries as are authorized by this Act.

There are conditions in the Bill such as are found in the Civil Service Act, that, before a chief clerkship can be created, there must be an Order in Council, a recommendation by the deputy head and concurrence by the head of the department.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me the government ought to be prepared to give the House some information as to the number who will be affected by this reorganization. Some one must have gone through and made some sort of calculation. If we have not that information, we do not know what expense the country is being committed to by this change. I assume that every one of these will want to be promoted at the earliest possible moment after this Act passes.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are not all at their maximum, comparatively few are at their maximum now. I have no doubt that there will be a certain number of promotions, and they will be made prizes to be sought after. Instead of dumping the whole number into the higher class, all who might by law be put there, the government will exercise a careful discretion. They are treated as privates, and this is simply an intermediate step between the chief clerk and a deputy.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose it is because the deputy heads do not die quick enough.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, but it makes a smaller step. It is an incentive to service, so that a man should not feel that he has got to the end of his career because he has got to the maximum of a chief clerk, and that there is still a prize beyond that point.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What sum of money is available from the votes of parliament for this purpose ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not possible to say, because at present there are eligible cases all through the service, and unless we have an omnibus clause such as clause 26, it will be necessary to revote the whole salary for every man who is promoted from a chief clerkship to grade A. Under the section, any payment of salary to a man as chief clerk should be available to pay that same man if he is transferred to the higher class. Otherwise you would have to go through the whole service and revote all that is voted for the chief clerkships.

Mr. BARKER. I understood there was to be a provision inserted in section 7 to apply the same rule to the Auditor General's Department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have an amendment for that purpose now. I move to add this subsection to section 7 :

> The provisions of subsection 3, section 24, of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, as that section is enacted by section 1 of chapter 16 of the statutes of 1891, shall apply to promotions to chief clerkships in grade A in the office of the Auditor General.

That is in order that the Auditor General should have the same control over promotions to grade A as he has in regard to promotions of other members of his staff. Since we are speaking of the Auditor General, I find it won't be possible for me to settle that particular question in time for the present measure. The session is so far advanced that I find it impossible to take up anything new, or to indulge in any departure or amendment that will involve any delay. So I think it will be wiser to leave the matter as it is with the expressions that have fallen from hon. gentlemen, until next session.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will the minister leave all the promotions to the Auditor General ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Whatever they are under the Audit Act ; we do not propose any change.

Mr. BARKER. This section which is proposed will give him the same power precisely with respect to grade A that he already has with clerks in his department, neither more nor less.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Precisely.

Amendment agreed to, and section, as amended, agreed to.

On section (a),

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This clause merely re-echoes the resolutions that passed, increasing the minimum and maximum by $100. Section 16 fixes the minimum of a chief clerkship at $1,800 and the maximum at $2,400. This adds $100 at each end.

On section 14,

The POSTMASTER GENERAL moved to amend by adding as subsection 2 the following :

Subsection 2 of section 39 of the Civil Service Act is amended by striking out the word 'only' in the second line and by inserting the following words: 'and at such other time as may be from time to time fixed by the Governor in Council.'

Section 39 of the Civil Service Act provides that promotion examinations shall be held only once a year, in the month of May. It is rather inconvenient to have only one time in the year at which to hold promotion examinations, therefore it is proposed, not to dispense with the promotion examination in May, but to hold promotion examinations at other times in addition, when desirable.

Mr. SPROULE. Can a supplemental examination be held at any time by one member of the board or must it be held by the whole board?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, it is held by Order in Council. It is really a departmental, technical examination. It is not an examination for the public, but for those actually in the service.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It gives the government power to hold a special examination between times.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, more than once a year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You can order a special examination for any candidate for a position?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Had you not that power before?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, the statute says only once a year.

Amendment agreed to, and section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 17,

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is that a substitute clause for the one that is at present in the Civil Service Act?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. At present there are no third-class clerks except those who are appointed before the repeal of the provision for third-class clerks. I think that under the Act they were eligible for $50 a year increase. We are restoring the old annual increase of $50. The class that took the place of the third-class, the temporary writers, began at $400, and they had only an annual increase of $30 a year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But my point is this: The parties who were appointed to be third-class clerks before that class was abolished claim that they had the right to their increment of $50 a year. Of course that question was threshed out in the House and Sir Charles Tupper, while leader of the opposition, took strong ground that it was a statutory right they obtained upon appointment. This does not make it a statutory right but leaves it optional with the government.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This does not alter the law.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is just a doubtful point whether it alters the law or not.

On section 19,

Any person who is now, or hereafter may be, writer, clerk, packer, sorter, or messenger, temporary or otherwise, in the service of the government of Canada, employed in one of the departments at Ottawa, or in the office of the Auditor General, may, under Order in Council, be appointed a third-class clerk at a salary not less than the salary of which he was in receipt or to which he would be entitled at the time of such appointment (but limited always to a sum not exceeding to maximum salary of the third class); provided always that any such person, who in the capacity aforesaid, or in any other capacity, has been continuously in the said service for two years prior to the passing of this Act, may be so appointed without regard to his age and without passing the qualifying examination, and the said Order in Council shall be held to create the third-class clerkship in respect of which such appointment is made, and the Governor in Council may, in the case of any such person whose salary is at the time of his appointment as third-class clerk less than five hundred dollars a year, increase such salary to five hundred dollars a year, but no such increase shall take effect from a date prior to the date of the coming into force of this Act, nor shall it be made except on the report of the deputy head of the department, concurred in by the head of the department, that such clerk is deserving thereof.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL moved that:

Section 19 be amended by inserting after the word 'who' in the first line the words 'either before or after the passing of this Act was or who thereafter' and striking out the words 'is now or hereafter'; also to insert the letter (a) after the word 'be' on the first line; and in the 30th and following lines to strike out the words 'but no such increase shall take effect from a date prior to the date of the coming into force of this Act, nor shall it be made except.'

He said: This does not change the legal effect. The Act will come into operation when it receives the royal assent, and these words are therefore unnecessary.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This virtually does away with the civil service examination for third-class clerks, because it allows anyone who has been in the service to be appointed to that grade without examination.

Mr. BELCOURT. It provides that those who have been in the service for two years in a temporary capacity as packers, sorters, messengers, &c., shall not have to undergo an examination.

Mr. CLARKE. After this amendment has been passed, who will be required to pass the examination?

Mr. BELCOURT. Those who have been in the service for two years prior to the first

of July, 1903, as packers, sorters or messengers in a temporary capacity may be promoted to the third-class without regard to age, and without having to pass an examination.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does this give power to make a third-class clerk, even if there is no vacancy ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No question of a vacancy would arise in the beginning, and this does not dispense with the examination for any person who is hereafter appointed.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It only applies to those who have been two years in the service ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Or who hereafter may be in the service as temporaries for two or three years. The temporaries can look forward to being transferred to the third-class as a reward. The question of vacancies would not arise at the beginning, because there will be no third-class clerkships in existence when this Act goes into effect. The old third-class clerkship has been merged into the junior second, so that to-day we have to start by promoting the temporaries into the third class. My own opinion is that we ought to make a liberal use of this provision, and transfer the temporaries into the third class clerkships as they show themselves deserving. A temporary position, with from $500 to $600 a year, is not a satisfactory position to hold in the service of the Dominion, and so far as my department is concerned I would look forward with pleasure to being able to go through the department, and to select all who are deserving of being made permanent. That is the spirit in which I would feel myself bound to interpret it.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you, by Order in Council, create the third-class clerkships ? That was the question of the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. member for Lanark spoke of vacancies, and I explained to him that the question of vacancies would arise. My own department is constantly expanding, and it is impossible to tell parliament with any accurate detail, the number of temporary writers you will require throughout the year ; you have to feel your way into it. Probably in one month you will find your staff inadequate to cope with the increased number of post office savings bank acccounts and other work, and you have to make a temporary appointment under the law. I would look forward to that temporary appointee becoming permanent, if he were fit for the position. We may consider that most positions in the service are of a permanent character; they certainly are in the Post Office Department. When a man is employed temporarily and proves himself deserving, he ought to be put on the permanent list and have a chance to rise in the service.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Under the present Act it requires the deputy minister to report as to the necessities of the department, and the minister to concur in that report, and the council to approve of the organization set out in that report, before parliament is asked to vote the sums necessary to provide for the organization of that department. This clause would appear to give power to the Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the minister, to appoint any number of third-class clerks.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not after this fiscal year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It certainly interferes with the existing Act in that respect. After all, I look upon our civil service examination as at present conducted as a sort of farce, and especially the examination for promotion from one class to another. A man who is at the maximum of the second class for thirteen or fourteen years, cannot be promoted to the first-class because he cannot pass some technical examination which is not pertinent at all to his office. I place very little faith in the civil service examination, but I think the minister should go through the form with regard to the organization as required by the existing Act.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The observations of my hon. friend, if applied generally, are very fair, but he will see that the promotion to the third class is limited to the number we have at present in a temporary capacity, and I hope the government will make a liberal use of this power.

Mr. BELCOURT. Section 40 of the Civil Service Act provides :

> Once in each year, and not later than the 15th day of March, the deputy head of each department shall make and lay before the board, through the Department of the Secretary of State, an estimate of the number of vacancies likely to occur during the ensuing year.

Then it names certain grades in reference to which this report is to be made.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This clause does away with that altogether, so that that is not applicable to this clause.

Mr. BELCOURT. It is applicable in this sense, that the only time when an estimate can be made of the number of clerks required in the department is once a year, on the report prepared under the provisions of section 40.

Mr. HACKETT. I desire to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister of Labour the case of Mr. H. W. Mutch, who has been a messenger for the Marine and Fisheries Department, in Mr. Lord's office at Charlottetown for the last ten years, at $20 a month. If the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries were in his place, I might get

some information from him in that regard. We are all proud of the civil service of Canada. In every department, from the deputy head down to the lowest clerk, they are a credit to Canada, and are equal to any body of civil servants in any other part of the world.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Would my hon. friend allow me to make a suggestion ? I am not familiar with the case to which he refers, but there will be an item in the estimates connected with the Department of Marine and Fisheries when the minister of that department will be present. If my hon. friend will bring the matter up then, it would be more satisfactory.

Mr. GALLERY. I would like to ask the hon. minister what examination the old employees will have to undergo ; for instance, men who have been working for the government for fifteen or twenty years ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend is referring to the Department of Customs. His question will be answered by subsection 3 of section 37, which provides that the examination hereafter shall be upon the duties of the office, and be departmental rather than the ordinary civil service examination.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I agree that in certain departments, such as the Customs Department, a civil service examination is out of the question. Take landing waiters, lockers and checkers, who check goods passing from steamers into cars ; these men have special training for special work, and I think it would be very unfair and ridiculous to ask them to pass a civil service examination.

Mr. SPROULE. What will be the effect of section 6 of the Civil Service Act provided this passes ? That section says :

> The Governor in Council shall, from time to time, determine the number of officers, chief clerks, clerks, messengers and other employees required for the working of the several departments.

Then it goes on to provide that all others shall be supernumerary clerks without being eligible for increase of salary. That is practically the skeleton of your service. I do not see any clause in this Bill which repeals that ; and if it is not repealed, it seems to me that you cannot by Order in Council add the third-class clerkship again.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This Act must prevail over all prior Acts. When it says the Governor in Council can create an additional third-class clerkship, it must take the place of any prior legislation that clashes with it.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think that is a very proper way to pass legislation. It seems to me that section 6 will have some force and effect if it is not specifically repealed.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not say that section 6 of the Civil Service Act is repealed entirely and actually ; but it is repealed pro tanto, so far as those now in the service are concerned. This is to start the new class going, but when this fiscal year runs out the full force of section 6 will apply.

Mr. SPROULE. If it only applied to those now in the service I could understand it, but you provide for those who may come in in the future.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There can be no appointment without a vote of money. This Bill does not dispense with the voting of money specifically, except for the remainder of this year and with respect to those now in the service. When this fiscal year expires there will be so many third-class clerkships, and the estimates for future years must be voted in the same way as heretofore.

Mr. SPROULE. But you are practically creating another class by Order in Council.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. A government would not create a clerkship if it had not money to pay the clerk. There can be practically no appointment made until parliament votes the money.

On section 20,

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the effect of this ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. This section does not alter the Civil Service Act of 1887. It classifies the employees under three classes, while now they are all enumerated in one list.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does it increase the salaries ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, it does not make any change in that way; it simply puts them in groups.

On section 21,

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. In section 37 of the Act of 1887 there was a subclause B ; that is left out.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is the clause providing that an appointment shall be made from outside the service only if no person in the civil service has the qualifications for the office.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We left that out for this reason : Suppose that in the Customs Department you want an appraiser, a techincal officer, and you have a man in the customs service who is possessed of the qualifications required ; you cannot appoint him, because the deputy has to certify that the requisite qualifications are not possessed by any person then in the service, and it may be a preventive officer, who has the qualifications and he

cannot give that certificate. Therefore we have left out the words :

Said appointments shall be made from the civil service if any person therein shall be found available.

Subsection 3 is entirely new, and is added to section 37. This is to meet a difficulty that was discussed when the customs estimates were under consideration, and I think the provision now made meets the wishes of members on both sides of the House. We have a great many old officers in the outside department of the service who have been engaged in the work for years and years, but who hesitate to attempt the literary examination, if I may call it so, that the Civil Service Act requires, and yet we consider that they are very competent officers in the discharge of their duties. But still, as they have not passed the examination, we have either to appoint them preventive officers, which is too general, or they have to remain on the temporary list. It is desirable I think in the public interest and in their interest, that they should be made permanent officers, and by this section you dispense with the literary examination pre scribed by the Civil Service Act so far as the outside service is concerned, and substitute therefor a technical practical examination on the duties of their office which they will be able to pass.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What changes does this make? The Minister of Customs said a moment ago that this would not affect salaries, but was simply putting them into classes ; but I see that it increases the salaries of a number of classes. Perhaps the Minister of Customs will explain that when he returns to the House.

On section 22,

So much of schedule (b) to the Civil Service Act as is included under the heading 'Inland Revenue,' as enacted by section 3 of chapter 12 of the statutes of 1889, is repealed, and the following is substituted therefor :—

Inland Revenue.

Inspectors, salary from..	$1,600 to $2,500
Collectors, salary from..	500 " 2,400
Deputy collectors, salary from...	400 " 1,700
Accountants, salary from..	600 " 1,500
Special class excisemen (chief officers in charge of distilleries), salary from..	1,400 " 1,800
Special class excisemen, other than as above, salary from.. ..	1,200 " 1,400
First, second and third-class excisemen, salary from..	600 " 1,200
Probationary excisemen, salary from	500
Stenographers and typewriters, salary from..	400 " 600
Messengers, salary from..	400 " 750

To which may be added for surveys of important manufactories an additional salary, for the special class excisemen and other officers connected with the survey, not exceeding in any one case two hundred dollars per annum.

Hon. Mr. PATERSON.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this clause intended to apply in the future as in the past ? It seems to me that you are extra liberal to these people.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I will explain that. With regard to the special class excisemen, we have been in the habit of paying additional salary because the hours of work are longer and because the work is special and highly technical. The clause remains the same with regard to that addition of salary to which may be added for service of important manufactories an additional salary for the special class excisemen, who perform that duty, not exceeding $100 per annum. But, as very often the work cannot be performed by one man, who is the chief officer in the distillery, we have had it revised so that the class will be :

To which may be added for surveys of important manufactories an additional salary for the special excisemen class and other officers connected with such survey, not exceeding in any one case two hundred dollars per annum.

But I have similar officers to these in distilleries, one man cannot perform the duties alone, and he has what is called an assistant, who may not be a special class officer, but an officer of the first or second class, which is next to the rank of first officer, he should receive an additional salary of not over $200 when he is in charge of these distilleries. But this salary is paid only to those officers who work in those distilleries and serve long hours.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you think they are of more importance than the deputy collectors, who only get $1,700, that you give these men $2,000 ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes. The responsibility is very much greater. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) knows that the most important part of the revenue is derived from the distilleries, and we must have a special class of men, men of technical knowledge. I regard the special class officers as the most important in the service—even more important than the collector or inspector of the division. They must possess technical knowledge which cannot be learned in a few years, and they must work for years, besides passing an examination of two or three classes before they reach that position.

Mr. SPROULE. Do not the deputy collectors require the same knowledge ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Oh, no. The position of deputy collector is open for almost everybody. They do not have to pass any examination, and their responsibility is not great, because the collector is responsible. Of course, he may take charge in case of the collector's sickness or absence, but he is not otherwise responsible. And he need not have technical

skill equal to that of the special class excise officer.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I understood that the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) had called attention, while I was out for a moment, to a mistake I had made in saying that there had been no increase in salary. I did not allow for the effect of the classification. For instance, under this Bill tide surveyors are classed with chief landing waiters and chief lockers. The old Bill being chief landing waiters and chief lockers, $1,200, that being voted, and tide surveyors being credited with that, gives them the same, and to that extent I was wrong. And the messengers get $100 increase to the maximum. That is a change, I think, since I gave the Bill consideration. When I spoke I was under the impression that it made no change and hon. members will see that the change is very slight.

Mr. SPROULE. The Bill does not make any difference between deputies in the first-class divisions and other divisions.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The salary is not mentioned here, but it is fixed by the minister himself. The minimum is $500 and the maximum $1,700, according to the importance of the division.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister thinks the duty of the deputy collector in a first-class division is almost equal to the duty of a special excise officer attending a distillery ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I always considered the duties of a special officer unique. They are quite different from any other service performed by any other officer in the department. Of course, the salary of $1,700 is paid only in large divisions like Montreal and Toronto, on account of the responsibility upon the collector and upon his assistant. It has always been left to the minister to determine what shall be the salaries of the deputy collectors. There are two classes, classes A and B, and each man is paid according to the importance of the work he has under his charge.

On section 23,

The Governor in Council may grant such increases of salary in the Departments of Customs and Inland Revenue as are by this Act authorized, but no such increase shall take effect from a date prior to the date of the coming into force of this Act, nor shall it be made except upon the report of the deputy head of the department, concurred in by the head of the department, that the person recommended for such increase is deserving thereof.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL moved to amend by striking out the words 'but no such increase shall take effect from a date prior to the date of the coming into force of this Act, nor shall it be made except'.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If you have a vote for the salary, and you are not limited to the date of the passage of this Act, why would it not be good for the current year ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That will be for the Department of Justice to determine. But if we pass the Act now and it goes into effect on a certain date, I do not know how you can make it retroactive.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the object of striking out these words ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Section 27 of the Bill says the Act shall go into effect on the 1st of July, 1903, and unless these words in section 23 had been inserted, it would have been possible, with section 27 standing, to have made the salary commence at the date when the Act came into force. But by striking out section 27 you must also strike out the corresponding safeguard that runs through the Bill. By not saying that the Act shall come into effect on the 1st of July but only allowing it to come into effect when it becomes law, then it is necessary to provide that the salary shall not begin at an anterior date.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am of the opinion the hon. gentleman is right as to his conclusion, but you would require either express words or necessary implication in order to give the Act retroactive effect. But I do not follow the line of his argument exactly. It does not seem to me these words are any less necessary now than they were before—I refer to the words which are being struck out. I do not see that striking out section 27 affects this either one way or the other. All you say in section 23 is that no increase shall take effect from a date prior to the date of the coming into force of this Act. It does not seem to me to make any difference.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. To make the point I had in my mind I should have said 'Prior to the passing of the Act.' However, what I intended was to prevent a retroactive effect of the law and to let it take effect when it receives the royal assent.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would be inclined to think that the hon. Postmaster General is right about that, and I think the original words in section 23 were introduced because of a possibly erroneous idea of section 27.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Quite so.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 26,

All sums of money voted by parliament for the financial year ending on the thirtieth day of June, 1904, for the payment of the salaries or the increases to the salaries of any persons now in the public service, shall, in the event of the promotion of any such persons to higher classes or grades, or on their transfer to other positions in the public service, or their becoming entitled to, or being granted, increases of salary under the provisions of this Act, be applicable in or towards payment of the salaries or in-

creases to the salaries of such persons so promoted or transferred, or becoming entitled to or being granted increases as aforesaid; and during the financial year ending on the thirtieth day of June, 1904, there may be paid from and out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada such sums of money as have been voted by parliament but are required for payment of such salaries and increases of salaries as are authorized by this Act.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL moved:

That section 26 be amended by inserting after the words 'nineteen hundred and four' in the second line the words 'and applicable'; also by striking out the word 'now' in the 4th line and by inserting the word 'not' after the word 'have' in the 3rd line from the last of the clause.

Mr. SPROULE. That gives you an opportunity of going into the treasury when you had no authority to go into it before. You can only deal with what has been voted.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This allows the government to apply the moneys which have been voted and are now applicable to the payment of the salaries of officers although they are transferred to a higher class. Take for example the case of a chief clerk. If a chief clerk were promoted to grade A the money that we have already voted to pay the salary as a chief clerk would be available to pay him although he was transferred to a higher class. Take the class of temporary writers. There are in the service of the Post Office Department alone about one hundred of this class. The sums for this class have been voted heretofore in bulk simply under the heading of contingencies and they will be available for this class for the present fiscal year although the temporary class have ceased to be temporaries and have become third-class clerks. At the end of this year, when we enter upon a new fiscal year, they will appear in the ordinary way under the old practice and hereafter a vote will be taken for them as clerks and not as a part of the contingencies of the department.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL moved:

That section 27 be struck out.

Motion agreed to.

Progress reported.

SALARIES OF PARLIAMENTARY LIBRARIANS AND REGISTRAR OF SUPREME COURT.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolutions:

1. Resolved, that the salaries of the general librarian and the parliamentary librarian of the library of parliament, and the registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada shall each be $3,500 per annum; with an annual increase of $100, up to a maximum of $4,000 per annum.

2. Resolved, that for the purpose of determining the salary of the officers at present occupying the said positions, each shall be credited with his period of service; and shall hereafter be paid such salary as he would by length of service have become entitled to, had the provision of the next preceding resolution been in force at the time of his appointment.

3. Resolved, that during the financial year ending June 30, 1904, there may be paid, out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, such sums as are required for payment of the foregoing increases. —The Minister of Justice.

Mr. SPROULE. What are their salaries now?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Chapter 15 of the Revised Statutes, 'an Act respecting the Library of Parliament,' section 4 provides that there shall be two officers, one of whom shall be called the general librarian and the other of whom shall be called the parliamentary librarian, which officers shall be appointed by joint commission, under the Great Seal, as librarians of parliament, and shall have equal powers as respects the control and management of the library. Section 5 provides that the salary of each officer so appointed shall be such sum not exceeding $3,000 as the Governor in Council directs. Under section 6 it is provided that:

The general librarian, parliamentary librarian, and other officers and servants of the library of parliament, shall be responsible for the faithful discharge of their official duties, as the same are defined by regulations agreed upon by the Speakers of the two Houses, and concurred in by the said joint committee on the library.

These gentlemen are really officers of parliament and do not come under the Civil Service Act properly so-called.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That will bring each of the librarians up to the limit of the statute?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This is in accordance with suggestions which, I think, were made at the time when the Bill providing for the increase of certain salaries was before the Committee of the House, that the librarians of parliament had some right to be considered in connection with it.

Mr. SPROULE. Then that brings them up at once to $4,000?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Those that have been in the position for a sufficient length of time go to $3,500 and then they go up by annual increments of $100 a year to $4,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Do they start at $3,500 now or would they only be entitled to $3,500 at a certain time and then go up?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Would it not be just as well to say in plain English that they will get $4,000 a year?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As a matter of fact, so far as the present librarians are

concerned, it is a proposal to give them $4,000 a year so long as they hold office. The difference is that a new appointee would begin at $3,500.

Mr. CLARKE. Has anything been done for the rest of the library staff ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. 48 and 49 Victoria, provides that the other officers and servants of the library of parliament come under the operation of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. BELL. I wish to call attention to the fact that the clerks of the House of Commons and the staff of the House of Commons generally, are, so far as I can understand, not included at all in the legislation that has passed this House, and are not going to derive any advantage through it. I would suppose that it would be advisable that the officers of the House of Commons should participate in the benefits of the present movement to increase the salaries generally speaking of the servants of the country. It would seem somewhat extraordinary if the House of Comons were providing for every one else to the exclusion of those who are more particularly their own officials. I understand that the Senate is much more liberal in dealing with its staff than is the House of Commons, but I would like to know from the Minister of Justice, if it is necessary to pass legislation in order that the staff of the House of Commons, and the staff of the Senate may participate in these advantages ? If so, this would be an opportune time to add to this resolution, so as to include the members of the House of Commons staff. I am sure that generally speaking, the members of the House of Commons would like to see the legislation so extended as to include the officers of this House.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This no doubt is a matter of very considerable importance, and ought to be dealt with at an early date, but I presume it ought to be dealt with in the estimates. I do not presume it is possible to deal with it in the way we are dealing with those who are affected by the Civil Service Act.

Resolutions reported ; read the first and second times, and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 267) respecting the Librarians of Parliament, and Bill (No. 268) respecting the registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada.

Motion agreed to, and Bills read the first time.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 257) to amend the Civil Service Act.—The Postmaster General.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. As this Bill is confined simply to the civil service, it is thought not advisable to add the class which the Minister of Justice has dealt with, by resolution. I would therefore move that the Bill be reported.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not a peculiar situation that the librarians shall not be under the Civil Service Act, but that all the other officials of the library are under that Act ?

The PRIME MINISTER. It is one of the mysteries of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. SPROULE. It certainly is.

On the question : When shall the Bill be read the third time :

Mr. SPROULE. Leave it until to-morrow.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Better let it go to the Senate now.

Mr. SPROULE. I have had some letters in reference to this Bill which I have not been able to attend to.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman presses it, I will let the third reading stand.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, I should like to have an opportunity of looking at these letters.

Order allowed to stand.

THE RAILWAY ACT, 1903—SENATE AMENDMENTS.

Consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 21) to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE moved :

That a message be sent to the Senate, acquainting their honours, that this House agrees to Nos. 1, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, of their amendments to the Bill intituled:

An Act to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways.

And amendments Nos. 52 and 53 as follows:

Amendments to 51.

So that the clause as amended by them will read :—Without leave therefor having been obtained from the board.

And disagrees to Nos. 2, 3, 4, 6, 11, 31, 33, 40, 45, 46, 60, 70, of their amendments for the following reasons :—

Reasons for disagreeing to their amendments Nos. 2, 3, 4 and 70.

(a.) Because the amendment made by the Senate refers to all railways, the construction and operation of which are authorized by special Acts of the legislature of any province whether the said railways have subsequently been declared to be works for the general advantage of Canada by this parliament, or not.

(b.) That the said amendment is ultra vires as declaring a railway to be a work for the general advantage of Canada only with respect of certain matters instead of declaring the whole railway to be such a work.

(c.) That the subject matters within the jurisdiction of this parliament should be made applicable.

(d.) Because it declares a railway to be a work for the general advantage of Canada in respect to provisions of an Act.

(e.) That the second subsection of their amendment depends upon the rest.

Reasons for disagreeing to their amendment No. 6 :

Because the amendment is inconsistent with the provisions of the Bill with respect to the tenure of office of a commissioner.

Because such Acts as in the amendment stated would be a cause for removal.

Reasons for disagreeing to amendment No. 11:

Because their amendment is inconsistent with other provisions of the Bill and with the spirit in which the Bill is framed.

Because a conflict of opinion between the Governor in Council and the Supreme Court of Canada might result.

Reasons for disagreeing with their amendment No. 31 :—

Because their amendment is inconsistent with the section which it is proposed to amend.

Because their amendment is not a complete sentence.

Reasons for disagreeing with their amendment No. 33 :—

Because their amendment unduly limits the discretion of the board of commissioners.

Reasons for disagreeing to their amendment No. 40 :—

Because their amendment is ultra vires.

Reasons for disagreeing with their amendment No. 45 :—

Because their amendment does not remedy the evil existing under the present law.

Reasons for disagreeing to their amendment No. 46 :—

Because their amendment is ultra vires of this parliament.

Reasons for disagreeing to their amendment No. 60 :—

Because their amendment either limits the meaning of the word 'traffic' or is unnecessary.

Mr. SPROULE. It is a difficult matter to bring any consideration to bear on these amendments, as we do not know what their effect is.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am moving with regard to the amendments, and it is for hon. gentlemen to say whether they agree with my motion or not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). After my hon. friend has spoken, we are just as wise as before. If the House is to give any intelligent consideration to the amendments, one of two courses will have to be adopted; either my hon. friend will have to take up each amendment and explain what it is, or else it will be necessary to adjourn the debate on his motion so as to give hon. members a chance to look into the amendments for themselves.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am entirely in the hands of the House. I am prepared to deal with the whole matter immediately, or, if it is more convenient to hon. members, I am willing to put off the matter.

I was under the impression that we had all considered these amendments, because they have been before us for some time. Of course, this motion must go to the Senate, and if they fail to agree, we must have a conference.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would suggest that the amendments be taken up one by one.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. Minister of Justice has no objection, we would like to have an explanation of each amendment, and we might afterwards take time to consider them.

On amendment 1,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The first amendment is to section 2, subsection (b). At present it reads as follows :

The expression 'by-law' includes a resolution.

The suggested amendment is :

The expression 'by-law,' when referring to the Act of the company, includes a resolution.

This amendment I think we ought to accept, because it is an improvement on the phraseology.

Amendment agreed to.

On amendment 2,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The second amendment is to section 5, for which the Senate proposes to substitute the following :

Every railway, steam or electric street railway or tramway, the construction or operation of which is authorized by a special Act passed by the legislature of any province, now or hereinafter connecting with or crossing a railway which, at the time of such connection or crossing, is subject to the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada, is hereby declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada in respect only to such connection or crossing or to through-traffic thereon or anything appertaining thereto, and also to the provisions set forth in this Act relating to offences and penalties, navigable waters and criminal matters, and this Act shall apply to that extent only.

2. This section shall not, however, operate as regards through-traffic on railways owned by any provincial government, without the consent of such government.

Then, they leave out sections 6 and 7 altogether. That is to say, we are to depart from the principle which we have adopted and which has been in force for many years, that parliament declares a work to be for the general advantage of Canada, and not simply a piece of the work. I can see no good reason why we should adopt a new principle which it seems to me would be of doubtful legality and a very serious inconvenience in the operation of the road.

Mr. CLARKE. What was the object of the amendment ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The object of the amendment, as I understand it,

is that instead of declaring the whole work to be for the general advantage of Canada, and as a result of that declaration bringing the whole railway within our jurisdiction, we should exercise our jurisdiction only with respect to that particular portion of the railway which is connected with the crossing.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman does not propose to concur in this amendment.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Oh, no.

Amendment not agreed to.

On amendment 3,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. By the third amendment it is proposed to leave out section 6, and by the fourth amendment to leave out section 7. These two sections are necessary if section 5 is retained, and therefore I propose to disagree with respect to those two for the same reason as in the case of the second amendment.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I quite concur in the view of the hon. Minister of Justice and I might have some other reasons in addition to those which he has already pointed out, although these reasons are, perhaps, more a question of legislative wisdom than of constitutional validity. I do not see how you could work out the provision that a railway in respect to its connection with or crossing by another railway should be a work for the general advantage of Canada and in respect to other things should not be a work for the general advantage of Canada; and I do not see how a railway shall be a provincial railway, that is not for the general advantage of Canada with respect to all local traffic, but for the general advantage of Canada as to through-traffic. I think that, in addition to what the Minister of Justice has suggested, it would be absolutely impracticable to work out the provision suggested in the Senate. I have not had the advantage, however, of hearing or reading the arguments that has been adduced in support of their views.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I read with some care what was said in the Senate and I think the object the Senate had in view was to prevent the parliament of Canada extending its jurisdiction to local railways. The intention was to limit our jurisdiction as far as possible. Now, that intention may be very good but it seems to me that with respect to this particular class of enterprise it is most desirable that railways which connect together should be under the same jurisdiction.

Amendment not agreed to.

On amendment 5,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I agree to number 5; the section amended is section 11. The words there added are in the second paragraph:

No commissioner shall, directly or indirectly, hold, purchase, take or become interested in, for his own behalf.

I agree to the addition of these words: 'directly or indirectly.'

Amendment agreed to.

On amendment 6,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I disagree with amendment number 6, which amends section 11, because the amendment is inconsistent with the provisions of the Bill with respect to the tenure of office of the commissioner because such an Act as is referred to in the amendment would be cause for removal. The amendment reads as follows:

Any member of the board accepting any gift or favour for himself or for any other person, or exercising his influence on behalf of any person with any railway company or officer for any position or favour shall thereby forfeit his seat as a member of the board.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Under what provision of the law or of this statute would that be cause for removal?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I will allow that amendment to stand; I cannot put my finger upon the clause at the present time. On general principles, of course, they would be removaable for any act of corruption.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose the provision that any such commissioner shall thereby forfeit his seat as here proposed would necessarily mean that legal proceedings would have to be taken so it would not be very different after all from what the hon. Minister of Justice suggests. As far as the substance of the clause is concerned it does not seem to me out of place. The objection of the hon. Minister of Justice is that it is inconsistent with the tenure of office of the commissioner. While in one sense it is, in another sense it is not. The tenure of office is for a term of years, but that tenure of office is coupled with certain provisions contained in this subsection, that the commissioners shall not under pain of forfeiture be guilty of certain acts. If this is provided for anywhere else in the statute I would agree with the Minister of Justice; but if it is not provided for anywhere else in the Act I would be inclined to think that the amendment of the Senate is a very wise one.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In any event we could not accept the amendment in its present form.

If any member of the board accepts any gift or favour——

Why, the giving of a cigar would be sufficient to disqualify a commissioner and in addition to that my hon. friend will mark the words:

—shall thereby forfeit his seat as a member of the board.

Forfeiture of a seat might be construed to mean the vacating of a seat and that might render all subsequent acts of the commissioner void; there is that embarrassment about the clause as drawn.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The minister will observe that I was referring to the policy of the subsection. I do not at all overlook the difficulty my hon. friend suggests as to the precise wording of this clause. However, perhaps we can let this stand my hon. friend the Minister of Justice can point out later the provision to which he referred.

Amendment allowed to stand.

On amendment 7,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This amendment I agree to. It is an amendment to section 25. It provides for inserting the words 'company or' before the word 'person.' The object of the amendment is to make the section apply to companies as well as to persons.

Amendment agreed to.

On amendment 8,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This also is an amendment to section 25, and is for the addition of the words 'company or' in another line. It has the same effect as the previous one.

Amendment agreed to.

On amendment 9,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This is an amendment to section 43, and it is one to which I agree. The object is to add, after the word 'may,' the words 'of its own motion or.' The section now reads that the board may upon the application of any parties state a case to the Supreme Court of Canada. This extends it so that the board may take this action upon its own motion. That, I think, is a good amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

On amendment 10,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This also is an amendment to section 43, and it provides for the addition of the words 'like reference may also be made on the request of the Governor in Council.' I think that is a useful amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

On amendment 11,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This is an amendment to section 44, and is one with which I disagree. The amendment is proposed to the second paragraph of section 3. That paragraph reads :

An appeal also shall lie from the board to such court upon any question which, in the opinion of the board is a question of law, upon leave therefor having been first obtained from the board.

It is proposed to substitute for this the following :

An appeal shall also lie from the board to such court, upon any question of law, upon leave therefor having been first obtained from the board or, in the event of their refusal from two judges of such court.

I propose that this amendment be not concurred in, the reason for disagreeing being because the amendment is inconsistent with other provisions of the Bill and the spirit in which the Bill is framed, and conflict of opinion between the Governor in Council and the Supreme Court of Canada might result. The intention of the Bill is to endeavour to have grievances that exist speedily remedied, and, to that end, that the finding of the board may be final and appeal to the courts excluded, except as the board may, of its own motion, determine to refer questions of law to the court.

Amendment not agreed to.

On amendment 12,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This is an amendment to section 52, and proposes to insert, after the word 'Canada,' the words 'notice thereof to be given to the secretary of the board, who shall keep a register for the purpose.' Section 52 provides that the head office of the company shall be in a place designated by the special Act of the company, but that the company may by by-law change it from time to time. The intention of the amendment is to provide that notice of any change of head office shall be given to the board, so that the board may know where the head office of every company is. This amendment I agree to.

Amendment agreed to.

On amendment 13,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This is an amendment to section 111, and to this also I agree. The proposal is, in the first line of subsection 4 to substitute for 'bonds' the word 'securities.' That is a better word, as having more general application.

Amendment agreed to.

On amendment 14,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This also is an amendment to section 111, and provides for the substitution of 'and' for 'but' in the third line of subsection 4. The subsection reads : 'The power of issuing bonds conferred on the company hereby or under the special Act shall not be construed as being exhausted by such issue ; but,' and so on. 'And' is substituted for 'but.'

Amendment agreed to.

On amendment 15,

Mr. BARKER. Ought not the word 'securities' to be put in place of 'bonds' on the fourth line of subsection 4, seeing it has been substituted in the other case?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend (Mr. Barker) will see that this will be unnecessary if we agree to amendment No. 15. The effect of No. 15 is to strike out the words 'upon the bonds constituting such issue being withdrawn or paid off and duly cancelled.' The whole clause reads: 'But such power may be exercised from time to time upon the bonds constituting such issue being withdrawn or paid off and duly cancelled.' The latter part of the clause is struck out. I agree to the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

On amendment 16,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The object of this is to amend section 122 by inserting before the beginning of the present subsection provisions with regard to the preparation of a map showing the proposed location of the railroad. To this amendment I agree.

Amendment agreed to.

On amendment 17,

In the province of Quebec the portion of the railway comprised in each municipality shall be indicated on the plan and in the book of reference by separate number or numbers.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is done as a result of the cadastral system we have in that province, in which each property is numbered. I think the amendment is useful, and I agree to it.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment 18 agreed to.

On amendment 19,

In the fifth line of subsection 3, section 139, leave out from 'certified' to 'an' in the seventh line and substitute 'as provided in section 129 of this Act.'

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The effect is merely verbal. It is to amend paragraph 3 of section 129 by omitting the words: 'Certified correct by the president, general manager or one of the directors of the company, and also by its engineer.' I move concurrence in the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment 20 agreed to.

On amendment 21,

In the third line of subsection 2 after the word 'Act' where it first occurs, insert 'excepting paragraph (c) of subsection 1 thereof.'

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I also agree to that. The paragraph will then read:

Such arbitrator or arbitrators shall have and may exercise with respect to such arbitration all the powers mentioned in section 49 of this Act excepting paragraph (c) of subsection 1 thereof.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment 22 agreed to.

On amendment 23,

For subsection 3 substitute:

3. Where the lands are situated in the province of Quebec, the notice shall be published as is required in cases of confirmation of title, and the registrar's certificate shall be procured and filed as in such cases.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I accept that amendment. It is another amendment to section 124, by which we substitute another new section to subsection 3, because of certain conditions existing in the province of Quebec, for which we made an amendment some time ago.

Amendment agreed to.

On amendment 24,

In the second and third lines of subsection 4 leave out 'or judgment of confirmation.'

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I accept the amendment. It is also applicable to the same section.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendments 25, 26, 27, 28 and 29 agreed to.

On amendment 30,

Leave out paragraph (g) and substitute:

Whenever any city, town or incorporated village is desirous of having lines of telegraph, telephone, or for the conveyance of light, heat, power or electricity, placed under ground the board may, on the application of such city, town or incorporated village, require the company to thus place its lines or wires under ground, and abrogate the right given by this section or by the special Act to carry lines on poles, in such city, town, or incorporated village, the whole on such terms and conditions as the board may prescribe.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the actual change made?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Paragraph (g) in the Act reads:

In case efficient means are devised for carrying any such lines or wires underground, no Act of parliament requiring the company to adopt such means, and abrogating the right given by this section to carry lines on poles, shall be deemed an infringement of the privileges granted by this Act, nor shall the company be entitled to damages in respect thereof.

This is clearer and more effective, and gives more complete control to the municipalities.

Amendment agreed to.

On amendment 31,

Add as subsection 3:

3. Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to authorize the company exercising the powers therein mentioned for the purpose

of selling or distributing light, heat, power or electricity in cities, towns or villages, without the company having first obtained the consent therefor by a by-law of the municipality.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I disagree with this amendment. It would make the company subject to absolute control of the municipalities, and make it impossible to exercise the powers conferred by parliament. I move that the amendment be not concurred in for the following reason :

Because their amendment is inconsistent with the section which it is proposed to amend, and because their amendment is not a complete sentence. I move non-concurrence with the amendment.

Amendment not agreed to.

Amendment 32 agreed to.

On amendment 33,

Add to the end of subsection 2 :

Having regard as to whether the right to one or more crossings or to take away or withhold rights of crossing formed part of the consideration paid by the company to the landowner, or of the bargain by which the company acquired the land.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The amendment of the Senate would have the effect of unduly limiting the discretion of the board while we contend that it is proper that the board should have absolute discretion in the premises to determine whether an additional farm crossing is necessary. I therefore beg to move :

That the said amendment be not concurred in for the reason that the amendment unduly limits the discretion of the board of commissioners.

Mr. SPROULE. Then you propose to leave it entirely in the hands of the commissioners as to whether they shall give an additional crossing to a portion of a farm ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, in case a farm is subdivided.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the farmer should have that right without being obliged to apply to the board for it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Section 198 provides that :

Every company shall make crossings for persons across whose lands the railway is carried, convenient and proper for the crossing of the railway for farm purposes. In crossing with live stock, the same shall be in charge of some competent person, who shall use all reasonable care and precaution to avoid accidents.

That is the law as we have it at the present time, but when the farm is subdivided the question arises as to whether each subdivision of the farm is entitled to a crossing. In a case in the Supreme Court against the Grand Trunk Railway Company it was decided that the original crossing was the only crossing that was binding on the company and that the subdivision of the farm afterwards did not entitle the man who got the subdivided farm to an additional crosssing. This provision of the new Bill is to enable the man who has acquired the subdivided farm to go before the board and let the board decide whether an additional crossing is necessary or not. The intention of the Senate is to limit the authority of the board by providing that the board shall be obliged to take into account all the conditions existing at the time the right to the farm crossing was acquired. We think it proper not to bind it in this respect but to allow the board to determine what shall be done under the existing conditions at the time the application is made.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The Senate amendment means, that, where a party sells his land to a railway company and makes a bargain with the railway company that he shall not have more than one crossing, or that he shall not have any crossing, notwithstanding that bargain, he may apply to the board for the purpose of securing a crossing.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is just the other way about. Subsection 2 of the Bill reads as follows :

The board may, upon the application of any landowner, order the company to provide and construct a suitable farm crossing across the railway, wherever in any case the board deems it necessary for the proper enjoyment of his land, on either side of the railway, and safe in the public interest ; and may order and direct how, when, where, by whom, and upon what terms and conditions, such farm crossing shall be constructed and maintained.

This leaves it absolutely under the control of the commissioners to determine whether or not an additional farm crossing is advisable. The Senate leave these words I have just read as they were originally, but they add this paragraph :

Having regard as to whether the right to one or more crossings or to take away or withhold rights of crossings formed part of the consideration paid by the company to the landowner, or of the bargain by which the company acquired the land.

Under this amendment the commissioners are obliged, in determining whether or not they shall grant an additional farm crossing, to consider the terms of the contract under which the railway company acquired the land from the original landowner in connection with which land application for a farm crossing is being made.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is exactly as I said it was. The Bill, as we passed it, gave the board, notwithstanding any bargain that was made with the landowner in reference to a crossing, the right to determine whether a crossing should be given or not, whereas, the Senate amendment directs that the commissioners, if a bargain has been made that there shall be no crossing, to inquire into the circumstances of that bargain in considering the application. If

a railway company in order to be relieved from the necessity of making a railway crossing, are obliged to buy a whole farm and sell it off in sections, after making that bargain with the individuals. why should they be obliged afterwards to provide a crossing if the railway commissioners decide that it is necessary ?

Mr. LANCASTER. I can answer my hon. friend's question. I think there would be good reason. The conditions may have changed as years have gone on. The situation of the land may be different. The reasons which originally made the crossing unnecessary might not then exist and would not be at all applicable to the matters that come before the board. As the amendment of the Senate limits the jurisdiction of the board I agree with the hon. Minister of Justice that we should not concur in it.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought our original Bill went farther. I thought it gave a farmer the right to a crossing upon any unsold land that he had. The old Railway Act provided that a farmer was entitled to a crossing, but I think that was only one crossing to every lot. That lot might be 100 acres in extent. The case I have in mind is where a man sells the half of his lot. He has one crossing for the whole lot but that crossing happens to be on one of the fifty acre subdivisions. He sells the one which has the railway crossing. The railway runs through the centre of the farm and he wants another crossing but because the original crossing happened to be on the other fifty acres and although he is willing to bear all the expense of making a second crossing he is not allowed the right to another crossing so as to get the use of his land which he owned before the railway was put through the farm at all. It seems to me that is a very hard case, but many cases of that kind occur and I thought that in the Bill which we passed we had provided a fair means of redress for a farmer under such circumstances as those.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Under the law provision was made for farm crossings. Supposing a farmer has 100 acres. He subsequently subdivides the property. The case I have in my mind at the present moment is a case with which I was connected, the case of a father who owned 100 acres of land. He subdivided his farm so as to give one part of his property on his right to one son and another part on his left to another son, he himself reserving the middle farm. After a time the sons wanted to get a farm crossing for themselves. Application was made to the railway company, the company refused, suit was brought in the province of Quebec, it was held that they were entitled to a farm crossing for each farm, but the case was appealed to the Supreme Court, and in the Supreme Court it was decided that in view of the original purchase of the property, a provision being made for only one crossing, they were entitled to no more. Under the Bill as we passed it the board can authorize as many crossings as under the circumstances they think necessary. But the amendment passed by the Senate would oblige the board when application is made to take into consideration the circumstances connected with the original purchase and limit their authority to deal with it. Under these conditions we think it better that the board should be absolutely free to exercise their own judgment in regard to the conditions which exist at the time the application is made.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the farmer is entitled to that right. While the board is free to say that a crossing shall be provided it is equally free to say that it cannot be made and if it says that there shall be no crossing the farmer is deprived of the right of using his land.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That would be a very good criticism of the Bill as we sent it to the Senate, but it is an absolute criticism of the amendment of the Senate which goes much further in the direction of doing what my hon. friend wants to prevent this Bill from doing.

Mr. SPROULE. I am entirely opposed to the amendment of the Senate. I think it is an absurdity. I thought the Act as we sent it contained a complete provision.

Mr. WILSON. What would the probable cost be of taking this before the Railway Commission ? I think there should be very little trouble for a farmer to get across a railway, because we know the very great inconvenience the farmers are often put to by railways being built across their farms. The case which the Minister of Justice cited, would show that if a farmer divided his farm among his sons, they might have a great deal of difficulty in getting across it. I would be strongly in favour of making it as easy as possible for a farmer to get across a railway without going to any great expense.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendments 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, agreed to.

On amendment 40,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I propose that we disagree to this amendment. It is an amendment to section 211, which is called the contracting out clause. Subsection 4, of section 211, provides that the company shall be liable for damages to the individual who has suffered injury, or to his representatives, notwithstanding any agreement to the contrary with regard to any such person. That is to say, no agreement can be entered into between the company and the individual, which will save the company from liability in the case of an ac-

cident; that if the company is liable to the individual, and if for any consideration which they choose to give, for instance by way of insurance, they make a contract with him by which he will waive all claims against the company for the damage he may suffer, accepting in lieu of the claim such indemnity as the company may fix or determine in advance; such an agreement as that is invalid. So far as I am personally concerned, I would like to make this statement: As to whether or not such a provision as that can be contained in a railway Act passed by the federal parliament, I am doubtful. I would like to protect myself on that score.

Mr. SPROULE. Doubtful whether it would invalidate the contract?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the effect of the Senate amendment?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Under the English workman's Compensation Act, or the Employer's Liability Act, I forget which, for the moment; an employee can contract himself out, provided the form of contract is prepared beforehand and submitted to an official who is called the registrar of friendly societies. If it is approved of by that official, the contract is binding, and there are certain conditions as to what this agreement must contain. It seems to me that the attempt of the Senate, was to some extent, to adopt that provision, but the Senate failed entirely in that object. Their amendment was:

> That after the words 'notwithstanding any agreement to the contrary with regard to any such person,' the following should be added—
>
> Unless such agreement shall have been first approved by order or regulation of the board.

The idea would be that each time an agreement which would have for effect to restrict the liability of the company, would be entered into with a particular individual, that agreement, if submitted to the board and sanctioned by the board, should be binding. I presume the object they had in view was to substitute the board for the registrar of friendly societies in England. My difficulty is, and I will not do more than merely state it; a contract of lease and hire is essentially a civil contract under the control of the provincial legislature, and if the contract is made in the province, it is made subject to the law of that particular province, and how far we have the right to say, that an individual in a province can not enter into a contract, which is in my judgment an ordinary civil contract, is to say the least doubtful. I do not enter any dissent against this, but I wish to express my personal view, and I do so for my protection if the matter is considered hereafter.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If we reject the amendment of the Senate, will not the effect be to do away with the present insurance companies, to which the largest amount is contributed by the railway companies?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It seems to me that will be the effect. At present each railway company contributes to the employees' liability insurance company a certain amount, and when each individual is hired by the company he signs an agreement by which he becomes a member of the insurance society, and by which he binds himself and his representatives not to claim more than a certain amount from the company. That means, that the liability of the company is limited. The consideration given by the company is a contribution towards the insurance fund. If that contract be not binding, it is presumable that the companies would not continue their contribution. However, I will not discuss that matter now. I have my individual opinion about it, but it is a matter which after all the employees who are interested in this legislation are most concerned about. If they consider it desirable to set aside these insurance benefits, that is a matter that concerns them, and I think after all they ought to be the best judges.

Amendment 40 not agreed to.

On amendment 41,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I move to concur in that.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why do you consent to strike out these words? I think it is a good provision that these bells should be rung.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There are two amendments to the same section, and if my hon. friend has the original section before him, and will follow me, he will see the reason.

Section 224 at present reads:

> When any train is approaching a highway crossing at rail level, the engine whistle shall be sounded and the bell rung at least eighty rods before reaching such crossing, and at short intervals, until the engine has crossed such highway.

Instead of saying 'at short intervals' the amendment provides that the Bill shall be be rung continuously, so that it affords a greater protection for the public.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendments 42, 43 and 44 agreed to.

On amendment 45,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This is the cattle-guard amendment. I propose to dissent from this and I put my reason very briefly. I believe I am expressing the view of the great majority of the House when I

say that the amendment does not remedy the evil existing under the present law.

Amendment not agreed to.

On amendment 46,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This amendment proposes to add as subsection 5 of section 237 the following :

5. In all actions under this section where a judgment shall be obtained in which the amount thereof does not exceed two hundred dollars, there shall be no appeal from the court of competent jurisdiction.

I dissent from this, because I contend that it is ultra vires of this parliament.

Amendment not agreed to.

Amendments 47, 48, 49, 50 and 51 agreed to.

On amendments 52 and 53,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. These two amendments require to be taken up together, as they both deal with section 253. They would practically make the section inoperative. It would read, beginning at line 40 :

Nor shall any company so distribute or allot its freight cars as to discriminate unjustly against any locality or industry, or against any traffic which may originate on its railway destined to a point on another railway in Canada with which it connects.

The words originally were, 'with which it may be connected.' 'Connects' means immediate contact; 'may be connected' suggests the possibility of an intervening space or road. While I do not absolutely disagree with the amendments, I propose that the clause be amended so as to read as follows :

Nor shall any company so distribute or allot its freight cars as to discriminate unjustly against any person, railway, locality, industry or traffic.

Amendment (the Minister of Justice) agreed to.

Mr. BARKER. What objection is there to section 252 as amended by the Senate, with the saving words which they have inserted :

The board shall not grant such leave unless satisfied that granting the same is not contrary to the public interest.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I strike that out altogether.

Mr. BARKER. I do not see that there can be objection to this clause with these words in. There may be cases where it will be a great convenience to railway companies to have power to divide their earnings in a particular manner, that is, as between each other, in an arbitratory manner ; division on a mileage basis may not be a fair division.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend is perhaps right so far as the first words are concerned :

Without leave therefore having been first obtained from the board.

That would give the board power to interfere; but I do not like the other words, which seem to be absolutely superfluous :

The board shall not grant such leave unless satisfied that granting the same is not contrary to the public interest.

It does not seem to me that it should be necessary to tell them that they are not to do what is not in the public interest. I was perhaps going too far in my proposed amendment, and perhaps had better restrict myself to eliminating the last words of the amendment of the Senate. I shall consider the matter.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

On amendment 51,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This amendment purports to amend section 252. I suggest that we accept part of the amendment. The clause as amended will then read : 'Without any leave therefor having been first obtained from the board.' I move that this amendment be not agreed to but that it be amended by striking out all the words except those I have quoted.

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Amendments Nos. 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58 and 59, agreed to.

On amendment 60,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This amendment purports to amend section 275 of the Bill, inserting after the word 'traffic' in the 27th line the words 'to which this Act applies.' I disagree with this amendment and move that it be not agreed to for the reason that it either limits the meaning of the word 'traffic' or is unnecessary.

Amendment not agreed to.

Amendments Nos. 61, 62 and 63, agreed to.

On amendment 64,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. From No. 60 to No. 64 these are all amendments to the same section, No. 275. The last is an amendment with respect to free transportation. Subsection 5 of this section provides that 'the company shall furnish free transportation upon any of its trains for members of the House of Commons of Canada and for any members of the board,' and so on. The amendment makes it read : 'The company shall furnish free transportation upon any of its trains, for members of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada with their baggage, and also for members of the board.'

Amendment agreed to.

Amendments 65, 66, 67, 68 and 69, agreed to.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). With respect to section 284, as to traffic agreements, is there any conflict between that and one of the sections we have already passed—I do not recall the number at the moment—providing that consent must be obtained for the pooling of receipts. This section No. 284 provides for 'division and apportionment' of tolls under certain circumstances. That does not seem to be very different from the pooling of receipts.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The section as it left the House of Commons provided :

284. The directors of any company may, at any time, make and enter into any agreement or arrangement not inconsistent with the provisions of this or the special Act, with any other company, either in Canada or elsewhere, for the regulation and interchange of traffic passing to and from the company's railways, and for the working of the traffic over the said railways respectively, or for either of those objects separately, and for the running of the trains over the tracks of another company, and for the division and apportionment of tolls in respect of such traffic.

The Senate amendment proposes :

The directors may at any time make and enter into any agreement or arrangement not inconsistent with the provisions of this or the special Act, with any other company, either in Canada or elsewhere, for the interchange of traffic between their railways or vessels and for the division and apportionment of tolls in respect of such traffic.

The hon. member will see this expresses all that appears in the first paragraph of section 284 in fewer words and more general terms. I think perhaps that it is an improvement, because when you elaborate the statute you are apt to forget something and so get into trouble. And the second paragraph of the amendment :

2. The directors may also make and enter into any agreement or arrangements, not inconsistent with the provisions of this or the special Act, for.

Then, the present subsection 2 becomes subsection 3. Subsection 2 provides that the making of any such arrangement or agreement shall not restrict, limit or affect any power by this Act vested in the board. That leaves all the power to the board intact. Subsection 2 of the Bill as we sent it to the Senate becomes subsection 3 under the new drafting.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This section seems to be perfectly consistent, so far as its own terms are concerned. But what I had in mind was a previous section.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That would be section 252, would it not ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes, that seems to be it. Subsection 4 of that section provides :

No company shall, except in accordance with the provisions of this Act, directly or indirectly, pool its freights or tolls with the freights or tolls of any other railway company or common carrier, nor divide its earnings or any portion thereof with any other railway company, or common carrier nor enter into any contract, arrangement, agreement, or combination to effect, or which may effect any such result.

Without leave therefor having been obtained from the board. This section 284 provides that the directors may make any such arrangements 'not inconsistent with the provisions of this or the Special Act.' I suppose that possibly those words to which my hon. friend has called attention might control.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think they do control.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Very likely that is the case. I suppose there may be some distinction to railway men between pooling receipts and a division and apportionment of tolls respecting traffic.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am told there is a great distinction, and I endeavoured to get an explanation of it, and the explanation embarrassed me. A pretended railway expert attempted to explain it to me, but I must admit that probably owing to my obtuseness I did not understand it. With respect to amendment 70, I dissent from it. This Senate amendment to section 310 would be admissible if we had adopted their amendments to sections 6 and 7 ; but having refused to concur in their amendments to sections 6 and 7, I cannot accept the amendment No. 70. I move non-concurrence for the same reasons as given in amendments 6 and 7.

Mr. BARKER. There may have been reason for the Senate striking that out. An examination of the statutes would probably lead the Minister of Justice to see it was a reasonable amendment. I think all these railways have been expressly made works for the general advantage of Canada. I think there is not a railway there which has not been converted into a Dominion railway by express enactment.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think there are one or two exceptions.

Mr. BARKER. I doubt whether there is any one of these that has not become a Dominion railway now by express enactment.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. What would you suggest ?

Mr. BARKER. I think the reservation of these in the general Railway Act may be altogether unnecessary if they are Dominion railways, and if so it is useless to retain such a provision.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Would the section do any harm ?

Mr. BARKER. No harm at all.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Then, if the hon. gentleman does not mind, I would prefer to leave it.

Amendment not agreed to.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE moved that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours with the reasons for non-concurrence with the foregoing amendments.

Motion agreed to.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACT AMENDMENTS.

Bill (No. 259) to amend the North-west Territories Act, read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 2,

2. Except where a question has been reserved and stated for the opinion of the Supreme Court of the North-west Territories as a court of appeal under section 743 of the Criminal Code, 1892, the judge by or before whom the judgment, order or decision then in question was rendered or made, shall not sit as one of the judges composing the court unless his presence is necessary to compose a quorum.

2. The proviso added to section 50 of the said Act by section 4 of chapter 17 of the Statutes of 1894 is repealed.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). This amendment has been suggested by Mr. Justice Wetmore, who has considerable experience in criminal cases in that part of the country, and who thinks it is desirable that the judge should reserve a case for the full court.

Mr. SCOTT. With the consent of the House and of the minister, I beg leave to propose two additional clauses to the Bill, as follows :

3. Notwithstanding anything in the North-west Territories Act, or any Act in amendment thereof, the legislative assembly may, by ordinance, repeal the provisions of sections 49, 51, 53, 55, 64, 88, 89 and 90 of the said North-west Territories Act as amended, and re-enact the said provisions or substitute other provisions in lieu thereof, but nothing in this section contained shall be construed as giving to the legislative assembly power to pass ordinances for the constitution, organization or maintenance of courts of criminal jurisdiction, or respecting procedure in criminal matters.

4. Notwithstanding anything in the North-west Territories Act, or any Act in amendment thereto, the legislative assembly may, by ordinance, repeal the provisions of sections 7, 8, 9, 11 and 12 of chapter 19 of the statutes of 1888, and section 18 of chapter 17 of the Statutes of 1894 as that section is enacted by section 9 of chapter 28 of the statutes of 1897, and re-enact the said provisions or substitute other provisions in lieu thereof.

I may explain the purport of these various sections of the North-west Territories Act under which it is proposed to give power to the legislative assembly.

Section 49 has reference to times and places of sittings of the Supreme Court in banc.

Section 51 empowers the Governor in Council to divide the territories into judicial districts. The amendment will give power to the assembly to make provision for determining the boundaries of judicial districts.

Section 53 makes a Supreme Court judge the instrument of authority in any matter which the law specifies shall be dealt with by a court or judge, in the absence of other specific provision.

Section 64 deals with justices of the peace, as to appointment, qualifications, &c., and with police magistrates.

Section 88 deals with the jurisdiction of judges in civil matters, and the class of matters in which either party may demand a jury trial, together with various other provisions relating to civil trials and cases.

Sections 89 and 90 also deal with judgments and procedure in civil cases.

The sections mentioned in No. 4 are 7, 8, 9, 11 and 12 of chapter 19 of 1888. All refer to the constitution of the legislative assembly.

Section 7 prescribes the qualifications of voters.

Section 8 the qualifications of candidates for election.

Section 9 specifies the oath to be subscribed and taken by members.

Section 11 deals with the election and duties of the Speaker.

Section 12 names the occasions when the Speaker may vote in the legislative assembly.

Section 9 of chapter 28, of 1897, which repealed and was substituted for section 18 of chapter 17 of 1894, prohibits members of the legislative assembly from holding positions of emolument, making the exception as regards members of the executive council who have procured election after appointment to such office.

In this latter important particular what I am proposing to do by the amendment is to give the legislative assembly power to define the qualifications or limitations and to regulate the conduct of its own members, a right and power which is possessed and exercised by this parliament and by every provincial parliament. I may say that in every discussion of the question of provincial autonomy by Premier Haultain, the lack of this power has been a matter of serious complaint. The proposal as a whole, while perhaps not very urgent or important, will have the effect of narrowing down still further the difference between the present position of the territories as territories, and the position of a province in confederation. I may explain that when Premier Haultain was on his last visit to Ottawa,

in February or March, a tacit understanding was arrived at, not, of course, with his willing consent, because, as a matter of fact, Premier Haultain believes that the question of provincial establishment should not be delayed at all, that the whole question of autonomy should not be dealt with and could not be dealt with at this session of parliament, and as a result of this understandig he suggested a number of intermediate changes in the existing powers of the legislative assembly. He proposed one important change by which the entire land titles system should be transferred to the local authority as well as a number of additional minor changes of which these I am proposing form a part. I believe, that, but for the long absence during this session of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton), all of these changes which have been asked for by Premier Haultain, would have been introduced and put through at this session, but on account of the pressure on his time, and perhaps partly because of the opinion which I think the hon. Minister of the Interior has formed that the question of provincial establishment cannot wisely be delayed beyond next year, he decided not to take up any of these points at this session, but to leave them over until next session, and then finally dispose of the whole subject by giving the territories a complete provincial status. On account of provision being made at this session for an additional judge of the Supreme Court of the North-west Territories, and a consequent necessary amendment of the North-west Territories Act, Premier Haultain, some time ago, wrote to me suggesting that even if the change respecting the transfer of the land titles system could not be made this year it would be a distinct advantage to the practical carrying on of the business of his government if certain of these minor changes were made. It perhaps would be only right for me to state further that Premier Haultain's proposals to the hon. Minister of the Interior included half a dozen other sections in addition to those that I have gone over. I have omitted a number of sections at the suggestion of the Department of Justice, which holds that these other sections deal with criminal jurisdiction over which for the present this parliament's authority had better be maintained. With that view of the department, I do not express agreement or disagreement. At this stage of the session it is perhaps wise not to attempt to introduce anything controversial, and I have therefore left out half a dozen sections which Premier Haultain desired to have added to this amendment. These various sections which I have added to this proposed amendment are not of very great moment. I do not imagine that they can raise any controversy at all. I trust they will meet with the unanimous approval of the House.

Mr. CASGRAIN. There is nothing in that germane to the Bill ?

Mr. SCOTT.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, the Bill is intended to provide for the constitution of the Supreme Court, and also for appeals to the court. The intention of the amendment that my hon. friend (Mr. Scott) proposes is merely to give to the council of the North-west Territories control over the court as to the time, place and sittings of the court, as to the dividing the territories into judicial districts, as to defining the territorial jurisdiction and other provisions of that sort. They also asked that they should have control over the administration of criminal justice, but I was not prepared to give it to them, and they did not get it. We are responsible for the administration of criminal justice in these territories, and we want to keep control over its administration.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It would be better if the committee could have some notice of amendments of this kind. It is almost impossible to understand them on the spur of the moment.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not think it is fair to take my hon. friend by surprise, and I have no objection at all that the committee should rise.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott), who has introduced the amendments, they are in the direction of giving greater powers to the legislature of the North-west Territories with respect to civil matters.

Mr. SCOTT. And the constitution of the assembly.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If that be the case, and when I have the opportunity to look them over, there will not be the slightest objection to them, and I will do everything to expedite their passage.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY—AUTONOMY OF THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House a matter which is of some importance not only to the people of the North-west Territories of Canada, but to the people of the entire Dominion. Early this session I called attention to the fact that the speech from the Throne made no reference to the granting of a provincial status to the North-west Territories, and I expressed the hope that before the end of this session—which at that time we thought would have been ended before this—the government would introduce some legislation for that purpose. According to the census of 1901, there were 158,000 inhabitants in the North-west Terri-

tories; according to the report of the department of immigration there came into this country in the year 1901 49,149 people; in 1902, 67,379 people; and the Prime Minister stated only last evening that, according to the information received from the department of immigration, no less than 110,000 immigrants came to Canada during the present year. That makes a total for these three years of 227,528, and we may fairly assume that at least 175,000 of that number have gone to the North-west Territories. If that computation is fair, and I believe it is, then we have in the North-west Territories at the present time a population of 330,000 people.

It is not contemplated by the government, apparently, to take any steps for the purpose of granting, during the present session, provincial autonomy to the people of these territories. It seems to me that, having regard to the very large population, the great territorial area, the magnificent country which we have in the west, the government of Canada should immediately give its attention to the granting of a provincial status to the people of the North-west Territories. It was asserted in this House by the Prime Minister the other day that the people in the North-west Territories have in effect at the present time all the powers which the people of the other provinces possess, with the possible exception of the power of borrowing money. The right hon. gentleman said :

> What are the powers which the territories have not to-day, which they would have if they were a province ? If I mistake not, speaking at first blush, the legislature of the territories has all the powers enjoyed by a province with the exception of borrowing money.

The right hon. gentleman greatly minimized the difference which exists between the powers possessed by the legislative assembly of the North-west Territories and the powers possessed by the respective legislatures of the different provinces. In the first place, the people of the North-west Territories have not the same full rights of citizenship as are enjoyed by the inhabitants of the older provinces, inasmuch as they have not the control of their public lands, which are controlled by the government of Canada, and which are administered, to a very great extent, from Ottawa. In the second place, the people of the North-west Territories have not the control of their minerals, which is possessed by the people of the older provinces of Canada. In the third place, they have not the power to charter railways and certain other companies. That power is taken from them by an exception to subsection 7 of section 13 of the North-west Territories Act, as amended by section 6 of chapter 22 of the Acts of 1891. That exception is as follows :—

> The legislative assembly shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, or of any other Act of the parliament of Canada at any time in force in the territories, have power to make ordinances for the government of the territories in relation to the class of subjects next hereinafter mentioned ; that is to say : the incorporation of companies with territorial objects, with the following exceptions :—
>
> Such companies as cannot be incorporated by provincial legislatures : railway, steamboat, canal, tranportation, telegraph, and irrigation companies.

Therefore, in respect to these six classes of companies, the legislative assembly of the North-west Territories has at the present time no power whatever to enact legislation. This exception deprives them of the power to incorporate a railway company and the power to deal with irrigation; it deprives them of the power to incorporate transportation, telephone or telegraph companies. I am not aware of any amendment to that section, but if there is any such amendment, I shall be glad to have my attention called to it. Then, in the next place, the North-west Territories have no power to borrow money for necessary purposes; they have not the same powers in connection with the administration of justice as the older provinces have, and they have no power to amend their own constitution. The Prime Minister of the North-west Territories, in a speech which he delivered in 1900, summarized the differences between the powers of the legislature of the North-west Territories and the powers of the legislatures of the provinces in the following words, which I will take the liberty of reading to the House. His words are as follows :

> Where we fall short of provincial powers is in these points : we have not the power to amend the constitution outside of the power to deal with certain phases in our election law ; we have not the power to borrow money ; we have not the power to deal with the public domain ; we have not the power to establish certain institutions, such as hospitals, asylums, charities—' eleemosynary institutions ' as they are called in the British North America Act ; we have not the power to take cognizance of public undertakings other than such as may be carried on by certain sorts of joint stock companies ; and our powers are limited to the extent that we have not the administration of the criminal law in the territories. That, I think, will suffice for any reference which it is necessary to make to the eighth recital.

Now this question has excited a good deal of interest in the North-west Territories during the past six or seven years ; and, although the documents which have been brought down at the present session of parliament are in a somewhat confused condition, I shall endeavour as well as I can to run very briefly over the correspondence and the proceedings respecting this question, and to point out to the House in what way the matter has been brought up in the legislature of the territories, and in what manner it has been brought to the attention of this government since the year 1897, when, so far as I know, the question first became a living issue in the territories. I

may say, however, in the beginning, that my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), as far back as the year 1895, gave a very strong expression of opinion in this behalf. Referring to the grant of $277,000 then voted to the North-west Territories, that hon. gentleman said :

We could save the whole of that expense by allowing the North-west Territories people to manage their own concerns. Give them self-government, do not lead them around as infants with a string, but let them manage their own business like free British subjects.

I do not agree with the hon. member for North Norfolk that there would be any saving at all to the country as a whole by granting provincial autonomy ; but in the last part of the hon. gentleman's remarks I thoroughly concur, and I think he has there very aptly expressed the idea in a few words.

Now, there was a memorial from the territorial legislature to this government on the 9th of December, 1897, which is to be found in sessional paper 116, at page 32. That memorial reads as follows :

Resolved, that in the opinion of this House the North-west Territories as they are at present composed should be maintained intact for administrative purposes until the time has arrived for their entrance into confederation as a province.

That was when a question first seems to have been raised in the North-west Territories in regard to this matter. It was more directly raised, however, in a memorial passed in 1900, which is to be found in sessional paper 116, at pages 2 and 4. I will not read the whole of the memorial, which deals with other matters ; but one paragraph, found at page 3, referring to the previous address, says :

That in the said address it was represented to Her Majesty, as a reason for the extension of the Dominion of Canada westward, that the welfare of the population of these territories would be materially enhanced by the formation therein of political institutions bearing analogy, as far as circumstances will admit, to those which existed in the several provinces then forming the Dominion.

Another paragraph proceeds as follows :

That under the several authorities so given the parliament of Canada has created political institutions in these territories bearing a close analogy to those which exist in the several provinces of the Dominion.

The two concluding paragraphs of the address are as follows :

That we do therefore most humbly pray that Your Excellency will be graciously pleased to cause the fullest inquiry to be made into the position of the territories, financial and otherwise, and to cause such action to be taken as will provide for their present and immediate welfare and good government, as well as the due fulfilment of the duties and obligations of government and legislation, assumed, with respect to these territories, by the parliament of Canada ;

And furthermore that, by the British North America Act, 1871, it was (amongst other things) enacted that the parliament of Canada may from time to time establish new provinces in any territories forming for the time being part of the Dominion of Canada, but not included in any province thereof, and may, at the time of such establishment, make provision for the constitution and administration of . . . . such province, we do therefore most humbly pray that Your Excellency will be also graciously pleased to order inquiries to be made and accounts taken with a view to the settlement of the terms and conditions upon which the territories or any part thereof shall be established as a province, and that, before any such province is established, opportunity should be given to the people of the territories, through their accredited representatives, of considering and discussing such terms and conditions.

All which we humbly pray Your Excellency to take into Your Excellency's most gracious and favourable consideration.

That memorial was forwarded, and subsequent correspondence took place. The first letter to which I will refer is a letter from the Prime Minister of the Territories, Mr. Haultain, to the Minister of the Interior, dated the 30th of January, 1901. It is to be found in sessional paper 116a, at page 1. I will not read the whole of this letter, but certain paragraphs of it are as follows :

While financial embarrassments rather than constitutional aspirations have led the North-west government and legislature to discuss the provincial status, I think that sufficient practical reasons can be given for the early establishment of provincial institutions in the west. We have a rapidly growing population, much larger, as the census will show, than that of British Columbia ten years ago, and than that of Prince Edward Island to-day ; a population trained to the exercise of powers of self-government falling a little short only of those enjoyed by the provinces. For nearly thirteen years the North-west legislative assembly has been occupied with founding local institutions and a body of laws suitable to the condition and circumstances of the country.

Further on, the memorial, referring to the anomalous constitution of the territories, uses these words :

The territories have arrived at a point, where by reason of their population and material development, the larger powers and larger income of a province have become necessary. I have already in former communications pointed out to you how our limited powers are still more limited by the reservation of subjects such as the Land Titles law, the administration of the criminal law and the control of the public domain. It is undoubtedly in the interest of any province or provinces herafter to be established, that the important questions surrounding the subject of the public domain should be settled at once, and before any more of the public lands of the territories are alienated from the Crown.

On the 21st of March, 1901, Mr. Sifton replied to Mr. Haultain, and his letter is to be found in sessional paper 116a, at page

4. In that letter, which I will not quote in full, Mr. Sifton used the following language :

It is the view of the government that it will not be wise at the present time to pass legislation forming the North-west Territories into a province or provinces. Some of the reasons leading to this view may be found in the fact that the population of the territories is yet sparse ; that the rapid increase in population now taking place will in a short time alter the conditions to be dealt with very materially and that there is a considerable divergence of opinion respecting the question whether there should be one province only, or more than one province. Holding this view, therefore, it will not be necessary for me to discuss the details of the draft Bill which you presented as embodying your views.

I may say, in connection with this matter, which I think has been alluded to also by my hon. friend the Prime Minister during the present session, that the difference of opinion as to whether there should be one province or two provinces does not seem a sufficient reason for withholding provincial status from the North-west Territories. Are the people of those territories to be for ever deprived of the status enjoyed by the people of the provinces of Canada, merely because there may not be absolute unanimity as to whether there shall be one province or two provinces or three provinces? It is not likely at any time in the future that you will have absolute unanimity in the North-west Territories with regard to a matter of that kind. It is only a detail after you have once settled the principle that the time has arrived when the people of the North-west Territories should be entrusted with the same rights of self-government as those enjoyed by the people of the various provinces.

Mr. Haultain replied to that letter on the 30th of March, 1901. His reply is to be found in sessional paper 116a, at page 2. I shall quote only portions of his reply. In the first place he quotes from Mr. Sifton's letter of March 21st, from which I have just read extracts. Perhaps as some of the letters from which he quoted have not been brought to the attention of the House, and as it would take too much time to read them all, I had better read his quotations from the previous correspondence with Mr. Sifton. Mr. Haultain's words are as follows:

So far from your conclusions not coming as a surprise as you suggest, I must say quite frankly that the decision of the government has come not only as a surprise, but as a deep disappointment as well. In your letter of March 21, 1901, you say :

He then quotes Mr. Sifton's language as follows :

I may say that I realize very fully the difficulties of the position in which the government and legislative assembly of the North-west Territories is placed, and I admit that there is very much in the suggestions which are made in your letter and in the memorial regarding the necessity of a change in the constitutional and financial position of the territories.

That language of Mr. Sifton is very significant because, so far back as March, 1901, he said there was very much in the suggestion that it was necessary there should be a change in the constitutional and financial conditions of the territories. We have now reached a period two years and a half later in the history of the territories than the day on which this letter was written, but we seem to be no nearer to any solution of the question by the present government than we were at that time. Continuing, Mr. Haultain quotes from Mr. Sifton's letter as follows :

Without at the present moment committing myself to any positive statement I am prepared to say that the time has arrived when the question of organizing the territories on the provincial basis ought to be the subject of full consideration. It would appear to me that the better way of bringing the matter to a more definite position would be to arrange for a conference upon the subject between the representatives of your government and a committee of council representing the federal government.

Now, if the time had arrived two and a half years ago, when the population of the territories was not one-half what it is to-day, when that question ought to be the subject of full consideration, how is it that, after the expiration of those two and a half years, when greatly increased importance has been added to the territories owing to the impetus which that country has received by the influx of a very great number of people, we are still told that the time for action has not yet arrived and we are still met with exactly the same objections which were advanced to Mr. Haultain by Mr. Sifton in the correspondence to which I am now referring.

Mr. Haultain in this same letter refers to a further letter from Mr. Sifton of April 5th, 1901, from which he quotes as follows :

The latter portion of the session of parliament here finds all the members of the government extremely busy, and it would be hopeless to expect from them that mature and careful consideration of the various and important subjects which will require to be debated and settled in connection with the establishment of the territories as a province or upon the provincial basis. I think I shall therefore be compelled to ask you to defer the discussion until after parliament has prorogued.

Mr. Haultain then proceeds to deal with the objections raised by Mr. Sifton, and I quote one or two paragraphs from his letter. One of these paragraphs is as follows :

Another reason advanced is : 'That the rapid increase in population now taking place will in a short time alter the conditions to be dealt with very materially. This rapid increase in population is one of the principal reasons why we are asking to be formed into a province, in order that we may be able to deal with the new conditions that it brings about. The longer it goes on without the change the more aggravated the present difficulties will become.

I think there is not one of us in the House who will not realize that there is great

truth and force in that statement of Mr. Haultain's. Are we to expect that the population of the North-west Territories is to stand still at any time within the next fifteen or twenty years? We have there a country which is capable of supporting many millions of population; we have there the best undeveloped country in the world, and I see no reason to anticipate that population will flow into the North-west of Canada less rapidly during the next fifteen or twenty years than it is flowing into that country at present. Therefore as Mr. Haultain forcibly points out in the letter to which I have referred, the difficulties in that regard will not be obviated by mere delay; there will always be difficulties of that kind and the only way in which we can do justice to the people of the North-west Territories in this matter is by dealing with these difficulties at the present time and by giving them, after proper consultation, after meeting their wishes as far as it is proper and reasonable and possible, that provincial status which the people of the eastern provinces now enjoy.

Mr. Haultain's letter continues as follows:

With regard to a divergence of opinion as to one or more provinces I might say that that is a difficulty that will always exist and any postponment of action will not remove.

I say again that those words of Mr. Haultain's are reasonable and forcible and there is no man in this House who does not, I think, realize the justice of his answer to Mr. Sifton.

Mr. Haultain's letter continues:

I must also say, on behalf of the North-west government, that after having been asked to meet a sub-committee of the Privy Council, and to state our case not only verbally but in writing, it is extremely unsatisfactory that the government has come to the conclusion: 'That it will not be necessary to discuss the details of the draft Bill which embodied our views.' This is a conclusion to the negotiations which have been held which we could hardly have expected considering the importance of the subject discussed and the formal manner in which the discussion has taken place.

I shall not refer especially to the draft Bill which was proposed by Mr. Haultain as a scheme for the government of the North-west Territories; I shall refer, however, to one or two passages in the memorandum which accompanied that Bill. In the memorandum accompanying the draft Bill, which is to be found in sessional paper 116, on page 19, Mr. Haultain, dealing with the question as to whether or not the people of the North-west Territories are entitled to their own lands, uses the following language:

As Great Britain has divested herself, for the benefit of her colonies, of all her proprietary rights in the public domain within those colonies, so, it is thought, Canada should do with respect to any claim that may be preferred on behalf of the Dominion to the beneficiary interest in the public domain within that part of the North-west Territories to be included in any province to be established.

It may be that the government of Canada will admit the principle contended for above on behalf of the people of the North-west Territories who may be included within the limits of any province to be created, but will argue that it will not be in accord with established public policy for the Dominion to divest itself of the ability, largely advertised abroad, to grant lands to actual settlers upon almost nominal conditions. Such appears to have been the view adopted in 1884 by the government of the day with respect to certain similar representations then made by the province of Manitoba. The validity of the claim was admitted by the agreement to recompense the province for the loss of its public property. It is not deemed necessary, here, at this stage, to discuss any such proposition further than to point out the one fact that, should the Dominion withhold from the province, for the benefit of Canada at large, the right to administer the public domain within its boundaries and to enjoy the revenues therefrom, the addition of each new settler, or—what experience has shown to practically almost amount to the same thing—the opening up of each new settlement, will impose a burden and financial strain upon the revenues of the province altogether out of proportion to any revenue derivable on account of such settler or settlement, and one that can only be met by an early appeal to extensive direct taxation.

Then he proceeds to deal with the expenditure per head in the different provinces and to compare that expenditure with the expenditure in the North-west Territories. He continues as follows:

Without extravagance and in order to provide for urgent public necessities, the per capita rate of expenditure in the territories, had the money been available, would have been between $6 and $7. This large rate of public expenditure in the territories, as compared with the rates of the eastern provinces, is entirely attributable to the extraordinary increase in expenditure due to the energy displayed by the immigration branch of the Interior Department. While such energy is commendable from the view point of Dominion interests, yet its results place a great strain upon the finances of the country, and it is, with all respect, urged that the exploitation of the public domain within the province to be established, in the interests of the Dominion solely and entirely, will place upon the province a burden too onerous to bear, and one which should properly fall where the benefits go.

On the 22nd of January, 1902, there was an acknowledgment by the private secretary of the right hon. Prime Minister of several copies of this draft Bill for the use of his colleagues. On the 22nd of March, 1902, there was a letter from Mr. Sifton to Mr. Haultain, which is found in sessional paper No. 116a, at page 4. I have already referred to that in substance, so I need not deal with it further. The next document is a telegram from Mr. Sifton to Mr. Haultain appointing a meeting between representatives of the two governments, which is found in sessional paper No. 116a, page 7. And on the 11th of February, in a letter which is found in the same document, page 7, Mr. Haultain again urges the question of provincial autonomy

upon the attention of the Minister of the Interior. He says, after referring to the correspondence and the various reasons why conferences have not been held : 'I should like to ask the consideration by the sub-committee of Council of our provincial proposition.' On the 19th of March, 1903, in a letter, which is found in this same sessional paper, page 13, Mr. Haultain, who had come to Ottawa with his colleagues for the purpose of a conference, had had a conference, and was waiting an answer, wrote the Minister of the Interior as follows :

Rideau Club, Ottawa, March 19, 1903.

The Honourable Clifford Sifton,
Minister of the Interior, Ottawa.

As I have remained here for some days since I last saw you, you may have written to me to Regina with reference to the result of the recent interview of Mr. Bulyea and myself with the sub-committee of Council regarding North-west affairs. In case no decision has yet been arrived at or communicated to me, may I ask you to let me have (addressed to Regina) a final reply on behalf of the government to our request for the creation of a province and for larger financial assistance in the meantime.

F. W. G. HAULTAIN.

In answer to that, Mr. Sifton, on the 27th of March telegraphed to Mr. Haultain at Regina, as follows :

Ottawa, March 21, 1903.

Hon. F. W. G. Haultain,
Regina, Assa.

I sent a note over to the Rideau Club but found you were gone. The question of your financial arrangements was up for discussion to-day, and Mr. Fielding will communicate with you. The arrangement suggested will, I think, prove reasonably satisfactory.

CLIFFORD SIFTON.

You will observe in Mr. Haultain's letter a demand for an answer as to the important question of provincial autonomy which had been discussed by representatives of his government with the representatives of this government. In fact this question had, so to speak, been made a matter of state by the appointment of a subcommittee of the Privy Council for the purpose of considering the status of the North-west Territories; and, in reply to the demand of Mr. Haultain of the 19th of March for a final answer—and he puts the question of provincial autonomy first—he receives a telegram addressed to him at Regina making some reference to important financial arrangements, but containing not a single word of reply to the demand of the North-west Territories, presented through their government, that a provincial status should be accorded to the people of that great western country. That, to say the least of it, Mr. Speaker, seems a somewhat casual and indifferent way of dealing with a great question of this kind, which, although, apparently considered a small and trifling matter by this government, is of some importance to nearly 350,000 people who at present inhabit our great west. Now, the next letter is one from Mr. Haultain to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, which is not printed at all in the correspondence brought down, but a copy of which I have procured from a document printed by the legislative assembly of the North-west Territories. I am sorry that this return brought down to this House is so very incomplete that hon. members who desire to consider this question must refer to documents brought down to the legislature of the North-west Territories in order to find a complete record. Mr. Haultain, not satisfied with this somewhat casual and supercilious response from the Minister of the Interior, wrote to Sir Wilfrid Laurier on the 15th of April, 1903, after his return to Regina. The letter is too long to quote in full, but I will read one or two paragraphs :

I am inclosing a copy of a letter addressed to Mr. Sifton for the information of the government to which I referred in my interview with the sub-committee, and which, no doubt, you have already seen. It deals exclusively with the question of provincial institutions in the territories, and I will again, on behalf of my colleagues, earnestly ask your consideration of our request.

Then, after dealing with the question of finance, he concludes his letter with the following words :

To sum up, I beg to ask for an early reply to our requests, first for the granting of provincial institutions to the territories ; secondly, for a vote supplementary to the North-west grant for the current year, and, thirdly, for a largely increased vote for the year 1903-4.

I have not observed in the correspondence any reply by my right hon. friend to that letter of Mr. Haultain's, unless we find it in a letter dated the 8th of June. The next communication in connection with the North-west government is to be found in sessional paper No. 116a, at page 13. It is in the form of a telegram from the Minister of Finance to Mr. Haultain, the Premier of the North-west Territories, and is as follows :

Ottawa, April 16, 1903.

To the Hon. Mr. F. W. G. Haultain, Regina.

Government will place in supplementary estimates for coming year two hundred and fifty thousand dollars to cover the over-expenditure of the territories, and also recommend to parliament an advance on capital account up to $500,000 from time to time for approved public works. The two bridges which have been specially arranged for to be charged to the capital advance. It will be better that all bridges in the territories be left to the territorial government. Please treat this as confidential for a day or two until I can arrange to have it dealt with by Order in Council.

W. S. FIELDING.

You will observe here again that there is not a single word of response to the demand of Mr. Haultain made to the Prime Minister and to the Minister of the Interior over and over again, that the demand of the North-west Territories for a provincial status should be considered by the government and

an answer given forthwith. I might say, in passing, that I have not been able to find in the correspondence brought down the letter from Mr. Haultain to the Minister of the Interior, which is referred to in Mr. Haultain's letter to the Prime Minister of the 15th of April, 1903. It may be that on account of the confused condition in which this correspondence has been brought down I have overlooked it. The next letter to which I invite the attention of the House is that of Mr. Haultain to the Minister of Finance, of the 20th of April, 1903, which is found in sessional paper 116a, page 14. I will have to trouble the House with a couple of paragraphs of this letter, which is a very long one. After quoting certain correspondence which had taken place, Mr. Haultain proceeds as follows :

It is with much satisfaction that I note that the government has so far appreciated the position of affairs in the territories as to approve, in the most practical manner possible, of our methods of administration by providing for the expenditures we found it necessary to incur in the public interest during the year 1902. It would appear, however, to have escaped your observation that the placing of the appropriation to cover our expenditures of last year in the supplementary estimates for the coming Dominion fiscal year will have the effect of keeping the money from the territorial revenue until after the first day of July next. All the representations we have made —both written and oral--have been to the effect that the supplementary appropriation is desired to the current fiscal year's appropriations, so that the money may be rendered available at the earliest possible moment. To do otherwise can only embarrass us still further, and I would submit that with a prospective surplus of thirteen million dollars, to a very large extent due to the present flourishing condition of these territories, the Dominion will not be put to any very serious inconvenience by granting us the money it has been agreed to give us during the month of May instead of July. I trust that upon further consideration of the subject you will see your way clear to recommending the government to grant our request that the $250,000 referred to in your telegram be provided for through the supplementary estimates for 1902-3.

Your telegram makes no mention whatever of any proposal to increase our grant for the coming fiscal year. I take it that the suggested advance on capital account has no connection whatever with that subject. In discussing the various phases of the question of territorial finances, it has been found necessary at times to point out that our limited and inadequate revenues were more restricted, and rendered only more inadequate, by the necessity for making expenditures out of current income which in themselves were more properly chargeable to a capital account. That is to say, we have occasionally found it necessary to incur heavy expenditures for the construction of bridges the cost of which has been a heavy drain upon our revenues, and which should have been spread over a series of years instead of being provided for out of the revenue of one year, to the exclusion of other and equally important works. But we have never asked for the establishment of a capital account, and we do not wish for the establishment of such an account until a more satisfactory subsidy or annual grant is provided. We would even prefer, if possible, to postpone all discussion of the question until the details of the financial position of the territories under the provincial status are settled. Whilst the Dominion retains to itself the control and beneficiary interest in our revenue producing property it seems but fair to us that the Dominion should provide all needed funds for the proper carrying on of our business. Further, we cannot assent to any proposition that our expenditures shall be subject to approval at Ottawa. The legislative assembly of the territories has for a number of years been providing for the administration of public affairs in the territories. What has been done in that regard has met with the approval of the people of the territories, and this government cannot consent, at this date to any such proposal as that made in your telegram. In one sense, I quite agree with you that 'it will be better that all bridges in territories be left to the territorial government,' but that proposition must be coupled with another, namely, that adequate financial provision therefor be made by parliament. The Dominion government in the first place built the two bridges at Macleod and Lethbridge without reference to the government of the territories. It was possible that at the time they were built it was not practicable to do so, but the fact remains that, in pursuance of its general public works policy, the Dominion government built the two bridges in question and has undertaken to replace them. Under existing conditions, which the Dominion government does not appear to wish to remedy, we are content to leave that matter as it stands at present.

Then he deals with similar matters at great length, and he concludes his letter with the following paragraph :

I trust that the further consideration of this whole subject, promised in your telegram of this date, will result in some more definite recognition of our necessities than has hitherto been evidenced. The one, and the best solution of all these difficulties has, on several occasions of late, been suggested to the Dominion government, and it seems to me that I might well close this communication by an expression of the opinion that just so long as the provincial status is withheld from the territories will it be necessary for the government of the territories to direct attention with increasing force and emphasis to the present unsatisfactory manner of making financial provision for the public requirements of the country.

Now, that was followed up by a resolution of the legislative assembly of the North-west Territories. But before dealing with that, I might say that on the 20th of April, 1903, the Prime Minister replied to Mr. Haultain's letter of the 15th of April, in the following terms :

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your favour of the 15th instant, as Mr. Fielding has communicated with you already by wire on the subject therein mentioned, I do not suppose that it requires any further reply.

So the House will observe that not only did the Minister of Finance ignore absolutely the demands of Mr. Haultain for an answer to the request of the territories for provincial institutions, but my right hon. friend, by referring to the Finance Minister's answer, expressed himself in exactly the same way. On the 24th of April, 1903,

by resolution found in sessional paper 116a, pages 20 and 21, the legislative assembly of the North-west Territories again passed a resolution in almost exactly similar terms to their resolution of 1900. They declare in paragraphs 8 to 10 :

8. And whereas under the several authorities so given the parliament of Canada has created political institutions in these territories bearing a close analogy to those which exist in the several provinces of the Dominion ;

9. And whereas by the confederation compact the province which formed the Dominion on the fifteenth day of July, 1870, were furnished with the means of carrying on local self-government upon certain well defined bases ;

10. And whereas the territories, being an integral part of the Dominion, and having had imposed upon them the duties and obligations incidental to the political institutions which have been given to them and said duties and obligations the parliament of Canada has declared its willingness to assume, are entitled to such federal assistance for their maintenance as will bear due proportion and analogy to that given to other portions of the Dominion for similar purposes.

Then a further paragraph deals with the question of finances, and paragraphs 14 and 15, concluding this memorial, are in the same terms as those I have already read to the House as part of the resolution of 1900. On the 2nd of June Mr. Haultain addressed a further letter to the right hon. Prime Minister which will be found in sessional paper 116a page 16. After referring to the correspondence which had passed between them he proceeds as follows :

In further reference to your letter of April 20, I beg to point out that Mr. Fielding's telegram does not deal with the most important part of my letter of April 16, namely our request for provincial institutions, and I would most respectfully urge that our representations on this important question merit some further reply than can be gathered by implication from the fact that Mr. Fielding does not refer to them.

Mr. Haultain had been pressing for some definite answer in regard to this matter from the month of March of that year. During that period he had written a great many times to the Minister of the Interior, he had written to the hon. Minister of Finance, he had written to the right hon. Prime Minister himself, and the only answer he ever got from any of these hon. gentlemen was a reference to some other gentleman, or a telegram of a somewhat casual character in which he was told that certain financial arrangements with the North-west Territories would be provided for by a grant during the present year. It does seem to me that the Premier of the North-west Territories, a gentleman representing a constituency of something over 350,000 people, might have been answered by any one of these three gentlemen to whom I have referred in a somewhat more formal manner than that which characterized the correspondence that I have read. On the 8th June Sir Wilfrid Laurier wrote to Mr. Haultain. The letter has not been printed at all as far as I can ascertain, but I have secured a typewritten copy of it. I repeat again my deep regret that the returns to which I have referred have come down in so incomplete a condition as to impose an enormous amount of labour on any man who desires to trace the sequence of this correspondence. I had better read the whole of the letter as it is important :

Privy Council, Canada,
Ottawa, June 8, 1903.

Hon. F. W. G. Haultain,
Regina,

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 2nd inst. The Minister of Finance has, by this time, communicated with you respecting the financial grant to be given to the North-west legislature.

With regard to your further request that legislation be introduced this session conferring on the territories full provincial organization. I have had the honour to discuss the matter with the members of the House of Commons from the territories. I have asked them to consider whether it would be advisable to have such legislation introduced this year. We are, as you know, introducing a redistribution measure at the present session, and we are giving to the territories a much larger representation in the House of Commons than they would be entitled to, were they to become a province. In fact the Bill which we have introduced allows to the territories a representation in the House of Commons of ten members. Were they to be admitted at once as a province they would be entitled to only six members. It would be a question of extreme difficulty and complications to give to the territories at the same time all the advantages of full provincial organization without the corresponding disadvantages.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Yours truly,
(Sgd.) WILFRID LAURIER.

Well, my right hon. friend has at last given a reply to the Prime Minister of the territories and it does not seem to me to be a reply which ought to carry very great weight. He does not take up any of the reasons for delay which have been urged during the past two sessions by the hon. Minister of the Interior. The right hon. Prime Minister in this letter confines himself almost entirely to the fact that under the Redistribution Bill which was introduced during the present session the territories are to receive a representation of ten members, whereas, if we went strictly on population, they would be entitled to only six members. Is that really an answer to the demand of these people that they should be accorded a provincial status ? It is not an answer, certainly, even if the contention could be supported for a moment. It could not be supported for a moment, because, the right hon. gentleman only yesterday admitted that it would be fair to regard the territories as having a population of over 300,000 and as the unit of population for Canada is something less than 25,000, if the

territories were created into a province today they would be entitled to twelve members instead of ten members. Therefore, I do not think there is very much force in the suggestion that my right hon. friend has made. I want to point out to my right hon. friend and to the House, that, if you create the North-west Territories into a province or provinces, you are not bound by the census of 1901. The very fact of your giving them ten members is evidence that you are not bound by the census of 1901. If you are bound by the census of 1901 the Territories would receive only six members, but you have a perfect right under the legislation that exists at the present time to give them twelve members. I believe from the statement of the Prime Minister himself that the North-west Territories have now a population which entitles them to twelve members instead of ten members. Therefore, if you organize them into a province they would not be under a disadvantage such as my right hon. friend has suggested. Ou the contrary, if you do justice to them and create them into a province to-morrow, you will be obliged from the facts that are patent to the government and to the people, to give to the North-west Territories twelve representatives in parliament instead of ten. Premier Haultain replied to that letter of the 15th of June, and as I have read the whole of the letter to the Prime Minister, I had better read the whole of Mr. Haultain's letter in reply:

Regina, June 15, 1903.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the eighth instant, relating to the question of provincial institutions in the territories, and to express regret on the part of the North-west government that that question has again been put on one side for a reason which seems quite foreign to the subject.

With all deference to the opinion expressed by you, I cannot see that the representation proposed to be given to the territories under the Redistribution Bill could be in any way affected by the passing of concurrent legislation granting the provincial status to the territories.

The provisions of the British North America Act relating to representation would not, I submit, apply to a province which, at the earliest, could only come into existence at the same time as the Redistribution Bill became law. Even if legislation creating a province were introduced at the present session of parliament, the actual coming into existence of the province would necessarily be postponed for some months to enable territorial affairs to be wound up, and thus any question with regard to representation and the effect of the British North America Act would be removed. I might also remind you that upon the admission of British Columbia into the confederation and upon the creation of the province of Manitoba larger representation was given than these two provinces were respectively entitled to under the British North America Act.

You say that you have discussed the question of provincial organization with the members of the House of Commons from the territories and asked them to consider whether it would be advisable to have such legislation introduced this year. Your letter does not make it clear what the opinion of these gentlemen is, but I feel justified in asserting that that opinion was not in accord with the wishes of the people they represent unless it supported the claims made by us which are unanimously endorsed by the North-west Legislature, and were practically unanimously endorsed by the people of the North-west Territories, at the general elections in May, 1902. The question of larger representation in the federal parliament is without doubt an important one, but the infinitely more urgent question of provincial organization should not be subordinated to it. The two questions are quite separate and independent, and cannot, I think I have shown, affect one another. Under any circumstances, however, the obtaining of provincial powers is in our opinion of much greater importance to the people of the territories than additional representation in a parliament whose failure to fulfil the duties and obligations it has assumed with regard to the North-west is one of our strongest reasons for demanding home rule.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) F. W. G. HAULTAIN.

I forgot to mention in connection with the reply of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister that he did also adduce as a reason why the provincial status should not be given to the people of the North-west Territories the fact that the members from territories, who are all supporters of the government, were opposed to doing anything with regard to that matter during the present session. That may or may not be a good reason, and I offer no opinion as to Mr. Haultain's comments upon that, except to say——

Mr. OLIVER. Might I ask the hon. gentleman——

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will my hon. friend let me finish the sentence?

Mr. OLIVER. Might I ask the hon. gentleman to read from the letter of the Prime Minister in which he made that statement?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will read it later. I am dealing with it as Mr. Haultain interpreted it. I make no comment on that, except to say that if Mr. Haultain is to be believed—and he gives reasons why he should be believed—the opinion of these gentlemen, if it is their opinion, does not seem to be in accord with the opinion of the majority of the people of the North-west Territories. I do not presume to have the same knowledge of political matters in the North-west which is possessed by my hon. friends who represent the territories in this House, but I know that in 1900 a resolution demanding that this question should be taken up at once, was passed by the territorial legislature. I have understood—if I am wrong in this I would like to be corrected—that Mr. Haultain went to the people of the North-west Territories in 1902

upon the platform that provincial autonomy and a provincial status should be granted forthwith, that going to the people upon that platform, he practically swept the constituencies, and that very few of those who were opposed to this government on that question were returned to the assembly. I have understood that the legislature of the North-west Territories to-day is practically unanimous upon that point. I have been so informed by those who profess to know the views of the members of the legislature. However, I have not the same acquaintance with political matters there as have the gentlemen who represent the territories in this House, and if I am wrong on that point I shall be glad indeed that these gentlemen shall set me right. My hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) desired me to read again a paragraph from the letter of the Prime Minister, and I will gladly do so.

With regard to your further request that legislation be introduced this session conferring on the territories full provincial organization, I have had the honour to discuss the matter with the members of the House of Commons from the territories. I have asked them to consider whether it would be advisable to have such legislation introduced this year. We are as you know introducing a redistribution measure at the present session and we are giving to the territories a much larger representation in the House of Commons than they would be entitled to were they to become a province. In fact the Bill which we have introduced, allows to the territories a representation in the House of Commons of 10 members. Were they to be admitted at once as a province they would be entitled only to six members. It would be a question of extreme difficulty and complications to give to the territories at the same time all the advantages of full provincial organization without the corresponding disadvantages.

My hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) is quite right in suggesting—if he intended to make that suggestion—that there is no direct statement in the letter of the Prime Minister that it was the opinion of the hon. members from the territories that such legislation should not be introduced this year, but the inference that has been drawn by Mr. Haultain is the only possible inference. It is this; that the Prime Minister, having consulted with these gentlemen, and having come to the conclusion that it would not be advisable to introduce legislation this year, they must have been of the opinion which the Prime Minister expresses in this letter.

Some hon. MEMBERS Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Otherwise, of course, the Prime Minister would be consulting these hon. gentlemen as a matter of form, and knowing that these are gentlemen of strong opinions, and quite capable of pressing on the Prime Minister of Canada or any one else the opinions which they strongly hold, we can hardly believe that the Prime Minister would conclude not to introduce a measure this year, unless their opinion had practically coincided with his own on that point. The only other letter to which I will refer, is a letter from Mr. Bulyea, one of the ministers of the North-west Territories government, to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, dated the 16th of June, 1903 ; it is found at page 18, sessional paper 116a, and is as follows :

You will please excuse the liberty I take in addressing you, if it is a liberty to lay before you facts that I consider will be of material influence on the welfare of the Liberal party in the North-west Territories.

You are, of course, cognizant of all the representations that the territorial government have made in reference to increase of the financial assistance that is voted to us from time to time, and the arguments that have been advanced why a material increase is absolutely necessary, if the alternative of provincial autonomy were not granted to us. I have had considerable correspondence with the federal members representing the territories, who were kind enough to apprize me of the general representations they had made to your government, and I advised them that I consider that if such were adopted it would reasonably satisfy the general public in the territories, and would put your candidates and your supporters in the coming election in a position in which they could fight with zeal and, I am pleased to say, with every prospect of success.

The supplementary grant, and the addition to the main vote, while not as much as we asked for, will be of very material assistance to me in the work of my department as Commissioner of Public Works. The capital advance tendered is also needed for the construction of the large and permanent structures that must be completed to meet the requirements of the large influx of settlers into the country.

I regret to say, however, that not only as a member of the territorial government, but as a citizen of the North-west Territories, I must dissent most strongly from the proposition to charge up against this vote the large expenditure of $84,000 which is purely and simply for the reconstruction of two federal public works, viz:—the bridges over the Old Man's and Belly rivers, erected by the late Conservative government.

Then he deals with certain details as to these two bridges, and he concludes his letter with the following paragraph :

I trust, therefore, that you will see the necessity of meeting the reasonable views not only of the North-west government but of your friends who are members of the territorial assembly, and who uphold unanimously our government in claiming that the territories are entitled to have these federal structures replaced at the general expense of the Dominion of Canada.

GEO. H. V. BULYEA.

A number of members of the legislative assembly sign an approval of that letter in the following words :—

The undersigned members of the legislative assembly strongly approve of the tenor of the above letter :—

George W. Brown.	P. Talbot.
L. Geo. de Veter.	B. Prince
J. W. Woolf.	R. A. Wallace.
W. J. Finley.	J. A. Simpson.
C. A. Fisher.	A. S. Rosenroll.
A. D. McIntyre.	Thos. Macnutt.
Charles Fisher.	Alex. C. Rutherford.
A. S. Smith.	

I have detained the House with the correspondence at this length principally for these reasons: In the first place, to show that this has been a live question in the North-west Territories since the year 1900 at least; in the second place, to show that it has been the subject of considerable correspondence between the territorial government and this government, that a sub-committee of the Privy Council has been appointed to deal with it, and that representatives of the territorial government have conferred with that committee; in the third place, to show the reasons on account of which this government has declined to act upon the memorial twice forwarded to His Excellency by the legislature of the North-west Territories, urging upon this government that provincial status should be granted; and in the fourth place, to prove by the statement of the Prime Minister of the North-west Territories and by the resolution passed by its legislature that the people of the North-west Territories are almost unanimous in their demand that the provincial status should be granted to them.

I shall deal very briefly—because I have taken up the time of the House longer than I intended—I shall deal very briefly with some of the objections which have been raised against granting a provincial status to the territories. In the first place, there is the objection which has been already adverted to in the letters of Mr. Haultain, that the population of the territories is increasing at a more rapid rate than the population of the older provinces. I say, as I have several times before said in this House, and as Mr. Haultain has said in his correspondence, that if this is to debar the North-west Territories from obtaining a provincial status, then we must deprive them of provincial status during the next ten or fifteen years. That reason would deprive them of a provincial status after they have a population of a million people—after they have a population three or four times, possibly five or six times, that of some of the provinces of Canada which have enjoyed representative institutions for many years.

In the next place, the objection was made—it was made by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior last year, and I think also in some of the correspondence—that with a continually increasing population it will be difficult to arrange a permanent financial basis. So far as that is concerned, it is one of the difficulties which you must meet in granting a provincial status to the people of the North-west Territories. It is impossible to believe that the population of those territories will not increase at an enormously rapid rate during the next ten, or fifteen, or twenty years; and if that fact is to afford an insuperable difficulty in arranging a permanent financial basis, then we shall have the people of the North-west Territories treated, to a certain extent, as wards of this county for a great many years to come. I do not believe the difficulty is insuperable. After you have arrived at a conclusion that the people of that country are entitled to a provincial status, why cannot this government, as demanded by the government of the territories, at once appoint a committee for conference with that government? And what reason is there for saying that it is impossible to find a basis which, on the one hand, will be just and fair so far as Canada is concerned, and, on the other hand, will give the people of the North-west Territories such an increase in the financial assistance to be obtained from the Dominion as the needs of their rapidly increasing population will from time to time demand at our hands? I do not conceal from myself that the question is attended with difficulties; but I suppose that almost every question of this kind is attended with some difficulties. The confederation of this Dominion was not unattended with difficulties. On the contrary, it was accompanied with difficulties tenfold greater than any of those which in the present case are considered so formidable. Those difficulties were overcome, and we have to-day a great Dominion as a result of the courage and the wisdom of the men who undertook to grapple with those difficulties; and all we require, it seems to me, is a certain amount of courage and capacity to be devoted to this question, and some means can be found by which justice can be done to the territories in that regard, and at the same time no injustice will be done to the people of Canada as a whole.

The next point which has been made has been referred to by my right hon. friend during the present session. If I may be permitted to refer to his language, in speaking a few days ago of the powers which are possessed by the people of the North-west Territories, and overlooking for the moment many of the differences which exist between their status and the status of the provinces, he used this language:

> They are as free as any of us, but have not the power to borrow money, and perhaps it is as well to keep that power in abeyance in a young country like that.

My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, during the past session, used somewhat similar language ('Hansard,' page 3110):

> If they had the power to mortgage that territory for all time to come, which they would have if they were granted provincial powers, it might be mortgaged for very unwise and very unnecessary purposes. In saying this, I wish to guard against the imputation of saying that the

people of the North-west Territories are not as capable of taking care of themselves and doing their own business as any others.

I do not share the apprehensions of my right hon. friend and of the Minister of the Interior with regard to these people. In the first place, although I have not the knowledge of them which is possessed by my hon. friends from that country who sit in this House, nevertheless I have some acquaintance with many of them from having made a tour through that country during the past year ; and I am prepared to say that if there is any body of people in Canada who would wisely administer a public domain entrusted to them, it is the people of the North-west Territories ; because I found in every meeting which I addressed in that country that the people were strongly imbued with the idea that the public domain should be conserved for public purposes, and not handed over to corporations and promoters. I believe that feeling is very deep and very widespread in the North-west Territories ; and a feeling of that kind is absolutely inconsistent with the possibility that if the public domain were entrusted to them, and they were granted the power to incur debt, they would be likely to use either the one power or the other in such a way as would not inure to the public interest of that country or of Canada as a whole. Who are those people who inhabit the North-west ? Why, up to the present year, they have been largely the same people who have been sending representatives from the older provinces of Canada—people of exactly the same type, having the same political training, accustomed to the same representative institutions ; and why is it that Mr. John Smith, living in the eastern provinces of Canada, is to be entrusted with the right to borrow money for public purposes, and the same gentleman, when he removes to the North-west Territories, finds himself classed in a different category ? I do not understand any such argument as that : and I do not believe any ordinary citizen of this country, going from eastern Canada to the north-west of Canada, will be so influenced by the fact that there is a great public domain in that country that he will be induced either to borrow money or to alienate the public domain to any unwise extent or for any unwise purpose.

Then, we have now another element coming into the North-west Territories—an element from the great country to the south of us. Are we to have any apprehension with regard to the attitude of these people on a question of that kind ? They are people who are accustomed to practically the same representative institutions as those enjoyed by the people of Canada. They are people who, I believe, for the most part, take a deep interest in public affairs ; and I believe that any one of those people will take at once as deep an interest in the proper administration of the public affairs of this country as any citizen of Canada in the east or the west. I was particularly struck with the interest which some of these people took in the country. I was struck with the fact that before they emigrated to this country they took the pains, some of them at least, to ascertain what were the laws with regard to the schools. They wished to know whether their children would have the advantage of public schools or not ; and they evinced an interest in the administration of the public affairs of the country which, I think, indicates that we might safely entrust to them, as well as to our own people from the east, who, with their descendants, are in that country, the management of their own local affairs. Under these circumstances, it does not seem to me that the reason that has been suggested is a good reason. And where are we to draw the limit ? If 350,000 people in the North-west Territories cannot be entrusted to borrow money, are you to entrust that power to half a million or to a million ? What number will afford any reasonable degree of safety ? I see no reason for withholding that power from 350,000 people and granting it to half a million or a million.

It is within the bounds of extreme probability that the North-west Territories of Canada will have well nigh one-half a million people before provincial autonomy can be accomplished if it is undertaken at once. Therefore there is no good reason why the government should stay its hand ; there is no good reason, I believe why during this present session the government should have stayed its hand. Is there any objection to granting to the people of the North-west Territories the power to charter railway companies, telegraph companies, telephone companies and steamship lines ? That power is possessed by the people of Manitoba who dwell alongside of them ; in what respect are the people of Manitoba better able to say whether or not a railway company shall be chartered than are the people of the North-west Territories who are separated from them only by an imaginary line ? I see no force in any suggestion that in respect of powers of that kind the people of the North-west Territories should not be placed on exactly the same plane as the people of eastern Canada.

The people of the North-west Territories contend, and it seems to me they fairly contend, that upon the conceding of a provincial status they should be given control of their lands and minerals. Objections have been raised to this ; I shall refer to one of them. The Premier of the North-west Territories touched upon this subject in his speech to which I have already referred and before concluding I shall trouble the House with a quotation from his remarks. I believe the argument against granting to the people of the North-west Territories the right to control their own lands is based on the theory that Canada as a whole and not the people of the North-west Teritories are en-

titled to a proprietary interest in those lands, and that, therefore those lands should be reserved for the people of Canada, including the eastern provinces, and should not be committed to the people of the North-west Territories to be administered by them. I have already considered the wisdom or unwisdom of conceding this power to the people of the North-west Territories so far as the likelihood of their making an unwise use of that power is concerned and I shall not repeat my argument as to that; but I say that the arguments used to-day in Canada with regard to lands in the North-west Territories are precisely the arguments used by English statesmen of forty or fifty years ago with regard to the public lands of Canada as a whole, and of the colonies generally. I had occasion to look carefully into this question some two or three years ago and I went into it somewhat fully in an address which I delivered in the town of Lindsay in this province. I pointed out on that occasion, what I believe to be the fact, that if the policy of certain British statesmen had been persevered in, and if the lands of Canada and of the other colonies had been administered from Downing Street instead of by the colonies, such friction and dissatisfaction would have been created that it is more than probable that Canada and some of the other colonies would before this have severed their connection with the mother country, I see no reason why the views which prevailed eventually and which reseulted in giving to Canada the absolute control of her own public lands are not just as forcible arguments to-day in the mouths of the people of the North-west Territories. I have under my hand in the speech of Mr. Haultain, the arguments of British statesmen of days gone by. Let me refer to one or two of them and you will see that they are exactly in line with the views of those who hold that the public lands in the North-west Territories should be retained by Canada. Lord Durham in his report said:

> The country which has founded and maintained these colonies at a vast expenditure of blood and treasure may justly expect its compensation in turning their unappropriated resources to the account of its own redundant population; they are the rightful patrimony of the English people, the ample appanage, which God and nature have set aside in the new world, for those whose lot has assigned them an insufficient portion in the old. . . . . Under wise and free institutions these great advantages may yet be secured to Your Majesty's subjects, and a connection, secured by the link of kindred origin and mutual benefits, may continue to bind to the British empire the ample territories of its North American provinces, and the large and flourishing population by which they will assuredly be filled.

Then Lord Grey, later on, used the following language:

> The waste lands of the vast colonial possessions of the British empire are held by the Crown, as trustee for the inhabitants of that empire at large, and not for the inhabitants of the particular province, divided by arbitrary geographical limits, in which any such waste land happens to be situate. Otherwise the consequence would follow that the other inhabitants of these vast provinces (if possessing these representative institutions which arise as of right in ordinary British colonies) are indefeasibly entitled to administer all the lands and land revenue of the great unexplored tract called a province and of which they may occupy an extremity, wholly without regard to the nation which has founded the settlement, perhaps at great expense, in order to serve as a home for her own emigrants and a market for her own industry.

Mr. Haultain also referred to a very valuable work, which is in the library here, the work of Mr. Egerton. He quoted from Mr. Egerton as follows:

> It was, however, when it became necessary to translate these admirable theories into practice that the real difficulties began. In the case of Canada these difficulties proved insurmountable.

And later on Mr. Egerton says:

> We have already seen that all English statesmen started with the firm intention to control the Crown lands in the hands of the mother country, but the practical difficulties in the way proved insurmountable.

Mr. Haultain, in his speech, referred to the policy of the mother country in later years and particularly to what was done when a constitution was given to the colony of West Australia in 1890. The policy of the British government in later years, where representative institutions have been conferred on a colony, is to give to the colony absolute control of its own lands and not to seek to administer those lands from London. The same policy was pursued by those who prepared the Canadian Confederation Act. The provinces were given the control of their own public lands in almost every respect. The province of Nova Scotia has control of its Crown lands and of its mines and minerals. The same rule prevails in Quebec, Ontario, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. In the province of Manitoba the lands are still administered, I believe, by the Dominion, but some compensation was made to that province when it received a constitution and I believe that since the erection of the province—although my friend from Manitoba will know this better than I do—the swamp lands have been entrusted to the administration of the province and I am under the impression, although am not sure, that any revenue derived from the administration of these swamp lands belongs to the province. I am correct in that, am I not?

Mr. McCREARY. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any more reason why a man in the North-west Territories who desires to apply for a grant of land, should have to deal with the government at Ottawa than a citizen of the

province of Nova Scotia should be required to come to Ottawa when he desires to make an application for a mining lease ? Is there any reason why matters of this kind should not be under the control of the local government ? Has any danger or any injury accrued to the public interest in the province of Ontario, in the province of Quebec, or in the maritime provinces on account of the powers of self-government which have been granted to those provinces in this respect ? The North-west Territories are not the only part of Canada containing great areas of surplus lands that may be filled with an enormous population in the future.

I am told by a gentleman holding a high position in the public affairs of the province of Quebec that in that great province there are 75,000,000 of acres of the best land in the world, which will be settled and will support an enormous population one day. The province of Quebec administers these lands. Immigration from foreign countries promoted by this government may come to settle on these lands. And yet, while the lands are controlled absolutely by the province of Quebec under their own local powers of self-government, the lands of the North-west Territories are controlled by this government through the Department of the Interior. We have heard a great deal lately of New Ontario, and no one can doubt that there is a splendid country in Ontario that will be filled up with a fine population one of these days, or that immigration will be brought from foreign countries to new Ontario. The lands of that country are administered by the people of Ontario through their local government, while, in contrast with that, the people of the North-west Territories have their lands administered at Ottawa by this government, through the Department of the Interior.

Mr. SCOTT. And the same with Manitoba.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think I stated that, except that I pointed out, as Mr. Haultain has pointed out, that the people of Manitoba received a certain compensation, I believe for their lands at the time the province was constituted. Further than that, a portion of the lands at least have been handed over to the control of the province since it was organized. And, so far as the province of Manitoba is concerned, I know of no good reason why any lands that remain to be administered in that province should not be administered by the local government instead of by this government. If the principle is good for the North-west Territories, I admit it is also good for the province of Manitoba. In matters of this kind, I do not think we should shrink from going the full length. If the people of Ontario, of Quebec and of the maritime provinces can properly administer their lands through their own local government, I say the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories are just as capable of administering their lands through their own local government, and they can better administer them than can this central government at Ottawa. Now, Mr. Haultain refers to some difficulties that might be suggested, with regard to immigration. I suppose he refers to homestead entries and matters of that kind. These questions would have to be dealt with between this government and the government of the territories. I believe that reasonable provisions could be made with the people of the North-west Territories which would ensure to the people of the country as a whole that there would be no restriction of immigration by reason of any dealing by the North-west Territories, with their own lands. The people of the North-west Territories are more interested than any one else in Canada in having these lands taken up and occupied, in having the country settled, and in the prosperity that would follow a great flood of immigration into that country. So far as that question is concerned, it has been suggested by Mr. Haultain, I believe, that it would not be incapable of solution, and that it could be settled satisfactorily not only to the people as a whole, but to the people of the North-west Territories.

I think I have dealt, though very briefly, with the principal objections which have been pointed out in the correspondence and in the speeches of the right hon. the Prime Minister and the Minister of the Interior in dealing with this question. I say in conclusion that, the people of the North-west Territories are practically unanimous on this question, that their government is urgent on this question, and as the matter has had the consideration of this government for at least two years and a half, there seems no good reason why active steps should not be taken for the purpose of giving to these people the rights of local self-government to which they are, I believe, justly entitled. I apprehend no injury, no danger, to the people of this country from taking that course. On the other hand, I believe the adoption of that course will tend to remove and obviate friction and dissatisfaction among these people which, however, will prevail and continue if we longer withhold from them those complete rights which the people of the eastern provinces enjoy, and which the people of the west, I believe, could exercise just as prudently and as well as the people of any province in Canada. Therefore, I move :

That all the words after the word 'That' in the proposed motion be left out and the following substituted therefor :—

'By humble addresses of the legislative assembly of the North-west Territories of Canada to His Excellency the Governor General, in the year 1900 and again in the year 1903, the said legislative assembly did humbly represent and pray (inter alia) to His Excellency as follows :—

'14. Therefore, be it resolved, that an humble address to His Excellency the Governor

General be adopted by this House praying him that he will be pleased to cause the fullest inquiry to be made into the position of the territories, financial and otherwise, and to cause such action to be taken as will provide for their present and immediate welfare and good government, as well as the due fulfilment of the duties and obligations of government and legislation assumed, with respect to these territories, by the parliament of Canada.

'15. And be it further resolved, that, whereas by the British North America Act, 1871, it was (amongst other things) enacted that the parliament of Canada may from time to time establish new provinces in any territories forming for the time being part of the Dominion of Canada, but not included in any province thereof, and may, at the time of such establishment, make provision for the constitution and administration of . . . . such province, His Excellency be also prayed to order inquiries to be made and accounts taken with a view to the settlement of the terms and conditions upon which the territories or any part thereof shall be established as a province, and that before any such province is established opportunity should be given to the people of the territories through their accredited representatives of considering and discussing such terms and conditions.'

That under the provision of the British North America Act and amending Acts the people of the several provinces of Canada enjoy large powers of local self-government committed to and exercised by the executive and the legislature of each province.

That the time has arrived when the same powers of local self-government should be granted to the people of the North-west Territories of Canada and to this end the said representations and prayer contained in the said humble addresses should be taken into immediate consideration and acted upon forthwith.

I know that there are many matters of detail which will have to be dealt with when this question comes to be considered. These matters of detail will have to be arranged by conference between representatives of this government and representatives of the people of the North-west Territories. For the present, the proposition which I desire to place before the House and the country is this—that the time has arrived when the same power of local self-government should be granted to the people of the North-west Territories as that enjoyed by the people of the older provinces of Canada, and that this government, in compliance with the prayer of the legislature of the North-west Territories twice repeated, should take immediately, without any further delay whatever, such steps as may be necessary to accomplish that purpose, which I believe, to be not only a wise but a just one.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). The North-west Territories are certainly to be congratulated on having received so much recognition from the leader of the opposition on this occasion, and from his followers. The people of the west will no doubt with great satisfaction hear of the interest he has taken and of the arguments he has made in their behalf. As one of the representatives of the territories in parliament, I can assure the House that it is with great pleasure and satisfaction I heard him take the stand he has taken to-night. I hope he is not alone, and that the gentlemen who sit behind him take as great a degree of interest as he has taken on this occasion. It has struck me however, and I think it will strike the people of the territories as well, that possibly there would have been a more definite and satisfactory result from the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite had the leader of the opposition spoken sooner. This is not a new question ; as he has intimated.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would my hon. friend permit me to make a statement in regard to that ? It was not until after we began the debate on the Transcontinental Railway Bill that the papers to which I have been referring to-night were printed, and since that debate has concluded I have spent a good deal of time in endeavouring to get this correspondence brought down, and now we have it in a very confused shape. But I can assure my hon. friend that it was only for that reason I had delayed until now in speaking on this matter. My hon. friend will do me the justice, I am sure, to remember that I brought the matter to the attention of the government in speaking in the debate on the address at the commencement of the session.

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly I do not wish to do the leader of the opposition any injustice under the circumstances, and I was not alluding to that particular feature of the case. I was about to say that the question is even older than he suggested in his opening remarks. It is not a question which arose in 1896, or in 1897, or in 1900. Having been a member of the North-west Assembly myself, I am perhaps more familiar with the matter than he is, and I can assure him that the question is of much more ancient date ; that it has been claiming the attention of the people of the territories for many years, and that the position has remained substantially the same all these years. That is to say, there has been a demand, either for terms which would go with provincial organization, or equally good terms without provincial organization. For the people of the North-west Territories the question has been one of finance and not of authority ; it has been a material question and not a theoretical question. The question in 1896, in 1897, and in 1900, was with them how to best govern the territories, how to meet the financial requirements of that government, and how best to bring to the notice and favourable attention of this government the requirements of that country. The financial needs of the territories are the same to-day as they have always been, except that they are greater to-day than they have ever been. Although my hon. friend has said that he did not have in his possession the particular correspondence that has been

laid upon the Table, and upon which he made such lengthy remarks this evening, still, as a member of this House since 1896, he must have known that there was a continual conflict of opinion between the government of the territories and the government here as to the amount of money that should be placed at the disposal of that government by this government. If he had been as enthusiastic ever since 1896 as he has expressed himself to-night, the people of the territories would have benefited thereby in the years which have intervened, and would have benefited substantially even this year. It is no secret that the opposition have a great deal to do with shaping the policy of the government, and that the government, in considering the demands of the territories from time to time, have had to consider the possibility of opposition from the opposition. It has been the somewhat thankless place of members of this House from the territories supporting the government, to bring before the attention of the House and of the country, year after year, the financial requirements of the territories. I do not recall that up to the present moment we have received any assistance from the leader of the opposition or from his supporters on the other side of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think my hon. friend is mistaken in that.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, I am willing to be corrected, but I do not remember anything of that kind at this moment. I may say that this is a subject that has taken my attention very strongly from year to year, and while I would not wish at all to question the statement, still, as I said, it does not come to my memory that we ever did receive any assistance. I would like to say that had that interest been taken by the members of the opposition in the early part of the session that was taken later on and to-night, the territories would no doubt have gained a very considerable financial benefit and would have been still better able to meet the requirements that they are called upon to meet. The point I wish to make is that the people of the territories want money and not talk. That is the question at issue, and the closer we keep to it the better will be the understanding, and the better the results that we will have. While I do not wish to go into anything very controversial at this particular time, I will take the opportunity of pointing out that a proposition which involves the placing before the people of the North-west Territories of the idea that they have been very badly used both financially and otherwise, that their premier, in fact, has been insulted by this government, and yet that does not offer in any degree or in any way any substantial suggestion for immediate or future relief, is not a proposition that is likely to meet with very much favour at their hands. Had it been intended to actually benefit the people of the North-west and had the address which we have listened to to-night contained propositions definitely tending to result in financial benefit to the territories, we could appreciate the action taken, but when action has not been taken until the last days of a session which already has lasted over seven months——

An hon. MEMBERS. How do you know they are the last days of the session ?

Mr. OLIVER. We hope they are. When action has not been taken until the last days of a session which has already lasted over seven months, and when brought forward no practical suggestion for meeting the present difficulty is contained in it, there is only one conclusion to be drawn, and that is that the remarks of the hon. gentleman are chiefly made to be added to the tons of printed matter already lying franked in stacks outside and inside of this building for distribution throughout the territories. Talk is cheap, but it is money that counts.

We are more than pleased to hear the expression of confidence by the hon. leader of the opposition in the intelligence and honesty of the people of the North-west Territories. I was not aware that they needed any particular certificate in that regard, but at any rate, we are pleased to have it from such a good authority. We believe that all his kind words are fully deserved, although the modesty of the people of the North-west Territories and of their representatives would prevent them claiming any special advantage in that regard. The hon. gentleman has been very willing to concede to us the control of the public lands in the territories, and of the public resources of the territories, and he has been willing to concede us the right to incur debt on our own behalf. As he said, I do not know why the people of the North-west Territories are not just as able to control their own land satisfactorily and just as worthy of being allowed to contract debt for public purposes as the people of any other part of the country. But, that is not the point. The point is this : What subsidy is to be given to the people of the North-west Territories as the basis of their provincial organization, so that they will not need to sell their public lands and so that they will not need to go in debt ? The hon. gentleman was very generous with us in permitting us to do as we like with our own. What we want to know is what share he is going to give us in the general financial arrangements of the Dominion. That is a matter which he proposed to leave to a commission or to arbitration. That is not the way in which the Premier of the North-west Territories left it. He made certain definite financial propositions. He said : Give us these as the essential part of provincial organization. But, the hon. leader of the opposition does not say that he will give them these. He says : We will leave it to a committee or to a commission. As a representa-

tive of the North-west Territories, and believing that the proposition made by the Premier would be a good proposition for the territories if acceded to, we want to know what the hon. leader of the opposition and his followers on the floor of parliament are prepared to give towards meeting the demands of the Premier of the North-west Territories. That is a definite proposition. It is not something that is in the clouds. It is not misty. Upon the acceptance of that proposition depends the whole question. Provincial autonomy is only a name, but the amount of subsidy which the proposed province will receive is an important fact, and that is the point we want settled or approximately settled before we go into a provincial organization.

Mr. CLANCY. By whom ?

Mr. OLIVER. By the Dominion government, and we want to know when we get offers of help from our hon. friends opposite what those offers of help mean. We want to know the measure of their sympathy in dollars and not in words.

Mr. POPE. You are ingenious but not clever.

Mr. OLIVER. I may return the compliment. It is of no advantage to the people of the territories that they should be permitted to sell the lands of the territories. If they sell the lands, settlement is thereby deterred ; if they do not sell them, they derive no revenue from them, and in so far as that is concerned, they might as well be administered by the Dominion government as by themselves. It is, I may say, a rather cool proposition that political credit should be claimed for an offer to permit the North-west Territories to control their own lands, when such a large portion of those lands have already passed out of the control of either government, and when the balance of these lands are not being sold and no revenue is being derived from them by the government which has them in hand.

The proposition, as it has been laid down, simply amounts to this : We will give you provincial autonomy ; we will give you the lands that at present are not being sold, and that the general good of the country requires shall not be sold ; we will allow you to go into debt to any extent you like; but we will not say what we will give you to run your government on; we will keep away from that subject altogether. It seems to me most unfair that an attempt should be made to create a feeling of dissatisfaction in the North-west Territories, without any steps whatever being taken to allay the dissatisfaction thus created, without saying in any shape or form, how far the desires of the people of the North-west in regard to financial assistance are to be acceded to. Just what these desires are it may be well to inform the House, and perhaps some gentleman on the other side will be able to tell us how far they will go towards acceding to these desires. I may point out that in the printed papers that have been placed before the House the financial question is the essential point in every one of the arguments of Premier Haultain and of his government. In his memorial of April 4th, 1903, the complaint is :

> That no sufficient response has been given to the repeated demands for financial assistance necessary for the proper and effective administration of the territories.

In the memorial which follows the complaint is that there are not sufficient additions to the annual grant. In Mr. Haultain's letter to the Prime Minister he draws particular attention—

> To the necessities, financial and otherwise, of the territories.

And all through the correspondence the great question is the financial question, the question of the amount of money that is to be derived by the territories from the national treasury as a condition of entering into the provincial status. It has been said that the people of the North-west Territories are unanimously in favour of this provincial organization. I believe they are unanimously in favour of it if they can get it on the terms proposed, but I am just as certain that they are just as unanimously against it unless they get it on these terms, or on some similar terms. I am perfectly satisfied that they are unanimously against it if they are only to get it on the same terms as it has been granted to the other provinces of the Dominion, and I will take the liberty of reading from the definite proposition made by Mr. Haultain in support of my statement. He submitted a draft Bill for the establishment of the territories as a province, and in that Bill he suggested the measure of subsidies which the territories should receive :

> The following amounts shall be allowed and paid by Canada by half yearly payments in advance as an annual subsidy to the province, that is to say :—
>
> (a.) For the support of the government and legislature, fifty thousand dollars.
>
> (b.) On an estimated population of two hundred and fifty thousand at eighty cents per head, two hundred thousand dollars, subject to be increased, as hereinafter mentioned, that is to say :—A census of the province shall be taken in every fifth year reckoning from the general decennial census of one thonsand nine hundred and one and an approximate estimate of the population shall be made at equal intervals of time between such quinquennial census and such decennial census, and whenever the population by any such census or estimate exceeds two hundred and fifty thousand, which shall be the minimum on which the said allowance shall be calculated, the amount of the said allowance shall be increased in accordance therewith until the population reaches one million three hundred and ninety six thousand and ninety-one, after which there shall be no further increase.

The words 'one million' are not contained on that page, but a telegram on a subsequent page states they should be inserted. The next demand is in the following terms:

The province shall be entitled to be paid and to receive from the government of Canada by half yearly payments in advance, interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum, on the excess over the sum of of a sum to be ascertained by multiplying the population of the province by 32·46, and for the purpose of this section the population of the province shall until after the next decennial census be deemed to be two hundred and fifty thousand: provided that immediately after the census of there shall be a readjustment under this section on the basis of the population as ascertained by such census.

Now, the proposition which the Premier of the territories asks this parliament to agree to, and to which inferentially the leader of the opposition has asked parliament to agree—but which he has been very careful not to definitely ask anybody to agree to—is that there shall be a continual readjustment of the per capita grant and of the debt account on the basis of the continually increasing population. I am here to say that no other arrangement can or would be satisfactory. No arrangement would be satisfactory that would not provide for an increase in the per capita grant and in the debt allowance according to increase of population. It is a play upon words, or it is a misuse of words to call an arrangement entered into under those conditions, acquiring the rights of the other provinces of Canada. It is acquiring rights which the other provinces do not possess. I will be very glad if the other provinces will agree to it, but I, as a representative of the North-west Territories, do not propose to go into a sort of blind pool, not knowing how we are going to come out when a conclusion has been reached on this very momentous question. As the members of the House know, in the case of the other provinces the per capita grant is paid on the actual or estimated population at the date of confederation, and that population is not continually increased.

Mr. SCOTT. The other provinces are going to ask for that to be changed.

Mr. OLIVER. Possibly so, but I am speaking of the condition as it exists. I am not finding fault with the proposition of Premier Haultain, but what I am finding fault with is that when the words 'provincial organization' or 'provincial autonomy' are used, the inference should be given out that we are asking for the same terms that the provinces now have. We are not asking for these terms; we would not accept these terms; we could not afford to accept these terms; we must get different terms, and the question is: Will the opposition, which is in such generous mood, accept those terms. The leader of the opposition had this document before him, and he was careful not to say that he would accept these terms. He was careful to convey the idea that this question was a mere matter of detail, and that it could be arranged by a committee. I want to say that it is not a matter of detail. I say that it is an essential question, and that upon this question hinges the willingness of the people to enter into the status of a province, or to remain outside of that status. I was somewhat astonished to hear the hon. member (Mr. Borden, Halifax) indicate that the question as to whether there should be one province or two was a mere question of detail. The question of the number of provinces, and the question of the subsidies which these provinces shall receive are the essential questions; other questions are matters of detail.

The question whether the territories, as they are at present, have all the powers which a province has, is a question of detail; because, if they have not those powers, they can be given to them in their present condition as well as they could if they were a province. The hon. leader of the opposition questioned the previous statement of the Premier, that the only important right belonging to a province which the territories did not hold was the right to incur debt. That statement stands, and stands correct in all essential particulars. If the territories lack any other power than that, it can be given to them without provincial organization; and provincial organization, with the power to incur debt, rests, not upon a legislative enactment in itself, but upon a fixed subsidy being granted. Until there is a fixed subsidy, the province, if the territories were created or called a province to-morrow, could not incur debt. Though this parliament were to pass a thousand Acts allowing it to incur debt, its credit would not be good until it had a fixed subsidy. Therefore, the question of incurring debt depends entirely upon the terms upon which the subsidy for the province to be created is granted. Given a permanent, fixed subsidy, the province or the territories, if you like to call them such, could incur debt, because their credit would be good.

I have said that the difference between the powers of the territories as they exist and the powers of a province are not important. They are not of chief importance. The chief purpose of a local government is to attend to local interests, of which the greater are the needs of education, the taking care of municipal legislation and the providing of the smaller public works. If these needs are attended to, it matters not whether it is under the name of a province or a territory. The needs and requirements of the people are met; and if they are fully met the people are better satisfied than they would be with an empty offer to allow them to sell their public lands

and to incur debt on their own account, which, as far as the proposition has been laid before us, might have to be met by local taxation.

I will just draw attention again to the difference in the status of the provinces and the status of the territories in the matter of subsidy, which, as I said before, is the main matter. The total subsidy per head amounts, in Ontario, to 66⅔ cents, in Quebec to 66 cents, in Nova Scotia to 94¼ cents, in New Brunswick to $1.40, in British Columbia to $1.72, in Manitoba to $2.08½, in Prince Edward Island to $2.05½, and in the North-west Territories, on the grant of this year, to $4.47⅝. Now, unless our hon. friends are prepared to give us some definite assurance that we are not going to be placed in an inferior position financially to that which we occupy at the present time, I certainly cannot say that we are in favour of provincial autonomy, especially when it is held out to us that provincial autonomy means giving us provincial organization on the same footing as the provinces. We do not want it on those terms; we cannot afford to take it on those terms.

There has been put up the argument that the territories should have control of their public lands and of their own resources in all ways, in order that they might be able to aid railways. I do not know just where this idea emanated from at present; but I take the liberty of calling the attention of the House to the fact that as a result of the proceedings of this session, as far as it has gone, the North-west is not doing badly in the matter of aid to railways. It stands at present to benefit by the credit of the country at large to the extent of some $9,000,000 in regard to the Canadian Northern Railway and some $12,000,000 in regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific. It might be, if the North-west Territories had control of their own lands, they would be required to pledge those lands to give aid to railways. I am in a position to say that it was for the definite purpose of being able to do so in years gone by that the demand was made for control of the lands at a time when there was no railway extension in the territories, when railway extension was very greatly needed, and when the lands of the territories had been given and were being given to aid in the construction of railways not in the territories at all. At that time the territories did demand and require the control of their own lands for the purpose of aiding railways; but to-day, I submit, the position is very considerably different. To-day there are no lands in the territories being sold to speculators; to-day there are no lands in the territories being granted to railways, but railways are being provided in the territories as they never were provided before—liberally and under satisfactory conditions. That reason, then, for the control of lands certainly does not exist.

In regard to the question whether there should be one province or two, I may point out that the Bill which the Premier has submitted provides for only one province. For my own part, considering the territories in their present condition, with their present population, I have no hesitation in declaring myself in favour of only one province. But the comparison which the hon. leader of the opposition has made between the territories and the other parts of the Dominion does not hold. There is no other equal area of the Dominion which offers the same prospect of an early settlement of an immense population as does the territories; and it is fair matter for consideration whether such a large area, if fully populated, might not be better divided into two or more provinces rather than be held as only one. I submit that at this moment, when there is a prospect of the early construction of two lines of railway across the territories, through the most fertile part and the prospect of an early and very large increase of population in that particular part of the country, which has until recent years been almost uninhabited, it is hardly opportune to decide on all questions relating to the manner of a final organization of the territories. I beg to assure hon. gentlemen that the territories are not in the state of excitement in regard to provincial organization which they seem to imagine. They will find that with fair treatment in the matter of subsidy, the people will be satisfied, whatever the politicians may be, or whatever may be those who would desire to exploit the resources of the country if placed in other than the present hands. In regard to the treatment accorded the Premier of the territories by the members of this government, I may say that I have had a long acquaintance with Mr. Haultain, and I am quite satisfied that he is able to protect himself; and from my more brief acquaintance with the members of the present government, I believe they are able to take their own part, and that we can leave that matter to be settled between them. In regard to the people of the North-west Territories, it is a different matter. The questions at issue are questions concerning them and interesting to them, and I am bound to say that the answer to the people of the North-west Territories has been fairly satisfactory. It is contained in the main and supplementary estimates of the present session, totalling something like $1,040,000. This is the answer we wanted; this is the answer for which we asked; this is the answer we received, and I beg to assure the House that, so far as it goes, it is entirely satisfactory, very much more so than would be any possible interchange of civilities that might have gone on between the representatives of the two governments. I might say also, in answer to the question as to the attitude of the representatives of the North-west Territories, that we are here to support and to

advance the interests of the people of the North-west Territories. Speaking for myself—as I am entitled to speak for myself only—I support the government so long as I consider it is supporting the interests of the North-west Territories. In this particular instance I am bound to say that I believe the North-west Territories has this year received a response to its demand and to its requirements which comes nearer being satisfactory than any which it has heretofore received. So far, then, we are entitled to congratulate ourselves upon the results achieved, and I believe the people of the North-west Territories will give due credit both to the government and to their representatives.

Mr. SPROULE. If the people of the west are satisfied with what has been done this year, why does Premier Haultain say that they have never asked for the establishment of a capital account, and refuse to accept the money on that basis ?

Mr. DAVIS. He called a special meeting of the assembly to vote $250,000, and they were in a hurry to vote it ; they did not let the grass grow.

Mr. OLIVER. I am very glad my hon. friend interrupted me on this point, because I had nearly missed it. As I said before, the power which goes with provincial organization is the power of borrowing money. This is the power which the hon. leader of the opposition is most anxious to give to the people of the North-west Territories. It and the power to sell the lands are apparently the only powers he is willing to give the territories. In the memorandum which Mr. Haultain submitted to the government it will be found that one of the grounds of complaint is that we are not permitted to draw on the future. He points out that extensive works are needed, and he complains that under their present status they are not permitted to draw on the future—to borrow money. That is his strong ground in demanding provincial organization, and now, when the government offers to advance and does advance, a matter of $250,000, the opposition want to know why it is done, and say that nobody asked for it and that it will not be spent. Surely, this money is just as useful to the people of the territories when advanced from the Dominion treasury as it would be if borrowed in the outside market. Surely, it is as much use to them and will build as many public works. Besides that, if they had borrowed it in the ordinary market, they would have had to pay interest, but by the present arrangement they are not required to pay interest, and indeed it is not at all certain, as the Minister of Finance pointed out, that they will ever have to account for the principal ; that is a matter which will be settled when a final provincial organization is arrived at.

Mr. HACKETT. Might I ask the hon. gentleman if he supported the resolution for home rule for Ireland ?

Mr. OLIVER. I did not happen to be here when that vote was taken ; I had not arrived in parliament, but if it is of any interest to the hon. member or to the House, I would say that if I had been here I would not have supported it.

Mr. HACKETT. The majority of hon. gentlemen on that side of the House did support it, and I think it is strange that, after supporting that resolution for home rule for Ireland, they should now oppose home rule for the west.

Mr. OLIVER. It does not concern me what the other members of the House did on that occasion or on any other occasion, as possibly members on both sides very well know. However, I do not see what that has to do with the question, and I would wish to point out to the hon. member, and to the gentlemen on both sides, that it is not we who are objecting to provincial autonomy ; we are asking provincial autonomy, but we want it on certain terms. It is hon. gentlemen opposite who are talking provincial autonomy, but are not willing to give it. They will not give the terms that alone make provincial autonomy a practical and reasonable proposition.

Mr. SPROULE. Would it not be a proper thing to settle whether parliament is prepared to give it or not, and then arrange the details ?

Mr. OLIVER. We understand that exactly. That is a view hon. gentlemen opposite take, but that is not the view we take.

Mr. SPROULE. You take the view that it should not be given on any terms.

Mr. OLIVER. Not at all. I said in this House last session, and this session, and I take the liberty of repeating it, that if the House will give the North-west Territories the terms asked for in the draft Bill contained in these papers, I will certainly support it most strongly. We will all support it. These are the terms we want.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not wish to do the hon. gentleman personally any injustice. In making the statement I did, I referred to the government he supports. They are not prepared to give the autonomy on any terms.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not discussing what the government have done. The terms of this draft Bill are what we want. That is what we want the government to do and that is what we want the opposition to say they will do—but they won't ; they are very careful not to. The leader of the opposition spoke for two hours, but was careful to go around this point, and that gives us to understand that he does not mean to con-

cede these terms. We do not expect we can get the terms unless we get some support from the other side of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). You put through the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill without any support from this side.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) must have forgotten that over half his followers did not vote against the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). All who were here did.

Mr. OLIVER. There were a great many who were not here. And the hon. gentleman will remember that it was stated in the debate last Saturday—if I may have the privilege of referring to it—that keeping away from the polls was an evidence of opinion as well as going to the polls. Therefore, we are entitled to claim that those of the hon. gentleman's following who remained away——

Mr. LANCASTER. They were all paired with gentlemen on the other side of the House. Every member of the opposition either voted or was paired.

Mr. OLIVER. I was discussing this question of debt, the condition which has allowed the territories an advance of $250,000. I point out that this is strictly in accordance with the request which has been made by the government of the North-west Territories from time to time, and which was introduced in the resolution before the House. And, in regard to the expenditure of the money, Mr. Haultain says that an advance on capital account is nothing more or less than a loan on which, eventually they would have to pay 5 per cent per annum. Naturally he would like to get out of paying five per cent interest, and I think that having got out of it—that is the government having given a loan without interest—he naturally accepts the money and prepares to spend it—and it will do the territories that amount of good. I refer to this because of the way the matter was alluded to by hon. gentlemen opposite in a recent debate. They seemed to think there was an intention to take advantage of the territories in some way by compelling—or impelling—them to take a loan which they either did not want or did not require. I wish to point out that it was strictly in accordance with the wishes expressed by the North-west government, that it was placing them in the same financial position exactly as if they were a provincial government, except that they were able to borrow money without paying interest, while if the territories had provincial autonomy, they would have to pay interest on borrowed money.

I repeat that what the territories want at the present time is adequate financial assistance with which to conduct their schools construct their public works, and generally care for the interests of government which have been entrusted to their care. We are glad of any assistance that we receive from hon. members of the opposition in pressing these interests upon the government. We hope that the coolness with which the opposition have viewed these matters in the past has given place now and for the future to deep interest, and that, therefore, we shall be able to depend upon the members of the opposition to aid us in impressing upon the government the needs of the North-west Territories in their present or future condition. But if our hon. friends expect to make political capital with the people of the North-west Territories, or with the people outside of the North-west Territories, by telling us they are in favour of provincial autonomy, but without providing means for carrying on that organization, I am afraid they will make a mistake.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). As the hour is late, I do not intend to take up much time in discussing this question. The leader of the opposition, in the long speech he delivered and the resolution he read, asked this House to vote in favour of granting provincial autonomy to the territories. It seems to me that in doing so he should have put some facts before us on which we could vote intelligently. As far as I could understand his speech, he seemed simply to be reading statements from the letters Mr. Haultain had written to the government, and part of the replies. As representing a constituency in the North-west Territories I have always been opposed to the proposition of Premier Haultain. In this connection, I may say that Premier Haultain in one of his letters said that the members here do not know the public opinion in the territories. I say I know as much about public opinion in the territories as Premier Haultain does, and I say a majority of people are opposed to this scheme, and for good and substantial reasons, as I can show. The leader of the opposition should have informed himself as to the revenue the people of the North-west Territories at this stage of the proceedings would be entitled to draw from the federal treasury, and show why it would be better for us to have autonomy. The hon. gentleman quoted a great deal from this sessional paper, No. 116, and in one case, I notice, he read only half a paragraph, and left the other half which did not suit his purpose. Mr. Haultain has made certain demands upon this country. My hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) has said he laid before the House a full statement of what he wants. I have taken the liberty of boiling down the demands, and I think I can give in brief just what Mr. Haultain asks this House to give him, if we are prepared to give provincial autonomy. He wants first, all the public lands. The leader of the opposition said he was prepared to support that part of the proposition. I am glad to see that he has approached the matter in

that spirit. We in the west would like to see the lands given to the government of the North-west Territories provided that government made a proper use of them, and did not undertake to shut off settlement. He wants to grant payment for all the lands that were given as bonuses to railway companies in years gone by. But hon. gentlemen opposite, when they were running the governmental machine, gave away a great many millions of acres of land in the North-west Territories, and I am sorry to say that they were not at all times given for the purpose of subsidizing railways in the North-west Territories, but most of them were given to subsidize railways in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. McCREARY. I suppose Manitoba would also be entitled to the same payment for all her lands given away ?

Mr. DAVIS. I fancy so. Mr. Haultain asked for the payment of lands given as bonuses to build railways. Now, the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) who is leading the opposition, would probably inform us whether he is prepared to pay us at a reasonable rate for the 50,000,000 acres of land he and his friends gave away in the North-west Territories to subsidize railways. At a reasonable price per acre, say $3, it would amount to something like $150,000,000. Well, we will accept it, we would like to get it, because it would put us on a good footing, a little better footing than the province of Ontario. Now, he goes on further, and if the leader of the opposition had read that portion at the bottom instead of reading only one portion of the document, he would have found that Mr. Haultain wants compensation for all the lands that are given as homesteads in the North-west Territories; in other words, he wants the federal government to spend a certain amount of money to put the people into the territories, and then the North-west government would like to be compensated for those lands given to those people as homesteads. Whether that is a reasonable demand to make, I will leave to the judgment of the leader of the opposition who seems to be quite friendly to Mr. Haultain, and who wants to have this thing carried out. Another thing which will interest my hon. friend from Grey, I know—because he is one of the old guard and sat in this House when that monstrous piece of legislation was put through which foisted a monopoly on the people of the west in the way of exemptions from taxation on the Canadian Pacific Railway roadbed, and all its stations for ever and lands for twenty years—he will be happy to know that Mr. Haultain asks that legislation be now passed to have that removed, so that the people of the North-west Territories, in forming a province, will not labour under the disability of having this road exempted from taxation. I do not know what it will cost the people of Canada. I leave the leader of the opposition to figure that out. But I would like to see him get the Canadian Pacific Railway to give up the privilege which was given them by his friends twenty years ago, the privilege of exemption from taxation on lands for twenty years, as we always supposed, but as it now turns out to be, for forty years, exempting them from taxation on their roadbed, rolling stock and everything else for ever.

Mr. McCREARY. That will apply to Manitoba also.

Mr. DAVIS. I suppose so. Now, the leader of the opposition has figured out that the population of the North-west Territories at the present time is something like 375,000. He goes Mr. Haultain one better.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not say 375,000.

Mr. DAVIS. I took down his figures. He said there was 158,000 in round numbers, according to the census, and that 170 odd thousand appear to have gone into the territories since then.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That makes 330,000.

Mr. DAVIS. Well, he has gone the Premier of the North-west Territories one better. I think the hon. gentleman will agree that the Premier of the North-west Territories is not unduly modest in his demands, and if he thought he was entitled to it he would ask for it. He said that the population was 250,000, and he wants a grant of eighty cents per head to start with. He wants to draw eighty cents per head until the population reaches 1,396,091. Now, with reference to the debt account. The present population on which that debt account is to be based is 250,000. Now, he is more modest in that respect than the leader of the opposition.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the date of that ?

Mr. DAVIS. You took it out of your own return you have been reading from.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the date to which the hon. gentleman refers ?

Mr. DAVIS. I am talking about this return brought down here.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am asking the date of that document.

Mr. DAVIS. It is in the Bill, it is 1901. I must say that if the leader of the opposition were consulting the Premier of the North-west Territories now he would be prepared to ask for $600,000, and I would not blame him at all. I am just taking what is in that Bill, the draft of the Bill that was presented to this House, and that is what he expects if you give him provincial autonomy. Now, we will take the figures of the leader of the opposition, 330,000. He wants the debt account based on 330,000,

and a revision every five years—which is a perfectly legitimate thing, and I think he is entitled to it. But I want to point out now to the leader of the opposition—I think it was three years ago that Mr. Haultain started this agitation for provincial autonomy—I want to point out to the leader of the opposition at this stage that every man, woman and child that goes into the North-west Territories is worth to us, on capital account, $33, or close to it. Mr. Haultain puts it at $32.40. Now, taking the statement made by the leader of the opposition that 170,000 people have gone in there since the census was taken—I think Mr. Haultain started his agitation before the census was taken—I think the leader of the opposition will see that by not having provincial autonomy we have added to our capital account something in the neighbourhood of between five and six million dollars, taking his own figures as to the population. Now he wants the census taken every five years—I do not know whether the leader of the opposition and the gentlemen supporting him would agree to that. I think it would be a good thing, but I do not know what hon. gentlemen opposite would say to it.

Now the leader of the opposition is more generous than the Premier of the North-west Territories, who asked for ten members in this House to start with. The leader of the opposition, in addressing the House to-night, said that they were entitled to twelve. But when there was a proposition before this House to grant ten members to the North-west Territories, I did not see that the leader of the opposition exercised any haste in getting on to his feet and advocating twelve members. He was a member of the Redistribution Committee, and I never heard that he asked for twelve members. But to-night, at the end of the session, when we are getting ready to return home, and when the idea is abroad that possibly there may be an election in the near future, and possibly with the idea of gaining a little kudos out in the west on account of this thing, he tells us that the territories ought to have twelve members. Well, why did not the leader of the opposition take that stand when there was a proposition before this House to give them ten members? I am positive that if the leader of the opposition had got up and said that we ought to have twelve members, the government would have granted us twelve. But after the Bill has passed, after it has practically become law, it is rather late for the leader of the opposition to advocate giving us twelve members.

Mr. BROCK. Are you speaking for the government just now?

Mr. DAVIS. I am speaking for myself. Now, the Prime Minister of the North-west Territories made the statement that we should have only one province and that the legislative assembly of the Territories should have the power to locate the capital. I think perhaps there might be some milk in that cocoanut, there must be some reason why the Premier of the North-west Territories is so anxious to have provincial autonomy. I want to say to the leader of the opposition that if he had gone out into my part of the country last year—and his own political friends up there felt sore that he did not go and see them—he would have found a fine country up there, a lot of fine people, and have heard from those people that they were not very anxious for political autonomy at the present time. I would like to call the attention of the leader of the opposition to what one of the leading papers in Saskatchewan says about it, to let him see what the people up there think about provincial autonomy. This is the Alberta 'Advocate' of October 5th—not very long ago. It is a Liberal paper.

> It is a God-send for the country in general at the present time that provincial autonomy has been withheld.

That goes to show that the people in that part of the country are not thirsting very much for provincial autonomy. I would be very glad if the hon. leader of the opposition and the gentlemen supporting him in this House were prepared to grant all these terms, to pay for the lands that had been given away to railways, to pay for the homestead lands that have been taken and to give all that Mr. Haultain is asking for. But I do not think there is any use of getting up and making the statement that we should have provincial autonomy without going into the question and letting us know what the hon. gentleman is prepared to do. He has brought this proposition before the House, and if he is in favour of accepting Mr. Haultain's demand in its entirety we would be happy to support it. I am sure that every member of the House who represents the territories would support it.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman said a moment ago that it was an excessive demand.

Mr. DAVIS. No, I did not say anything of the kind. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) is just getting wakened up. I have taken the trouble, Mr. Speaker, to make some comparisons and to see what, under the proposition laid down by Mr. Haultain, we would be fairly entitled to if the North-west Territories were to become a province. We do not know exactly what we should get. I have a statement here, first, of what we would get if we were organized into a province, and, second, of what we do get under the present arrangement, which is as follows:

Provincial Basis.

For government	$ 50,000
Eighty cents a head on 250,000 people	200,000
Debt acount, 250,000 people at $33 a head $8.250,000 at 5 per cent	412,000
In lieu of public lands	300,000
Total	$ 962,000

Territorial Basis.

Grant from Dominion government this year	$ 457,979
To pay off debt	250,000
Additional grant made	250,000
To pay for two bridges	84,000
Total	1,041,979
Advance on capital account	250,000

So that, taking the statement that I have made, we would be entitled, if we had provincial autonomy, to receive from the Dominion government $969,000 a year, while we are drawing at the present time over a million dollars, showing that we are fairly well-off at the present time. There was a time in the history of the North-west Territories, as my hon. friend from Alberta has pointed out when we were not so well-off, and when we did not get as much as we were entitled to for the purpose of building roads and bridges. Yet the hon. leader of the opposition talks about what Mr. Haultain did a couple of years ago, when serious storms swept away the bridges. Mr. Haultain went around to the people and told them that he had no money, but that if they had provincial autonomy they could have the bridges rebuilt. If the people of the North-west are in a position to get $250,000, and $250,000 more without being called upon to pay interest on capital account, they are in a better position than if they had to pay interest on that money. Another advantage of the present position of the North-west Territories is that they have not to maintain the extravagant form of government which is kept up in all the other provinces. I would like to call the attention of the House to some of the services that we would have to maintain ourselves if the territories were put upon a provincial basis that are now performed by the Dominion government. There is, in the first place, the police force. If the North-west Territories were formed into a province, I suppose the hon. leader opposite would admit that the province would have to pay for the maintenance of the police force. The mounted police is paid for at the present time out of the federal treasury and it performs police duty in the territories. The territories would have to assume this expense. I do not know what the force costs, but I am satisfied that for the territories that Mr. Haultain proposes to bring in Assiniboia, Saskatchewan, Alberta and a portion of Athabasca, it would not cost less than $200,000 a year. The registry offices are self-supporting, so that it is not necessary to say anything about them. But, in addition to the mounted police, they would have to pay for the administration of justice, and for the maintenance of asylums. Any money that is paid out for these institutions now is paid by the federal government. Then, there are the public works that are constructed by the Dominion government, such as the building of court houses, and the only way in which the money could be obtained for these works would be by borrowing it, and reducing our revenue every year by having to pay interest on that amount of money. We would have the increased cost of the provincial system of government, because we would have a lot of the paraphernalia that we do not have at the present time. Then, there would be more officials. If all these services were paid for out of the revenue of the territories, you would find that the people there would have a grievance. In my part of the country I do not see that many persons are thirsting for this change. I think the trouble lies more with the politicians than with the people. If you give us enough money so that we can build our bridges and maintain our roads that is all we want, and we will not trouble you for the present. I am glad to know that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are prepared to vote whatever we want from time to time, but I do not think the people of the North-west will trouble them very much about provincial autonomy, so long as they do that. The hon. gentleman also alluded to railway subsidies. The government is guaranteeing bonds to an amount of something like $20,000,000 for the construction of railways in the North-west Territories, but if Mr. Haultain had been allowed to carry out his propaganda two or three years ago, we would have been obliged to mortgage the resources of the territories for this work. Gentlemen from the province of Manitoba will tell you that they have no debt, but if hon. gentlemen opposite will look at the Year-book, they will find that Manitoba has a debt of $16,664,647, charged up against it. The people of the North-west Territories have no debt at all, because the railways are subsidized by the federal government, and if they get enough money to carry on the business of the country it is not very likely that they will be thirsting to change their system of government. I have a statement here of the subsidy per head of the different provinces in the Dominion and also of that of the North-west Territories, which is as follows:

Ontario	61½
Quebec	66
Nova Scotia	94½
British Columbia	1·72
Manitoba	2·05
North-west Territories	4·47

An hon. MEMBER. You are getting too much.

Mr. DAVIS. We are not getting too much, but I think we have been fairly

well treated. I want to point out one feature of the case, and it is this : The hon. leader of the opposition thinks that provincial autonomy is a new proposition in the territories. There was a meeting held in my own town 13 years ago, and a committee was appointed and money collected to agitate for provincial autonomy, but that agitation soon died out. It is, therefore, an old scheme. Four or five years ago, when Mr. Haultain started his agitation we had a population of 100,000 ; to-day we have a population of 330,000, we are told, and if we are entitled to have $33 per head placed to our credit on capital account, we are $7,590,000 better off to-day than we would have been if Mr. Haultain had succeeded when he first commenced. It is all very well to say that we could get a re-arrangement, but I notice that the other provinces have not been successful in their attempt in that respect. When we do form a province, we want it formed on such terms and conditions that we will not have to ask for better terms from year to year. We see the province of Manitoba loaded up with a big debt. We may call it a guarantee of bonds and say that the people will not have to pay the interest, but nevertheless it is a liability against the province which they may be called upon to pay. The North-west Territories is getting all that work done by the federal government, and I think they are better off as they are to-day. The leader of the opposition told us that he considered the question of the number of provinces into which we are to be divided as a secondary consideration. If he went to my district he would find out what a mistake he makes in that. The southern belt of the North-west Territories has had the advantages of a transcontinental railway for 22 years, but the northern belt has been without railways until the last few years. There were a couple of railways there, but they might as well have been built to the moon, for they were of no use whatever to colonization. It is only now that the northern portion of the district is getting immigration, and as a member of the district I will say that the people there are not prepared to go in with the people of the southern portion to form one province. We think there should be two provinces, and if my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) were leading the government he would not coerce us unless he wanted to have another rebellion on his hands like that which the Conservatives fomented in 1885. All that has to be taken into consideration. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) goes to Calgary, which is the centre of this agitation, he will find that the people there want three provinces, and some of them want four provinces. If he told the people of Calgary that he wanted one province, the first question they would put to him was : Would he have the capital in Calgary, and if he proposed to leave it to the legislative assembly to decide, as Mr. Haultain proposes, they would tell him that they would prefer waiting until something else turned up. The leader of the opposition has perhaps approached this subject in a fair spirit, and I am glad to know that he is prepared to lend his assistance at all times, and to sympathize with us. We would be much better satisfied if he would tell us that he is prepared to sympathize with us to the extent of demands made by Premier Haultain. They are modest demands in a way, and the people of the North-west would be glad to know that my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) endorses them. If the hon. gentleman only gets up and states that it is a good thing to have provincial autonomy he might as well say that it would be a good thing if the sun would shine to-morrow, or that it would rain next summer, but the people of the territories want something more definite than that. They have been educated by—I was going to say my friend Mr. Haultain—they have been educated by the friend of the leader of the opposition up to considering that they were entitled to the conditions laid down in his proposition, and the leader of the opposition will find it hard to satisfy public opinion without going as far as Mr. Haultain proposes. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) stated that in 1902 Mr. Haultain swept the country for provincial autonomy. Everybody knows that Mr. Haultain adopted the tactics of the wily politician, and that he took a snap verdict. I fancy that if sufficient time were given to have threshed out the question of political autonomy and other questions, Mr. Haultain would not have a majority at all. But, when the people were putting their crops in, and could not get to the polls, he brought on the elections and got a snap verdict, and he claims it as a verdict in favour of provincial autonomy. I want to say that the people took no stock at all in that question. The leader of the opposition might as well say that when Mr. Roblin was returned to power the people of Manitoba pronounced in favour of a high tarfff, because Mr. Roblin mentioned it on the platform. Mr. Haultain is in the same position. The people did not take any stock in the question of provincial autonomy, because they knew it had to come from Ottawa and not from him, and as a matter of fact Mr. Haultain got several in my district. I supported him myself, and I helped him to the best of my ability to carry some seats, and I never considered the question of provincial autonomy at all. I want to say as one of the representatives from that country, that the people whom I represent are opposed to provincial autonomy at present. I think we are well off as we are. We have been treated very generously, and with the help of the leader of the opposition, we will be treated more generously in the future in getting sufficient subsidies to run the affairs of the country without going into debt, and without

putting taxation on the people. There is no part of Canada where a taxation is lighter at present than in the territories. I have had some intimation that Mr. Haultain intended to introduce the municipal system. If he does, he will grant the municipalities power to borrow money, because, although he cannot borrow money himself he has power to give the municipalities authority to borrow. I understand he intends to submit a Bill of that kind. I do not know how true it is, or how it will be received by the people, but I believe that taking everything into consideration, we are doing very well as we are and we had better adopt the old saying: Let well enough alone. I believe the people of the North-west Territories are of that opinion.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I have listened to some curiosities in the way of speech-making in this House during the past seven years, but the member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) has surpassed even himself tonight in the matter of exhibiting curiosities in the speech-making line. I sympathize with him, because his position must be very embarrassing in having to make a speech for autonomy and against autonomy. He is in favour of the details being settled immediately and he is against the details being settled unless they are settled in advance, not by the leader of the government, but by the leader of the opposition, forsooth. He is for an increased subsidy, but he is against the motion of the leader of the opposition, which asks that this question shall be taken up at once, and the details referred to the representatives of the people before autonomy is granted and before it is accepted by them. The hon. gentleman, therefore, finds himself in a most embarrassing position, and he feels at heart that he is speaking against the sentiment of the people he represents when he, in a faint-hearted manner, I admit, opposes autonomy. He told us that he would be in favour of autonomy if autonomy were granted on the terms asked by Premier Haultain in the Bill as submitted, but that without that, he would not be in favour of it. Surely he has read some speeches made by Premier Haultain since that Bill was submitted to parliament by the government, in which he stated that while he asked only what he considered was right and what the territories were entitled to, still he would not refuse to discuss the question and to accept terms less favourable for the sake of getting territorial autonomy for his people. He does not state in so many words, hard and fast, that unless he can get territorial autonomy on those terms he is not willing to accept it on any other terms. He says: This is what we are entitled to, these terms should be complied with; but, as he has stated in public speeches delivered since that time, he is willing to enter into a conference with this government and make the best terms possible.

The hon. gentleman has directed his remarks largely to the leader of the opposition. I can understand his position as a subservient supporter of the present government. He knows that the government are opposed to the granting of autonomy, and he did not wish to place them in an embarrassing position. He rather fears that his own supporters may rally to the support of the leader of the opposition, because he has struck a responsive chord in the North-west Territories; and instead of directing his remarks to the government of which he is so strong a supporter, he has directed them wholly to the leader of the opposition, as if it were his part to offer a policy on this question. He says that this is an old question, that it is not just of this year's growth, that it was discussed in years gone by when he occupied a seat in the territorial assembly. Yes, and he forgot to tell this House that when he occupied that seat, he himself favoured local autonomy; but to-day he opposes it. The hon. gentleman rather blamed the leader of the opposition because this question was not brought up earlier. But the leader of the opposition has brought this question up, not only this session, in an early part of the session, but last year, when he urged immediate action on the part of the government of the day. So I think the refefence of the hon. member for Alberta to the hon. leader of the opposition was ill-timed and not at all deserved.

The hon. gentleman says it is money they want, and not talk. It is sometimes necessary to have a good deal of talk to this government to get a little money for a certain portion of the country; but that is not the case when they propose to vote $125,000,000 for a railway between Winnipeg and Moncton, which is of little use for relieving the congestion of the west; and, by the way, our North-west lands are designed by the Minister of the Interior to pay for that railway.

Mr. McCREARY. No.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). No other impression was possible from the statement of the Minister of the Interior in this House, that he was going to bring in a Bill to get authority to dispose of 50,000,000 acres of land which he stated had been liberated to the Crown, and which by the construction of this railway would be made very much more valuable and would realize a better price. The Toronto 'Globe' took up the statement and said in so many words that this was the intention of the government; and it was only lately, since public opinion was aroused, that an inspired article appeared in the Regina 'Leader,' edited by the hon. member for Western Assinibioa (Mr. Scott), stating that there had been a misapprehension on that point, that such was not the intention of the government, and that they would not introduce legislation on this question this session, though he would

not vouch for the future. The granting of provincial autonomy has been the subject of debate, not only this session, but last session. The hon. Minister of Finance, in some remarks he made, left the impression on this House that in the very near future, possibly within the next year, local self-government will be afforded to the people of that portion of Canada. Unfortunately, however, the gentleman who is supposed to mould the policy of the government, the Prime Minister, threw cold water on this assertion, and left the House in no doubt whatever as to his proposition on the question. He stated distinctly, in almost so many words, that so long as this government were in power, the people of the territories need not expect local autonomy for many years to come; and the Minister of the Interior took the same ground last year, pointing out that it would not be right to grant autonomy to the North-west Territories until 600,000 or 700,000 people were in that country. Therefore I cannot understand the hon. member for Western Assiniboia when he states to-night that the Minister of the Interior has as much as promised that within the next year we would have autonomy, whereas the Minister of the Interior, not only in public documents, but in speeches delivered in this House last session, stated the direct opposite.

Mr. SCOTT. Let me remind the hon. gentleman that the Minister of Finance made a statement practically to that effect in this House this session.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). And what did the Prime Minister say immediately afterwards, when I placed his views before the House? I stated that I was putting the Prime Minister's sentiments correctly before the House to the effect that for many years to come the territories need not expect autonomy at the hands of this government, and the Prime Minister said 'hear, hear.'

The PRIME MINISTER. If I said 'hear, hear,' it was not affirmation. On the contrary, it was negation.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). But the right hon. gentleman's speech bore out my contention.

The PRIME MINISTER. Quote my speech, then.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). If I am allowed to refer to a past debate, I will do it with pleasure, as I have 'Hansard' under my hand. He pointed out that it was not an unmixed evil to prevent the people of the North-west having power to mortgage their patrimony, to borrow money on their property; and his whole argument was directed against granting autonomy for many years to come. I regret that on this most important question, for the welfare of the people of the west, there should be a diversity of opinion amongst the representatives of the west who are supporters of this government. I think I am not misrepresenting these hon. gentlemen when I state that they are not a unit on this question, unless the hon. member for Western Assiniboia has changed his mind remarkably since last session.

Mr. SCOTT. There is a new condition this year.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). When I was speaking on this question before, I said:

> But the Prime Minister adduced arguments that were strong, no doubt, from his point of view, that the North-west Territories should not be granted local self-government for many years to come.
>
> The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.
>
> Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). The Prime Minister says 'hear, hear,' so I am not misstating the case from his viewpoint.

I think the right hon. gentleman will see that I was perfectly correct in my statement. The hon. member for Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas), who is not in his place to-night took the ground that it would be wiser to defer the granting of autonomy to the territories for many years, as he believed that they were much better off in their present condition. He stated that in his own opinion the majority of the men in his riding were opposed to local autonomy, whereas his colleague, the hon. member for Western Assiniboia, took the contrary view. He stated distinctly that even with an increased subsidy—and I commend that remark to the hon. member for Alberta—the people of the territories would not be satisfied with anything short of local autonomy. This was the view of the hon. member for Western Assiniboia last session, although I will admit that he was rather faint-hearted, lest he might embarrass the government of which he is a supporter. On the other hand, the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) was rather more canny last session than this, and did not commit himself so much against autonomy; but still he stated that the great majority of the people were opposed to it, and he himself thought it would be better not to have it until there was a larger population in that country, and they would draw a larger per capita allowance; whereas the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) has both in this House and out of it taken such strong grounds that he has been taken to task not only by the press of western Canada, but by the independent press of eastern Canada for his opposition to provincial autonomy. So here we have a House divided against itself on this most important question, on which unanimity is required, at least on the part of the supporters of the government. It is not surprising, that the government should deny the people local autonomy when we have this diversity of opinion expressed in this House by their own supporters. The hon. member for Alberta, when speaking on this

question on one occasion before, stated that the overwhelming sentiment—I believe these were his words—of the people of the North-west was in his opinion opposed to the granting of provincial autonomy. Now, I do not believe he gauged public opinion on that question when he made use of that expression.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman has repeatedly said that I was against provincial autonomy. I have always said that I was in favour of provincial autonomy on the terms asked for by Mr. Haultain.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Of course, the hon. gentleman may well say that; I suppose there is not a single member present who would not be. But does the hon. gentleman mean to say that Mr. Haultain would not accept provincial autonomy at the hands of this government unless the exact terms which he submitted were granted?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say what Mr. Haultain would do; I simply take his terms and say that they are acceptable to me. When discussing this he simply stated that he would be in favour of provincial autonomy only on the basis of more population.

Mr. SCOTT. Premier Haultain is on record as saying that he would rather do without provincial autonomy for ever than accept Manitoba's terms.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). That has nothing to do with the question at issue. We are not demanding Manitoba terms or limiting the discussion to any terms; we are asking that the matter be immediately taken up in accordance with the prayers and petitions of the legislative assembly and to have these dealt with by this government. The hon. member for Alberta said:

> Speaking for myself and for those who think with me, who I believe constitute the overwhelming majority of the people of the North-west Territories, I believe it is better to wait until we can be sure of a more satisfactory arrangement, based on increased population, than we can possibly expect to get to-day.

Mr. OLIVER. Might I point out that what I said there had reference, not to what Mr. Haultain proposed, but to what I expected we could get, quite a different matter.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Mr. Haultain himself did not ask exactly what the hon. gentleman asks; he asked a per capita allowance on a stated population.

Mr. OLIVER. No; he asked a per capita allowance on an increasing population.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). The hon. gentleman has blown hot and cold on this question over and over again. He gave me the impression, in fact he explicitely stated, that it would be better to wait until there was a larger population, so that they could draw a larger per capita allowance. From the interviews which I have had with prominent citizens in that part of Canada, from newspaper comments not including, however, the Edmonton 'Bulletin', but from newspaper comments independent of politics, and from the representatives in the territorial assembly, I had formed an opinion quite contrary to that formed by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). That there may not be a perfect unanimity of opinion I grant you, but as the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott), in his terse language last session, said, if the government wait for that they will wait for Kingdom come, and certainly they will do so upon this or on any other great public question; there will always be a certain divergence of public opinion, but if the expressions of the territorial representative are any gauge of public opinion on that question, it is overwhelmingly in favour of provincial autonomy at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. OLIVER. On what terms?

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). If you vote for the amendment of the leader of the opposition you will see upon what terms. That is exactly what they are asking a conference to fix terms and I do not see how the hon. gentleman can consistently with his duty—although I do not want to lecture him, as he knows his own duty—oppose the amendment of the hon. leader of the opposition, when it is asking something so very reasonable and moderate. There may be a difference of opinion in regard to the number of provinces which should be created; I admit that, but that is a question that must be faced sooner or later. It will have to be faced five or ten years from now just in the same way as it will to-day, and at the most it is a question of detail which the people of the territories themselves, if you give them an opportunity, will be only too glad to decide for you. In the speech from the Throne in the local assembly, at the last session of the territorial assembly, it was distinctly declared that it was a national necessity to have more power, more revenue and provincial institutions, and Mr. Haultain, in his opening address on that speech, stated that the territorial government had resorted to almost everything short of force to gain their rights from the present government, and had failed. That is strong language to emanate from the premier of the territories, but it only goes to show the friction and the irritation that is caused by the treatment accorded these people by the government of the day. Mr. Haultain, in that speech, stated:

> 'Every thing possible has been done that could be done,' he said, 'to procure the necessary money and powers. These representations have been backed up by resolutions, memorials and addresses by the legislative assembly. Now, the question is, what more can be done? He spoke of the $13,000,000 surplus and the 'lavish expenditure in eastern Canada,' and said that 'if the comfort and prosperity of

the new settlers is not more important than breakwaters, drill halls, &c., are we then not forced to the conclusion that the present dependency of the territories on the Dominion should be put to an end immediately ?' Immediate provincial institutions in the territories must be the demand.

Mr. Haultain discussed certain means of temporary relief, such as having resort to municipal administration and increased local taxation. This latter must come with the growing needs of the country, he said. But, above all, they must have provincial institutions. 'The provincial question is, after all, the one solution to our constitutional difficulties and our financial difficulties. It is the one solution because we shall have not only the revenues to meet them, but the powers to do the work which it is necessary this legislature should do to meet the necessities of this great and growing country.

Manitoba, which lies alongside the territories on the eastern side, has been in the enjoyment of provincial institutions to its own advantage and to the great benefit of its inhabitants for a great many years. This autonomy was granted the province of Manitoba at a time when the population was about 17,000. British Columbia also enjoys that advantage with a much less population than the territories have at the present day. The territories of the present day have a considerably larger population than Prince Edward Island, and yet some 250,000 or 300,000 of the population are denied the right afforded to Canadians in the other provinces of the Dominion.

The House is surely aware that this condition of affairs cannot exist much longer. It is causing a great deal of trouble and a great deal of unrest amongst the newcomers who are entering that country, and sooner or later he will find that unless this question is dealt with the government will be piling up for themselves a heap of trouble. The longer they put off dealing with it the greater the difficulties will be. People are flocking into that country year after year, settlement is becoming more compact, new school districts must be organized and new schools provided in order to meet the wants of the rising generation. All of this will cause great demands on the territorial exchequer, and the territorial government has not means of recouping itself except a small tax on land ; it has come here to this parliament, asking for the amount that may be doled out to it, large or small. It galls the people there to feel that they are dependent on this parliament, and makes them feel that they are being kept in leading strings. Two years ago, and I believe, again a year ago, that country was visited by very severe floods which swept away, according to the correspondence laid on the Table, upwards of 140 bridges ; and because the government of the territories had to anticipate for a few months the revenues which they would receive, the hon. Minister of the Interior, when bringing down a supplementary of $100,000 to meet this contingency, said in an apologetic manner that the government of the territories had anticipated their revenue, and had rushed into this expenditure six months in advance, perhaps unwisely, as he put it.

What else could the territorial government do ? Here were new people coming into that country, and here were the rivers from which the bridges had been washed away. The people must reach their markets, they must have the bridges. The government had not the money to provide the bridges, and sooner than cause dissatisfaction, and even distress, among the people, they anticipated their revenue. And the Minister of the Interior thought fit to refer to this as 'perhaps being an unwise expenditure.' In my opinion, the people of the North-west Territories are as capable of managing their own affairs as those of any other portion of Canada, notwithstanding the distrust that the present government seems to have of them. And why should they not be as capable as others ? Whence come these people ? Many of them come from south of the American boundary line, as has been pointed out. These are people accustomed to representative institutions, and they look for them in Canada, and will not be satisfied without them. Many were residents of eastern Canada, who enjoyed local autonomy in the provinces from which they came ; and they will look for the same autonomy on the part of the community among whom they have settled, and will not be satisfied without it. We all know that the best immigration agent is the contented settler. And, unless we make these people feel that they are not dependent upon others, unless they are free to elect representatives to manage their affairs who will be directly responsible to them, I think you will find considerable irritation arising in the future. We have heard in the past eulogies heaped upon the succession of governments headed by Mr. Haultain. And properly so. I believe that the management of territorial affairs under his direction has been wise and judicious ; otherwise he would not have received the public endorsation on numerous occasions as he has done. And when he and his associates show such capacity, what is there to lead us to suppose that they would not show as great capacity if the territories were granted the powers of autonomy that they have been claiming ? Why, what was the course followed in making up the present cabinet ? The Prime Minister did not confine himself in his choice of colleagues to men who had stood behind him in opposition for eighteen years. He went far outside the ranks of members of this House. He went to the provinces to secure the provincial premiers to make up his cabinet. He took one premier from Nova Scotia, he took one from New Brunswick, he went to Ontario for another, and he went to Mani-

toba for their attorney general. Here were four of these gentlemen taken from provincial governments. And what surprises me is that, now that these provincial cabinet ministers are elevated to positions of ministers in the Dominion cabinet, in their egotism they say : We are the heaven-born legislators, and those who do not happen to have been taken, but were left outside, are not to be trusted with the management even of their own local affairs. It all depends upon the terms, as the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) states, whether local autonomy will be accepted or not. This parliament can well afford to deal, not only justly, but liberally with the people of the North-west ; and, in doing so, as I say, they will take the very best step to encourage immigration to go into that country. We are to-day spending upwards of half a million dollars a year for the purpose of bringing in immigrants. I think it is the duty of parliament rather to try to provide for the protection of the settlers we have and make them contented with their lot than to favour an enormous expenditure in order to import people, some of whom may not be so desirable as we would wish.

In the return brought down, we have resolutions from the North-west in favour of provincial autonomy. The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) read from a certain paper, I think from his own town, a few lines to show that the people were not in favour of local autonomy. There is no great expression of opinion there in favour of autonomy, according to the hon. gentleman. But, in looking over the return that has been brought down. I find that the hon. gentleman himself, in a letter dated April 14th, 1903, sent to the Prime Minister a resolution passed by the board of trade of his own town. The resolution reads as follows :

> Resolved by the Prince Albert Board of Trade, that in the opinion of this board the time has now fully arrived when action should be taken towards the erection of this portion of the Dominion of Canada, known as the North-west Territories, into provinces, each of these with all provincial rights and privileges. The enormous number of settlers pouring into the Saskatchewan district, not only from other parts of Canada, but virtually from all over the world, necessitates largely augmented grants for the improvement of roads, building of bridges and for public works, schools, &c.. Our board feel fully convinced that the only way by which we can meet our yearly increasing indebtedness, is by having the power in our own hands to deal with the matter.
>
> The board of trade, while cognizant of the fact that this matter has previously been brought to the attention of the government, feel that this is a most opportune time to urge that the matter should be taken up at once, as we feel assured that the present and future prosperity of this large and important part of the Dominion of Canada largely depends upon our request being acceded to.

Here is the board of trade, composed of the business men of Prince Albert, of both political parties, I presume, as in other places ; and they, through their representatives, send a request for the grant to the North-west of provincial institutions. And yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis), on the strength of a few words that he reads in a newspaper, and entirely ignoring the board of trade, says that there is no public opinion in favour of autonomy. There were other resolutions presented from other places in the territories, as, for instance, Calgary, Lethbridge, Glenfel and others, resolutions, not only from boards of trade, but from city councils and town councils.

The hon. member (Mr. Davis) states that this is a political move. He says that the last election was not won on the question of provincial autonomy at all. The result, he says, was a snap verdict. Yet he takes credit to himself for having helped to obtain that snap verdict, because he says his influence was brought into requisition to carry three or four constituencies for the territorial government. There is a gentleman in that territorial government, Minister of Public Works, I believe, Hon. Mr. Bulyea, who is a Liberal. That hon. gentleman was in the city of Winnipeg last October, and while there he was interviewed by a representative of the press. And here are the opinions that are attributed to him :

> Winnipeg, October 5.—Hon. G. H. V. Bulyea, Commissioner of Public Works in the territorial government has been in Winnipeg, and while here talked with your correspondent on the question of territorial autonomy. Mr. Bulyea seemed to think that the matter was a simple one. The last territorial elections were fought out on the question of attaining provincial powers, and for one province in the area covered by the present territory. The result was unmistakable, thirty out of the thirty-five members of the assembly being returned on the territorial autonomy platform.

Here is this member of the territorial government, this Liberal and supporter of the government at Ottawa, who has, I believe, urged this government, even on grounds of political expediency, to grant provincial autonomy to the territories. Surely the hon. member for Saskatchewan cannot repudiate Mr. Haultain's Liberal colleague. Without wearying the House, I simply state my opinion that it should be the desire, not only of those from western Canada, but those from eastern Canada as well, to have this question disposed of once for all, and in a manner satisfactory to the people of the west. And that desire can be expressed by voting for the amendment of the leader of the opposition, which calls for immediate action to add to the powers of the territorial legislature, and to have terms decided upon which must be referred to the territories to see if they are satisfactory before they are agreed upon.

Mr. WALTER SCOTT (West Assiniboia). It is to me, as it was to my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) a matter of regret that the leader of the opposition did not raise

this very important question at an earlier stage in the session. He makes the excuse that the printed return was not brought down until the end of July, but if my recollection serves me, he informed the House that the printed return had been received by him from the legislative assembly at Regina at a much earlier date in the session. It is regrettable that this important discussion should have been delayed until this late stage of the session, when, for about three months, from the beginning of May to the end of July, this House was simply marking time. However, I am gratified to hear the expressions from the leader of the opposition and from my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) following so closely the expressions which I gave voice here two years ago at the first opportunity I had, and again last year. I think, however, that the people of the North-west Territories would have more confidence in our hon. friends opposite if their anxiety and keenness were not made so open to suspicion. It is plain that the opposition is best pleased when the welfare of the North-west appears to be threatened. Why the hon. member for Marquette a few moments ago endeavoured to throw doubt upon a denial that was made here less than a month ago by the Minister of Finance with regard to the policy of this government, when that hon. gentleman was represented as holding out a threat that the North-west lands were to be sold and that this government was to continue the insane and iniquitous policy pursued by previous governments, and that they were going to continue to dispose of the North-west lands for federal purposes. The Minister of Finance a couple of weeks ago stated distinctly that no such policy was contemplated.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman is quite wrong. The Finance Minister made no such statement in this House, and I say that in the presence of the Finance Minister himself.

Mr. SCOTT. The Finance Minister can speak for himself. I listened to what he said, and I understood him to say that no such policy was contemplated and no such legislation was going to be brought down. The hon. member for Marquette seems to be anxious to believe that the opposite is the case and anxious to believe that autonomy is to be long withheld, for less than fifteen minutes ago he quoted an expression of the Prime Minister made a couple of weeks ago, and tried to give it a distorted meaning as if the Prime Minister had said that provincial autonomy would not be granted for many years to come. The Prime Minister states to-night that he did not mean that the people of the North-west Territories were to be left for years without provincial autonomy, but the member for Marquette is keen to believe the opposite. So, I think hon. gentlemen opposite are evincing that kind of anxiety which will lead the people of the North-west Territories to doubt whether they are really interested in their welfare. Further, I have to say that, in my opinion, it is very regrettable that this question of so much concern to the territories, this question of our local government, should be made a party issue. Until this year it was kept free from this position. A few months ago in the North-west Terrritories an attempt was made to drag this question of provincial autonomy down to the plane of party politics. I regret that the leader of the oppositon, the leader of the Conservative party in this country, has shown to-night a willingness to aid in the attempt to make this a party question, moving his amendment on a motion to go into Supply and so making the question one of want of confidence in the government.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is merely a motion asking the government to comply with the demand of the legislature of the North-west Territories, and is no more a motion of want of confidence, unless the government desire to make it so, than was the motion of the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell) two or three years ago in regard to preferential trade, and which was moved in exactly the same way.

Mr. SCOTT. If we take the words of the leader of the opposition and the words of the hon. member for Marquette and couple them with other words which have been used within the last few months, I think we are bound to believe that an attempt is being made, with the assistance of the leader of the Conservative party of Canada, to make the granting of provincial autonomy for the territories a party question. If my hon. friends are willing to take that responsibility, then it becomes the duty of the citizens of the North-west to view the question from that standpoint, and I propose, even though the session is late and the hour is late, to spend a few minutes in looking at this question from the point of view of its treatment by the two great parties in this country. As my hon. friend from Alberta truly said, this is chiefly a financial question. If the North-west Assembly is put in a position financially to carry out its duties, then there is no complaint to be made on behalf of the people of that country, and very little complaint would be made by the legislature of that country. Speech after speech made by Mr. Haultain could be quoted to that effect. Therefore, if we are able to show that in this present year the financial needs of the North-west Territories are being met we will go far to show that the urgency for provincial autonomy is removed for the time being. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) raised a query respecting the attitude of the North-west government with regard to the capital advance of $250,000 voted by parliament. It would be a matter of great surprise to me to

learn that the North-west government had refused to accept that capital advance, as I understand they have called a special session for the purpose of voting this money which is being put at their disposal.

Mr. SPROULE. They say they do not want it if it is regarded as an advance on capital account.

Mr. SCOTT. I will read my hon. friend a quotation from the Budget speech of the Prime Minister of the Territories at the last session of the legislature. I quote the report from an independent paper, the Regina 'Standard'?

I would say with regard to capital advance that if such were offered to us on what we consider reasonable terms, it is a question whether we should not take advantage of it.

If a capital advance could be obtained on reasonable terms, we would then be justified in meeting capital expenditures out of it, for example in connection with these large steel bridges we are building and the surveys, roads, &c., which are properly chargeable to capital.

There were certain objections made by Mr. Haultain to some of the conditions which the government proposed to attach to the capital advance in the first instance, but those conditions were removed and I have been informed that Mr. Haultain is quite willing to accept this capital advance and is very pleased to make use of the money. If the opposite were the fact I would be exceedingly surprised, because, on April 18, the Prime Minister, Mr. Haultain, wired me himself as follows:

Capital advance satisfactory if unconditional and if not charged with Belly and Old Man bridges.

Mr. SPROULE. When was that?

Mr. SCOTT. On the 18th of April, 1903.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Haultain says on the 20th April:

But we have never asked for the establishment of a capital account and I do not wish for the establishment of such an account until a more satisfactory subsidy or annual grant is provided.

He did not want it.

Mr. SCOTT. My hon. friend is merely quoting a fact that was stated to the House by the hon. Minister of Finance when the capital advance was going through.

Mr. SPROULE. I am stating it in answer to the contention of the hon. gentleman that the provision that has been made is comparatively satisfactory to Mr. Haultain.

Mr. SCOTT. I am not making the contention myself. I am quoting from a telegram from Mr. Haultain who says on the 18th of April:

Capital advance satisfactory if unconditional and not charged with Belly and Old Man bridges.

Mr. SPROULE. I have quoted what Mr. Haultain said on the 20th of April.

Mr. SCOTT. Now, Sir, in the same message, Mr. Haultain stated that Mr. Fielding's telegraphed proposal to pay $250,000 deficit and to provide $457,979 for current year's services was not satisfactory and that an additional $200,000 to the grant was absolutely necessary. The vote which has been made this year includes not only $200,000 which was stated to be absolutely necessary but $250,000 additional to the current revenue vote. In an earlier message, Mr. Haultain had advised me—and this no doubt explains the point raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) that he was unwilling to consider the capital advanced until the current revenue vote was made larger and on the 18th April he wired me that the last addition to the current vote that would be acceptable would be $200,000. The government of the North-west Territories gets not $200,000, but $250,000 additional and the objectionable conditions attached to the advance against which Mr. Haultain complained are removed. If he is still unsatisfied I would be bound to say, as one who in a sense acted as Mr. Haultain's agent in pressing these proposals on the hon. Finance Minister, that I misapprehended the instructions given by him. I will go a little further and state that the provision made this year for the North-west government is fully and entirely what we Northwest members asked for from the Finance Minister and his colleagues and our proposition—I state it upon my responsibility as a member of this House—was made in accordance with what we had been led to understand by Mr. Haultain and his colleagues would be reasonably satisfactory to them.

Mr. SPROULE. He says further:

We cannot assent to any proposition that our expenditure shall be subject to the approval of Ottawa.

Yet it was granted specifically on that condition.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no condition existing in regard to the expenditure of the North-west government on capital account that does not apply to every province in the Dominion.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. Minister of Finance deny that when the matter was before the House and when we asked the question specifically as to whether this was subject to approval from Ottawa or whether the North-west government council would be allowed to expend the money as they saw fit the answer was: Of course it must be subject to the approval of the authorities at Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no distinction as between the capital account of the North-west Territories and that of any other province. Any sum which remains in the capital account of any of the provinces is credited and if it is taken for local purposes it is taken by the local au-

thority. There is a nominal approval necessary by the Governor in Council but it is a purely formal proceeding, at all events the conditions are precisely the same as they will be in regard to capital account of the North-west Territories if the provinces are established.

Mr. SPROULE. Then why did Mr. Haultain object on the 20th of April ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not see why he did so, and I am quite sure that when he understands it he will not object to any feature of it.

Mr. SPROULE. He has done so.

Mr. SCOTT. It is perfectly clear. The members of the North-west government were under some misapprehension as to the measure of control that the Dominion government were going to exercise over the capital advance. But, when they read the words that the hon. Minister of Finance used here the other evening when the advance was being voted that practically the money will be entirely under the control of the local authorities they will have no further objection as indeed they cannot have. But, to proceed with what I was saying here, I go even farther and I will state that when we submitted our final proposal to the hon. Minister of Finance, a proposal which he has met in every particular this year, I communicated the effect of it to the members of the North-west government and I received a reply to the effect that the proposed provision would be considered reasonably satisfactory, and would fairly well meet their needs. I do not wish the hon. gentlemen to misunderstand me to mean that the North-west government indicated that they regarded this proposition as giving them everything that they were entitled to but they led us to believe that they would be reasonably able to carry on all the services for which they were responsible if this proposition were carried out.

Mr. CLANCY. For how long ?

Mr. SCOTT. For this year. In regard to the capital advance it is merely to enable the local government to borrow a quarter of a million dollars. The whole provincial autonomy demand is very largely the result of the feeling of the people of the North-west Territories that they should not be deprived of the power of borrowing money. In Mr. Haultain's last budget speech this sentence occurs :

> Throughout all the correspondence and argument concerning our financial and constitutional relations with Ottawa there has been a constant and strong reference to capital expenditure. We have said that not only have we been confined to a very slender income, but we have been compelled to make large expenditures which very properly might be charged to capital account.

I will quote a few words from Mr. Haultain's letter to the hon. Minister of Finance on the 20th April, 1903.

> It has been found necessary at times to point out that our limited and inadequate revenues were more restricted and rendered more inadequate by the necessity of making expenditures out of our current income which in themselves were more properly chargeable to capital account. That is to say we have occasionally found it necessary to incur heavy expenditures for construction of bridges, the cost of which have been a heavy drain upon our resources and which should have been spread over a series of years instead of being provided for out of the revenues of one year, to the exclusion of other and equally important works.

At this point I may read an extract from a letter which was sent to me a little more than a year ago by a gentleman closely connected with the North-west government. He said :

> Let me illustrate by saying that at the present time there are on file in the Public Works Department, Regina, applications for works in the way of improvements for this year (1902), resulting from the rapid development which has taken place in the country, to complete which would involve an expenditure of $400,000. I know from my own personal knowledge that a very large proportion of the work asked for in certain districts is urgently needed in connection with the development of such districts, and from present indications the answer to all such applications is gong to be ' No funds, and impossible to undertake such work,' because the Dominion government have neither increased the subsidy nor put the territories in a position to incur debt, so that they can meet these demands resulting from the ' growing time ' which we are now realizing in the territories.

The fact is that the lack of power to borrow money, to pledge the public credit, to undertake permanent works and spread the payment over a long period of years so as to permit the inhabitants ten or twenty years hence to assist in meeting the cost of works constructed now has been seriously complained of for years. This lack is one of the strong features of the gradual growth of public sentiment in the country in favour of provincial autonomy. As the hon. gentlemen from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) and from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) have shown, the grant made to the territorial government this year is a very much larger grant, taken proportionately or measured in any other way, than the grant given in any former year. Including the advance, it is actually more, than the North-west government stated in their estimates this year was necessary for their various purposes. The hon. the leader of the opposition will find in Mr. Haultain's budget speech, that he asked for $1,130,000, and he has received in all, on current revenue account, $957,979, which is apart altogether from the $84,000 grant for bridge construction, and apart altogether from the capital advance. The amount granted therefore, is 85 per cent of the estimates Mr.

Haultain submitted here last winter and I may say that a grant amounting to 85 per cent of the North-west government estimate, is better treatment than the North-west Territories ever got in any former year. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) read extensively from letters, and communications and documents, and records, of one kind or another, to prove that the Prime Minister of the North-west Territories was very much dissatisfied with the treatment meted out to him by this government. I do not know whether it would be proper to say that this state of dissatisfaction is chronic with the Prime Minister of the territories, but it is a fact that in former years and under other federal governments, his dissatisfaction was no less pronounced. Let me read to my hon. friend a letter which Mr. Haultain read in the assembly last spring, to prove that he has no more particular complaint to make against this government, than he had against former governments. This is a letter which Mr. Haultain wrote on November 8, 1895, to the government which was then in power in this Dominion :

I have the honour to make an additional statement on behalf of the executive committee of the territories with regard to the amount requird for the territories for the financial year 1896-7. The committee cannot refrain——

It will be noticed that at the time the North-west government was called 'a committee.'

The committee cannot refrain from expressing a feeling of great dissatisfaction over the fact that there is no substantial increase in the amount proposed to be voted for expenses of government in the North-west Territories. The estimates show clearly that the government do not intend to pay any attention to our financial recommendations, which have been made for four years consecutively, both in our written statements and on our personal interviews.

While the government are willing to take all credit for the growth and development of the territories, they do not consider that that growth and development mean a necessarily increased expenditure.

There was no very great development there in 1895, but the Conservative government failed to cope with even what there was.

Our local institutions and machinery have been created by parliament, but parliament does not supply the necessary money for working them.

A glance at the estimates of 1891-92, when our vote was itemized and administered by the lieutenant governor alone, will show that the government and parliament recognized the necessity of making provision for certain detailed services. These services recur annually and become more costly (for example, schools), yet the increase in our vote since that date does not bear any proportion to the increased expenditure under these heads alone. In a growing country new obligations arise and new objects of expenditure make themselves felt. Yet this self-evident fact is quite ignored at Ottawa, and year after year the services and amounts provided for in 1891 are made the basis of the new votes.

Mr. DAVIS. Did Mr. Haultain write that when the Conservatives were in power ?

Mr. SCOTT. He certainly did.

On the top of all this, demands for seed grain, for relief from starvation and other extraordinary and unforeseen contingencies, are referred to the local by the federal authorities with an unmeaning reference to the fact that matters of this sort are dealt with by the provincial authorities in Manitoba.

Mr. GALLIHER. He didn't write that about starvation when the Conservative' government were in power.

Mr. SCOTT. It was written in 1895.

No analogy exists between the territories and Manitoba, either as regards powers or income. When we ask for a larger grant in the nature of a subsidy, or for more powers, or for some legislation absolutely necessary to the performance of the duties imposed upon us, we are told: 'Oh, you are not a province, you cannot have provincial powers or a 'subsidy.' But when an extraordinary and unforeseen demand for expenditure in the territories is made we are asked to meet it out of an amount granted for entirely different purposes, and are referred with tantalizing inconsequence to the fact that 'in Manitoba the provincial government deals with these matters.'

In the matter of legislation, too, there seems to be a similar amount of indifference to our wants and our requests. We have for four years asked that the amount transferred to the assembly should be voted as a straight grant, by that means obviating the necessity of a double audit and account, a double system of books, a largely increased staff in our offices, and an amount of extra work altogether out of proportion to any benefits derivable from the system. This request was agreed to by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of the Interior in 1892, and has been approved by the Minister of the Interior every year since then. A simple clause in the Act would bring about this most desirable change, but the clause has not yet been proposed.

None of these matters belong to the arena of high politics or party questions.

As I have said, up to this present year the whole people of the territories endeavoured to keep this question out of party politics, and I repeat that it is a regrettable fact, that an effort has been made this year, assisted by the leader of one of the political parties in this country, to bring it down to a question of party politics.

They are matters which concern the domestic economy of the territories, who are still the wards of parliament, and of the legislative assembly, which is its creation.

The reasonableness of our request has avowedly been recognized by ministers from year to year but with no practical result. We now, for the last time during the life of this parliament, beg respectfully to call attention to our needs and trust that the result may be a fairer indication of the amount of attention the committee feel assured the territories may look for from the government.

The Prime Minister of the territories obtained no satisfaction in regard to that representation, until the change of government took place. I think it was in 1897, the first session that the present Minister of the Interior was here, that the representation

which Mr. Haultain made in the letter was listened to, and given practical effect to. I shall place upon the records of the House, a table of figures that will go to prove that if there is any cause to-day for the North-west Territories being dissatisfied at the financial treatment meted out to them by this government; there was a great deal more cause in past years when another government was in power in this Dominion, and there was real reason then for the emphatic language put in the state papers by the Prime Minister of the territories. I shall give to the House, the demands made by the territories for the past ten years for financial aid, and the proportion in which these demands have been acceded to each year:

PERCENTAGE of Grant to Estimates presented.

—	Amount asked.	Amount granted.	Per-centage.
	$	$	
1892-93	368,723	195,700	53
1893	368,723	199,200	54
1894	403,640	225,534	55
1895	375,640	267,534	71
1896	387,800	242,879	62
1897	400,000	282,879	70
1898	438,000	282,879	64
1899	535,000	282,879	53

(Yukon liquor licensess yielded $160,000 spread over two years.)

1898 } $973,000 { Grants $565,758 } =$725,758 or 74 %
1899 } { Yukon $160,000 }

1900	600,000	424,879	70
1901	600,000	407,879	68
1902	600,000	457,979	75
1903	1,130,000	957,979	85

In the year 1899, the North-west government collected $160,000 on account of liquor licenses in the Yukon, and it was allowed to retain that money, which I believe it was entitled to. They spread the amount thus collected over two years, and the real sums available by the North-west government in 1898 and 1899 amounted to $725,758, being 74 per cent upon the amount which they asked in these two years, which was an aggregate of $973,000.

I have made a comparison also for periods of five years. We will call the first period five Conservative years, because the Conservative government was in power during those years, from 1892 to 1896, inclusive. The total estimates submitted here by the North-west government during those five years aggregated $1,904,526, and they were granted $1,130,847, being 59 per cent of their estimates. The Liberal government have been in power for seven years. In those seven years the estimates of the North-west government have amounted to $4,303,000, and they have been granted directly in cash $3,097,353, to which must be added the $160,000 of Yukon liquor licenses, making a total of $3,257,353, being 75 per cent, as against 59 per cent during the last five years the Conservative government were in power. Take the first five years that the Liberal government were in power, from 1897 to 1901, inclusive, the total requisitions amounted to $2,573,000, and the total grants amounted to $1,841,495, being 71 per cent. Or, take the last five years of the present government, from 1899 to 1903, inclusive, the estimates presented amounted to $3,465,000, and upon these estimates they have been given $2,691,595, being 77 per cent of the amounts asked for in those five years, as against 59 per cent in the last five years of the previous government.

In view of these figures, I think we are fairly well justified in stating that on the whole we have very much less to complain of this year than there was to be complained of in any former year. While I say that, I would not care to take the position that the grants are being made too large, because it is my belief that twice the amount of money that is being voted could be profitably and advantageously expended in the North-west Territories, and to Canada's general advantage. I say that there is no part of any country in the world which offers to-day such a good field for investments, with such an assurance of speedy and large returns. Still, I am bound to say that I think the government are this year fairly well meeting the financial demand. The comparisons which I have made with former years can lead to no other conclusion.

My own attitude in former years on the question of provincial autonomy has been referred to, and I am free to state that if no new condition had arisen, if the conditions were exactly the same at the present time that they have been in former years, I would be expressing the same view that I expressed two years ago on the question. But a new condition has arisen—the condition of the Canadian Pacific Railway tax exemption, to which I intend to refer a little later—which, in my opinion, furnishes a very strong reason why it is better to hesitate, why it is better not to have action taken at the present time. But, on the general question, apart from that condition, which I hope will be removed in a very short time, I would simply take the occasion to repeat the opinion which I have expressed in other years, that the people in the territories have the same right to full powers of local government as the people of any province.

Besides the question to which I have referred, that of the Canadian Pacific Railway land tax, there are one or two other factors which might suggest the advisability of a little delay. One of these is found in

the joint request of the provincial premiers, made last fall, for a revision of the scheme of annual provincial subsidies. The details of their request involve questions which must and do form an important portion of the autonomy question as relates to the North-west Territories, and I fail to see how the autonomy question can be satisfactorily settled without parliament previously or simultaneously deciding as to the merits of the provincial statement of claim. The other factor is what, to be perfectly frank, I must term the lack of fair comprehension of the autonomy matter by this parliament and by the people of the provinces whose representatives form so great a majority in this parliament. Of the fact of this lack of comprehension, I need go no further than quote the statement of the hon. leader of the opposition last year, when he said :

With regard to the details of Mr. Haultain's Bill, with which I am not at all familiar, as I have not had an opportunity of seeing it, I do not think that these details have much to do with the matter.

It is fair to say that when the leader of one of the political parties is not well seized of a question—a live political question—it is too much to expect that the ordinary member or ordinary citizen is well informed regarding it. In my opinion, the admission was a confession of utter lack of comprehension of the matter. Mr. Haultain's draft Bill practically contains the whole question. The whole question is made up of details. Although there is a sentimental side to it, it is essentially a matter of business to the people of the North-west. When speaking of a province, we are not dealing with an empty name. When a province is formed, the people will assume serious and heavy responsibilities. Whereas at the present time this parliament is under the responsibility of meeting the cost of our local government, with a provincial establishment the people of the territories would themselves have to bear that responsibility ; and, as has been stated by the hon. member for Alberta, the measure of their duties and their ability to meet those responsibilities will depend upon the terms granted by this parliament when the province or provinces will be established. If the people have not adequate sources of revenue, they will be unable to enjoy the advantages of good government in its full sense. Now, in stating that I am really repeating what the Prime Minister of the territories says almost every time he speaks on the question. In the speech of 1900, from which the hon. leader of the opposition quoted, Mr. Haultain said :

I would like it to be understood very distinctly that when I have ever expressed an opinion in favour of the establishment of provincial institutions it was always coupled with a very strong proviso that the proper financial terms are attached. I would never consent for one moment, if my consent were necessary, to the establishment of a province or provinces even under the terms and conditions granted to the province of Manitoba. When I say that I believe the time has come for the establishment of provincial institutions it is always coupled with the statement that with these institutions there must be given means for carrying them on.

Thus as the hon. member for Alberta said, the details, the terms, are the essence of the whole question. On the trip which the hon. leader of the opposition made through the west last fall, a slight change of mind was worked on him with regard to the importance of matters of detail in relation to this question. On one very important detail then he expressed himself clearly in the North-west Territories, just as he has done here, and, on behalf of the North-west Territories, I wish to take occasion to thank the hon. leader of the opposition for the expression of opinion which he gave in favour of the view which we in that country unanimously take, that when a province is formed it is only fair, just and proper that the lands, timber and mineral resources in that province should be handed over to the people dwelling there to be managed and owned by them. This should be done in the North-west Territories in the same way as in every other part of the Dominion, except in the province of Manitoba which was formed when the Conservative party was in power. But on several of the other items of detail my hon. friend carefully avoided giving any expression of opinion when he was in the west last fall, as he has done on this occasion. I was in hopes when my hon. friend gave notice of this motion that he had made up his mind to give a definite opinion upon some of the details which he had failed to give in the west. At Qu'Appelle he was asked if he supported our claim to compensation for the lands which had been alienated for federal purposes and I can assure my hon. friend that the people in the audience went away without really knowing what his answer meant, whether the reply was that he would support them in their demands for compensation or not. These were the words of his reply :

In regard to the alienation of the lands, of course the question why they have been alienated should be asked and I answer that Manitoba and the North-west should receive compensation for such lands as had been alienated for exclusively Dominion purposes.

At Regina also he answered a similar question by stating in regard to compensation for lands :

In regard to the compensation for lands which had been alienated it would of course be necessary to consider the purpose for which they had been alienated.

Now, I venture to say that that was not a very clear statement and that in reality the people at Qu'Appelle and Regina went away without knowing exactly where the leader of the opposition stood on this exceedingly important item, this supremely important item in the demand made by the

people of the west for provincial autonomy. My hon. friend wants to know why these lands were alienated. Surely it is a little late for my hon friend to be asking that question. Some of the new settlers in the west might ask this question without creating any surprise, but surely it is a late date for the leader of the Conservative party, the party which alienated the lands contrary to the interests and well-being of the people of the west and of the whole of Canada, to be asking in this year of grace why these lands in the west were alienated and given away to railway companies. We may differ as to the wisdom and policy pursued by the Conservative party, but the thing is done, there is no need to ask any questions about the lands being alienated, and is not my hon. friend able to say now whether he thinks they were alienated for federal purposes or for some other purpose? Surely the building of railways is a federal undertaking ; these railways were authorized to be built by parliament and the aid was voted by parliament, so that surely they are federal undertakings. The people in the west had the idea that my hon. friend was simply evading the question by a quibble. Let me explain to my hon. friend how serious this question is and why it is viewed so seriously by the people of the west. The total areas of lands which were voted away by the Conservative party to railway companies was 56,082,072 acres. Now the roads constructed with this in the North-west amounted to 1,606 miles and in Manitoba 1,217 miles. North-west land was taken to construct roads in Ontario and the mileage in Ontario is 650 miles and in British Columbia it is 253 miles. By these various items railway companies in the North-west Territories, Manitoba, Ontario and British Columbia have earned 29,-986,826 acres of land mostly in the North-west Territories. Part of this area of land is in Manitoba, but the North-west Territories furnish all the lands earned by the roads in the North-west Territories, British Columbia and Ontario and a portion of the land for the roads constructed in Manitoba. In Manitoba 2,699,230 acres are patented and perhaps another million of acres will be selected there, so that the Territories will have furnished more than 26,000,000 of the total 30,000,000 acres of land furnished by the public to these companies. The territories therefore furnish about 86 per cent of the land earned by railway companies, yet only 43 per cent of the land aided railways were built in the territories, 1,606 miles out of a total of 3,741 miles which were aided by land grants. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) at Regina said :

> The policy to the west ought to be one of generosity, and such is the policy of the Conservative party.

Generosity to the railway companies, generosity to Ontario, to British Columbia, to Manitoba if you like ; our lands were taken to build roads in all of these provinces, our lands were taken to make these railway corporations rich, but surely it is a little too much to ask the people of the North-west Territories to believe that the policy of the Conservative party in this respect has been one that can be properly classed as a generous policy towards the people of the North-west Territories. If the Conservative party had remained in power another five years and had continued that policy of generosity there would be practically no public lands in the North-west Territories at the present time to have any dispute about. Even as it is of our lands that may be said to be 'fairly fit for settlement, but little remains outside of the even-numbered sections, as was proved by the case of the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Company. The company were going to enter a suit in the Exchequer Court against the government to avoid being compelled to take the only land that was available for the purposes of their land grants which they said was not fit for settlement. Mr. Haultain says, and I say, and I think every man of the North-west will say, that these lands voted to railway companies were lands voted for federal purposes and that there is no possibility of any real dispute with regard to the purposes for which the lands were voted.

When a railway is aided with a cash vote by the federal government, every person in the Dominion contributes to that vote. But when the land of the North-west is taken for this purpose, only the people of the North-west contribute to the aid so given. I repeat, let the leader of the opposition, the leader of the Conservative party in the Dominion, state, so that the people of this country and especially the people of the North-west Territories can understand what he means, that the 26,000,000 acres of the North-west Territories land given to railway companies, alienated for federal purposes, are to be taken into account and that the North-west Territories are to be compensated for these lands—a statement that he failed to make when in the west, that he does not make here and that is not contained in his amendment to this motion for supply. He must recognize that his general statement in favour of autonomy is not worth very much to the people of the North-west Territories unless he goes further, as he was pressed to do by my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) and makes it known to the public just what he means by autonomy, and what position we shall occupy with regard to financial ability to carry on our local government, if we get the autonomy to which he thinks we are entitled. The hon. gentleman cannot this year claim ignorance of details, because he has Mr. Haultain's draft Bill before him. I will ask the hon. gentleman as the hon. member for Alberta asked him, whether he is willing to support Mr. Haultain and the member for Alberta and myself in favour of the

propositions of this draft Bill, propositions that, I believe, are supported by all the people of the North-west. For I do not agree with all my colleagues from the North-west on this point, but believe that Mr. Haultain's proposals are approved with practical unanimity by the people of the North-west. Until the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) is willing to say that he will stand by these propositions, until he is prepared to say that if we are granted autonomy it will be by the assistance of his vote for these terms, he can hardly command the support of those of us from the North-west Territories, and he can hardly command the support of the voters of the North-west who approve the details of Mr. Haultain's draft Bill.

Now, I made reference a few minutes ago to a condition which had arisen and which made it wise, in my opinion to delay for this year, granting autonomy to the North-west. That new condition is the judgment given by the Supreme Court of Manitoba in March last upon the test case concerning the Canadian Pacific Railway land tax exemption. And, in my view this is a very important consideration. Even in the view of the Prime Minister of the North-west Territories at least a very short time ago this was a very important consideration. In the explanatory part of his draft Bill prepared less than two years ago he says :

> The effect of these exemptions is to prohibit any province which may be established, or any municipal corporation therein, from requiring the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to assist in the 'administration' of the country or the maintenance of 'peace, order and good government' within its bounds with respect to a part of its property for ever and with respect to another part for a limited period of time. This exemption falls hardly upon the people of the North-west Territories in a number of ways. The nature of the land grant to the company, in that it is spread over the whole country in small blocks of one mile square, alternating with those open for homesteads, causes every dollar spent by a settler in the improvement of his homestead, where it lies within the districts reserved for the selection of the land granted on account of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to enhance the value of the lands held for the company in its neighbourhood. All public expenditures made in such districts for roads, bridges and other works of a similar description improve the value of the lands still held by the company under its main line grant, the company contributing nothing on account of such lands towards the cost of the works by reason of which they are benefited.

Further down in the same document he speaks of these exemptions as making an extraordinary burden on the people of the North-west Territories. Until six months ago, when this judgment of the Manitoba Supreme Court was given, nobody had ever thought to question the right of the Canadian Pacific Railway to exemption from taxation in the territories, as respects its right of way and railway property, from the time the road was built and for ever, nor the right of the company to exemption from taxation as respects its lands for a period of twenty years. The date of commencement of the twenty years period was disputed, but not the right of exemption for twenty years.

The trial of the test case has brought to light an exceedingly important and entirely new contention in behalf of the North-west Territories, namely that so long as that area remains in its present position the company is entitled by law and under its contract with parliament to no exemption either as to its roadbed or lands, and that in reality it has never had a right to exemption from taxation in the territories, and never will until that area is given the status of a province.

And as concerns schools, the Supreme Court of Manitoba upheld the contention, and this year all the land and all other property of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the North-west Territories are held liable for school taxation.

The court did not express an opinon as to whether the company is equally liable to municipal or direct government taxation—the North-west Territories case before the court was the case of a school district only—but the judgment given on the school case leaves little room for doubt that the court would give the same judgment as regards municipal and government taxation.

Now, upon a legal question of this kind I speak with some hesitation, not being a lawyer, and I have been careful to put on paper just what I wish to say so that I may make no error. But, I followed closely the press reports of the argument at the trial in Winnipeg. I have also seen the judgment. And before judgment was given I met Mr. Howell, counsel for the government and for the North-west people, who kindly took the trouble to explain to me the contentions he advanced in behalf of the North west Territories. I believe I have grasped the main features, which are as I have described.

He contended that with respect of school taxation, before the Canadian Pacific Railway contract and Act were passed in 1881, granting exemption from taxation 'by the Dominion or by any province thereafter to be established, or by any municipal corporation therein,' an Act (North-west Territories Act, 43 Victoria, chapter 25) was in force, and under section 10 power to assess and collect school rates was conferred. Therefore, the Dominion government had already delegated taxing power to at least this extent, and, the Canadian Pacific Railway contract not providing for the abrogation of such power on the part of the North-west Territories the power and right to levy taxes was not cancelled by the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, which Act therefore must be considered, as far as exemption is concerned, as subject to the right already conferred upon the North-west Territories in this respect. The

court upheld the contention, and the judgment means that the company enjoys no exemption from school taxation.

The feature that concerns this autonomy question is this—that upon the creation of a province parliament would become liable, under the contract, to secure and safeguard the company in the exemptions granted in the contract. The language of the contract means plainly that the Dominion government or parliament will not tax for twenty years the lands and for ever will not tax the other property of the company, nor permit such taxation to be levied in any province whenever such is created; in other words, parliament contracted with the company to restrict the taxing powers of any new province.

When new territory was added to Manitoba this provision of the contract was observed, and the company was safeguarded against taxation as agreed. The added portion was brought under provincial status, and specifically made subject to the exemption provision of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract.

It is true that the North-west Territories urge that when they made a province it shall not be subject to the Canadian Pacific Railway exemptions.

This feature of the autonomy problem tends to prove the wisdom of the words used by the Minister of the Interior last year respecting the advisability of taking time to develop a full, general and popular understanding of the question. If the settlement with the North-west Territories had been made last year I very much fear, in view of the lack of full comprehension by parliament of the details of the whole matter, that the Canadian Pacific Railway would have been left in enjoyment of its contract rights, no matter how unfair as against the people of the new province, and that the new province would have been in the same position as the added portion of Manitoba, which, by the Manitoba Supreme Court judgment, is left under the exemption handicap for twenty years as to lands and for ever as to roadbed. It is for this reason that I think it is extremely fortunate that autonomy was not granted us last year. I have not the slightest hesitation in declaring that it is vastly better for us to await autonomy two or three years, and finally obtain it free from these exemptions than to obtain it immediately with the heavy handicap of the exemptions.

I have already occupied so much time, and the hour is so late, at this late stage of the session, that I do not feel justified in going as fully into the question as otherwise I would feel it incumbent upon me to do. Let me say, in conclusion, that in face of the position of this Canadian Pacific Railway tax matter, in view of the millions of acres of land that are involved, of the millions of value in railway property of the company that are involved, it appears to me that the people of the North-west would be simply crazy at present to accept autonomy unless driven to it as a last resort—and we are not driven to the last resort this year because our immediate financial needs are fairly well met; the lack of the borrowing power remedied by the capital advance method; and little room for complaint is left us as regards railways. Such being the case, I certainly approve of delay until all doubts as to the Canadian Pacific Railway tax question is removed. I hope this doubt will not exist very long, I hope the case will soon be settled by a judgment of the Privy Council. Possibly it may be too much to hope that it may be settled before next year, because the law courts move slowly. But the position I take is that the government should obtain from the Privy Council a final decision upon this Canadian Pacific Railway tax exemption, and that as soon as it is obtained the people of the North-west should be granted provincial autonomy.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Borden, Halifax):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Gourley,
Avery,	Hackett,
Ball,	Haggart,
Barker,	Henderson,
Blain,	Kaulbach,
Borden (Halifax),	Lancaster,
Boyd,	MacLaren (Perth),
Broder,	McGowan,
Bruce,	Morin,
Carscallen,	Pope,
Casgrain,	Roche (Marquette),
Clancy,	Sproule,
Clare,	Wilmot,
Clarke,	Wilson—29.
Cochrane,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bazinet,	Mackie,
Beith,	Macpherson,
Bernier,	McCool,
Bourassa,	McCreary,
Brown,	McGugan,
Bruneau,	McIsaac,
Bureau,	Madore,
Campbell,	Marcil (Bagot),
Champagne,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Christie,	Matheson,
Davis,	Mayrand,
Delisle,	Mignault,
Demers (Lévis),	Morrison,
Desjardins,	Oliver,
Dugas,	Parmelee,
Erb,	Paterson,
Fielding,	Préfontaine,
Fisher,	Proulx,
Fitzpatrick,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fortier,	Roche (Halifax),
Galliher,	Ross (Ontario),
Gauvreau,	Ross (Rimouski),
Geoffrion,	Rousseau,
Gibson,	Schell,
Grant,	Scott,
Holmes,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Kendall,	Tobin,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Turcot,
Lavergne,	Turgeon,
Leblanc,	Wallace,
Lemieux,	Wright.—63.
Loy,	

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Calvert,	Taylor,
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Hyman,	Gilmour,
Johnston (Lambton),	Simmons,
McColl,	Ward,
Fraser,	Bell,
Guthrie,	Porter,
Cowan,	Pringle,
Costigan,	Hale,
Gould,	Thomson (Grey),
Heyd,	Tolton,
Mulock,	Brock,
Talbot,	LaRivière,
Ross (Victoria),	Bennett,
Copp,	Calvin,
Girard,	Léonard,
Monk,	Meigs,
Thompson (Haldimand),	Ingram,
Cartwright,	Tupper,
Dyment,	McCormick,
Emmerson,	Fowler,
Charlton,	Tisdale,
Sutherland (Esex),	Northrup,
Harty,	Reid (Grenville),
Wade,	Smith (Wentworth),
Riley,	Earle,
Maclaren (Huntingdon),	Rosamond,
Stephens,	Seagram,
Belcourt,	McIntosh,
Stewart,	Halliday,
Blair,	Roddick,
Borden (Sir F.),	Birkett,
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Culbert,
McCarthy,	Maclean,
Power,	Osler,

Amendment negatived ; motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT—INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps my right hon. friend (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will not forget the correspondence which he promised to lay on the Table in connection with the agreement between the Department of the Interior and the North Atlantic Transportation Company.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will keep it in mind. I have some correspondence here which may be a little late in regard to the autonomy of the provinces. I have had it recast and will now put it on the Table of the House, and perhaps it may be printed again.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps it would be better with this belated additional material to repeat the debate to-morrow. I would like to ask my right hon. friend what business will be taken up to-morrow ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Supply.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to give notice that I intend to move a resolution in regard to Fast Atlantic Service, on going into Supply.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.40 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, October 14, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Mr. WILSON asked :

1. What amount of bonuses or subsidies have been voted by parliament each year to railways during the years 1900, 1901 and 1902 ?

2. How much of the said bonuses or subsidies has been paid during the said years, and up to 1st September, 1903 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The hon. gentleman's question is covered by a more comprehensive one which is on the Order paper, and to which I will reply in an answer which will contain all the information, except as respects the period from the 1st of July to the 1st of September in the current year. The question of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Heyd) deals with the years mentioned. But no payments were made between the 1st of July and the 1st of September.

Mr. WILSON. Out of that particular grant ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No payments for railway subsidies.

Mr. WILSON. From any source ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. For railway subsidies, no payments have been made between the 1st of July and the 1st of September. All the other information asked for by the hon. gentleman is covered by another question which I will answer.

Mr. HEYD—by Mr. Talbot—asked :

1. What is the total amount per annum of railway subsidies granted for each of the past ten years ?

2. What is the total amount paid per annum on account of railway subsidies for each of the past ten years ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) :

1. —

Year.			Total Amount.
1893			$ 1,052,088
1894			4,659,160
1895			No Grants.
1896			"
1897	992·17 miles at $3,200-minimum	$3,174,944	
	Specified	4,509 544	
			7,684,488
1898			No Grants.
1899	1417·91 miles at $3,200 minimum	$4,537,312	
	Specified	2,670,175	
			7,207,487
1900	835 miles at $3,200 minimum	$2,672,000	
	30 miles at $2,500	75,000	
	Specified	725,000	
			3,472,000

1901	1,103 miles at $3,200 minimum	$3,529,600
	Specified	35,872
		3,565,472
1892		No Grants.
	Total	$27,640,695

2.—

1893-4	$ 1,229,885 10
1894-5	1,310,549 10
1895-6	834,745 49
1896-7	416,955 30
1897-8	1,414,934 78
1898-9	3,201,220 05
1899-1900	725,720 35
1900-1	2,512,328 86
1901-2	2,093,939 00
1902-3	1,463,222 34
Total	$15,203,500 37

IMPORTS FOR YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1903.

Mr. HENDERSON asked :

1. What was the total imports entered for consumption in the Dominion of Canada for the year ending 30th June, 1903, and the duty collected thereon ?

2. How much of such imports came in under the preferential tariff ; and what was the total amount of duty paid thereon ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. William Paterson) :

1. The total imports entered for consumption in the Dominion of Canada for the year ending 30th June, 1903, were $136,796,065 dutiable, $96,994,451 free, and the duty collected thereon was $37,110,354.59.

2. $37,614,505 of such imports were entered under the preferential tariff, and the duty collected thereon was $7,069,692.42.

PER CAPITA REVENUE FROM CUSTOMS AND EXCISE.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

What revenue per capita was derived from customs and excise taxation for the fiscal years ending 30th June, 1896, and 30th June, 1903, respectively ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. William Paterson). The revenue derived from customs taxation for the year ending 30th June, 1896, was $20,219,037.32, and for the year ending 30th June, 1903, $37,109,675.72. The census of 1901 shows a population of 5,371,315 in Canada, but as the population has not been definitely ascertained in 1896 and 1903, the customs revenue per capita for these two years cannot be stated with accuracy.

Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) has not answered the portion of the question relating to excise.

Mr. SPEAKER. The portion of the question in regard to excise stands.

Question allowed to stand.

THE CENSUS, 1901.

Mr. HEYD—by Mr. Talbot—asked :

1. Was there at any time, in the preparation of the census, a new basis applied, so that the work of a staff of thirty men, who worked for months on enumerators' accounts, was thrown away ?

2. Was a year's work done by a large staff on mortality tables, condemned and burned ?

3. Has a staff of about thirty persons been engaged in altering and amending enumerators' returns, changing forest lands to pasture, and fallow lands to pasture, and in making other alterations ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) :

1. There was no new basis applied, there was not a staff of thirty men working for months on the enumerators' accounts and none of the work was thrown away.

2. There has not been a year's work by a large staff on mortality tables and none of the work has been condemned or burned.

3. There has not been a staff of about thirty persons, or any other number, engaged in altering or amending the enumerators' returns, changing forest lands to pasture and fallow lands to pasture, or in making other alterations.

IMPERIAL SERVICE DECORATION.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

What are the names of the officials who have been recommended by the government to receive the imperial service decoration and medals ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). No recommendations are made by the government of Canada. Such recommendations are made by the Governor General in consultation with his ministers. I do not think it would be advisable or at all constitutional to bring down these names.

PREFERENTIAL TRADE.

Mr. R. LEMIEUX (Gaspé). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to call the attention of the government to the following cable which appeared in the Montreal 'Star' of last evening :

London, October 13.—Though the Canadian government has made no formal declaration regarding Mr. Chamberlain's proposals, Mr. Fielding is to-day reported in the 'Morning Post' as emphatically pledging the ministry to support Mr. Chamberlain on one condition. Arthur Gill, a correspondent of the 'Post,' declares that the minister who will probably be the next Liberal leader, that is, presumably Mr. Fielding, expressed himself thus verbatim : 'We are ready to go to the country in support of what I understand to be Mr. Chamberlain's scheme and carry the election on that platform, provided no rider is tacked on to it about a contribution to imperial defence. With such a rider added we could not defend it successfully.

I desire to ask the government if there is any truth in that statement.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I am glad to be able to say that I gave no interview on the subject to any newspaper correspondent, and I have

not used these words attributed to me in conversation with anybody whatsoever.

WITHDRAWAL OF ALLAN LINE STEAMSHIPS FROM ST. JOHN.

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (King's, N.B.). Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask if the government is aware that any steps are being taken by the Allan Line Steamship Company, or by any person or persons on their behalf to reduce the number of sailings of the vessels of that line from the port of St. John during the coming season, and if so what is the intention of the government in respect to any such action if any such demand or request has been made ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Mr. Speaker, I think, perhaps, in the absence of the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) who has charge of the arrangement, that it would be better that I should not make a full statement of the case at the present time. There have been some negotiations between the government and the Allan Line in regard to the winter business at St. John and if my right hon. friend is not in his place to-morrow I will endeavour to have the information.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thought to-morrow was Thanksgiving Day.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On the following day. I have a general knowledge of the matter, but in the absence of my right hon. friend I prefer not to make a statement.

THE PILOTAGE ACT.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine) moved the third reading of the Bill (No. 261) respecting the pilotage district of Montreal and the port and pilotage district of Quebec.

Mr. T. CHASE CASGRAIN (Montmorency). Mr. Speaker, before this Bill is read the third time I would like to ask my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) if he still persists in taking from the pilots of Quebec the Saguenay river ? I am sorry that I was not here when the Bill came up for its second reading or when the Bill was referred to the committee. If I had been I would have moved that the clause of the Bill which takes the River Saguenay from the pilots for Quebec and below, be erased from the Bill. I cannot see how my hon. friend is going to make the Bill workable, because, as everybody knows, the pilots for the harbour of Quebec and below start their work at Bic in the county of Rimouski. Is it the object of the Bill, for instance to have one pilot to take a ship that is coming from Chicoutimi in the Saguenay river down to the mouth of the Saguenay, and then have another pilot take it from the Saguenay river to Bic ? The pilots will require to have a station at the mouth of the Saguenay if the assumption that I have just referred to is right. If not then the pilot who takes the ship from Chicoutimi or any other point in the Saguenay river down to Bic will have to be acquainted not only with the River Saguenay, but also with the part of the St. Lawrence river from the mouth of the Saguenay down to Bic. It seems to me that the plan proposed by the pilots is a sensible one and one which should have been adopted by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, namely, that pilots, if they are found not qualified now to navigate the River Saguenay, should be given a chance to qualify themselves ; but, as far as my information goes, the pilots without any exception are perfectly qualified to navigate the Saguenay river. It is true that this summer one accident has taken place at the mouth of the River Saguenay. But this as far as my information goes, is the only accident that has taken place in a considerable number of years that is attributable to the pilot. The accident which occurred to the steamer 'Carolina' could not be attributed to the pilots, because the pilots had nothing to do with it, but the accident which took place at the mouth of the Saguenay river is the only one that has occurred in a number of years that can be attributed to the pilot. In this case it was certainly an act of negligence on the part of the pilot. Under these circumstances I really believe that the hon. minister should drop that part of the Bill which relates to the Saguenay river. As has been pointed out by the pilots in their memorial which was read by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) the remuneration which they get is being reduced every year. Some time ago a decision was rendered in the vice-admiralty court in Quebec which was confirmed by the Exchequer Court by which barges in tow are not obliged to take pilots. This, of course, has also decreased the money earned by the pilots. Now, by taking away from the pilots the Saguenay river——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We do not intend to take away from the pilots of Quebec the pilotage in the Saguenay river. The intention is simply to regulate the pilots and to see that they are duly qualified.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I cannot understand when my hon. friend says he does not intend to take away from the pilots of Quebec the pilotage of the Saguenay river, but that he only intends to regulate them, how he is going to carry out that intention. I cannot understand how he is going to regulate the pilotage on the Saguenay river, apart from the pilotage between Quebec and Bic. Is he going to have one authority sitting in Ottawa, directing the pilots navigating the Saguenay, and another authority directing the pilots who navigate from Quebec down to Bic ? I call the attention of the minister to these facts, because I do not

think that the Bill, as presented to the House, can be made workable.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT (Bellechasse). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before this Bill is read for the third time, I wish to lay before the House a memorandum submitted to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners, and to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to its contents. That memorandum is dated Quebec, September 10, 1903, and reads as follows :—

Quebec, September 10, 1903.

James Woods, Esq.,
Secretary-Treasurer of the Harbour Commissioners,
Quebec.

Dear Sir,—At a meeting of the Board of directors of Pilots, held yesterday, the letter from the deputy minister of Marine and Fisheries, dated 24th ultimo, was duly considered, and I hasten to acquaint you with the conclusion arrived at by my colleagues and myself

In the first place, the right of the pilots, granted by law, to act in the river Saguenay is recognized.

Inquiry is made as to whether the pilots object to the Marine Department assuming control.

In answer to that question, it is a matter of serious doubt whether the shippers, agents, consignees, &c., would gain much by having to deal with a government, whoever they may be, in order to obtain, even in a general way, a thoroughly efficient pilotage service. In our humble opinion, the pilots should under no circumstances be the creatures of a government. What is required primarily from the sailor is a thorough knowledge of his craft, such as will render him altogether reliable. Now, where are these competent men to be found ? We hear it stated over and over again that the unlicensed pilots of the firm of Price & Co. have not met with serious accidents in the river Saguenay. That may be true ; but we should not lose sight of the fact that these men have had to pilot only sailing vessels drawn by a tug, the 'Thor,' under the command of an experienced sailor. Now, the trade on the Saguenay river is carried on mainly by steamboats. These unlicensed pilots, who have never been out at sea, who have never served as sailors, who cannot even use the compass, would not be of much use in any emergency, such as occurred in the case of the 'Mersey' or the 'Carolina,' &c. The Price men who act without a license are not liable in case of any accident, and do not come under the control of your board. We have already prepared a tariff, which was approved by your board, but it was pigeonholed at Ottawa. The members of the board respectfully suggest that the Department of Marine should place at the entrance of the Saguenay licensed pilots, known for their long experience of that river. There are, to say the least, about fifteen who are well qualified. As only two or three are required for that service, it is a very easy matter to attain the desired end. We have the pilot Boulanger, who keeps the Saguenay station, and who has already twenty-five years' experience and practice on that river. His ability cannot be denied by any one, and he has been requested more than once to replace those connected with the firm of Price & Co. See copy of letter attached as proof of this.

Mr. CASGRAIN.

I shall not read that letter, as it is not important.

Thus the corporation of pilots is prepared to enter into the following agreement : Two pilots, recognized as having a long experience on the river Saguenay, and whose ability nobody could deny, would have the exclusive charge of piloting vessels on that river. The licensed pilot Boulanger, who has already a practice of twenty-five years on that river, would train the pilots in turn for some time, in order to qualify them thoroughly, and put them in a position to replace later on those who would retire on account of old age or otherwise. The pilot Boulanger would, on board his yacht, survey the river from one end to the other, in all directions, with assistants, make soundings, and ascertain the best places for anchorage, &c.

No others but pilots appointed and salaried by the board of directors would have a right to pilot, or have a charge of any vessel on the river Saguenay.

Some coalers have been taken away from the pilots : but the company, be it said in passing, have lost more than they have gained owing to the great waste of time ; as might be easily shown. The pilots are anxious to retain the rights they enjoy under the law, and are especially desirous of showing that they are in a position to fully meet, in all respects, the requirements of the shipping trade.

I remain, sir,
Yours very truly,

LOUIS F. MORIN,
President of the Corporation of Pilots.

May I be allowed to draw the attention of the Minister of Marine, to the very wise suggestions contained in this memorandum. As this law is about to be passed, I wish the minister would defer its enforcement for some time in order to enable the pilots to put in practice what they suggest in this memorandum, and what will give to the trade and to the country as a whole all possible assurances as to safe navigation on the River Saguenay.

I hope that the hon. minister will consider my suggestions, which I submit in good faith, and though realizing the serious responsibility which rests on those who are entrusted with the safety of the travelling public on the rivers Saint Lawrence and Saguenay. But I must say that I would take exception to any discrimination being made as regards the River Saguenay, when the pilots are thus prepared to offer every guarantee with a view to ensuring public safety.

Mr. S. DELISLE (Portneuf). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the great majority of the pilots reside in the county of Portneuf, and for that reason, I take a particular interest in the legislation which is now introduced by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I must say that I do not know of a class more worthy of consideration than that of the pilots. They are leading and influential citizens, who qualify themselves

by close application to carry on their work, and who, in the exercise of their functions, incur heavy responsibilities, since they are entrusted with the lives and property of individuals. When a pilot takes charge of a ship at Quebec or Montreal, he becomes responsible for the whole ship, for the lives of the passengers and crew, and for the rich cargo on board. It is obvious that a clear mind and great ability are required to lead safely ships of 10,000 tons, four or five hundred feet long through the channel, from Quebec to Montreal, a channel which is no where wide, and which, in places does not exceed 300 feet in breadth. It often occurs that the channel is only one or two feet deeper than the actual draught of the ship. So that the slightest sheering of the ship, the least mistake in steering, may bring about some fatal accident. Besides currents and winds are to be taken into account, and difficulties must be constantly overcome.

Mr. Speaker, if I make these observations on the life of the pilot, it is to show that all legislation relating to pilots and pilotage cannot be considered too seriously. The public should be protected by laws imposing on the pilots reasonable obligations; and on the other hand, the pilots should be duly protected when it comes to pass judgment on their conduct and liability.

The pilots in the province of Quebec are divided into two classes: Those who take charge of ships on the lower Saint Lawrence from Quebec to Pointe-au-Père, and those who do the same service between Quebec and Montreal. Those on the lower Saint Lawrence have long since secured the right of managing their own affairs, parliament having granted them an Act of incorporation.

The Bill under consideration refers to the pilots who are doing service between Quebec and Montreal. It is by far the most difficult part of the river. They have applied to parliament for an Act of incorporation, but that favour has been refused them. They have heretofore been under the control of the Montreal Harbour Commissioners, and it is easy to understand, Sir, why that system has not given full satisfaction. That body is apt to change often, and is made up of members who are not all conversant with the art of navigation, and who, consequently, are not all qualified to lay down safe rules for the settlement of difficulties which may arise between the pilots and the steamship companies. I may add that several of the commissioners are directors of companies whose interests in some cases come in conflict with those of the pilots.

I am glad to see the Department of Marine assume the control of pilotage and of pilots, for several reasons, and the principal is that the change has been advocated by the pilots themselves. However, I venture to suggest a change which I consider essential; I think that two or three experienced pilots should be called upon to stay on duty, during the season of navigation, in the Department of Marine, here, in order to be in a position to supply the department with the necessary information and give them the benefit of their advice and their experience.

The government, in 1890, appointed a commission to inquire into matters relating to pilotage; and in going over the report of that commission, I find, at page 8, that the commissioners take the ground that in all questions concerning the pilots, their duly selected representatives should be heard.

At page 9 of the same report, I read the following:—

> As regards the grievances of pilots, set forth and detailed in the preceding pages, your commissioners beg to recommend the following:
>
> The pilots are not judged by a competent tribunal.
>
> We are of opinion that proceedings against pilots on account of accidents happening to ships when navigating the waters covered by the pilotage between Montreal and Quebec, under the care of pilots, should be taken before a maritime court, made up of three experts, one of whom would be appointed by the harbour commissioners, another by the pilots (although it may not be necessarily a pilot doing actual service between Montreal and Quebec), and the third appointed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. But if later on an admiralty court was established in Montreal, then such proceedings should be taken before that judge, with the assistance of two nautical assessors.

That report of the pilotage commission contains, Sir, a fair statement of the position of the pilots, and some suggestions, which, I hope, will be given effect to by the department of Marine and Fisheries.

I entertain the hope that the interests of the pilots will be safeguarded and that the public will be benefited thereby.

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

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Sir William Mulock) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 257) to amend the Civil Service Act.

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (King's N.B.). Before this Bill is read a third time, there are one or two things to which I wish to call the attention of the House. Under the Bill, provision has been made for the promotion of, and increases of pay to certain clerks in the civil service; but other officials, namely, the officers of this House and certain others, have been singularly ignored. I wish to direct the attention of the Postmaster General to that fact.

For instance, the librarians of parliament, who are officers of parliament, who are not members of the civil service in the strict acceptation of the term, are to have their

case attended to, while other officials of this House have been ignored. I do not think this is right, and I wish to call the attention of the promoter of the Bill to the fact. Officers who take precedence of deputy heads are left at their present salary, which is considerably below the salaries of the other gentlemen to whom I have referred. The clerk of this House, the clerk of the Senate, the clerk of the Privy Council, take precedence of deputy heads of departments. I understand that some provision is being made for the clerk of the Privy Council; his salary is being increased; but the salary of the clerk of this House has not been increased, nor have the salaries of the other officials of this House. As I pointed out when the Bill was in committee, the salaries of the officials of this House are very much less than those of the officials of the Senate, gentlemen who do not perform one-quarter and in some instances not one-tenth of the duty performed by the officials of this House of Commons. It seems to me that is a thing that should be remedied. If these gentlemen in the Senate are receiving too much, there should be some way of reducing their salaries. If they are receiving no more, and it is to be presumed that they are receiving no more than their services entitle them to receive, the honour and dignity of this House demands that its officials should be put on an equal footing with the officials of the other chamber. It seems to me that this is a matter of importance that ought to be considered, and that fair play and justice should be extended to all the officials in the service of the country. The same argument which the Postmaster General has used to justify an increase in the salaries of the officers who are affected by this Bill, can be used with equal force and effect in the case of the officers to whom I have referred. The office of clerk of this House is a very important position. It is necessary that the incumbent of that office should be possessed of very high qualifications. There is no position on the bench of this country that requires higher qualification in its incumbent than the clerk of this House. I am glad, Mr. Speaker, to know that we have in the person of the gentleman who occupies that position today a worthy successor of the gentleman who so honourably and ably filled it in the past years. I see no reason why the clerk of this House should not receive equal consideration with the deputy heads of departments, particularly when the onerous duties he has to fulfil are considered—duties which are in excess of those performed by gentlemen who have already received consideration at the hands of this government. In saying this I am speaking for myself; I have had no consultation with any of my friends on this side of the House on this matter; but I believe I am voicing the sentiments of the greater proportion of them when I say that we are desirous of having the officials of this House and the officials of the country generally paid reasonable and proper salaries. We do not believe in cheese paring along these lines. We think there is extravagance in the public expenditures, but we do not think there is any extravagance in properly paying the officials in the service of the country. We should have good officials, and we should pay them good salaries. I hope the Postmaster General will take these matters into consideration, and refer this Bill back and have it so amended as to include all these officers from the highest to the lowest. From the messengers up, there should be an increase of pay. Even the 'Hansard' reporters should have an increase, this year at least, on account of the long session, which has been a great detriment to them.

Mr. S. HUGHES (Victoria). I wish to draw the attention of the Postmaster General to an omission from the Bill of provision for the officers of the Militia Department who are not regarded as coming under the Superannuation Act or the Pension Act which applies to the militia. I do not know whether the minister's attention has been drawn to the matter or not, but I think, he should give it his consideration. Will he kindly look into it, or has he looked into it?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. With reference to the point raised by my hon. friend from King's, New Brunswick, (Mr. Fowler), no doubt the government have to plead guilty of the charge of being careful of the finances of the country in regard to increases of salary. I understand that we are accused of cheese paring. It is not an altogether unpardonable offence, although perhaps it is unwise to underpay any person. However, in accordance with the character which is assigned to us of being extremely careful in the administration of the public funds, we must go slowly even in dealing with salaries, because the expenditure on salaries is a very large item. My hon. friend will find that there is a measure before parliament dealing with the salaries of the librarians. Perhaps his absence from parliament accounts for that oversight.

Mr. FOWLER. I have attended this parliament more than the hon. gentleman has; and besides, I referred to what is proposed to be done for the librarians. The hon. gentleman must have been asleep, as he usually is when in this House.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. With reference to the other point which the hon. gentleman raised, that this measure should embrace the employees of the two Houses, I may say that that question has been before this House and has been discussed; and I have already said that the government do not wish to interfere with the privileges of the two Houses. It is their privilege, we understand, to regulate the salaries of their

officers, subject of course to the power, if the government choose to exercise it, of modifying or carrying out or not respecting their views. However, this is not a Bill dealing with the salaries of the officers of parliament; it is a Bill dealing with the salaries of those in the civil service. That is the reason that subject would not properly find a place in this Bill. As to the question raised by my hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes), that the Bill does not deal with the officers of the Militia Department, I would point out that the measure does not pretend to deal with the status or the salaries of all the officials of the government. It is less pretentious than that. It applies chiefly, almost exclusively, to those who are classified. There are some slight exceptions, as in the case of the outside service in the Customs and Inland Revenue Departments. The subject of the militia officers has not before been brought to the attention of the House, and it would be too late, I think, to reopen this question this session, if the measure now before the House awaiting its third reading is to become law this session. The subject is worthy of every consideration, and I have no doubt that my hon. friend having brought it to the attention of the House, it will in due time receive careful consideration.

Mr. C. E. KAULBACH (Lunenburg). I have listened with interest to the remarks of the hon. member for King's, New Brunswick (Mr. Fowler) with reference to the salaries of our public officials, and I cannot see why there should be any discrimination with reference to those who by chance do not come under this Bill. I refer particularly now to the clerk of the House. It is delicate for me to offer a remark in reference to that gentleman, he being in the chair. I may say I have known him for a number of years and consider that he is a very worthy successor to his predecessor; and in my opinion, although he does not come under the Civil Service Act, he and his staff should not be discriminated against as respects increase of salary but be given similar considerations as the others. I believe that my hon. friend the Postmaster General, who has charge of this Bill, has the same disposition as myself in this respect, and I hope that when the opportune time arrives he will look after the officials of this House and recognize their claims for services well rendered.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I concur in the remarks just made by my hon. friend and would like to have them apply to the assistant clerk of the House.

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). I wish to endorse the remarks of the hon. member from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach). The clerk of our House is well known to us all. He has been a member of parliament many years and is eminently well qualified to fill the responsible position he now holds. I would therefore urge on my hon. friend the Postmaster General that, in increasing the salaries of other civil servants, we should not leave out of sight the clerk of the House. My acquaintance with our worthy clerk has extended over forty years, and my experience of him is that he has creditably filled every position he has occupied and is most certainly, in his present position, the right man in the right place. He therefore should be treated as regards salary on an equality with other officials.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The other evening I drew attention to the fact that there were one or two classes in the outside service, concerning whom no provisions were made with regard to salary. I pointed out that the preventive officers in the Customs and Inland Revenue branches were not provided for. In reply the Postmaster General referred me to subsection 2 of section 37, but that only provides for their appointment without examination. It does not stipulate what their salaries will be. It seems to me that they are as much entitled to an increase, according to length of service and faithfulness in the discharge of their duties, as any other class.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Hon. M. E. Bernier). These are temporary officers not subject to examination, who can be removed at any moment.

Mr. SPROULE. But they are usually kept on permanently.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. These men may pass an examination and will then be subject for promotion, but at present they are not subject to any examination and they are not classified. I am simply following the custom which has been in force for years.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). I did not quite apprehend the reason given by my hon. friend the Postmaster General why the salaries of the officers of the House have not been taken into consideration?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Bill before the House is one dealing with the civil service and not with the officers of the House of Commons and the Senate. It is the privilege of these two Houses to deal with the salaries of their officers and employees, and the government does not desire to encroach on that privilege. It is open to this House, through its committee, to bring up the question of salaries in a report presented to the House, and if that report should be adopted, of course the government would give proper respect to the decision of the House. No such procedure has been adopted and the government do not feel warranted in taking from the House that ancient privilege. The government are extremely pleased to hear the expressions of opinion on all sides as to the

wisdom of the selection of the clerk of the House, which, I am positive, time will confirm. Although nothing is done on this occasion, the House will understand that the non-interference of the government is not to be regarded as in any way an indication that the government do not share the opinion of hon. members regarding the claims and merits of the gentleman selected for the high office of clerk of the House.

Mr. N. A. BELCOURT (Ottawa). As the Civil Service Bill must be the subject of the attention of the government at an early date, I would like to point out that in the commonwealth of Australia the officers of both Houses of parliament have been placed under the Civil Service Act and are treated in the same way as the other permanent employees. The reason which has been advanced by the Postmaster General may be a good one, but I might point out to him a recent instance where, under conditions very similar to those which prevail in this country, it has not been considered a sufficient reason, and the contrary course has been adopted ; the clerks of both houses in the commonwealth of Australia have been put under the civil service list and treated in the same way as the rest of the officers of the commonwealth. I should think that that was a proper course and I cannot see why the officers of this House and of the Senate should be treated differently from the officers of any other department, under the control of either the House or the executive. The same reasons apply for putting the officers of the House or Senate under the permanent list, for providing them with superannuation and the other advantages of permanency in the service that apply to the different departments of the service. I hope when the matter is again under consideration that the precedent which I have cited may receive the attention and consideration of the government.

Mr. E. HACKETT (West Prince). I desire to emphasize the remarks of the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler) as well as those of the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock), and the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach), that the servants of this House are deserving of the same consideration as any other branch of the civil service of Canada. The hon. gentlemen referred to the Clerk of the House, who has performed his duties in a very able manner ; he referred to the assistant clerk, to the messengers, to the pages ; we are all proud of them. But, Sir, there is one who is above and beyond all these in the importance of his duties, and that is yourself, Mr. Speaker, if I may refer to you. You have presided with the greatest dignity and with great ability over the deliberations of this House, and I trust that in considering matters of this kind, the government will take into consideration the right of the hon. the Speaker of this House to have an increase of salary. I say this, Mr. Speaker, with great delicacy and with great moderation ; but I cannot forget that during the three sessions that I have been in parliament you have presided over this House, not only with great ability but with great impartiality. We are proud of the fact that we have in Canada a young Frenchman who can take the Chair at the head of the House of Commons and ably preside over its deliberations, not only with tact but with firmness. When any of us have departed from the established rules of debate he has at all times been prompt to check us and to preserve the decorum of the House.

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

SUPPLY—FAST ATLANTIC SERVICE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand that it is not convenient for the Minister of Trade and Commerce to be here to-day, and therefore I have arranged not to proceed with the motion respecting the Fast Atlantic Service, of which I gave notice last evening. I might say to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister that I would like to proceed either on Saturday or on Wednesday. Believing that this session would have ended before this, I made an engagement for Monday, which will necessitate my absence on Monday and on Tuesday until ten o'clock in the evening ; therefore, I would be prepared to go on on Wednesday or on Saturday, as may be most convenient.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am exceedingly obliged to my hon. friend. I am sorry that the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who we all know has not very good health, is not able to be here to-day. But whether my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce is absent or present, we will make it a point to give the hon. leader of the opposition an opportunity of moving this motion on Saturday.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As I expect to have to leave on Saturday afternoon at four o'clock, I would like, if convenient, to have it fixed as early in the day as possible.

The PRIME MINISTER. We shall make it three o'clock.

SETTLERS' CLAIMS RE REBELLION OF 1885.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I desire to bring to the attention of the government and of the House a matter which affects a large portion of the population of the community in which I reside, and which

I have the honour of representing in this House. I have had the honour of bringing this question before the House on other occasions, but up to the present time nothing has been done in the matter. I refer to the claims of a great many settlers in the Saskatchewan district arising out of the rebellion of 1885. After the rebellion, the government of the day appointed a claims commission who were sent up to the Saskatchewan district with the idea of settling the claims of the settlers for losses incurred in that rebellion. The government of that day, apparently in a fair spirit, saw fit to appoint on that commission a resident of the district who was well known in that part of the country. The commission was appointed on August 25th, 1885, and sat until January 6th, 1886, a period of 135 days. They brought in a report, which I have here, in which they recommended the payment of a certain number of claims. A short time after that, as the election of 1887 was coming on in the near future, and as there was a great deal of dissatisfaction with reference to the unsettled claims, the government saw fit to send the same commission to settle the balance of these claims. On March 15th, 1886, this commission resumed its labours and apparently was employed until August 9th, 1887. During the summer of 1886, this commission took evidence in a great many cases and reserved judgment as to what should be done in the matter of paying or not paying, and that is where the grievance comes in. One of these commissioners, a gentleman appointed from my district, came up to the Saskatchewan district in the fall previous to the election of 1887, and started to work as an agent in the interests of the government of the day. He attended public meetings and spoke at public meetings and worked among the people for nearly three months, until the election of March 15th, 1887.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Would the hon. gentleman give the name ?

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Thomas McKay, now a member of the local legislature. He spoke at these meetings and canvassed and worked there until the election took place. At that time we had an open vote, and it was possible to know just how each elector voted. This gentleman, being in charge of the organization of the Conservative party in that district, was in a position to have access to the poll-books and everything of that kind and knew exactly how every man polled his vote at that election. When the election was over and the commission made its award, it was found that the gentlemen who had voted against the government of the day had received cold justice, while those who supported the government of the day were in some cases paid twice the amount that was legally due to them. The worst feature of the whole thing was—and I have the record under my hand—that during the three months that Mr. McKay canvassed and worked and addressed public meetings in the interest of the Conservative party, he was receiving from the Dominion government $15 a day as claims commissioner and $5 a day for living expenses, and in addition his travelling expenses from here to the scene of rebellion and back again.

Now, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is it possible that justice could be rendered to these people in a case of that kind ? Here was a paid official of the Dominion government who was getting $20 a day as claims commissioner going up and attending political meetings, and after he had attended the meetings, after these people had refused to vote as he wanted them to, this man is authorized to sit as a judge on their claims ? Could they expect justice in a case of that kind ? They could not expect justice in a case of that kind ? They could not expect it, and they did not get it. These people have been agitating ever since, getting up petitions and sending letters, and they are not going to be satisfied until at least some steps are taken to investigate their grievance, and to see that the gross unfairness of the award of that commission has been rectified. Why, there are cases of men that we know of ourselves who were drawing $13,000 and $14,000 for losses of goods that one man could have carried on his back, while other men, bona fide settlers who did lose their all, got nothing or scarcely anything. I have all the reports here, the awards made, the amounts claimed, the amounts paid, and everything of that kind. I am not going into that, but I have briefly placed the facts before the House, and I would ask that some steps be taken to look into the mattter and see that these people get justice, because they certainly did not get justice at the hands of that commission; and every member on both sides of this House will agree with me that they could not expect to get justice from a gentleman who was paid $20 a day by the government for stumping up through Saskatchewan and who was afterwards sitting as a judge on the claims of these people.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). It seems to me extraordinary that the hon. gentleman has sat in this House ever since he came here, and it is only at this late date that he brings this subject before parliament.

Mr. DAVIS. I want to draw attention to the fact that if the hon. gentleman goes through 'Hansard' he will find that I have brought the subject up several times in this House.

Mr. SPROULE. For several years there has not been a word from the hon. gentleman, but now he gets up, in the dying days of a long session, when it is expected there will be an election in the near future, and brings this subject to the attention of the

House, without notice of any kind. Now, whether this Mr. McKay did or did not act as a political agent during that time, it is impossible for us to say, at least it is impossible for me to say.

Mr. DAVIS. I have made a speech here in parliament showing that the people in my district know well whether he acted as election agent or not, and here is a return from the department which goes to show that he was paid for the time during which he was acting as agent. I think the proof is absolutely clear that he did.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman, in my opinion, should have gone further, and he should have shown us from his records whether this gentleman did any work as a commissioner during that time, because if he had proven by the records which are in the possession of the department that he had not done any work at that time, then it might be assumed that he was acting only as a political agent, and was improperly paid for the time he was doing no work. But the hon. gentleman has not done that, and we are not in a position——

Mr. DAVIS. Will the hon. gentleman allow me for a moment I make this statement, if he wants to know, that for two or three months after this gentleman was appointed claims commissioner he acted as political agent of the Conservative party in Saskatchewan, that he spoke from platforms, and he canvassed, and he did everything that an organizer had to do in Saskatchewan and he was paid $20 and travelling expenses by the government of the day while he was doing all that.

Mr. POPE. Did he sit as a commissioner ?

Mr. DAVIS. Certainly not.

Mr. POPE. Then sit down.

Mr. DAVIS. Certainly he was not sitting on cases when he was electioneering.

Mr. SPROULE. Of course, we are obliged to accept the hon. gentleman's word, in the absence of any proof. I suspect, however, that if the records of the department were looked into it would be found that during the time the election campaign was going on he was acting as commissioner and not as a political agent, and doing his work as commissioner, and that from day to day.

Mr. DAVIS. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that he is absolutely wrong. He was not in the district and I was.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, it is a very strange fact that for several years, he has said nothing about it, although this must have been known by the hon. gentleman, because he says he brought it to the attention of the House after the last election in 1900. Now, we are in 1903, and there has not been a single word heard from the hon. gentleman since his own friends were in power. They had it in their power to give redress, if redress was required. Why did they not attend to this ? They have remained all this time perfectly oblivious to the injustice done to these people, until we are supposedly upon the eve of a general election, and then he gets up and makes this plea and shows that nothing has been done for these poor people. It seems to me, to use the language of the street, a little too thin. It looks more like an election dodge than anything else.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. gentleman must not measure me from his own standpoint.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, I have seen so many efforts from that hon. gentleman along the same lines that I can now catch on to them pretty rapidly. They are well known. Now, with regard to these claims having been often discussed in this House, from my personal remembrance they have not been discussed frequently, and in my judgment, there never was a single instance where a good case was made out where the government were not disposed to do justice. But if justice was not done while his own friends have been in power for the last nine years, and surely during that time——

The PRIME MINISTER. The time seems long to my hon. friend since he has been in opposition.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, nine years in the life of a government or in the life of a nation surely ought to be long enough to allow of these cases being brought to the attention of the government, and for them to do justice where injustice has been done. But the hon. member represented that constituency during all that time, and knew that injustice was done to these people—if his allegations be correct. Therefore, I say it is a strange fact that he has not secured justice for them during all this time that his own friends have been in control. They have done nothing but turn a deaf ear to his pleading ; so it does not seem to be exactly an appropriate time to bring it up now, but I suppose it answers the hon. gentleman's purpose.

Mr. DAVIS. Like provincial autonomy yesterday.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) is altogether astray in stating that my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) has been tardy in bringing this question to the attention of the House and of the government. He has brought it more than once to the attention of the House, and he has brought it repeatedly to the atttention of the government. The circumstances with regard to these complaints are not new to me. I heard them when I was in opposition, and I have heard them since this government took office. The old government appointed a commission to

look into the losses which had been experienced by a good many residents in the North-west, and they made compensation for those losses. I know that some parties complained that they had not been fairly dealt with by the commission. These complaints were brought to me several times when I was sitting on the other side of the House, and they have been brought to my attention since this government was formed —repeatedly brought to my attention by the present member for the Saskatchewan district (Mr. Davis). It is always difficult, however, to re-open a matter of this kind after it has been closed for so many years, and the government did not see their way clear to have a further investigation into the mattter. The only thing I can say is that the government will look into the matter, but I will not pledge myself to anything more than that at the present time.

Mr. N. BOYD (Macdonald). Mr. Speaker, the matter that has been brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), as has been stated by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), would indicate the expectation of an approaching election. That is the view I would take of it. When we see the way in which that hon. gentleman has attacked a gentleman outside of this House, and when we observe the method he has used in order to injure a gentleman, who, I understand, is spoken of as very likely to be his opponent, we can readily understand why he has brought this question so forcibly to the attention of the House. The hon. gentleman has been a supporter of this government for seven years, and if he was not able to use his influence to do something for the people, who, he claims, have been so badly treated, I think this little speech that he has made in this House will not have a tendency to further their case to any great extent. I would not expect any hon. member of this House to attack a man who has no opportunity of defending himself. Anything may be said in this House under the cover of the privilege of the House against a man outside of it.

Mr. DAVIS. I made this attack upon the public platform. Mr. McKay could have come to my meeting, but he took the other road and never came.

Mr. BOYD. The fact remains that if this gentleman has such a reputation as the hon. member for Saskatchewan would lead us to believe he is worthy of, it is a strange thing that he represents the people in the local assembly at Regina. Therefore, he cannot be so low in the estimation of his fellow citizens as the hon. gentleman would lead us to suppose he is. I can see pretty plainly what the intention of the hon. gentleman is, but if he is deceiving the people around Saskatchewan he is not deceiving the people around this House. I have had some experience in supporting a government and I always found that if I could not induce the government by my own personal persuasions, with the assistance of my friends, to do a certain thing, I was very much less likely to do it by getting up and making a stump speech in this House. I would suggest to my hon. friend that he bring his persuasive powers to bear upon the government, that he surround himself with the members from the North-west Territories, who are not backward in expressing their opinions, have an interview with the right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and see if he cannot induce him to give a promise, and thus by his actions, which should speak much louder than his words in this House, show to the people of Saskatchewan that he is succeeding in doing something for their benefit, instead of getting up and attacking a gentleman outside of this House who has no opportunity of defending himself.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) that if he desires to have a matter of this kind intelligently discussed he should give some notice to the House, as I have no doubt he has given notice to the government, of his intention to bring it up. It is obvious that he could not have expected any very great benefit from the discussion, otherwise he would have adopted the course that is usual. I do not know whether we have really gathered very much of importance from my hon. friend's remarks, except a suggestion that my hon. friend's presence on the platform terrified Mr. McKay so much as to deter him from going near him.

Mr. DAVIS. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) is going a little astray in that statement. I was charged by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) with having attacked in this House a gentleman who did not have an opportunity of defending himself, and I stated that I had made the same attack on the platform, in the district where the parties were interested, and that Mr. McKay knew that I was going to do it, and that Mr. McKay did not turn up.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman said that Mr. McKay immediately took the other road.

Mr. DAVIS. He was not there.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). He was not only supposed to have run away from the meeting, but to have immediately taken the most rapid means of transportation in an opposite direction, so that he might not be within range of my hon. friend's eloquence.

Mr. DAVIS. He has been within range of it more than once.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think he has not suffered from it. I am reminded of the fact that my hon. friend has sometimes had his suspectibilities wounded by attacks made upon gentlemen outside of this House. I think I have seen him displaying a great deal of feeling about references which have been made to officials of this government in the Yukon and elsewhere. But, in the remarks which my hon. friend has made to-day he seems to have entirely overlooked the considerations which influenced him at such times.

Mr. DAVIS. This gentleman is not an official ; he is a public man.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). He is a public man, but my hon. friend has made the deliberate charge against this gentleman——

Mr. DAVIS. Which I am prepared to prove to this House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax)—that he corruptly denied justice to these people. He said that being in receipt of some remuneration from the Conservative government, the people of the territory could not expect justice from him, and that they did not get it. This is a charge of a deliberate and corrupt denial of justice. Whether my hon. friend has proved it or not outside of this House it hardly seems to me to be a very courteous course to make the charge under the circumstances under which he has made it here. If there has been a corrupt denial of justice, it seems to me that it would have been the duty of this government upon coming into office, in 1896, to have investigated this matter, and I am surprised that my hon. friend, during the last seven years, has not brought it to the attention of the House in a more forcible way than he has to-day. There is no statute of limitations against a corrupt denial of justice, and if that has taken place it is a matter than should have been investigated long ago.

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

Amount required for additional building at Banff, N.W.T., $10,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. At the National Park at Banff, we have several buildings which have been in existence for some years and which enable visitors to have the benefits of the mineral waters. This vote is to build a bath house to replace that which was destroyed by fire last spring.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any revenue derived from it ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, there is a fee charged to visitors, but I do not think the revenue is sufficient to maintain it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I should think that a very excellent bath-house could be built for a smaller sum.

The PRIME MINISTER. We have the report of the resident engineer at Calgary, and I see that it includes a cottage for the caretaker.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The right hon. gentleman was recently rather horrified at the idea of the government owning hotels and sending agents to canvas for freight throughout the country, but he seems to have no objection to the government undertaking to operate a bath-house. Will the right hon. gentleman point out the difference between the government operating an hotel and their operating a bath-house ?

Mr. COCHRANE. The bath is to wash away their iniquities.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If there is any difference between the government operating a bath-house and a government operating an hotel, I would like my right hon. friend to explain.

The PRIME MINISTER. I can only explain that we do not go into this undertaking for business purposes ; it is simply an expensive luxury.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I suppose it is on the principle that as you own the bath you must have a house over it.

The PRIME MINISTER. Perhaps.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Is this building to be erected adjacent to the basin ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The bath-house itself is to be a special building.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the salary of the caretaker ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot tell what his salary is, but he has no revenue outside of it.

Mr. FOWLER. Has he any duties in addition to attending to the bath ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes ; the caretaker, Mr. Douglas, has a general supervision of the whole park and of the public buildings which we have there. What I would consider one of the most important of his duties is that he takes care of the animals. We have a valuable herd of buffalo, which now numbers forty head, and which is steadily increasing I am glad to say. We have some moose and some wapita, and he looks after these.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is this building to be erected by contract, and will it be given to the lowest tenderer ?

The PRIME MINISTER. That is a question which might be asked the Minister of Public Works, but I should think he will answer in the affirmative, because it will cost over $5,000, and that is the law.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Will private circulars be sent around, or will it be advertised in the newspapers ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Not in the newspapers of Banff, but elsewhere.

Amount required for the expenses in connection with the Alaskan boundary commission, $140,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. $50,000 has been already voted, and this will make a total appropriation of $190,000.

Mr. FOWLER. How is the cost arrived at ?

The PRIME MINISTER. It will cost a large sum of money, because lawyers are expensive—my hon. friend belongs to the profession, and he knows that by experience. The class of lawyers we have had to employ must be paid high fees. Then we have had a very large staff in the preparation of the case, and my hon. friend will agree with me, if he has read the case, that it has been prepared with great care, and reflects credit on those who had charge of it. I do not yet know what will be the result of our efforts, but when the details are brought down I think it will be found that the money has been as economically expended as it could be.

Mr. FOWLER. There is no doubt that able counsel were selected on the Canadian side and that a good selection was made. I do not know that I am able to say so much for one, at least, of the commissioners, if the statements attributed to him have been correctly reported. I do not wish to say anything at this stage reflecting on this gentleman. I understand that he has made some sort of a denial of the report, but not such an absolute and emphatic denial as we would have expected. If that gentleman has been correctly reported, he certainly has given expression to very unwise utterances for a man occupying such a high judicial opinion. This is not a party question, and we do not want to make it a party question ; we are all alike interested that the honour and dignity of our country should be maintained to the highest degree. It is a matter of peculiar regret to me, as a member of the same profession to which that gentleman belongs, that the report should be sent broadcast through the world that he should so far forget his duties and responsibilities as a member of that very high tribunal ; perhaps no higher tribunal has ever been created in the world of a judicial character than the tribunal of which that gentleman is a member. It is a most unfortunate incident if that gentleman is correctly reported.

The PRIME MINISTER. For my part, I do not believe that Mr. Aylesworth has given any such interview as that which has been reported. The misfortune is that such a report should ever have got into the press, but my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) is aware that it would not be the first time that false reports have been published in the press, attributing statements to public men, and which reports had not the slightest foundation in fact. Not later than yesterday I had to give the negation of no less a person than the Lord Chief Justice of England, who stated that a certain report made about him was a pure fabrication. The undue liberty that has been taken with the name of the Chief Justice of England may well have been taken also with the name of Mr. Aylesworth ; but I am sure that my hon. friend will readily believe that Mr. Aylesworth would be unable to so far forget himself and his duty to his profession as to be guilty of such an indiscretion as that. When a man has been at the bar the length of time that Mr. Aylesworth has, even though he has not attained Mr. Aylesworth's eminence in his profession, he would not so comment on a matter before the judges, especially when he is one of the judges himself. For my part, therefore, I absolutely discredit the report.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The only thing that would seem to lend some possible credence to what has been suggested in the press is that the report of the proceedings of Monday seem to have been cabled to London; and, while the government have a telegram from Lord Alverstone denying the interview with him, Mr. Aylesworth has not seen fit to send any contradiction. Perhaps I should not attach too much importance to that, because it may be that the telegram to the London newspapers has not been brought to his attention. If it had been, and if the interview was not as reported, it would have been a prudent and wise thing for Mr. Aylesworth to have followed the example of Lord Alverstone and sent a telegram to this government denying what I would call the impropriety of granting an interview of that character, with regard to a subject which is not only under the consideration of a tribunal of which he is a member, but which is also a matter of political controversy in the mother country at the present time. I would like to ask the government what the arrangements are with regard to the British counsel to represent Canada, Sir Robert Finlay and Sir Edward Carson. Are these counsel paid by the government of Canada, or are their services given ex-officio as law officers of the crown ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Sir Robert Finlay has been selected by the British government, and, so far as my memory serves me, he is to be paid by the British government itself. I do not think this would apply to Sir Edward Carson, who was selected by us to replace Mr. Blake, who unfortunately became ill and had to give up his position.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think the cases and counter cases submitted on behalf of the two governments have been laid on the Table of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think they have.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is a claim and a counter claim and a case and a counter case, and there are appendices to these documents, and I think a set of atlases which accompany the case and the counter case. It seems to me that it would be well to have these laid on the Table of the House, and also a print of the proceedings of the committee from day to day, if my right hon. friend has it, either during the present session, or in another session, so that they will be available for reference by the members of the House. I do not know whether it is proposed to print any portion of the proceedings of this committee for distribution among the members of the House or to form a part of the sessional papers. I think that matter might well be taken into consideration by the government, as sometimes it is not convenient to get them in any other way. For example, I do not know where one can get at the proceedings of the Behring Sea tribunal except by referring to the one set of the proceedings which is in the library.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am not aware that the proceedings of the Behring Sea commission were ever printed by this parliament. The only edition of these proceedings, so far as my memory goes, was that issued by the committee itself, a copy of which is in the library. I will take care that all the proceedings of the present tribunal be laid before the House. They will be too voluminous to print, but a good selection of them will be made for future reference, and will be referred to the committee on printing.

Mr. FOWLER. Has the Prime Minister had any communication from Mr. Aylesworth since these statements were made ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, I have not had any.

Mr. FOWLER. That in itself would seem to lend some colour to this report. I am very loath to believe that a member of the bar, and so distinguished a member of the Canadian bar as Mr. Aylesworth, should make the statements which he is reported to have made. But the fact that these statements have been published, not only in the press of Canada but in the English press, must have called his attention to the fact of these statements having been circulated. Not only that, but I understand that a legal friend in Toronto, as soon as these statements appeared in the Canadian press, at once communicated them to him in England, assuming that they were not published there, so that a prompt and emphatic denial of them should be made by Mr. Aylesworth; and it has not been made. It seems to me that the First Minister should take some steps to ascertain from Mr. Aylesworth himself, by communicating with him, whether or not he made these statements. This matter concerns not only Mr. Aylesworth but the whole people of Canada, whose special representative he was on that committee. Therefore it does seem to me that we should at once, if the gentleman did make those statements, take some means of bestowing upon him censure for having so far forgotten himself.

The PRIME MINISTER. For my part, Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to take the view of my hon. friend. My hon. friend himself, I think, would hesitate to take that view. He has been in public life for some years, and he knows that life is too short to give attention to everything that is published in the newspapers. If we were to do that, I suppose there would be nothing to do but to write items in the newspapers and give contradictions to them. I rather think that a man of Mr. Aylesworth's eminence knows his business, and knows it too well to have committed himself in that way.

Mr. FOWLER. It is not a case of ordinary misrepresentation—not that sort of misrepresentation which a man who is in public life is able to ignore. There is a class of misrepresentation which we do ignore. If we did not, we would be constantly defending ourselves from attacks which are unworthy of notice; but this is not a case of that character. I am loath to believe that these statements were ever made by Mr. Aylesworth but it was his duty, as representing Canada, to at once disclaim having made any such statements. Lord Alverstone considered the matter of sufficient importance to wire the right hon. the First Minister denying that he had ever said anything which would lead Mr. Aylesworth or anybody else to the conclusion that he proposed to sacrifice Canada on behalf of the United States. If Lord Alverstone deemed it necessary to send such a denial, was it not more important that Mr. Aylesworth should also send a disclaimer ? Nothing having been heard from Mr. Aylesworth would lead one to conclude that there might be only too much truth in the report. I am loath to believe it, because Mr. Aylesworth is a distinguished Canadian, and because I am an humble member of the same profession to which he belongs. But I cannot understand his silence

Mr. LEMIEUX. I can well understand the silence of Mr. Aylesworth. If he has any duty to perform at present it is to take no notice of the wild rumours published by the reporters in London. It is his only duty to stand by his own country and try to convince his fellow commissioners that our contention is right.

Mr. FOWLER. That is a reflection on Lord Alverstone, who is a much more distinguished man.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He referred to the matter because it was brought up in the House of Commons in England.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The telegram which was sent referred to the discussion in the House of Commons, not only with regard to Mr. Aylesworth, but to Lord Alverstone.

Mr. GOURLEY. These unfortunate telegrams give rise to the necessity for his House to question whether we have pursued a wise policy in giving $15,000 a year for our Canadian press service. The Yankee service is bad, but if it is always twisted it is clear. There is some sense in its telegrams. They have a Yankee colouring but are intelligible. Since we have had this new service, I have read with utter disgust the nonsense that is telegraphed—utter and absolute nonsense, and I was in no particular surprised that this despatch relating to Lord Alverstone and Mr. Aylesworth should have been sent. At the same time I think that Lord Alverstone did the correct thing. It would be very extraordinary indeed that a British chief justice, acting in a very high capacity, would say the things attributed to Lord Alverstone. However, while members of the House of Commons would not believe it, other people, who have not the same training, possibly would.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Some members of the House of Commons seem to be the only ones who want to believe it.

Mr. GOURLEY. Undoubtedly there are hundreds of thousands in Canada who believe it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. Only a few members want to believe it, and nobody outside.

Mr. GOURLEY. There are many people in the United States who believe it. The chief justice did the correct thing. When this statement was given world-wide publicity there was no other course for him to take than the one he did. Mr. Aylesworth should follow his example more particularly because there was considerable circumstantiality in the nonsense attributed to him. It was circumstantial in every particular. While I regard the despatch as utterly unfounded, still I was amazed at the circumstantiality which the correspondent put into it. In ordinary matters, no doubt, Mr. Aylesworth's course would be the correct one, but this is not an ordinary matter. It involves national relations. The thing is world-wide, and it seems to me that the right hon. the First Minister would be well advised to suggest to Mr. Aylesworth to make a contradiction in equally wide terms as that of Lord Alverstone. I regard this Alaska boundary question as of great consequence to the future welfare of Canada and the British empire. If anything untoward or anything which would give rise to a suspicion of unfairness should occur, it will shake the confidence of the Canadian people in British jurists, diplomatists and statesmen for all time. Therefore I would like these men to put themselves right in the eyes of the public, in order that there should be no feeling of any kind in Canada, previous to the making of the award, which might lead to a charge of impropriety afterwards. Parliament voted $15,000 for a press association service, so that we are in a measure responsible for the cablegrams we get from England and ought to exercise control, and the man who sent that stuff should be summarily dismissed. He is not fit to be out of a lunatic asylum.

The PRIME MINISTER. I should certainly not feel inclined to follow the suggestion that I should wire Mr. Aylesworth for a denial of the words attributed to him. I want hon. gentlemen sitting here to remember that we should have some regard to what is the duty and the character of a public man. Public men to-day on whatever side of politics are simply the victims of the mad craving for sensational articles which characterizes modern journalism.

Mr. GOURLEY. I believe that.

The PRIME MINISTER. For my part, I refuse steadily to deny things attributed to me without foundation. A year ago when I left New York for England, I found that the New York papers were filled with interviews attributed to me with regard to the Alaska boundary, whereas, as a matter of fact, I always denied every interviewer who called on me. As I came on deck, these men waylaid me without any shame and asked me to give them an interview. And, although I said I would not be interviewed, still interviews with me were published. I would not take the trouble to deny such things. They were not true. It is time that public men should not be held responsible except for what they utter themselves otherwise some time or other they will have to take this position. They will have to deny responsibility for anything attributed to them in the papers unless it bears such a character as makes it sure it comes from them. The chief justice, in my opinion, in the abundance of his caution, went out of his way to deny the statement attributed to him. Nobody thinks more of him because of that denial; no one would have thought the less of him if he had not made it. Nobody would have thought him capable of such an indiscretion. He thought it worth while no doubt to make a denial because there had been persistent statements in the American press to the effect that he was going to give away the case. Even the Canadian papers have been indiscreet enough to repeat such statements which have been continually in the American press the last two months. Perhaps on that ac-

count he thought he should at once take this opportunity of nailing down such a calumny, but he had no call to do so for everybody knows the statement was false.

Mr. POPE. The right hon. the Prime Minister has said that no one believes Lord Alverstone was going to give away our case. He must have forgotten his Canadian history. He must have forgotten that practically every Canadian case was given away, and there is a very strong suspicion——

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). What about the fishery award ?

Mr. POPE. In nearly all cases. My hon. friend knows his history as well as I do, because he began reading it a long time before I did. That is a fact, and when this appeared in the public press there was a great deal of anxiety in the minds of ordinary Canadian citizens far and wide, and it afforded pleasure to the people and showed great wisdom on his part that Lord Alverstone sent that message. Not that any one who knows Lord Alverstone, not that the Prime Minister of Canada or any citizen who really considers the position Lord Alverstone occupies, thinks that that message would make any difference in his decision, but if his decision were to be against Canada, it is fortunate that he sent that message, and if it is for Canada, it is fortunate he sent it, because it will help to allay that unfortunate feeling of unrest that exists in the minds of the public of Canada, when they think of the manner in which they have been used in the past in treaty matters.

At one o'clock, Committee took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). When we rose at one o'clock, Mr. Chairman, we were discussing questions arising out of certain cablegrams respecting alleged utterances of Mr. Aylesworth. For my own part, I am still inclined to take the view that language of this kind could not be uttered by Mr. Aylesworth, although I appreciate the force of what has been said by some hon. gentlemen in this House that a little uncertainty is created by the fact that he has not followed the example of Lord Alverstone. I appreciate, of course, what my right hon. friend has said as to the impossibility of men in public life giving attention to every case in which they are misrepresented ; I have said twice during this session that any public man who would undertake to do that would not have much time for anything else. But a situation of this kind is a little out of the usual course. We are dealing with delicate international relations, and possibly it might be a case, in fact it is a case, where the rule to which my right hon. friend has referred might have been departed from by Mr. Aylesworth, if this telegram has been brought to his attention.

We must not, of course, overlook the fact that he possibly knows nothing about this telegram. Since we rose at one o'clock, I observe a telegram from London from which it appears that Lord Alverstone has made some reference to discussions in this House. The language of the telegram is as follows :

> Lord Chief Justice Alverstone in replying after referring to the death of Sir Michael Herbert, said that though the tribunal was not an illustration of arbitration it was 'an honest and patriotic attempt to solve by mutual discussion subjects which might become serious. I have no fault to find with anything that has been said and done. We have proceeded with great unanimity and I only wish that those who do not understand the motives of the tribunal would abstain from attributing motives to its members which do not exist.'
>
> This open reference to Canadian criticism of Lord Alverstone's supposed pre-disposition towards the American case caused no little sensation. It was followed by Lord Alvestone somewhat passionately declaring that in a long public career he had never objected to criticism after he had taken a certain course of action but he did bitterly resent criticism beforehand.

So far as this parliament is concerned—and the reference by Lord Alverstone seems to me to matters that have been mentioned in this parliament—I think that all the members of this House should agree with me that not the slightest attempt to criticise Lord Alverstone has been made here. The only reference to him was made by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) who brought to the attention of the government a certain telegram which was sent out from a reputable source in London, and on being assured by the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce that in his opinion no attention should be paid to a rumour of that kind, my hon. friend (Mr. Bell) made no further reference to the subject and accepted as absolutely satisfactory the view of the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. I think it is perhaps right for us to say this lest there should be any impression in the mind of Lord Alverstone or any one else that there has been in this parliament the slightest suggestion of criticism upon any action which his Lordship has taken since he was appointed one of the commissioners to sit on this tribunal on behalf of Great Britain.

The PRIME MINISTER. I certainly endorse every word of my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax). Nothing has been said which reflected in any way upon Lord Alverstone. For my own part, I still persist in believing that even the report which has just been read by my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) of the remarks of Lord Alverstone have been highly coloured.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Very likely.

The PRIME MINISTER. I repeat that I cannot believe Lord Alverstone could take offence at anything that has been said here.

Additional amount required to assist in defraying cost of the publication of documents issued by the Canadian Mining Institute, $2,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is a valuable publication to which for years past parliament has voted $1,000 annually. It is proposed this year to increase the appropriation by $2,000. The sum of $1,000 already placed in the main estimates for the fiscal year 1903-4, and this additional amount of $2,000 is to enable the Canadian Mining Institute to publish its transactions. The institute has now four hundred members scattered throughout the Dominion. The valuable contributions received for the members of that influential body have become so numerous that the income of the institute is not sufficient to cover the expenses connected with their publication. Canadian mining operations amounted to $70,000,000 last year, and the above sum is asked with a view to further promoting the mining interests of the country.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Might I ask whether or not the proceedings of the institute are distributed ? Are they sent to members of parliament or to any public bodies ? It is a very desirable object, I believe, to assist this work, although the increase is a very substantial one. Possibly it would not be impossible to make some condition as to the distribution.

The PRIME MINISTER. Speaking under correction, but I am sure that I am right, I may say that these reports to which we are now contributing this sum are sent to all public libraries, and I think they are also sent abroad.

Amount required to cover expenses connected with land slide at Turtle Mountain, $8,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. This grant is made necessary in order to undo the great damage which was caused by the flood at Frank. The House will remember that during the present session, I think it was in the month of May, in consequence of a very serious flood after great rains which took place at Dead Man's river, a part of Turtle mountain was thrown into the river, which accident threatened the collieries at Frank, and we had to send a force to that place in order to remove the debris and make a passage for the water. This is to cover that expenditure.

Additional amount required for expenses of the Assay office in British Columbia, $1,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is a Dominion assay office at Vancouver, and the provincial authorities have established a provincial assay office at Victoria, which is maintained by a grant from the provincial legislature and by a fund subscribed by several citizens, and we are asked to subscribe $1,000 for the same purpose.

Geological Survey—to provide for the salary of one second-class clerk, $1,100.

The PRIME MINISTER. When the other items of this department were passed the other day I was asked for an explanation of this item and could not give it. It is to promote a junior second-class clerk to the second class. Instead of asking for an appropriation of $1,100 we only require $400, and I move to reduce the item by $700.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think I understood from the right hon. gentleman the other day that the real effect of this was to give an increase of $100.

The PRIME MINISTER. I was mistaken. It is an increase of $400.

Dominion Lands—chargeable to income—further amount required for salaries of the outside service, $10,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is to provide for an increase in the outside service, and chiefly for clerical work in the different land offices in the North-west Territories. The clerical staff has to be increased on account of the great increase of work which has taken place in the various land offices. I was asked to give some information upon this subject the other day. During the first nine months of 1902 the number of free homestead entries was 15,983. For the same nine months of the present year the number of free homestead entries has risen to 36,882. The arrivals during the first nine months of 1902 were 68,802, and the arrivals during the first nine months of the present year were 108,014.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Last year I drew attention to the fact that a great many of the settlers coming in and taking up homesteads were unmarried men. You cannot force a man to marry, but you can encourage him to marry. I want to say that it is my opinion, based on careful observation, that a married man two years in that country is worth a single man half a dozen years

The PRIME MINISTER. So he is everywhere.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Much more so there than anywhere else, because in other localities the young fellows have an opportunity of brushing up, they are under the influence of women in the older settled districts more than they are in the remote regions of the North-west. I think the Prime Minister could do a good service to the country by giving a man his homestead after two years provided he is a married man, and making it five years if he is a single man.

Mr. McCREARY. Why does not my hon. friend go further, and say that spinsters may take up homesteads, the same as in the United States ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I think that should be a law, too.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would go back to the practice in my own province and provide a free homestead for every man who has children.

Mr. POPE. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman if there has been any provision made for the increase in the salary of Mr. Bennett at Strathcona ?

The PRIME MINISTER. There has been no increase.

Excise—salaries of officers and inspectors of excise, &c.—further amount required to provide increase in accordance with the proposed amendment, schedule B, Inland Revenue, Civil Service Act, $12,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Will the Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Bernier) give us an explanation ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Hon. M. E. Bernier). Mr. Chairman, the main estimates were made up at the beginning of the year, and this sum is to meet the increases provided for by the Bill amending the Civil Service Act which was passed to-day. I propose, with the consent of the Committee, as four months of the current year have elapsed, to reduce the amount to $8,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Give us a list of the officials who have received the increases.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. When the list was originally prepared provision was made for increases totalling $12,528.13. The collectors were to receive $2,205, the deputy collectors $1,467.50, accountants $460, special class excisemen $930, first-class excisemen $3,910.63, second-class excisemen $2,782.50, third-class excisemen $772.50. This money is divided by inland revenue districts as follows :

ONTARIO.

District.	No. of Officers.	Amount.
Belleville	5	$305 00
Brantford	7	318 75
Cornwall	1	40 00
Guelph	14	747 50
Hamilton	15	946 25
Kingston	5	265 00
London	12	593 13
Ottawa	5	225 00
Perth	3	190 00
Owen Sound	3	67 50
Peterborough	1	75 00
Port Arthur	1	40 00
Prescott	6	462 50
St. Catharines	3	132 50
Stratford	4	380 00
Toronto	27	1,885 00
Windsor	16	1,177 50
Total	128	$7,850 63

QUEBEC.

Joliette	1	130 00
Montreal	32	1,802 50
Quebec	7	355 00
St. Hyacinthe	3	137 50
Sherbrooke	4	225 00
Three Rivers	1	60 00
Total	48	$2,710 00

NEW BRUNSWICK.

St. John	6	415 00

NOVA SCOTIA.

Halifax	11	567 50
Pictou	1	40 00
Total	12	$ 607 50

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Charlottetown	1	60 00

MANITOBA.

Winnipeg	7	477 50

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Vancouver	3	160 00
Victoria	4	247 50
Total	7	$ 407 50

I ask that the amount shall be reduced from $12,000 to $8,000.

Mr. FOWLER. May I ask the hon. minister whether provision is made for raising the salary of his secretary ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No.

Mr. FOWLER. How many private secretaries has the hon. minister at the present time ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I have one secretary—Mr. Bourgault. He will receive the same increase as the other officers of the inside service under the Bill.

Mr. FOWLER. Do I understand that the minister has only one private secretary, although the civil service list credits him with three ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. There is only one private secretary ; Mr. Bourgault, of St. Hyacinthe, at $600.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Would the minister give me the names of those who received increases at Prescott, and their present salaries ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Subject to a deduction of one-third in the figures I give, the following are the increases : Mr. Keilty, collector, salary $1,600, increase $200. Mr. Gerald is a special officer and he will receive no increase. Mr. Melville, increase $100 ; Mr. Macdonald, increase $60 ; Mr. Keeler, increase $42.50. Mr. Johnston is asking for a superannuation, but he would be entitled to an increase of $30, and Mr. Marshall gets an increase of $30 also.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Would the minister give the increases in the office at Perth ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Mr. McLenaghan, increase $70 ; Mr. Mason, increase $70 ; Mr. Goodman, increase $50.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Are these increases given according to length of service, or on what are they based ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The increases of salary are based on the following plan : officers who have not yet reached the new minimum receive an increase that will bring their salaries up to that minimum as fixed by the new amendment to the Civil Service Act ; officers who have passed the new minimum and are receiving a regular increment of 5 per cent will receive an additional amount beyond that provided in the main estimates, which makes the annual increase 5 per cent on the new minimum.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What is the present salary of Mr. Melville and Mr. Gerald ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Mr. Melville's present salary is $1,200, and Mr. Gerald's $1,600.

Mr. REID (Grenville). In so far as the increases of salary at Prescott are concerned, a more unfair proposition could not be submitted to this House. Personally, I am glad to see these officers getting an increase of salary, but here is Mr. Gerald, who has been in the department for twenty years and who is one of the best officers in the Dominion of Canada without doubt, and who has passed his civil service examination and he gets no increase, while Mr. Keilty, who is not capable of taking the position which Mr. Gerald occupies, gets an increase of $200. Mr. Melville, whom the minister only appointed a few days ago at a salary of $1,200, gets an increase of $100 per annum, and Mr. Gerald, who has been so long in the service, gets no increase. The best man in the service to-day is Mr. Gerald. He is the most competent man in the office. Working right alongside him is Mr. Macdonald, who gets an increase of $60, and Mr. Gerald gets none. The minister tries to get out of this by saying that Mr. Gerald is a special officer, but he has passed all examinations and he is the chief excise man there, and there is no question that he is one of the best men in the Dominion of Canad to-day. It may have been that Mr. Gerald's brother, who is the deputy minister, has hesitated in recommending an increase, but it is a most unfair thing that the other officers should get increases and that Mr. Gerald, who has been twenty years in the department, should get no increase. I do not object to these other gentlemen getting increases, and I am glad to see that they do, but there should be fair-play all round. While on this point, I wish to express regret that the Minister of Customs has not taken a vote to increase the salaries of his officers at Prescott, because they are all hard-working officials and they should have got increases. I appeal to the Minister of Inland Revenue, to add to this vote an increase of $200 for Mr. Gerald, and I may say that there is not a Liberal in the town of Prescott who would not recommend that being done.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I am free to admit that Mr. Gerald is one of the best officers we have in the province of Ontario. He had an increase of $100 in his salary from the 1st of July, and he has received every year $150 of what we call duty pay in addition to his salary. Though Mr. Gerald is a very capable man, the law does not allow us to give him more. The list was prepared by the deputy of the department. He knows the law, and I am informed by him that we could not do better than we have done. With regard to the deputy collector, he is, of course, a new man ; but he has received the salary to which he is entitled under the law. There is a minimum, and maximum fixed, and it is the custom of the department to give a fair remuneration to the officers. These increases have been given in order to raise the minimum of each class as it is prescribed by the amended Act.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. minister is now leading us to believe that in giving the deputy collector this increase, he is doing what is fair all round. Why did he not deal with the officers entitled to an increase in the town of Prescott ? He had a deputy collector in the town of Prescott before he appointed the present one five or six days ago. Why was his salary not brought up to the salary of the present deputy collector ? This man is ahead of the other, so far as promotion is concerned; but the other was appointed to evade the Civil Service Act, and he has since passed the examination. One of these deputy collectors in the town of Prescott has received an increase of $100, though appointed less than a month ago, and has $1,300 per annum. Will the hon. minister explain why he discriminates between the two ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The hon. gentleman refers to Mr. White. He was appointed deputy collector class B. He has not passed his examination, and therefore it is not in our power to raise his salary. If I were to increase the salaries of all the deputy collectors in class B in one locality, I woud have to do the same all over the Dominion. I have tried to equalize the salaries as well as I could. It is no fault of the department if Mr. White had not taken the precaution to qualify himself. I have nothing to say against him ; he is a good officer ; but he is not in

a position to perform the duties of deputy collector in class A, or those of Mr. Gerald.

Mr. REID (Grenville). When Mr. White was appointed two or three years ago, he was appointed deputy collector to evade the Civil Service Act, and at the present time he is filling the position of exciseman. In this way the law is evaded. Was the collector in class A when he was promoted ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes, he was collector in class A, and he had passed the promotion examination.

Mr. REID (Grenville). In the list of increases which the hon. minister has read, is there any deputy collector in class B who has any increase?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No, none.

Mr. FOWLER. I asked the minister a question respecting private secretaries. He stated that there was only one, Mr. Alphonse Bourgault. I see that the civil service list gives his name and two others, Napoleon Potvin and Robert Peter Yetts. Besides, I understand that the minister has an assistant secretary, Miss Chevrier, one of the famous Chevrier family who are so numerous in the civil service. Will the hon. minister say why he has these three private secretaries ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I am not responsible for misprints. Mr. Alphonse Bourgault is my private secretary, but the others are messengers. Napoleon Potvin has never been my private secretary, and Mr. Yetts is a messenger. He has never been a private secretary.

Mr. FOWLER. It is strange that there should be any misprints. In the first place, I do not see why this office should require three messengers.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. There were three in the department, and one was transferred to the laboratory branch.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. gentleman states that Mr. Johnston has applied for superannuation. Has that been granted yet ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No, but I have prepared a recommendation for it at his own request.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Has any other gentleman been recommended for the position ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I understood that another officer had applied for superannuation.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No. Mr. Ferguson was superannuated at his own request about three months ago.

Hon. Mr. BERNIER.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Has Mr. Bisset passed the examination ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No, he is a temporary officer.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is he likely to hold that position permanently if he does not pass the examination ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No. He has been told, like everybody else in the department who has not complied with the law, to present himself for examination in the month of November next.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Suppose he fails in the examination ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Then I suppose we shall have to keep him there for a certain time, and he will run his risk.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. minister is evading the Civil Service Act; and when I brought the fact to his attention, he tried to make out that there was nothing in it. He has appointed a man to that position who never passed the civil service examination and never will. The hon. minister admits that if he fails next November to pass, he will still be kept on. And if he should fail the following November, he will still be continued in office indefinitely. I have heard it discussed throughout the constituency that the hon. gentleman has agreed to appoint preventive officers and promote preventive officers to collectors without any examination whatever. That is unfair to those who have passed their examinations.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The hon. gentleman has gone a little too far. I have said already that there were two doors open by which appointments could be made without the applicants passing an examination. One is to appoint deputy collectors and the other temporary officers. These temporary officers are not appointed by Order in Council but by letter sent to the collector, telling him to employ a man temporarily at a stated salary. If my hon. friend is so anxious to have the law respected, he should go back some twenty years and he will find that almost every department had then and has still men who never passed their examination. This Mr. Bissell was appointed just the same as other temporary officers. He was not appointed to fill the position left vacant by Mr. Ferguson, but if he qualifies himself he will be entitled to take that position. If he does not do his duties properly or if he cannot pass the examination, he will have to resign; but if that rule be applied a great many officials, who are friends of the party opposite and who were appointed by them, would have to be dismissed.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. gentleman asked me to go back twenty years,

but we are dealing with the present, and I am not referring to any constituency but the one I represent. I challenge him to name one instance in the county of Grenville, while the Conservatives were in power, in which the law was evaded. What I am asking is not unfair. If he appoints any person to a vacant position and that person cannot pass the civil service examition, he ought to withdraw and give the place to someone who can pass it. The hon. minister proposes to let that man go on indefinitely, whether he passes or not. The hon. minister will have an Order in Council passed appointing the man as preventive officer. Will he say that if this man to whom I refer should fail in his examination, he will not continue in office ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. If I were to apply the law the hon. gentleman would find it would hurt his own supporters more than anybody else. There are many gentlemen who support the party opposite who have been years in office but for one reason or another have never passed the examination; and if the hon. gentleman wants the rule to be applied to all departments he takes the responsibility of urging that perhaps 200 or more temporary officers, who have been in the service many years, will be dismissed. I am not not ready to say that there is one in the constituency represented by the hon. gentleman who has not complied with the law ; but should there be one, it would not be prudent, or in the interests of that gentleman, that we should bring his name forward, because he is exactly in the same position as many others who are not disturbed.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. minister led us to believe that he was going to have a better staff and make improvements and have everything in better shape. Is it a sample of his improvements that he will appoint men to positions who cannot pass the examination ? Because that was done in the past is no excuse for doing it now. I understood from the hon. minister that he was going to stand by the Civil Service Act, and I think it is a very poor excuse to say that because his predecessors made appointments of this kind, he is going to continue the same thing. I am not asking for the dismissal of any officer who has been in the service for years, but I do not want him to appoint men on the staff whether they can pass the examination or not. There are plenty of men in my constituency who have passed the examination and who are just as good Liberals as the man you have appointed. If the hon. minister is going to continue a policy of this kind, there will be no object for young men to pass the civil service examination, because all they will need to get positions will be a recommendation from the Liberal committee, even if they cannot read or write.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Is the hon. gentleman able to give me the name of a man in Prescott who cannot sign his name ?

Mr. REID (Grenville). I did not say that there was an officer in Prescott who could not write his name. I say that if any man in the county of Grenville can secure the recommendation of the Liberal committee to a vacancy in the Inland Revenue Department, whether he can write his name or not, the hon. minister will appoint him and evade the law.

To increase the salaries of the inspectors of distilleries, inspector of bonded factories, inspector of tobacco factories, and inspector of malt houses and breweries, not exceeding $300 in any one case, $1,200.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. As the Committee will see, no increase in salary was provided for the inspectors in the different divisions of the Dominion. We have eight of those divisions in the Dominion—one in British Columbia, one in Manitoba, three in Ontario, two in Quebec and one in the lower provinces. Before the position of assistant commissioner was abolished three years ago, the gentleman who held that position, the present deputy minister, acted at the same time as inspector of tobacco, manufactories, distilleries, breweries, &c. Since the positions of commissioner and assistant commissioner were abolished the duties of the deputy minister were such that he could not attend to the duties required from the inspector. Mr. Barrett, of Winnipeg, is inspector of breweries and malt houses ; Mr. Kenning, of Windsor, is inspector of distilleries ; Mr. Stratton is inspector of bonded factories. The inspector of tobacco factories has not yet been appointed, but he will be chosen from the best qualified district inspectors in the province of Quebec, and probably Mr. Lawlor will be appointed as such inspector. The jurisdiction of these inspectors will be over all Canada, and the increase will take effect from January or sooner. The present maximum salary of the inspectors is $2,500.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to me that these gentlemen are well provided for now with $2,500 and expenses. Why are the words added :

Not to exceed $300 in any one case ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We are not bound to give all of that increase in the same year, that will be the maximum of their salaries. We have among these gentlemen some who have not yet reached the present maximum of their salaries.

Mr. FOWLER. By this provision you are taking into the hands of the minister power to do just the thing to which objection has been taken, give increases on

grounds of favouritism to men who have not fulfilled the conditions which, under the Act, entitles them to an increase. These increases should be statutory and should not be at the discretion of the minister, subject, I presume, to the recommendation of the deputy minister. I make no reflection upon the minister or his deputy. I assume that these gentlemen are the same as ordinary mortals, with the same infirmities, moved by the same impulses, and I say that you are putting that power into the hands of the minister of the deputy to discriminate between officers who may be equally worthy. It gives an opportunity for a great deal of unfairness, and should not be sanctioned.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. These officers, Mr. Kenning, Mr. Barrett, Mr. Stratton and Mr. Lawlor, are officers of long standing and capacity in the department.

Mr. FOWLER. I am not saying anything against the officers. I do not know anything about these gentlemen, I assume that they are worthy men.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I give this information, because some persons might suppose that undue favour was being shown to these officers. Mr. Lawlor has been in the service as collector at Montreal for fifteen or seventeen years. Last year he was promoted to the office of inspector, with a salary of $2,300, whereas he was only getting $2,200 as collector. The position of inspector may be transferred from one man to another man. The first gentleman appointed inspector was Mr. Gow. Some two years ago he retired and was superannuated, and was succeeded by Mr. Kenning who was collector at Windsor, and one of the oldest officers in the department. Mr. Stratton held a similar position for many years, as did also Mr. Barrett. When another man is appointed he will be entitled like these gentlemen to receive an additional $300. If any of these gentlemen were to retire or were to be replaced by some others, their salary would be reduced, because the salary is attached to the position and not to the person himself. This $300 is given to the gentlemen, whoever they are, who fulfil the duties of inspector of breweries, distilleries, tobacco manufactories and so forth.

Mr. FOWLER. If that be the case why does the hon. gentleman want power to make a distinction ? If the salary belongs to the office and not to the incumbent, why does he want to make a distinction ? You say these four men are to be selected from the eight officers who are now fulfilling certain duties. What additional service do these four men have to give in order to entitle them to receive an increase over the other four men who are left behind ? Is it because they are travelling inspectors that they require more salary ? That is a reason against it, because if you pay, this man's expenses, if he is travelling all the time you pay all his living expenses. He is not at the expense of living at home. If he were at home he would have to pay his own board. The person who remains at home really requires more salary than the officer who is constantly travelling. I can not see any justification in anything the minister has said in favour of this increase.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. This practice has prevailed ever since I have been at the head of the department. These special inspectors will be chosen among the best officers, and we consider the best officers are those whose capacity and long training have fitted them for the first positions in the service, that is to say, district inspectors. Of course, there will be four men who will not benefit by this special allowance, but there has been no discrimination shown. I had to appoint two, Mr. Kennie and Mr. Lawlor, and they were chosen among the oldest officers on the staff. The other four will wait until these gentlemen disappear by death or otherwise. It may be said that it is not fair to choose between them. But we hold out an inducement for those who aspire to be district inspectors to qualify themselves to fulfil the duties of an inspector for a special industry. The hon. member must remember that these gentlemen must possess not only qualifications of a special character which enable them to fulfil the duties of inspector in their own division, but they must go all through the Dominion and inspect all these various manufactories, and inspect the books. There fore they must possess a technical knowledge. I do not see that there is any injustice in saying to these inspectors who are younger : Wait for a while until these gentlemen who are now your superiors disappear, and then, if the same salary is still provided by parliament, you will have your opportunity of rising and getting the $300 additional. This $300 is only a small reward for those who receive no increase of salary. I find by looking at the schedule of salaries that the salaries of the inspectors have not been increased, they remain at $2,500, while the other officers, the collectors and deputy collectors, accountants and so forth, are receiving increases.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister says it is not the intention to give the salary to the man but to the position. Supposing the inspector of a distillery was removed and went back to his old position, then he would lose the additional salary which is attached to the former position.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. He would lose a portion of the $300.

Mr. FOWLER. If it be the case that the salary goes to the office and not to the individual, why should there be that discrimination between the positions ? Is not the position of inspector of distilleries as impor-

tant as that of inspector of bonded factories, of tobacco factories, or malt houses and breweries ? Why, make any distinction between the positions in respect to salaries ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. There is no discrimination with regard to salaries. I have stated that we can do one thing or another. The intention is to give these gentlemen $300, and we ask for that amount, but we are not bound to give it. I have explained that there is no discrimination, that in the case of Mr. Lawlor, for instance, he is inspector of the largest and most important districts in the whole Dominion. He is the inspector, but, as he is a new officer, he is only receiving $2,300. I said that we proposed to give him $300, which would make his salary $2,600, and the other gentlemen would be entitled to the same amount of increase ; that is to say, $300.

Mr. FOWLER. Then you are giving the salary to the particular incumbent and not to the office, unless you give each one occupying the same position $300 also. If you give $250 or $200 to two officers and $300 to another and $100 to another, you are making a discrimination between the four positions. The individuality of the incumbent should make no difference if the salary attaches to the office and not to the officer. If a salary attaches to the office and not to the officer you should give each one of these positions the same increase. If it attaches to the officer, then it is another matter. In this case you are making a discrimination between these different officers.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. That is not what I propose. I say that we are not bound to give $300 to all of them. We might begin at $100, or $200, or we might make it $300, but if one receives $100 the others will receive $100, and there will be no discrimination.

Mr. FOWLER. And no more ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. And no more.

Mr. FOWLER. That is satisfactory. The hon. minister did not say that before.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We cannot change the scale of salaries now paid to those officers who are occupying positions as inspectors. We do not propose to change the salaries of those who receive $2,500. I have taken the case of Mr. Lawlor, because he is only receiving $2,300, as he was recently appointed, and if we give $100, $200 or $300 to one, the other three will receive the same increase.

Mr. FOWLER. As the hon. minister has made that statement, as far as the division of the money is concerned, it is perfectly satisfactory. At the same time, I protest against the increase at all, because I do not think there should be an increase. I do not think the fact that they are travelling men should entitle them to an increase.

Mr. REID (Grenville). As far as Prescott is concerned, I would make one more appeal to the hon. minister. Mr. Keilty receives $1,300 and Mr. Gerald $1,500. The hon. minister states that Mr. Gerald is to receive $1,600 and that Mr. Keilty will receive $1,600. Mr. Gerald is a special officer, he has a large family to support, it is very expensive living there, and as I think he should have an increase I would be very glad if the hon. minister could see his way clear to give him one. We could pass it now. He is a special officer, and there is no reason why he should not get an increase with the rest. He is really the head of the staff at Prescott. He is the main officer there and he is entitled to a little increase. If the hon. minister would consent to give him an increase I do not think it would be unfair, and I think every officer in Prescott would be glad to see him get an increase with the rest. I hope the hon. minister will see his way clear to grant him an increase.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I regret that I cannot change the law, although I am ready to appreciate that Mr. Gerald is one of the best officers in the service. Mr. Gerald is entitled to a $100 increase from the 1st of July. He received it. Next year he will be entitled to $100 more and he will receive it. I cannot change the schedule of the Act.

Mr. TAYLOR. And he has $150 from another source.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes. I think he is entirely satisfied. My authority for speaking in that way, is that the gentleman who applies the law is a brother of Mr. Gerald, of Prescott.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I am very sorry, but I understood that the law was such that in the case of a special officer the department could give him any salary they wished. I think, if the hon. minister could see his way clear to evade the law in other instances, he could have seen his way clear to have got around it in this case.

Mr. HACKETT. What salary has Mr. Nash, the inspector of Inland Revenue in Prince Edward Island ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. One thousand two hundred dollars, and he will receive $60 of an increase according to the amended schedule that forms part of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. HACKETT. I desire to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue the fact that I spoke to him a few days ago in regard to the claim of Mr. O'Rielly, whose factory was burned and whose tobacco had to be supplied from the

outside. Will the hon. minister state if Mr. O'Rielly is to be compensated ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I am told by my deputy that this claim was discussed, and that there is no legal ground for entertaining the same.

Mr. HACKETT. There may be no legal grounds for it, but there are moral grounds. Mr. O'Rielly's tobacco factory was destroyed by fire after the place was stocked for the winter season. The hon. minister will find that the revenue derived from this factory this year was more than the previous year, and I trust that he will see that Mr. O'Rielly is compensated for the loss he sustained in the fire.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I would not like to pass judgment on the case of Mr. O'Rielly. The facts are these : There was a certain quantity of tobacco destroyed by fire. I presume that this gentleman had some insurance on the premises and on the goods, but the law says that no refund can be made on goods destroyed by fire after the duty is paid. The goods were in store in Mr. O'Rielly's factory. They were destroyed, and we are not able, because the law prevents us, to give any refund to the gentleman. I presume this has been discussed somewhere, and although the department would be willing to help Mr. O'Rielly to the best of its ability, we cannot do it under the law as it is now.

Mr. HACKETT. Have you not already allowed Mr. O'Rielly a certain amount of compensation for this loss ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes, but the cases are quite different. In one instance he was allowed to pass a free entry to cover goods destroyed in bond but when the goods have been entered and the duty paid we are not allowed to refund the money.

Mr. FOWLER. Were these goods destroyed in the bonded warehouse or in the factory ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. In his tobacco factory.

Mr. FOWLER. There is a bonded warehouse which is a part of each factory. Were these goods in that bonded warehouse or outside of the bonded warehouse in the factory ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. If the goods are destroyed before duty is paid he has not to pay the duty ; but, when the goods were destroyed in his factory or warehouse as was the case in Prince Edward Island, they were his property and should have been insured.

Mr. FOWLER. They were not in the bonded warehouse ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No.

Mr. HACKETT.

Salaries and contingent expenses of the several ports in Canada—additional amount required for salaries (including pay for overtime of officers, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act), $100,000.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. When the main estimates were under consideration I explained that the government would in future pay officers who are engaged for extra service at railway stations and such. This has been a charge on the transportation companies hitherto, and for many years past they have been representing that it should be a charge on the revenue of the Dominion.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister fully explained this before.

Mr. POPE. This vote is well worded when it speaks of working 'overtime' and the 'outside service.' Would it include the salary of H. L. Pelletier, who is employed in the customs house in Montreal, and who works overtime canvassing for 'Le Canada' ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There is a gentleman named H. E. Pelletier in the Montreal office.

Mr. POPE. That is the gentleman. Does the minister know he is canvassing for 'Le Canada' in the country districts and that he has been spending some three weeks in the county of Chateauguay in that mission ? Would that come under the heading of 'overtime' or 'outside service'?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No. This is the first I have heard of that matter, but I can assure the hon. gentleman that Mr. Pelletier will not be paid out of this vote. I do not know whether Mr. Pelletier may have been doing some work during his holidays.

Mr. POPE. I understand that Mr. Latour, an officer of the Public Works Department, got six months leave of absence on account of ill health, his son taking his place, and that he is also an agent for 'Le Canada' through the province of Quebec. I have often heard the Minister of Customs in his eloquent and able and sometimes loud manner, denounce public officers for doing political work, and if Mr. Pelletier, who is drawing a salary from the government is canvassing for a political organ like 'Le Canada' will the Minister of Customs take his political head off and dismiss him?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not know anything about the circumstances of the case, but they will be inquired into. He is a permanent officer and gets three weeks leave of absence.

Mr. POPE. When did he have his three weeks leave ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The collector arranges that, and we have no means

of knowing. I do not think that the collector at Montreal would give Mr. Pelletier extra leave to go on a mission of that kind.

Mr. POPE. Do I understand that a permanent officer can devote himself to political work when he is on his holidays ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Is canvassing for a newspaper 'political work' ?

Mr. POPE. Canvassing for a government party organ.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The interference of officials in politics is not favoured, but does canvassing for a regular established journal come under the head of political work ?

Mr. POPE. What is the opinion of the minister on that ? During the last seven years we have had a great many dismissals because some officers interfered but slightly in political matters, and there is no doubt that when a man is canvassing for a party organ he is probably making as much political capital as he can out of it. I know of no better introduction to a house for political work that the canvassing for a newspaper. I would like to know if the minister thinks this man has a right to do that work in his holidays ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I would not like to express an opinion on what a man might or might not do in his holidays. As to a man being connected with a newspaper, I think complaints have been made of that in my department, and it has been recognized that we must not draw the line too strictly in that respect. As the hon. gentleman says he has done the work in his holidays, I would not like to say offhand that he had done wrong. I would like to inquire into the matter first.

Mr. POPE. Certainly, I would not ask the hon. minister to condemn him without inquiry. That he was canvassing there is no doubt. During his holidays he would be drawing his salary, as he is a permanent officer. Under these circumstances, how can the minister have any doubt as to his doing partisan work?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am not putting it on the ground of partisan work. I am putting it on the ground that the hon. gentleman says he has been canvassing for subscriptions to a public journal. It seems to me that there is a distinction between a case of that kind and the case of an officer going out and canvassing to have votes cast for a political party. I think the hon. gentleman must see the distinction.

Mr. POPE. I would see a distinction if it were an ordinary magazine or paper that was not absolutely wrapped up in politics. But I think the minister must agree with me that a paper published as a mouthpiece of a political party is different. If a man takes that paper into his household, I think it is a pretty strong temptation for him to begin to canvass and talk politics for that paper. I think it is the strongest evidence that that gentleman has been working for a certain party through a certain journal ; and if it be found to be true that Mr. Pelletier was going through the country canvassing for 'Le Canada,' which is recognized in the province of Quebec as a political paper published in the interest of the Liberal party, the minister should tell us whether he considers that work political work or not, and whether he intends to investigate the case ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. All our papers, I suppose, might be called political papers, as they are supposed to represent the views of one party or the other. I do not want to say anything about the matter, as this is the first time that it has been brought to my notice; but the hon. gentleman having brought the matter up, I will ask the collector for a report upon it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Had not the hon. gentleman better allow this item to stand until he communicates with his officer in Montreal, and ascertain the facts ? My hon. friend says this man spent three weeks in Chateauguay county. If he has spent three weeks in every county in Quebec, he has used up all his holidays and more. The information is that he is travelling around the country doing this kind of work. The hon. minister had better ascertain when he took his leave of absence, to see whether it corresponds with the time that my hon. friend says he spent in the county of Chateauguay. Then, he brings up the case of Mr. Latour, an employee of the Public Works Department, who has been granted leave of absence and whose son has been put in his place, in order that he might become the head travelling agent for 'Le Canada.' It is said that he goes to every postmaster in the country and demands from him the names of all the subscribers to Conservative newspapers which go to that office and if the postmaster refuses to give the names, he threatens him with dismissal. The government gives this man six months' leave of absence to go out and do this work; and the hon. minister now wants this vote to give this man an extra allowance for doing this political work.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think my hon. friend is not serious in that. This vote has nothing to do with Mr. Pelletier. He is a regular officer on the Montreal staff, and is being paid out of appropriations already granted by parliament. As I have explained, the larger part of this vote is for the pay of extra officers who have previously been paid by the transportation companies.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is not Mr. Pelletier under the pay of the department?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. COCHRANE. So this has nothing to do with the circumstance, because this vote does not appertain to his payment.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. His pay does not come out of this ; therefore, I think there would be no necessity of letting the item stand. I will make inquiries, and if he will bring the question up on concurrence, I will tell him then what I have learned about it. The estimates of the Department of Customs are generally prepared with that regard for economy which should meet the approval of the House, and they generally go through without any very disparaging comment.

Mr. COCHRANE. It is all very well to talk about the estimates being prepared with due regard to economy, but the hon. members on the back benches must laugh in their sleeves when they hear the ministers discourse in this strain. We were told by these gentlemen that they would not allow the civil servants to indulge in any active partisanship and they made that the excuse for dismissing a number of them without trial, yet here we have a case of an official going through the country doing party work, and when it is brought to the attention of the hon. minister he treats it very lightly. I should like very much to find one instance in which these hon. gentlemen opposite have kept their word. Here is a case of offensive partisanship, and I ask the hon. minister to treat it as the government did the cases of many Conservatives. They dismissed any number of officials, without even giving them an opportunity of defending themselves. Yet here is a flagrant case of political partisanship and they refuse to act. Here is an official who went around the country doing the political work of his party, and he is to be paid, not out of the pockets of hon. gentlemen opposite, but out of the revenues of the country. The farmers are bled white paying officials for running around doing work which the ministers ought to do themselves. We have the Minister of Customs now, a full fledged minister, although the party he supported said that the position he holds should not have been created, and that there were too many ministers. But no sooner did they secure office than they appointed more ministers.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman who brought up the case is satisfied with the assurance that I have given that it was the first I heard of it and that I would inquire into it.

Mr. GOURLEY. I regret that I am not satisfied with the plea of the hon. minister. I would have thought that, from his long training in opposition, he would have had a very live mental apprehension of what political partisanship meant and would not have found it necessary to take time to ascertain whether a man who goes around canvassing for a political paper is a partisan or not. The hon. gentleman appears to be losing his mental intuition in these matters. I would regard it as a flagrant case of partisanship that an official should introduce among my electors a Liberal organ. What I find extraordinary is that the hon. minister could have any doubt about it. I would not mind an officer taking the stump for weeks during a violent political campaign because men's feelings are then aroused and you cannot then make a man change his political creed, but when you introduce, in times of peace, a political organ among the people, if it is intelligently written, you are introducing a very dangerous element against the party it is opposing, and I would regard the agent of that organ as a violent and a very astute political partisan. What I find extraordinary is that the minister should have any doubt.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is there in that $100,000 any increases in Prescott ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes. The whole vote will be taken up with the payment of overtime and a little extra amount for the salaries of some officers we think are deserving.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I understand that many officers have been getting quite a little sum from the Canadian Pacific Railway for overtime at night. I think they average something between $30 and $40 which they divide amongst themselves. Has that been taken away now ? Does the government receive the revenue and then pay these officers ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It will be paid by us and not the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway used to pay that sum to the collectors at the various ports who paid it to the officers for extra work. The House is now assuming the payment of these officers for overtime. We require the transportation companies still to pay something where we consider the work entirely for their own benefit. For instance we require the services of a customs officer outside of Canada at the request of the railway companies they are accommodating. They ask that for their own convenience. The Canadian Pacific Railway may ask for a Canadian customs officer at Boston, Portland or Chicago, because it is a convenience to parties passing over that road, and they can secure passengers by having that facility. We have officers in attendance on frontier highway bridges and ferries during certain seasons of the year, to be regulated by the collector, subject to the approval of the department, and then such other customs services of a special character or class as may be required on the approval of the minister himself and on the applications of the par-

ties accommodated. When a company gets the services of an officer for its own special benefit and not for the benefit of Canada, we still require them to pay. In all other cases, if parliament consents to this vote, all extra services rendered by officers, which have hitherto been defrayed by the transportation companies, will be defrayed out of this vote.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I hope that the two officers who have been dividing the time and receiving about $40 a month will continue to receive that, either from the railway company or from the department. They are in receipt of small salaries, and that is quite an item to them.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, that is the intention. In cases where officers' salaries have been supplemented by this extra service we will continue that, and they will be paid that amount, provided the hours of their day's duty before that has not been too long. We require the officers to give us the full day's time, and all services rendered after that will be paid for at 25 cents an hour. It may be that in some of the large ports which the commissioner has visited we may have to use some of this money to add an extra man or two, as it may be advisable to have night men, and we are asking for a little latitude in order that we may get this system into proper order.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is a collector of customs at a port supposed to be in his office a certain number of hours per day ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, certainly ; offices are generally open from nine till four ; but we require all our officers to be on duty from eight to six, if business calls for it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Minister of Customs tells us, in a somewhat soothing tone, that every one seems to be perfectly satisfied about the charge made with respect to Mr. Pelletier, but I hardly think we ought to be satisfied with the very vague remarks of my hon. friend with regard to that case. It seems to me a most extraordinary thing that an employee of the Department of Customs should, while drawing a salary from government, be engaged in canvassing for any newspaper, and I would think that my hon. friend himself would suggest that an item in his estimates referring to Mr. Pelletier should stand until an investigation had been held and definite and accurate information on the subject obtained and given to parliament and the people. My hon. friend seems to suggest that Mr. Pelletier had been canvassing while he was on a holiday. Would my hon. friend inform me whether or not this gentleman has any definite period for holidays ; and if so, at what season of the year ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, there is no definite three weeks in the year to which officers of the different ports are entitled. The collector arranges so that they may go away one by one, or two at a time, as he can spare them.

Mr. POPE. The hon. minister said that I was quite satisfied with what he said ; I am satisfied that he should investigate the question, and so far his reply was encouraging to me ; but I received no other information, and the balance of his reply gave me no satisfaction whatever. I still think that the minister should not permit such a violation of the proper conduct of an employee of his department. We know that many dismissals have taken place in the public service for alleged political actions by employees, and sometimes we can scarcely find a reason for dismissals that have taken place. Many of these men, some old and some young, have had to seek new ways for getting a living, and are suffering in consequence of either the high ideal of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, or of the meanest sort of political ambition. I think we are entitled to know on which of these principles such dismissals have taken place. Personally, while I do not believe in officers taking any part in politics, there have been instances in my own knowledge in which the government have gone a very long way in seeking a reason for the dismissal of employees. I think the hon. minister should hold an investigation in this case, and that we should know whether the government is going to permit the employees of the departments to use their energies, while they are receiving government pay, to canvass for political newspapers ; for we know that a man who thus sows the seeds of a particular political faith in families is doing the most telling work in promoting the interests of a party. The hon. gentleman would not like to be held to the statement that there is no election in sight. He is not himself yet positive whether or not there is an election in sight. He does not know whether the government can or can not afford to have an election in the near future. The ministers have vacillated in their opinions as to the holding of an election ever since we came here on March 12th. The man who goes about as a canvasser for a political paper is doing the real work of a political organizer.

I do not know what my hon. friend thinks of the work of a man who goes out on that business. Of course, it is not the work of a man who goes forth to buy votes. But I know of no better way of spending money, if you wish to prepare a constituency, than to see that the proper newspapers which preach your political doctrines are circulated among the people in the constituency. I am not alone in having discovered that. I think the Minister of Customs is possessed of that fact as well as I am. It is well

known that every party makes a desperate effort to see that its own political organs take the place of others. Here we have a man going about for that purpose who is paid by the government—for I understand that Mr. Pelletier was in the permanent service—going about and asking the postmasters and others to give him a list of the people who get mail at their offices, and of those who take the opposition newspapers, in order to discourage the taking of the opposition papers and to encourage the taking of government organs. In my judgment this gentleman is doing most efficient political work. If he has been doing it he should be dismissed. I am satisfied the minister is going to investigate it. I wish I was going along with him, because I would be more certain how the investigation is going to be conducted. I trust he will make a complete investigation that will either clear Mr. Pelletier or put him where he belongs.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not know that any one has been dealt with by this government, certainly not in my own department, in a harsh way for doing nothing more serious than what the hon. gentleman alleges has been done in this case. The hon. gentleman surely would not ask me to pronounce judgment upon a man before he has been heard in his own defence. If there be something wrong in the matter—and I confess that canvassing for a great public journal, if he is doing it in his own time, is not a very serious matter—but if he has been guilty of any partisanship, he will be dealt with. Parties have been dealt with who had shown violent partisanship in using the power of their office in order to induce people to vote in an election. In my opinion a civil servant should abstain from anything like partisanship. But the hon. gentleman will allow that he should be heard in his own defence, he will allow that I ought to ask the collector at Montreal what the circumstances were. In cases of people dismissed from my own department for political reasons, there was in every instance an investigation, and when the report came it was dealt with. The rule was not stretched in any case in order to inculpate any one. It was more pleasing to me to find that there were reasons that might justify the retention of the accused officer. Simply because a man had perhaps inadvertently taken part in an election, did not appear to be sufficient reason for dismissing him. There have been cases where complaints were made that men were writing for the papers, and even editing papers, which the department were able to overlook when all the circumstances were inquired into. However, I recognize the fact that the hon. gentleman wished to bring this matter before the House and the public, and as it appears that there is another officer in another department against whom a charge is made, we might pass this item, and the subject can be brought up again. I am fully impressed with this case, and I will look into it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As relating to this subject, I may inform my hon. friend that a man in my own constituency, who was employed in the Department of Inland Revenue, was dismissed without investigation merely because he asked a question in a public meeting. I would consider that not a greater offence than canvassing for a public journal. It is desirable to have great public journals, of course, and those great journals can be conducted more economically if they are canvassed for by officers of the government. It is an advantage to the journal from its own standpoint, but from the standpoint of the public the arrangement might not be so advantageous as my hon. friend would seem inclined to regard it.

Mr. BELL. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Customs to a matter which I may not have another opportunity of mentioning—a case in which the Bank of Nova Scotia was charged with the sum of $204 customs duty upon a safe which was made in Canada, exported to Newfoundland, and afterwards re-exported to Canada. The article was entirely of Canadian manufacture, but having been exported and having remained outside the country for a term exceeding three years, I think, upon its return to this country they were compelled to pay duty upon the whole of the original value. Possibly the minister has some remembrance of the case.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do remember it. I think it was out of the country more than three years, and the tariff law which parliament passed, and which we only administer, says that if goods the manufacture or produce of Canada are exported to a foreign country and return unimpaired and unaltered within three years, they may come in free. In this case the safe was more than three years out of the country, and parliament has passed a law which takes away from us the power to admit such an article free. In this case there was no desire to deal in an exceptional manner. Any one could have appealed to the treasury board, and if the appeal had been reported favourably upon by them and adopted by council, the duty could have been remitted. But as I say, the department only administers the law, parliament makes the law.

Mr. BELL. In this case it would appear that the safe which was in existence for a long time and which originally cost $680 was charged duty at the rate of 30 per cent upon the original value when it was returned to the country. It would appear as if it were a very extreme charge.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was improved by the sea voyage.

Mr. BELL. I do not suppose that safes are like ale or beer that is supposed to be improved by a sea voyage or even like port wine which I understand occasionally is improved by a sea voyage. The safe went out of the country by sea and came back in a few years. I would suppose that there must be some authority or power in the Department of Customs to deal with such a case. I have been asked to bring it to the notice of the hon. minister.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It could only be dealt with in the way I have pointed out. It is beyond the power of the department to do it. All the department could do would be to submit a case to the treasury board of the Privy Council.

Mr. POPE. I want a little more information. I am sorry to be bothering the hon. minister but he is laying down the principle, in so far as I understand it, that he does not think it any violation of the privileges of a member of the civil service in his department, a man being paid in a public department, a permanent officer like Mr. Pelletier, or any other man, to engage in the circulation of newspapers. The hon. gentleman has no objection to his doing so. Do I understand that to be the hon. minister's view of the matter ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I said that I was reserving judgment, until I knew the whole facts of the case.

Mr. POPE. I do not ask the hon. minister to judge the man. I have no positive evidence to produce before him. I recognize Mr. Pelletier's absolute right to be heard and to be dealt with most leniently, but providing that the hon. minister finds out that he has been employing himself in circulating the newspaper,' Le Canada,' I want to know whether the hon. minister thinks this is justifiable work ? In the hon. minister's department and throughout the country there are many political friends of my own and of others on this side of the House and if the hon. gentleman's friends have the right to circulate ' Le Canada ' our friends have the right to circulate some other papers. We are paying taxes and the hon. minister will realize that. Although we are not in power, although we are a minority as far as this House is concerned, I think, we have still our rights of citizenship. Hon. gentlemen are going forth now to prepare for an election which is going to take place at a more or less early date. I can understand that the supporters of the government as they return from different parts of the country after having visited their constituents are not very urgent for an early appeal and of course ministers of the Crown must listen to those people as they return from the different parts of Canada, they will not have any very great encouragement to give them to have an early election. However, circumstances must govern ministers irrespective of their supporters. Although they may imagine that they are making a very wonderful impression on the country, if circumstances compel an appeal to the people they will find that they have not made any impression at all. These are the conditions which the cabinet must deal with. The work is to be done. The distribution of party newspapers and literature is of great assistance in the organization of a party and I think the hon. minister should now decide that principle. He does not condemn Mr. Pelletier. If he has not been doing that work he is not punished by the hon. minister and if the hon. minister decides that he may do it he will not be punished. But, if he may do it at all the other officers in his department may also do it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I see that paper sometimes but I cannot read it as clearly as some others can. I judge that sometimes there are articles which favour the government but I do not wonder at that. But, to deal with the point that is put by the hon. gentleman, I think he is stretching the thing perhaps a little too far because he will remember that the Audit Act does not prohibit employees of the government from engaging in duties other than their own outside of office hours provided their salary is not over $1,000, and it is thus that you have civil servants outside of office hours engaging in the insurance business and in other kinds of work.

Mr. TAYLOR. What salary does Mr. Pelletier draw ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. They are not prevented from doing that by the Audit Act, and therefore, if this gentleman were, upon his own time, engaging in something which was remunerative, it would have to be considered. I think the hon. gentleman is pressing the point rather far when he says that a man shall not, during his holidays, engage in any other work. If the hon. gentleman wants my opinion as to whether an officer, paid out of public money and during the time of his service to the country, should engage in other work which interferes with his duties, of course, there is only one answer—he should not do it.

Mr. POPE. The question of salary does not arise at all. I know what the Audit Act is. A permanent officer is always under pay whether he has a holiday or not. His salary is always going on.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He cannot get his holiday unless the collector gives him permission. It is provided for under the statute, but I suppose the collectors try to oblige their officers. I suppose if this officer went upon his holidays and engaged in doing some other work he did it with the view of earning something beyond his salary not in the time of the government.

I do not know the facts but I suppose this official, during his holidays and upon his own time, has been endeavouring to supplement his salary and he may have been canvassing for other papers at the same time. But, as I said, I do not know anything about that. I do not think we need dwell upon the matter any longer. I cannot say anything more than I have said.

Mr. POPE. I am sorry the hon. minister has not seen fit to lay down some guiding principle in this matter, not that I expect him to get on his feet again because as he says perhaps we have discussed it enough. I have not much confidence in any investigation he is going to make. He has thought of one hundred and one excuses for Mr. Pelletier by which he can escape. He says that he may have been on his holidays and that he may have been canvassing for half a dozen papers. He should trot out one of these newspapers as evidence of the statement he makes. He has not, however, answered the question which I put to him.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would like to ask the hon. minister if the Audit Act prevents a man after office hours from going to a public meeting and making a speech or asking a question ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, the Audit Act would not come in then.

Mr. COCHRANE. Well then, why do you refer to it in connection with this gentleman ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I was simply pointing out——

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes, pointing out to evade the question. The hon. minister can not dismiss it with the bland smile which appears upon his countenance now. He never had that smile when he was in opposition ; he has assumed it since he got a big salary. I do not say that the Minister of Customs was particularly bad in dismissing Conservatives, and he may excuse himself because he has not been harsh, but he is part and parcel of the government that has been harsh, and he is responsible. I can tell him that the officials on the Murray canal were not accused of partisanship, but they were dismissed just because they voted Conservative in a gentlemanly fashion. I now want the few Conservatives who are left in the department to understand that they can go and canvass for 'La Patrie' or any other Tory paper.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. COCHRANE. I had 'La Patrie' in my mind, but perhaps it is not a Conservative paper, it is 'Le Journal' I refer to. Is the principle laid down by the Minister of Customs that when a Conservative official is on his holidays, he can go and canvass for the 'Mail and Empire' or any other Tory paper ?

Hon. Mr. PATERSON.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Mr. COCHRANE. Do I understand that a Conservative official can canvass for the 'Mail and Empire,' and that he won't be dismissed ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If a gentleman like the member for Compton should report to me, that an officer in the public service was out canvassing for the 'Mail and Empire,' I would say that I would inquire into the matter.

Mr. COCHRANE. You would not dismiss him ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is very doubtful ; I have not dismissed many.

Mr. CLARKE. I was not present when the Minister of Customs gave an explanation with regard to the rights and immunities of public officials, after office hours. Do I understand that it is permissible for officers in the civil service, who do not receive a salary in excess of $1,000, to canvass for insurance, for example, after office hours or before office hours, or during their holidays ? I had a complaint made by a business concern in Toronto during the present session, that an officer in the civil service, was canvassing their customers against them for certain goods. I made a complaint to the department, because I thought that such conduct was not justified by the law. It would seem rather extraordinary that officials should be permitted to engage in outside business under such circumstances.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I dare say the hon. gentleman knows the Act as well as I do.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not, that is why I ask the question.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It does not forbid an officer who is in receipt of less than $1,000 a year from engaging in some work that does not interfere with his duties. If he is in receipt of $1,000 or over, it does absolutely prohibit him.

Mr. TAYLOR. What salary does Mr. Pelletier get ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Five hundred dollars.

Mr. HACKETT. Why was Mr. James Currie, collector at Charlottetown, dismissed ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He was superannuated.

Mr. HACKETT. Why ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not remember, but I think it was on account of age.

Mr. HACKETT. That can not be possible, because the very same day that Mr. Currie was dismissed, a man of the same age was

appointed in St. John, N.B. What is the explanation of that? Why was Mr. Geo. Conroy, sub-collector at Tignish dismissed?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have no recollection. When did that take place?

Mr. HACKETT. It took place immediately after the Grit government came to power.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That was a long time ago.

Mr. HACKETT. It is only about seven years ago, and we all have occasion to remember it with regret.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I will look into the matter.

Mr. TAYLOR. Was there an investigation in Mr. Conroy's case?

Mr. HACKETT. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. What did they dismiss him for?

Mr. HACKETT. Simply because he was a Conservative.

Miscellaneous—amount required to pay for services of Thomas Kilroy, acting customs officer at Windsor, Ont., 360 days ending March 29, 1894, at $1.50 per day, $540.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Mr. Kilroy was employed as a temporary empolyee at Windsor, prior to 1893, but at the close of that year his services were dispensed with, on the ground that the staff was sufficient without him. He was re-employed as temporary officer at that port during the months of March, February and April, 1893, by order of the then Controller of Customs, the Hon. N. C. Wallace. From the 1st of April, 1893, the collector of customs at Windsor was notified that Mr. Kilroy's services were to be discontinued, but it appears from an investigation made by Chief Inspector S. W. MacMichael, that the then collector, Mr. Geo. E. Martin, did not notify him of the action of the department. The chief inspector's report which is dated 17th of October, 1900, clearly says that Mr. Kilroy was actually on duty at the port of Windsor for 360 days after the collector was notified of the discontinuance of his employment. This case was exactly similar to that of Mr. Jas. Gibson, who was employed at the port of Windsor at the same time, under the same circumstances. Mr. Gibson's case was provided for in the supplementary estimates, 1901-2, but Mr. Kilroy's claim could not be disposed of then for the reason that the late collector at Windsor had during the time Mr. Kilroy was without pay from the department, paid out of his own money $691.04 for groceries and supplies to Mr. Kilroy, during the period covered by the claim.

Acting upon the advice of the Department of Justice, Mr. Kilroy, having made a petition of right to obtain payment for his services, the Department of Customs refused to ask parliament for a vote to pay the claim until such time as the late Mr. Martin's account had been properly adjusted. In the month of October, 1902, the executor of the estate of the late collector gave a release of all demands, discharging Mr. Kilroy from all claims; and on the same being submitted to the Department of Justice, they decided, in a letter of the 9th of May last, that the claim was one which the department might reasonably settle without reference to the courts. These are the circumstances of the case. The late collector sent word that he had dispensed with the services of these two men. The collector never notified them, and they went on and rendered the services for the whole year, and claimed that having rendered the services they should be paid. Parliament paid Mr. Gibson's claim two years ago, and Mr. Kilroy's claim would have been dealt with at the same time, but the collector had advanced him so much out of his own pocket and the department would not pay his claim until a settlement had been made with the collector. In May last he brought a release from the executors to the Department of Justice.

Mr. TAYLOR. Would it not have been fair to make the collector lose that money when he failed to give the notice?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The poor man is dead now and the matter is settled. However, these officers rendered the services and they claim that they should be paid. The mistake was on the collector's part.

Mr. HACKETT. I wish to ask why Mr. John P. Brennan was dismissed from his position as sub-collector at Alberton?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is some years ago, and I cannot remember what the cause was. No doubt it was deemed sufficient at the time.

Mr. HACKETT. It is not very many years ago. I regret that the hon. minister is not able to give me an explanation. I think the people of our province are bound to resent the action of the government in cutting off the heads of the best men because they are Conservatives and placing inferior men in their places.

Post Office Department—to transfer from the temporary to the permanent staff—nine messengers and packers, inside service, employed under the provisions of the amendment to the Post Office Act, 1902, $5,814.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Before we enter into the Post Office Department estimates, I want to know if now is the time for the hon. Postmaster General to give us some information with regard to the request of the accounting postmasters in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, as promised when these estimates would come before the House.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think this would be a very appropriate time for me to make the remarks which I intend to make in answer to my hon. friend's inquiry; but it is almost six o'clock, and perhaps it would be more convenient to pass this item, and I will make the explanation on the next item.

Mr. CLARKE. Have you a list of the gentlemen who are to be placed on the permanent staff ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The names are W. G. Smith, P. Green, A. Smith, P. Braceland, J. H. Jones, O. May, E. Butterworth, S. Dawson, P. S. Dodd. There are three messengers and six packers.

At six o'clock, Committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

To pay provisional allowance at the rate of $10 per month to Mr. J. W. T. Dixon of the dead letter office, Winnipeg, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary, $120.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This officer is in Winnipeg and a provisional allowance is made to the officers of the department at Winnipeg. He is included in this. He is in the inside service but could not have the benefit of the provisional allowance except in this way. He has $400 per year. He was appointed temporary writer on the 1st of January, 1903, and was transferred to the Winnipeg dead letter office on the 13th of March, 1903. He was appointed to the inside service at Ottawa and was moved from Ottawa to Winnipeg.

Mr. POPE. Does the hon. gentleman not think that this sudden surprise will injure him ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think he will be able to stand it.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Could nobody be found in Winnipeg to fill that office ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Dead Letter Department is in the inside service. Until the last four or five years all dead letter matter was dealt with at Ottawa, but by the legislation of 1898 permission was granted to decentralize in order to save time, and dead letter branches of the main office at Ottawa were opened at Winnipeg and at other points remote from the centre here. But the officers appointed at the dead letter branch have always been men who have served here first and have become trained in the method.

To provide for eight additional junior second-class clerkships in the inside service, $5,800.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Some years ago third-class clerkships were abolished and a large number of clerks entered the service as juniors in the capacity of temporary writers. Some sixty to seventy temporary clerks were appointed, some by the late and some by the present government, commencing at $400 and increasing at the rate of $30 per year. These are prizes which will be distributed wisely to those that are deserving.

Mr. TAYLOR. What salary do they start with ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The junior second clerks start with $600 and the maximum is $1,000. Under the Civil Service Bill which passed to-day, they will enter at $700 and the maximum is $1,100.

Mr. TAYLOR. $5,800 would give the eight clerks $725 each.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. How many clerks are already employed in that office besides those six who are to be made permanent ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The explanation of that $5,800 is this. There are some offices in connection with the international money-order branch who have a different status. It is intended to transfer them to the status of junior second class at the salary they now enjoy. There are five in that position and three new appointees at $600. The other five have gross salaries of $4,000. There are five transferred from one class to another and three new appointees. In fact this item is not large enough if the Civil Service Bill becomes law because the three new officers will begin at $700 and we are only providing for $600.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Were not these $4,000 voted in the main estimates ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That might be, but it would not be applicable to them under a technical construction of the vote. Money voted for the payment of the salary of a man filling one position is not available for the payment of the salary of that person if put in another position. These five were formerly engaged as clerks in connection with the money exchange office at Montreal. We had to make an international exchange at Montreal on account of our business with the United States. But owing to some changes being made in connection with our international business, those men are to be made junior second class clerks at their present salary. The money voted to pay them in their former position would not be available to pay them now, because the money is not voted to pay the individual as such but as the occupant of the office.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is the hon. gentleman to fill the positions of those five ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, the offices are abolished.

Mr. TAYLOR. A junior second-class clerk has been in the service for some time; he started at $600, and by statutory increases his salary has become $700 beginning on the 1st of July last. How will this Bill affect a junior second-class clerk who is in that position?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It will not have any effect upon such officers, they will continue junior second-class clerks if they reach $700, which is the minimum, and at the expiration of each year they will be eligible to another increase of $50. A second-class clerk who, at the time this Bill goes into operation, is in receipt of a salary not less than the minimum is not affected by the Bill, except that when he reaches $1,000, the present maximum, he will still be eligible to go on to the $1,100.

Mr. POPE. I have been absent from the House for some time, and I am not conversant with the application of the Bill which has recently passed this House. I am interested in the welfare of the civil servants, and I would like to ask if by this Bill they will receive the annual increases which they were led to expect in joining the service? In many instances civil servants have not received these increases to the extent they were led to expect. I have in mind particularly some mail clerks who have served many years and who have not received their promotions from one class to another, nor the increases to which they are entitled. I would like to know if that would be remedied by this Bill?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend says that he is particularly interested in the welfare of the civil servants, and yet he was absent during the discussion of this Bill, which has now passed out of this House. I do not like to return to the discussion of a measure which has gone to the Senate. The Bill speaks for itself. I would remind the hon. gentleman that a measure which has been passed through this House and become law this session deals with the status of railway mail clerks, and I do not think he will find one railway mail clerk in Canada who will say he has been unjustly dealt with by the present government.

Mr. POPE. I am not speaking of the present government; I think I can find mail clerks who think they have not had the promotion to which their length of service entitled them and which they anticipated when they joined the service.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The measure that passed in August last is of great advantage to the railway mail clerks of Canada, who have not hesitated to so express themselves. It has given them a much more satisfactory status than they ever before enjoyed, and they have expressed themselves to that effect in many ways to me.

Mr. CLARKE. How many officers of the service are eligible for promotion under this clause?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are sixty or seventy clerks who would be eligible. Others of these may be appointed from time to time if the number of junior seconds had increased.

Mr. CLARKE. You are now appointing three?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes. The hon. gentleman will remember that we have provided for the advancement of all these temporary clerks from the position they now occupy to be third-class clerks, and by the Bill which passed this House they can all be made third-class clerks, the minimum and maximum of which grade are $100 more than the minimum and maximum of the class to which they now belong.

Mr. CLARKE. Sixty or seventy are eligible for promotion to this junior second-class position, and the minister is now taking a vote to provide for eight additional junior second-class clerks. He has explained that five officers will be taken from the exchange branch at Montreal. Then there will be only three vacancies while sixty or seventy are eligible?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I told the hon. gentleman that it would be possible to appoint sixty or seventy. I suppose there are sixty or seventy temporary writers, and they have all passed a qualifying examination. I have stated that I trust that a liberal use will be made of the Bill which has passed this House in respect to these temporary writers. If that policy is adhered to, these temporary writers will receive a great advantage in being put into a class, the minimum and maximum of which are $100 more than that of the class to which they now belong.

To pay O. Higman for investigating the pneumatic tube service in the United States and reporting thereon, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $324.15.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The pneumatic tube service is a system that obtains in many cities of the United States for the rapid transmission of mail matter to different places in the city. It has been tried for some years in New York, Washington, Philadelphia and many other cities, and I hope that in the not distant future we will be able to adopt it in Canada. I sent Mr. Higman, who is an officer in the Inland Revenue Department, to the United States to examine and report upon this system, and he made a very valuable report, which will be useful when we come to consider the question of adopting the system to the Canadian post office.

Mr. POPE. Does the government expect to confer any advantage on the public by the adoption of that system?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Nothing has been decided. The first step is to study the system and to consider whether it is applicable to Canada. I think that the report is a very valuable one. I have given some study to it, and I think that it might be usefully adopted for distributing mail matter in large cities. It affords a very excellent method of rapid delivery.

Mr. POPE. I suppose in a city like Montreal you would have a central office from which you would distribute the mail matter by this system. It does not mean that you are going to run a tube into every man's house.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The pneumatic tube system is this: You have underground steel pipes, perhaps 8 inches in diameter. In the United States they have three different sizes of 8, 10 and 12 inches in diameter. Then there is what is called a carrier which travels inside this tube, a cartridge shaped structure, perhaps 30 inches long, and as large as the tube will allow. This is filled with mail matter, closed up, and forced by pneumatic pressure from one place to another connected by the tube. The mail matter distributed by that system starts from the post office or from some central point, and thence is distributed throughout the city wherever the system reaches. Where the public thoroughfares are thronged with traffic which occasions delay in the transmission of mail matter by vehicles, this system is found to afford very rapid delivery.

Mr. POPE. It only carries mail matter from the central office to branch offices?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. POPE. It does not interfere with the ordinary mail carriers or distributors?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It would not affect letter-carriers.

Mr. HACKETT. Over how great a distance would this pneumatic system be feasible?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am afraid it would not go under the Straits. I think it would carry two or three miles. If you renewed the power at different points you might send it an indefinite distance, but I do not know how you would continue the pressure.

Mr. FOWLER. Is this the total cost of the investigation?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the cost per mile?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot say from memory. The cost of installation involves more than merely putting the pipe under ground. You have to have an engine, for instance, and in a large city like Toronto that would involve the acquisition of a site for operations, where you would need to build a station and an engine house. Then at other points there would need to be some more machinery.

To increase the salary of F. H. Smith, first-class clerk, to $1,750 from 1st July, 1903, and arrears from 1st July, 1901, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $150.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Smith was formerly assistant inspector at the Soo. He was transferred to the inside service on his former salary as an inspector. I think he was at the maximum of his class of assistant inspector. After a year or so it was suggested that he should be given a different status, and I made him a first-class clerk, and proposed to treat him as a first-class clerk from the time of his transfer, and that is the reason we are giving him this small increase. He is a very worthy officer indeed. He is a son of the late Postmaster General the Hon. Sydney Smith.

To provide for the appointment of an assistant post office inspector in the Vancouver division, $1,500.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That sum is to provide for the payment of Mr. J. R. N. Greenfield as first-class clerk, having a salary at the present time of $1,500 a year. He was appointed to the inside service here on the 1st of July, 1883. He was transferred to the post office inspector's office, Victoria, on the 6th of July, 1893. He was made first-class clerk on the 5th of October, 1894, and on the 19th of December, 1898, was transferred to the office of inspector at Vancouver. Formerly there was only one inspector for the province of British Columbia, stationed on the island at Victoria. That was found inconvenient, and I laid the foundation for the creation of another inspectorate at the city of Vancouver upon the mainland, and appointed Mr. Dormer to the office after he had been tried a while as to his qualifications. For a time he continued in Vancouver as first-class clerk, conducting his office as a branch of the Victoria office. But this involved delay, and it was deemed advisable to have an independent branch at Victoria, so he has been appointed an inspector. Mr. Greenfield is the chief clerk there. Mr. Greenfield is a most capable man and deserving of this promotion. He has been in the service for many years, he is thoroughly efficient and highly recommended as being well qualified for the position of an assistant inspector.

Mr. POPE. Have you only one inspector there?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Only one on the mainland.

Mr. POPE. How many assistants?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is the only assistant the inspector has in his office.

To provide for an additional senior class clerkship in the office of the post office inspector at Winnipeg, $900.

Mr. POPE. What is that for ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is intended to promote Mr. E. R. A. Stevenson. He is a senior third-class clerk, and he has been at the maximum of his class since 1900. He was appointed on the 1st of July, 1887.

To provide for the appointment of the undermentioned temporary employees in city post offices as fourth-class clerks, from 1st July, 1903, at their present salaries, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary :

Montreal post office—C. Martin....	$	547
" " N. Nadou....		547
" " P. St. Jean		547
" " J. Lyons..		547
" " C. V. M. Murray..		547
" " J. A. Mayrand.. ..		547
Kingston post office—E. C. Hiscock.. ..		456
Winnipeg post office—N. Gouin..		580
		$4,318

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. By the Act of last August a new class, a class of fourth-class clerks, was created and these men occupying lower positions are now being placed on the permanent list as fourth-class clerks. They were temporaries before.

Increases of salary for post office inspectors, assistant post office inspectors and assistant post office inspectors and superintendents of the railway mail service, $2,950.

Mr. CLARKE. How is this money intended to be distributed ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. These are increases authorized by the Act of last August and they go to various officers in the service, as follows :

Inspectors.—N. R. Colter, St. John ; A. Bolduc, Quebec ; J. W. Bain, Montreal ; F. Hawken, Ottawa ; J. Henderson, Toronto ; H. G. Hopkirk, London ; E. H. Fletcher, Victoria ; W. H. Dorman, Vancouver.

Assistant Inspectors.—D. Stewart and A. Costley, Halifax ; W. C. Whittaker, St. John ; S. T. Green, Quebec ; D. Nelligan and J. P. Chillas, Montreal ; C. P. LeSueur and J. Chamard, Ottawa ; P. H. Macarow, Kingston ; C. E. Fisher and D. Maloney, London ; A. W. Cairns and H. H. Phinney, Winnipeg.

Superintendents of the Railway Mail Service.—F. B. Bent, Hailfax ; G. M. Ryan, St. John ; O. Talbot, Quebec ; F. Briegel, Montreal ; C. Plumb, Ottawa ; J. E. McLeod, Toronto ; A. G. McWhinney, London ; C. E. Kavanagh, Winnipeg ; and J. Ó. McLeod, Vancouver.

They come in automatically under the measure.

Mr. HACKETT. Before this item is declared carried, I would like to ask the hon. minister if he has heard from Prince Edward Island in regard to the illness of the Hon. Mr. Brecken, who is inspector there ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, I am extremely sorry to say that it is worse than a case of illness. Mr. Brecken died this morning. At least I received a despatch early this morning announcing his death. Mr. Brecken was at one time a member of this House, and there are some present who will remember him. I am sure they have a very kindly recollection of him. He proved himself an admirable officer, faithful and efficient, and the country has lost a capable officer in the death of Mr. Brecken.

To provide for increases of $50 each to fourth-class clerks recently promoted from the class of stampers and sorters, such increases to date from the times when they would respectively become entitled to increases if they had remained in their former class, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary, $3,950.

Mr. POPE. Before we proceed with this item, as I see we are approaching the close of the supplementary estimates, if there is not another leaf to be attached which is not already down—possibly there may be—I would like to bring a question to the attention of the hon. Postmaster General in connection with certain reports which have come to me, I think fairly well-founded, that a Mr. Latour who was Postmaster in the Public Works Department in Ottawa, owing to ill-health, has received six months leave of absence. Is that correct ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I really do not know.

Mr. POPE. And that he has been replaced by his son, which is a matter of indifference to me. Whether he has been replaced by his son or by the son of some other son, does not make any particular difference to me. But, I understand that this gentleman has had a six months leave of absence. I suppose that would imply that his salary is continued ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I made some inquiry in my department, and I find we never had an officer of that name in the department.

Mr. POPE. He is postmaster of the Public Works Department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not inquired throughout the service, but we never had an officer of that name in the Post Office Department. Thou canst not shake thy gory locks at me. Thou canst not say I did it.

Mr. POPE. I suppose that when a man was a postmaster he was connected with the postal service.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, we have no such officer.

Mr. POPE. Do you mean to say that I will have to turn my attention to the hon. Minister of Public Works ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I heard the hon. gentleman say before six o'clock that he thought this officer was in my department and my hon. friend the hon. Minister of Customs desired to transfer the discussion to me. I made inquiry in the department, and I find that we have no such officer.

Mr. POPE. I am making the usual effort of gentlemen who are dealing with the government, and they are shifting from one position to another. The hon. Minister of Customs, the head of the collecting department of this government, this afternoon referred me to the hon. Postmaster General. But, of course, he did not know what he was talking about. I thought he did not know this afternoon.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You should not let him escape.

Mr. POPE. I did not like to let him escape but he assured me he was not smiling and consequently I considered he might be serious when he said that when the hon. Postmaster General's estimates came up, I would have an opportunity of discussing the matter. However, the question I have to raise is that a public officer of the government has been granted leave of absence and is now in the employ of 'Le Canada,' newspaper, which is the leading Liberal organ in Quebec, and is travelling through that province being the head agent of that Liberal organ, seeking subscriptions for it. More than that, he is going about through the various post offices which do come under, I presume, the hon. Postmaster General. We find that he goes to the postmasters where he thinks he can frighten and control them and asks them to furnish him with a list of people who receive at these offices papers that are favourable in their editorial departments to the opposition members of this House.

Does the Postmaster General think it right that any government official should be guilty of such conduct? I have this information from a source which I do not feel at liberty to use, but it is a source from which the Postmaster General has no doubt got information, and I think he would acknowledge it as a reliable source. I do not think that the Postmaster General would take the same view, outside the cabinet of course, as his colleague the Minister of Customs, who stated this afternoon that it was not partisan work to disseminate the seeds of Liberalism by canvassing for a Liberal party organ. I look upon it as partisanship of the highest order, for there is nothing which can so much redound to the benefit of a political party as that the faithful should read daily the organ of that party. Seven years ago the Prime Minister decided that any official guilty of partisan conduct should leave the service. What is he going to do with Mr. Latour? I am informed that he is postmaster of the Public Works Department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He cannot be postmaster of the Public Works; they have no postmaster.

Mr. POPE. That is his description. Of course, in the country parts our information may not be absolutely correct about these officers. They may come down and boast amongst us in order to make themselves out great men amongst the ignorant agricultural community, so that their partisan works may bear greater fruit than if they came down simply under their own name, without such a high-sounding description. But that is the way Mr. Latour represents himself in the country parts, and he is represented as having been replaced by his son, at a salary of $1,200 a year, and he is cut loose on the province of Quebec to spread 'Le Canada.'

Mr. TAYLOR. On sick leave.

Mr. POPE. Certainly, I said that at first. The climate here is not conducive to his health, and so he goes to a healthy climate in the province of Quebec, where he can travel day after day from house to house breathing in the invigorating atmosphere, inspired by 'Le Canada' in his pocket, and enjoying a sick leave salary while he spreads the policy of the Liberal party. And the Minister of Customs thinks there is nothing wrong in that! Now, Sir, such a high ideal has the Postmaster General of what is right and just, and so often has he decapitated postmasters—and a certain postmistress too, about which I have reminded him often—so often has he applied the cruel axe, which to these people seem cruel, although it seemed just to the just judge; such a high ideal has the Postmaster General of what is proper, that I am sure he will agree with me that the conduct of this official is most reprehensible. I am not surprised, after what we have seen for seven years, that Mr. Latour might go to the province of Quebec and represent himself as postmaster of the Public Works Department, when he does not occupy that position at all. But at the same time I would like to know if the Postmaster General is going to condone the action of this mischievous character, who is getting the addresses of the subscribers to Conservative papers from the different postmasters throughout the country? The Postmaster General should be careful to protect us poor innocent souls in the country against people who come down from Ottawa representing themselves or misrepresenting themselves as holding high office in the government. Take the country postmasters, who are getting from $15 to $20 a year, and you can gauge by the salary they get, how intimidated they would be when all the paraphernalia of a department at Ottawa is imposed upon them.

If a man goes down and knocks at their doors and says that he has been sent by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as the organizer of 'Le Canada,' to get a list of subscribers to Conservative papers, you can easily understand how frightened would be a man receiving $15 or $20 a year in the presence of such a high official. I do not believe the Postmaster General would countenance such a thing. I do not believe that he will shirk the responsibility thrown upon him by the Minister of Customs, who asked us to defer these remarks until this special item was brought up. Of course, we know that there has not been absolute unanimity in the government; we have had an exhibition of that during this session; we know that they are not so united as they were six or seven years ago. But one would have supposed that when the Postmaster General was sitting there in the presence of his colleague when that took place, he would have informed me what he knew of the matter. With regard to that part of my complaint that this man has been interfering with the postmasters of the country, the hon. Postmaster General must assume the responsibility, and no doubt he will inform me what he intends to do in the way of investigating the case of this man Latour, who is gradually degrading the department over which the hon. gentleman presides.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When my hon. friend was discussing the estimates of the Minister of Customs this afternoon, I was not giving very great attention to the discussion; but when I heard it stated that this man was an officer of the Post Office Department, I was not in a position either to affirm it or deny it; and when the House rose at six o'clock, I asked the officers of my department if there was such an officer, because if there had been, it would have been my duty to have looked into the case. I did not learn until eight o'clock that there was no such officer in the Post Office Department. In whatever branch of the service he is employed, my hon. friend says that he has been applying to the postmasters throughout this country for the names of subscribers to newspapers. My opinion is that the names of the addresses of mail matter, newspapers, and all other kinds, is confidential information, which no postmaster is warranted in revealing to any person. No postmaster will be allowed to do that with impunity, so long as I have anything to say in the matter; and if the hon. gentleman is aware of any postmaster having so far forgotten his duty as to disclose to any one the names on newspapers, or any other mail matter, without the authority of the addressees, it will be my duty to call that postmaster to account. If my hon. friend will furnish me with that information, I will at once proceed on the line I have mentioned. But it would be rather unfair to ask me to proceed to discipline or to find out who may have transgressed, among the large number of postmasters. I am sure my hon. friend would not ask that. I do not know what department the official is in.

Mr. HACKETT. I would ask the Minister of Finance if there is not a man named Latour in the service of the government in Prince Edward Island?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have made inquiries with regard to a man named Latour. There is no postmaster in the Public Works Department that I know of, but there was a man named Latour in the temporary employ of the department. He has not been in the employ of the department for some considerable time.

Mr. TAYLOR. On sick leave perhaps.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS No, he is not drawing any pay from the department. This may be the man who is canvassing. I agree with my hon. friend the Postmaster General, that if he were in the employ of the government in any way, his conduct would be quite irregular and improper.

Mr. POPE. What salary was he getting.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Two dollars a day, I think. That is all the information I can give.

Mr. POPE. I think that is the bird we are after.

Mr. HACKETT. I have no proof with regard to the conduct of Mr. Latour; but I can assure you that during the election of 1900 he was very active in the county of Prince, in the province of Prince Edward Island. When the judge of the county court called in, under the authority of the law, the ballot boxes from the different polling divisions, one was missing, and we alleged, and can substantiate the fact, that this Mr. Latour was the means of getting that ballot box out of the way. I tell you further that if this Mr. Latour places a foot on the soil of the province of Prince Edward Island, he will find himself in a very hot box.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope), in discussing some of the other items of the Post Office Department, asked if any provision was being made in these estimates to pay the men who were deprived of their statutory increases for two or three years, the sums they were then deprived of?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman presents the question as if what were known as statutory increases were legal liabilities of the Crown to those officers. That is an erroneous view to take. It is discretionary with the government to pay these statutory increases or not. Therefore it cannot be said that if a man does

not get the statutory increase, he has anything coming to him, or there can be any arrears owing to him.

Mr. POPE. We have often considered this matter in this House. We are not wrong in assuming that these people are entitled to a certain annual increase, according to the statutory arrangement of the department or the government. A man commences at $400, and he is entitled to an increase of $50 a year. It is plain that he is entitled to it, or you could not give it to him. The particular man is not named, but the inducement is held out to every young man who enters the service and who is worthy of being kept there. If he is not worthy of being kept there, dismiss him. But if he is an efficient officer, he is entitled to his increase. Were he in the employ of a private corporation or individual and did not get the increase to which he was entitled, he would go on strike and the Minister of Labour and the deputy would go down to see whether they could not induce his employer to give him the extra $50 or $60 which he had earned. When we have a Minister of Labour in the government itself, he ought to be able to exercise on the cabinet that authority which he sometimes exercises in private matters. The ministers tell us that it is not they but the deputy heads who select those they consider deserving of an increase. No doubt if we had the deputy heads here, they would shift the responsibility on to the chief clerks. It is very difficult to believe that in the selection, politics rather than merit have not an influence. It would be a great relief to members of parliament if our civil service were put into the hands of a commission, as it is done in England, and thus remove all opportunity for the exercise of political favouritism. That would be better for the public life of Canada and we would have more even handed justice dealt all around.

Mr. AVERY. Some weeks ago I asked the Postmaster General why the postmaster at the village of Enterprise was dismissed. This man kept his office in good condition, took no part in politics, and gave general satisfaction, and it is difficult to understand why he should be dismissed and another man put in his place. The right hon. gentleman who leads this House said he would dismiss anybody in the employ of the government who took part in politics. That was not the course adopted by the late Sir John A. Macdonald. I remember that when Mr. G. W. Dawson was postmaster in Addington, he stumped against the Conservative government and was not dismissed. He kept the office until he resigned to run as a candidate. He was elected and after he was subsequently defeated, he was appointed inspector of prisons. But this man at Enterprise took no part in politics, and I would like to have an explanation why he was dismissed.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The postmaster at Enterprise was dismissed on account of his mismanagement of the office. He was charged, among other things, with sending out his own business letters through the post unpaid.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). By transmitting them through other offices than Enterprise ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot tell that, I shall read the memorandum which I have from the department and the hon. gentleman can satisfy himself.

With reference to the change of postmasters. There had been very great laxity in the conduct and management of the office. The postmaster made a practice of sending out book accounts to his customers through the post office in sealed envelopes not prepaid or stamped with the date stamp of the office, thus prejudicially affecting the revenue of the department. It was also shown that unauthorized persons were permitted to enter the inside compartment at any and all times and take out mail matter, presumably to their address. In consequence much dissatisfaction and complaint existed in the neighbourhood.

These were the reasons why the postmaster was changed.

Mr. AVERY. Who made the investigation ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Inspector Merrick, who made a report on the 6th of October, 1902.

Mr. AVERY. What is the postmaster's explanation ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The report states that the postmaster refused to make any statement unless he was compelled to do so in court.

Mr. AVERY. Who laid the information against the postmaster ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It would not be proper for me to say who laid the information ; any information against a public officer is confidential information.

Mr. HACKETT. Will the hon. Postmaster General be good enough to inform me what he intends to do in regard to the opening of a post office in the settlement of Portage, West Prince, Prince Edward Island ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. An application was received for the establishment of a post office to be called Portage. That application, in due course, was transmitted to the inspector for his report and, on receipt of that report a post office was opened some weeks ago and it only awaits the

appointment of a postmaster to go into operation.

Mr. HACKETT. Thank you.

To provide for promotions in city post offices—seven first-class clerkships, five senior second-class clerkships, 22 junior second-class clerkships, and 30 senior third-class clerkships, $3,900.

Mr. CLARKE. Might I ask if these officers have yet been selected ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Under the new Bill these are to be distributed about as follows : To the city of Toronto, three 1st class, four sr. 2nd, six jr. 2nd, six sr. 3rd ; to Montreal, one 1st class, four jr. 2nd, four sr. 3rd ; Winnipeg, three 1st class, one sr. second, one jr. 2nd, four sr. 3rd, four, jr. 3 ; to Hamilton, two sr. 2nd, two jr. 2nd ; to London, one jr. 2nd, two sr. 3rd ; to Ottawa, two jr. 2nd, two sr. 3rd ; to Halifax, two sr. 3rd ; to Quebec, one jr. 2nd, one sr. 3rd ; to Kingston, one sr. 3rd ; to Vancouver, one jr. 2nd, one jr. 3rd ; to Windsor, one sr. 3rd ; to Charlottetown, one sr. 3rd.

Mr. CLARKE. Have the officers yet been selected ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No choice has been made.

Mr. POPE. Why do you limit the number ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Ross of Toronto, the chief inspector of the city post offices, has made this request. He visits all of the city post offices in the Dominion and is at present in Vancouver. I am sure that any one who is at all familiar with his work will say that he is an excellent officer. He is assisting the leading city post offices with great zeal and encouraging them in every way and it is entirely on his recommendation that I am now acting.

Mr. CLARKE. Will he make the nomination ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He will recommend, of course subject to the opinion of the postmaster ; he will consult the postmaster. I would not for a moment say that he would supersede the postmaster. The system will probably be that the postmasters will go through their lists and make their selections and recommendations. They will doubtless consult with Mr. Ross and I have no doubt that there will be concurrence of opinion. But I suppose that we will act really upon the recommendations of the postmasters. I would not wish to weaken the authority of the postmasters by allowing the staff to suppose that there was any person beyond the postmasters to deal with their merits and demerits, although I would think it very proper for the postmasters to consult with Mr. Ross.

Mr. HACKETT. Will the Postmaster General be good enough to inform me why Mr. Jerome Buote of Little Tignish was dismissed from his office ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Could the hon. gentleman tell me when that event took place ?

Mr. HACKETT. About two years ago, and I would like to have some explanation.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If my hon. friend will repeat the question on concurrence, I will give him the information then. My deputy has no recollection of it. I fancy it must have happened more than a year ago.

Mr. HACKETT. I would like to ask why Mr. Thomas Keith, postmaster at Alberton, was dismissed ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Perhaps my hon. friend will repeat that question on concurrence. We have no knowledge of it at present.

Mr. HACKETT. The Postmaster General should have all this information at his fingers' ends. Mr. Thomas Keith, the late postmaster at Alberton, is a gentleman we should be proud of, and he was dismissed because he happened to be a Conservative.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend from Toronto asked me what the increases under the new Act would amount to in my department. They may amount to a sum in the vicinity of $80,000.

Additional amount required for salaries and allowances in outside service, $50,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This item is to make provision for increasing the salaries of letter-carriers who may elect to accept positions under the amended Act of 1902, and also for increases to railway mail clerks who accept the provisions of the Act of the present session of parliament.

Mr. HACKETT. Does the minister intend to establish free delivery in the city of Charlottetown, P.E.I. ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no provision in the estimates for the establishment of a letter-carrier system in the city of Charlottetown. There are a number of centres of population throughout the Dominion that are desirous of having the system extended to them, but no conclusion has been reached.

Mr. HACKETT. I desire to call attention to the fact that Charlottetown is the capital of Prince Edward Island, and there should be some consideration given to it with regard to mail delivery. I trust the hon. gentleman will see his way clear to

establish free mail delivery to the people of that town.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What is the population ?

Mr. HACKETT. About 12,000. I think that is a sufficient number.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I think the Postmaster General ought to try and give all towns of 12,000 inhabitants free mail delivery.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Has the hon. gentleman ever made an estimate as to what would be the cost to the post office service ?

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). The Postmaster General would have a better knowledge of that than I have.

Mr. McCREARY. Under this item I would like to make a remark with regard to one class that do not seem to have received any attention. The letter-carriers, the mail clerks, the accounting postmasters and town postmasters have all been assisted, their salaries have all been increased, and I am sure that during this growing time we all appreciate that fact. But a large majority of the postmasters, the men who render the best service for the smallest amount of money, the country postmasters, have received no increase whatever. I do not know how it is in the east, but in the western country they generally get from $12 to $50 a year. When a man or some member of his family has to stay at home for half a day to attend to one post office, and to keep it open for the convenience of the public, it becomes a hardship when labour is so expensive as it is during the summer months in our country. In the county I have the honour to represent I think there are from six to ten post offices that have been closed this year because the Postmaster General cannot get any one to accept them at the miserable salary offered. I spoke upon this subject last year, and I said that if the Postmaster General could not bring down some systematic measure to give these country postmasters more salary, in the new districts their salaries should be charged up to the immigration fund. One of the greatest drawbacks of keeping immigrants in the country is the want of postal facilities, next to schools. Last year I cited a case 28 miles from Swan river, in the Thunder Hill district, where a family had come from the north of Ireland with eleven children. They had neither school nor post office. Finally he wrote me saying that he would leave and go back home within three months unless he got some place where he could educate his children, and get some postal facilities. He was able to get a school, but a post office has only recently been established. That is a sample case of a good many others.

Mr. HACKETT.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman knows of no case where a post office recommended by the inspector in Manitoba or the territories has not been opened.

Mr. McCREARY. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, I did not say it had not been opened, I said a post office had been opened now in the place I mentioned. That is not in my county, and it was when I was commissioner of immigration that the post office was opened. But I am explaining that the postmasters do not get sufficient salary to pay them for keeping the post offices open. There ought to be a minimum salary of $40 or $50 a year assured before a post office is established. I do not contend that the postal system should be a revenue producing branch of the department. I believe that the public convenience should be considered first, and then if it is afterwards self-supporting, well and good. I submit that the hon. minister, who always takes an interest in seeing that people are properly paid for their services, might seriously consider whether some new means cannot be devised by which, if a rural system cannot be made practicable, the country postmaster shall be paid for his services in a better manner than he is at the present time.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Perhaps, since my hon. friend (Mr. McCreary) has made this observation, I may make known now some views I have on this question, and also comply with the request made of me at an earlier stage in the session to make a statement as to the progress of the department, I think it will be agreed that one cannot in expenditure disregard the case of the taxpayers of this country. To comply with the request which was made of me I will very briefly give a few figures. The work of the department has proceeded in the last few years with the object of enlarging the organization, developing the service, increasing the number of post offices and improving the facilities for the transaction of post office work, so as to make the post office more available for the people. I know of no branch of the public service that is brought more directly into touch with the people than the post office, and it seemed to me that it would be in the public interest, as far as possible, to increase the number of post offices, to increase the frequency of the service and to enlarge those other functions of the post office service such as the transmission of money, providing post office savings banks and so on. The department has followed out that policy. I shall make a comparison now covering the period of seven years since the present government have been in office, or between the fiscal year ending the 30th June, 1896, and the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1903 :

	1896.	1903.	Increase.	Increase per cent.
Post offices in existence	9,103	10,150	1,047	12
Number of miles mails carried	30,551,683	35,509,412	4,957,729	17
Money order and postal note offices in existence	1,310	6,184	4,874	372
Post office savings banks	755	934	179	24
Number of letters carried through Canadian post offices	116,028,000	234,991,000	118,963,000	1·02
Total amount of money transmitted by money order and postal note	$ cts. 13,081,860 62	$ cts. 28,904,096 92	$ cts. 15,822,236 13	120
Number of savings bank transactions, receipts and payments	242,619	336,012	93,393	38
Number of accounts opened in post office savings banks	126,442	167,023	40,581	32
Amount of money deposited by the people in post office savings banks	$ cts. 28,932,929 68	$ cts. 44,255,326 95	$ cts. 15,322,397 27	52

I should say that there was no postal note system in 1896. The postal note system has since been established, and it has proved a very ready and cheap means for the transmission of sums of money up to $10. Thus far I have given the committee the increases. I have to break in upon this line of argument, and I now take up another branch, not dealing with increases. For many years prior to the 30th June, 1896, the revenue of the Post Office Department failed yearly to meet the expenditure by very large sums, and for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1896, the revenue of the department fell short by $781,142.19 of meeting the expenditure. There was a loss on the working of the department for that year of over three-quarters of a mililon dollars. As hon. gentlemen will remember, in 1898-9 there was a very material reduction in the revenue of the department caused by the reduction of the letter rates, both Canadian and imperial. On Christmas Day, 1898, the letter rate from Canada to the United Kingdom fell from 5 cents to 2 cents. Subsequently the same reduction took place on all letters from Canada to various parts of the empire, and to-day 2 cents takes a letter from Canada to every part of the British empire. That reduction in the rate of from 5 to 2 cents seemed to indicate a loss, unless followed by an increased volume of business, of a considerable amount of revenue. It will be recalled that on the 1st January, 1899, the rate on domestic letters was reduced from 3 cents to 2 cents per ounce. On the same day we reduced the rate on letters from Canada to the United States from 3 cents to 2 cents per ounce. It is impossible to tell definitely what effect these great reductions have had upon the revenue of the department, but the late Minister of Finance, in speaking in the House a year or so before 1896, indicated that a very considerable loss of revenue would follow from a reduction of the domestic letter rate. The late leader of the opposition, Sir Charles Tupper, placed that amount of $1,000,000. The late Minister of Finance, Mr. Foster, I think, placed it in the vicinity of a million dollars. Whatever view you may attach to the effect of the reduction, it certainly is a fact that so far as it goes it leaves in the pockets of the people the percentage of the postage which they otherwise would have had to pay had they transmitted through the post office the volume of letters which we have carried since this reduction went into force. It is not unreasonable to say that these reductions have left in the pockets of the people at least $1,000,000.

We had a balancing up for the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1902, and the result was that for that year, the revenue met all the expenditure of the department, with the exception of the cost of operating in the Yukon, and left us a surplus of $5,109.14.

Mr. GOURLEY. What was the deficit in the Yukon ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not remember it for that year, but I will give it to you for this year in a moment. The reason I omitted the Yukon service in the public accounts up to the present, has been, in order that it might be possible to institute a comparison. There was no Yukon mail service prior to the present government assuming office, and therefore we could not compare it with anything which had gone before. Taking the year that has just closed, I will give the figures both including the Yukon and excluding the Yukon, so that hon. gentlemen may draw their own deductions. There will always be a deficit in the post office service of the Yukon because they must have the same rate of postage in the Yukon as in the other parts of Canada, while there is no prospect of the cost of labour there coming down to the level of cost of labour in older Canada—there may be approaches to equalization, but that will be in the distant future. If we had had no Yukon expenditure and no Yukon deficit to pay, the working of the department this year would have resulted in our having a surplus of $395,316.31.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Omitting the deficit in the Yukon, I say that the Post Office Department to-day hands over to the treasury of Canada $395,316.31 for the year's work.

Mr. CLANCY. What was the deficit in the Yukon ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The deficit in the Yukon was $102,614.31, and paying the deficit in the Yukon, and paying all the expenditure of the post office service in every part of Canada, and including and charging against us the deficit in the Yukon, we have to-day a net surplus of $292,702.23. of revenue over expenditure for the year ending June 30, 1903.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. For the year ending the 30th of June, 1896, we had a loss of $781,162.19, and we have wiped out all that loss and we have to-day a surplus over and above our expenditure, amounting to over three quarters of a million dollars; and the people have in their pockets a million of dollars or so each year. in reduced rates which I presume they would not have had if the higher rates were charged.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. But leaving aside the reduction of rates, then so far as the taxpayers of Canada are concerned, there is a change from a deficit of $781,152.19 in 1896, to a surplus of $292,-702.23, which means a total change in the accounts of $1,073,854.42.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister will not pretend to say that was all from revenue of the Post Office Department, because the money we voted a few years ago to wipe out that $700,000 did not come from the post office at all.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman evidently thinks that that $781,000 is a cumulative deficit.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then he is entirely in error. The sum of $781,-152.09 is the result of the operation simply of the one fiscal year ending the 30th June, 1896, taking all the revenue collected for that year and making the expenditure for that year within these twelve months only. There was a complete commencement and closing of accounts for that year, and to carry on the service for that fiscal year, without any part of any other year, and without any balance from any prior year, for that one year of 365 days, it cost Canada $781,152.09, more than the gross revenue, to carry on the service.

For this past year, we have paid the whole expenditure for the service from the first to the end of the year, and have on hand a surplus, excluding the Yukon, of $395,316, and paying the deficit of the Yukon we have a surplus of $292,702. It means a change from the deficit to the surplus in the ledgers of Canada, amounting for the year to a betterment of $1,073,-854.42 since 1896.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am asked, what it is proposed to do with this fund. I agree with hon. gentlemen that in a country like Canada we should not treat the post office service as a money making service. If it can be made to take care of itself, that I think would be satisfactory to the people of Canada, and it is but right that those who are engaged in the carrying on of the service, should, when circumstances will warrant it, be remembered. It is in view of that fact and in view of what seems to me to be the satisfactory position of the department. that I have been able of late to propose to parliament—and which parliament has been good enough to give effect to—recommendations having in view increases of salary to those in the service. Legislation has been passed during last year and this year, improving the salaries here and there. I shall not enumerate what has been done in that respect, as it is within the knowledge of hon. gentlemen. But my hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. Lariviere) and my hon. friends on this side of the House, have from time to time been pressing the department to consider the position of the country postmasters. I would be only too pleased if I were able to consider these gentlemen even more favourably than I now can, but so far as the present is concerned. I will give you the conclusion at which I have arrived. There are many postmasters throughout Canada whose offices may serve ten, or a dozen, or twenty immediate neighbours, and these postmasters are only paid a nominal sum for the trouble of keeping the office. That scale of payment did not originate with the present administration, and I am not aware that it originated with the prior administration, nor does it make any difference. It has been acquiesced in by both parties, and without any blame to either side. The exigencies of the country, our sparse population compared with our vast area, made it necessary to adopt some means to give postal facilities, and thus this system grew up in our broad Dominion. The question is, how can it be bettered ? At present, where the revenue is merely nominal, amounting to perhaps $10 or $20 a year, it has been the practice to pay postmasters a minimum fee of $10, going up to $12 or $15. I propose that from the first of July last all this class shall receive a minimum fee of $25.

A petition was presented to me last spring on behalf of a certain other class of postmasters, called accounting postmasters, ask-

ing for increases of pay and allowances. They asked that these allowances and increases should be made applicable to the territories and Manitoba. There is a great difficulty always in discriminating between one class and another, one locality and, another; and if what they asked for were granted, not merely to those in the western country, but to the same class in all Canada, it would involve increased expenditure exceeding $1,000,000 a year. I therefore shrank from meeting such a large demand. The system at present in Canada, which has been handed down to all succeeding governments ever since we have had a post office in Canada, and from pre-confederation days, has been to pay the postmasters a salary based upon the revenue of the office. There are a few exceptions to this scheme; but most of the postmasters of Canada to-day are being remunerated on the basis of the old system which has prevailed for so many years, namely, a percentage of the revenue. With regard to them, I propose to increase their remuneration by 10 per cent of the amounts that they would derive according to the existing scale, that 10 per cent to be paid to them, not only in respect of their salaries, but in respect of what are known as their forward allowances, which form a considerable item in the gross expenditures of the Post Office Department. These increases will make a substantial inroad upon the revenue of the department. Added to these the increases in salaries which are authorized by legislation will make a much greater demand upon the treasury. But I have no doubt that we shall be able to meet them successfully, and I trust without having to face parliament with the statement that the department, even for the current year, has been administered at a loss.

In referring to the organization and development of the department, I omitted to say that a little more than a year ago the department opened negotiations with the United States for the purpose of simplifying the money order system between Canada and that country, enabling the Canadian people to remit small sums of money through the post office to a very much larger number of places throughout the United States than the former arrangements made possible. Those negotiations were successful, and an international arrangement was made by which the number of money-order offices in the United States upon which we might remit was greatly increased. The actual increase amounts to over 28,000. Up to the time I speak of, we could only send money-orders payable, in the United States at, something like 5,900 post offices; but by the arrangement made, which was mutual, we are now able, for the convenience of the Canadian people, to remit money to no less than 34,000 post offices in the United States. A corresponding convenience is afforded to the people of the United States in remitting to Canada. The practical working of this, so far as the volume of business goes, is as follows. This system has been in force now two clear years. For the year prior to its going into force the total number of money-orders remitted by Canada to the United States was 204,653 for sums of money aggregating $2,118,295.33. For the year just closed the number of money-orders sent by Canada to the United States was 344,665, representing in money $3,682,189.96, being an increase of 72 per cent. The United States, in like manner, have remitted to Canada a much larger sum through the post office than under the former system. The figures of the return business are as follows: For the last year under the old system the number of money-orders sent from the United States to Canada through the post office in 1901 was 137,611, representing the sum of $1,-909,168.74, and the amount of the year ending the 30th of June, 1903, was 270,779, representing in money $3,783,925, or an increase of 98 per cent.

The department has had negotiations with the United Kingdom for an extension of our money-order system on the same basis with that part of the empire, but up to the present time we have not been able to make that arrangement. We have also extended that system lately to Newfoundland, and we have negotiations for its extension to many other parts of the empire and other countries. For example, negotiations are on foot at the present time to extend it to Bermuda, Barbadoes, Jamaica, the Leeward Islands, Tobique and British Guiana. We have also during the year completed arrangements for the extension of our money-order system to Norway, the Transvaal, Cape Colony and Trinidad; and negotiations are pending with Austria-Hungary and Sweden. These are all conveniences to the Canadian people for the transmission of small sums of money to the various parts of the world. I might also say that at the postal convention, held in London last July, the following resolution, on the motion of Canada, was adopted:

> That it is advisable to adopt the principle of cheap postage between the different parts of the British empire on all newspapers, and periodicals published therein, and the Prime Minister desires to draw the attention of His Majesty's government to the question of reduction in the outgoing rate. They consider that each government should be allowed to determine the amount to which they may reduce such rates and the time for such reduction going into effect.

Acting upon this resolution, the Canadian Post Office Department put itself in early communication with various parts of the empire in order to obtain permission for the public in Canada to forward their newspapers and periodicals to all parts of the empire at the domestic letter rate, and already that permission has been granted in respect of the following countries: The United Kingdom, Baha-

mas, the Barbadoes, Bermuda, British Honduras, Cyprus, Ceylon, Falkland Islands, Cambia, Hong Kong, Leeward Islands (including Antigua, &c.), New Zealand, Transvaal, Sarawak, Sierra Leone, Turk's Island and Zanzibar. To all those countries to-day Canadian publications pass at the same rates as are charged for their transmission throughout Canada itself. And considering the very cheap rate of transmission of newspapers, periodicals and other Canadian publications throughout our own country, I think it may be said that no country in the world enjoys to-day as cheap a rate for the transmission of its publications, dealing with our own life, giving people outside of our country the knowledge of our affairs, as does Canada.

Mr. FOWLER. Are there not some corresponding increases? Has not the rate on parcels been increased and city deliveries?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There was an increase in some of the parcel post regulations. In 1897 there was a rate imposed upon newspapers of a half a cent a pound, but even that rate has been almost cut in two by legislation this session. The legislation of this session has reduced the newspaper rate from half a cent per pound to one-quarter cent a pound on all newspapers to be carried 300 miles.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). I have reason to thank the hon. the Postmaster General for small favours. Three sessions ago I urged on him an increase of pay to the rural postmasters, and he promised to look into it. The following session I brought the matter up again, and also this session, and on each occasion I was the first to bring that subject to his notice. I am pleased now that he has acceded to my request to some extent, though I would have preferred that he had made the increase $50 or thereabouts instead of $25. While I am on my feet, I would draw the attention of the hon. minister to the fact that there are two places in my county which have petitioned the government for two mails a day. They are important villages, the village of Alton has two carriage shops, a foundry, two woollen mills, and a great many other industries, and quite a large population. These people claim that they have lost a great deal of money at times by not being able to send out two mails a day to Toronto. It would be only reasonable to give this large village the accommodation it requiries. The village of Caledon East stands in the same position. It only has one mail a day, and there are two grain buyers there and quite a lot of business done. On Saturday night the mail that gets up on the Canadian Pacific Railway is not delivered until Monday at noon. We have been complaining and sending petitions to the government for a long time. I would ask the hon. gentleman to consider the request of these two important villages. Alton village has a train running through it, and I believe it would not cost the department anything for carrying the mail from the station to the post office. The Grand Trunk Railway runs through Caledon East twice a day, and I think the expense will be very small of providing these two villages with two mails a day. I do not know of any other two villages of the same size and importance and doing the same amount of business which have not better mail accommodation. In urging this request on the hon. gentleman, he must see that I am not doing so in order to get any political pull, because the government have wiped out the county of Cardwell. I speak solely in the interests of the people.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I am glad that I have been persistent in advocating the cause of the postmasters, especially those of my province; and while I can congratulate the hon. Postmaster General on the generous way in which he has treated the postmasters of the small offices, I am afraid that he has not been sufficiently generous with the accounting postmasters, because an increase of 10 per cent on the actual revenue they receive is a very small increase indeed. The salaries of the postmasters are calculated at the rate of 40 per cent of the revenues of their offices, so that if the fees produce $100 revenue, the postmaster gets $40 of a salary, and 10 per cent on $40 is only $4. Therefore, while at first sight it may appear that an increase of 10 per cent is pretty generous, when we come to make the calculation, it is reduced to 4 per cent, or $4 on every $100 of revenue. Such a small increase is not sufficient for officers holding such responsible positions as the accounting postmaster. These officials have to deal with postal notes. They sell postal notes, they issue post office money-orders, and they pay out large amounts of money in some instances. They also receive large amounts to be transmitted to other offices, and some of them have post office savings bank branches to look after. So that I think that the small allowance they get, based on the revenues of their office, are not at all sufficient, compared with their responsible duties. I hope that instead of making it 10 per cent on the actual income, the Postmaster General will accept the suggestion made by the accounting postmasters of Manitoba, and make their allowance 50 per cent on the revenue of the office instead of 4 per cent. In that case I think it will be perfectly satisfactory, because it would be a material increase in their salaries while the present 4 per cent allowance is quite inadequate.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by 4 per cent; the increase is 10 per cent.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The hon. gentleman said 10 per cent on the actual salary they are getting. Supposing the income of an office is $100, then the postmaster would be

entitled to 40 per cent of that, which would be $40. But you allow 10 per cent on the $40, which is $4. Well, it is only 4 per cent of an increase they are getting.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I say the emoluments of the postmasters will be increased by 10 per cent. I am not taking 10 per cent on other things. A postmaster who gets $1,000 will get $100 more under this scheme. He has 10 per cent on his original salary, which is increased by that much.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. If he had $40 he would get $4 additional.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. And if he had $1,000 he would get $100 more.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). Will the Postmaster General say that he will look into the case of these villages I mentioned ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The deputy has made a note of the hon. gentleman's remarks, and the subject will be carefully looked into.

Mr. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.) I cannot allow the present opportunity to pass without complimenting the Postmaster General on the very excellent showing he has made this evening in the conduct of his department. It must be gratifying indeed to parliament and to the country to know that the management of the Post Office Department has produced such excellent results. Many of us, indeed all of us on this side of the House, have been pressing on the Postmaster General for the last few years the advisability of increasing the salaries or remuneration which the rural postmasters have been receiving. The Postmaster General promised to look into the matter, and that just as soon as the revenues would warrant him in doing so he would take that very deserving class of public servants into consideration. He has done so, and I consider that the minimum remuneration the Postmaster General now finds it in his power to give to the rural postmasters of $25 a year, is very satisfactory indeed, and I am sure this very deserving class of public servants, whose services are so useful in keeping these small post offices, will be well pleased and will appreciate this increase in their remuneration. So far as the accounting postmasters are concerned, to which reference has been made by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière), he has said that a man who has been receiving $40 a year, under this arrangement will receive $4 a year more. That is true, but a postmaster who has been receiving a salary of $1,000 a year will receive an increase of $100 a year.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. But that does not affect a $40 affair.

Mr. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.) It must be a small office indeed where the salary is not more than $40. I know several accounting offices where the salaries range from $500 to $700 a year, and these men will receive $50, $60 or $70 increase per year, which is a very substantial increase, and will be much appreciated by these men. But the most satisfactory feature of the whole case is that after these increases are made the revenue will still meet the expenditure. I am sure the people of this country will congratulate the Postmaster General upon his management of that department for the last seven years.

Mr. GOURLEY. I think it is unfortunate that the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Hughes) should throw this note of discord into a happy family such as we are at this moment. I say it is unfortunate, because it makes me angry when I hear a man making false claims. Now, the Postmaster General made no claim to being a party to this prosperity in that particular, and I think he was wise. I think he followed the example of the young man we read of the other day in England, the young Marquis of Salisbury, who inherited his father's magnificent estate. Some American correspondent called upon him, and looked over this magnificent pile of buildings erected by his ancestors two or three hundred years ago, the old Cecils, who had won it for the modern Salisburys, who for the last 30 or 40 years had never put a brick to the castle or added an acre to the estate. But the Yankee blusterer commenced to congratulate the young man upon being the owner of this great estate. The fellow was abashed by the candour of the young man, who sat there clothed with humility and sorrow, and who replied : 'I am ashamed to inherit this magnificent estate, in building up which I have done nothing ; it is the work of the great Cecils of two or three hundred years ago.' The Yankee blusterer turned away, he had met an honest and noble-minded man, such as are many of the better classes in England. Now, I think the Postmaster General—or shall we call him the Minister of Labour ? Which title does the hon. gentleman prefer ? I do not know what to call him. I do not wish to hurt his feelings, because he may have a preference for one title over the other. I think he should be called the Postmaster General and not the Minister of Labour, because his ample proportions do not fulfil the poetical idea of a Minister of Labour. I think a Minister of Labour should be thin and lank, and show the evidences of a laborious life. He should be lean and hungry-looking like Cassius, rather than the robust gentleman he is, who seems to have been reared in the lap of luxury and to have lived there all his life. However, apart from that, I hope the Postmaster General is too modest to accept all this honour that has been thrust upon him by the hon. member for Prince Edward Island.

I am proud on behalf of Canada to see this splendid showing, to know that our post office pays. I assume that our post office pays $292,000 of surplus into the treasury of Canada. I understand from the hon. Postmaster General that we pay all the bills in connection with the post office for Canada and for the Yukon, and that we have then $292,000 to pay into the treasury of Canada. If that is the statement it is a creditable showing for Canada, but it is only what might have been expected. There never was a country the foundation of whose administration in every department of government was laid with such wisdom as that of the administration of Canada as laid in 1867 and from that time down to 1896. These hon. gentlemen have inherited one of the most perfect systems of government that was ever developed in the British world. All the great public works had been built. The post office system had been extended all through Canada, and these hon. gentlemen had only to sit down and see the revenues flow in. They had not to turn their hand in any department to help Canada, and until this scheme of the transcontinental railway was brought forth they never had added one thing to the public life of Canada or secured one dollar of revenue for Canada. They have been heirs to a magnificent estate, and I have never heard these hon. gentlemen in the course of this parliament attempt to claim credit for the great progress that Canada has made. They do not deserve it, and I will appeal to any hon. gentleman in this House to say whether in justice and fair-play, apart from political partisanship, he can wake any claim for this government, except that they had the luck to inherit a magnificent estate, at a very fortunate time, when the great public works had been constructed and when we had been waiting for the development which was bound to come in consequence of these great public works. We had settled the principles of government, we had constructed the great public works, and we had said to the people of Canada: Wait, the Intercolonial Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the canals cannot produce this great wealth and progress in a day. We said that this development would come. It came in due time, and it came when the great public men of Canada had pointed out that it should come. In the vicissitudes of fortune these hon. gentlemen opposite came into power and inherited the results of the splendid achievements of others. I was glad that the hon. Postmaster General did not make any claim to the credit for any of these great results. I always say in the country, of course, that Canada is prosperous and that Canada must become a great nation, because the party that had been in power for eighteen years had laid well and truly the foundations of national greatness. It was at the time that they had completed the work that these hon. gentlemen came into power. After they had been criticising the Conservative party for eighteen years, they came into power and they paid a splendid tribute to our policy by adopting it, because, as sensible men, they could do nothing else, although I believe there were some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who would have been reckless enough to have adopted some other policy had not public opinion been so strong. While I congratulate hon. gentlemen opposite on the progress that Canada is making, I would say that it is only the progress that I have been predicting for the last twenty years. I used to say: Wait, this country will be great; wait, the people's railway will pay an enormous revenue; wait, immigration will pour in; wait until we break down the prejudice against Canada; wait until we get the Liberal party to cease reviling and slandering Canada, and then her wealth will be increased. Whenever I made the declaration that this progress would come, the Grit party were howling that Canada would be broken. The right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) was reviling us down below, describing us as the shreds and patches of Canada and insulting every portion of Canada. I have no doubt this progress would have come years ago if, when our Finance Minister went to England a few years ago to float a loan, he had not been met by the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce and by the financial papers which the right hon. gentleman controlled, in an attempt to break down the credit of Canada by one of the meanest, the lowest political conspiracies that ever disgraced any country. Even in war there are honourable principles. A man must fight fairly even in war, if he is to be regarded as a generous and decent foe, and those same principles must be applied to political warfare. The Conservative party stood up for eighteen years and fought for Canada just as much as if a foe had invaded Canada, because the Liberal party were just as much an invading army as if Canada had been invaded by Americans or Mexicans. That was what always angered me. I have always taken the view that I have no right to oppose my political opponents by saying one word which will hurt Canada. If I differ with the party or the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite I will attack them as vigorously as I can, but I will never say a word against my country. It is my bounden duty, as a citizen of Canada, to say words of praise for my country or to hold my tongue. No man in this opposition, the only loyal opposition that ever stood out in defence of the whole country, in all the debate on the transcontinental railway, has uttered a word except in praise of Canada. Yet, when hon. gentlemen opposite were opposing the great Canadian Pacific Railway, the country rang with slander from

end to end, until no man believed himself safe to live in this country for twenty-four hours. The hon. Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson), with that sweet, low voice of his, charmed the people of Ontario with the most reckless slanders against the people of Canada that were ever uttered by any public man. There never was an occasion on which a more reckless stream of slander was ever poured from any human throat than that which flowed in a continuous stream from the hon. Minister of Customs. That party kept back the progress of Canada for twenty years by this continuous flow of slander. It is bad enough to see these men occupying the treasury benches. It is the irony of fate that the Conservative party should sit here after we have made this country, and see hon. gentlemen opposite occupying the treasury benches. They wear the robes that they never won ; they wear the chaplet to which they are not entitled. They never won the race, and yet they want the bay. They want the plume, and yet they never won the race. The Conservative party have always been anxious for the success of Canada. We want to see this country great. I feel that I want to be a Canadian in any part of the world. The old Roman used to say in every part of the world : 'Civis Romanus sum.' I want the magic wrds 'Civis Canadensis Sum' to be more attractive even than the old boast of the Roman. I can sit here at any time and see these hon. gentlemen go along with their estimates. I can help them to vote their estimates, until they claim that this progress is due to their party or to their policy. I commend the hon. gentleman for his modesty to-night, because I remember that in the earlier part of this session, when he was making a speech in regard to post office affairs, he took occasion to rake up some old matters that had better have been left alone at the present time. I noticed a change in his manner to-night, and I was delighted to see that he is improving. The improvement may not be very marked, but in him it is worthy of commendation. On this occasion the hon. Postmaster General has absolutely disclaimed any connection with the result which he has been able to show. So he says : I have had nothing to do with this, I am only a little pipe through which the water is running, and I take no credit for it. I have no fault to find, and I say it is a creditable showing on behalf of Canada. If hon. gentlemen opposite take that position, I have no fault to find, but whenever the Liberal party of Canada attempts to claim one iota of credit for the development of this country, they make a false claim, and they must be accused of false pretenses.

Mr. GALLERY. I understood from the Postmaster General that the minimum increase granted to postmasters would be $25. Now, if a postmaster receives $40 a year, would he get $65 now, or would he only get 10 per cent on the $40, which would make his salary $44.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I stated that a large number of postmasters in Canada now receive salaries amounting from $10 to $20 per year, and in future the minimum salary of these gentlemen will be $25. As to the postmasters who are paid by commission, they will hereafter receive an increase of 10 per cent on that commission, be their salaries small or large. On the revenue of the office they will receive 10 per cent more than they formerly received.

Mr. BOYD. I have sat in the House for some days listening to the increased votes which have been granted to the various departments, and in the interest of my constituents, I often felt like making a strenuous protest. If the Postmaster General, who had charge of the Bill granting increases to civil servants, and if many of his supporters were on this side of the House, I can imagine what protests they would have made in the interests of the farmers who in the days of adversity, they professed such an affection for. However that may be, let me point out that the country postmasters receive under this proposal the smallest increase of any of the civil servants whose salaries have been increased this year. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) has proved that to a demonstration. I was much amused that the member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) should expect any modesty from the ministers of the present government. My remark may not apply to the Prime Minister and it may, but, it certainly is a fact that all the other ministers from first to last, are anxious to avail of every possible occasion to make a stump speech to their own glorification. The Postmaster General to-night has claimed great credit for the success of his department, but he has failed to show that he has inaugurated anything which would bring about that success. We know that this prosperity of the department is largely, if not entirely, due to the prosperity which has prevailed of recent years throughout Canada, and for that matter throughout the civilized world. He told us that the number of post offices had increased during the Liberal regime at the rate of 149 per annum, but if he looks back to 1891, or even to 1871, he will find that each year up to the coming into power of the Liberals, there was an increase of 149 in the number of post offices, and possibly more. I rose more particularly to bring to the attention of the House the case of the accounting postmasters. I had the opportunity of meeting the Postmaster General in company with the deputation of accounting postmasters who waited upon him, and I shall read the memorial which they presented, and which shows that the decrease in postage from three cents to two cents has been largely taken out of their income. In order that I may quote their case

properly, I propose to read their petition, so that it may be recorded on 'Hansard.'

Mr. SCOTT. It is on 'Hansard' twice already.

Mr. BOYD. Then I will put it on three times, so that you will not have to hunt so far back for it. Let me say in the first place, that some years ago the matter of an increase in the remuneration to these postmasters, was urged by the member for Cardwell (Mr. Johnston). To-night we have the member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) making a display, and no doubt he was advised as to what was coming from the Postmaster General.

Mr. GOURLEY. He was rehearsing.

Mr. BOYD. Certainly, but it is to the member for Cardwell (Mr. Johnston) that the postmasters have to be thankful for pressing their claims upon the government. Here is the petition to which I refer:

Winnipeg, Manitoba, February, 1903.

To the Right Hon. Sir William Mulock,
Postmaster General,
Ottawa.

Sir,—We, the undersigned, accounting postmasters of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, beg to bring to your attention the following statement of facts regarding our work which goes to show that the remuneration is most inadequate, in the hope that you may be able to grant us substantial and immediate relief. We do this the more hopefully in view of the stand you have taken on the question of the hours of labour, &c., of the workingman.

1. The postmaster is responsible for the safe handling of many important letters, and valuable parcels. In this country large amounts of money formerly sent by express are now sent by registered mail to wheat buyers to enable them to carry on their business. In many places the branch banks remit to, or receive from, the head office large sums of money. This increases the postmaster's responsibility and where help is employed necessitates care in the selection. The money-order business necessitates the handling of large sums of money for the miserable pittance of 25 cents per $100. The amount of stamps kept on hand must always be large with the source of supply so far away. In no other line of work would persons be held responsible for the proper handling of such large amounts, with the same possibilities of irregularities and losses, without remuneration at least from five to ten times greater than the postmaster receives for his money-order work. In many cases there is added responsibility through the handling of customs parcels for which there is practically no remuneration. The postmaster is expected to provide a roomy, centrally located office without any regard to the rental which that office would command if leased for other purposes. The necessity for the correct and prompt despatch of all mails regardless of hours of arrival and departure is in many instances a very grave responsibility. Understanding that the present basis of remuneration has been in vogue for a quarter of a century or more we would respectfully point out various increases in work which clearly show that, although it may have been sufficient then it is utterly inadequate now.

Mr. BOYD.

You see, they knew the Postmaster General was also Minister of Labour, and they thought they would appeal to him on that score.

Firstly. In connection with newspapers and periodicals we think it a conservative estimate to assume that a family will now receive an average of six to eight times as many periodicals as a family would be receiving twenty-five years ago.

Secondly. The use of the mails as a means of distributing advertising matter is a practice of recent years entirely and the quantity handled is simply enormous and constantly increasing. These increases affect both local distribution and the sorting of matter for forwarding to outside offices.

Thirdly. The recent reduction in the rate of letter postage necessitates (in the matter of Canadian and United States postage) an increase of fully fifty per cent in the number of letters handled before an increase of revenue can accrue, or an increase of salary be hoped for. In the case of British, and some other lines of foreign postage, the increase in the number of letters must be 150 per cent before we have established a basis for any possible increase in salary. A working out of the figures in this connection will establish that the postmasters are bearing from thirty to forty per cent of the expenses of the reduction so appreciated by the public. This appears to be an altogether undue proportion.

That proves what I have already said, that the reduction in the postal rate from three cents to two cents, has, to a very great extent, been borne by the postmasters, owing to the fact that a very large number of them are remunerated by way of commission.

The introduction of the postal note system has increased the amount of labour out of proportion to the revenue attached. This method of remitting small amounts (chiefly to the city offices) has largely curtailed the sale of stamps which were formerly used. At offices where customs parcels are handled and distributed by mail to smaller offices, stamps are usually sent in payment of duty and cash is remitted to port of entry, again curtailing the sale of stamps received from the department.

2. An examination into the method of handing customs parcels and the remuneration (even where any is allowed) will reveal the fact that the work actually required to be performed, which is considerable, is practically unpaid for. This is one of the points which we desire to bring to your attention, that unremunerative work of this sort is being multiplied while the revenue of the office is being held down by reduced rates of postage.

3. In a number of the offices, besides keeping the office open throughout the regulation hours, the postmasters are compelled to await the arrival of a late evening train and again in some instances have to get up at 5 or 6 o'clock in the morning to despatch a mail, thus imposing unduly long hours of service without any allowance for any class of assistance, to say nothing of a competent assistant. In some offices, owing to the arival of several different mails the public is entitled to call and demand individual attention several times during the day, whereas the basis of remuneration makes no special provision for this. In places where tri-weekly

trains carry the mails, the postmaster is compelled to remain eleven hours a day for six days a week and provide (if he would give the public anything approaching satisfactory service) for a portion of three days a week, one or more duly qualified assistants. His allowance is inadequate for his own support at present cost of living, thus providing nothing for the payment of assistants.

4. In view of the amount of mail matter to be re-sorted and forwarded the forwarding allowances do not begin to pay for the work done or the extra office room required. Another department with a deficit.

5. The allowance for rent, fuel, and light is decidedly inadequate. In practically every town where the post office is kept in a separate compartment, the room occupied could be leased for a rental in excess of the full allowance for rent, for heating and for lighting. In the town of Morris, the postmaster is allowed $100 for rent, fuel and light. For less space in the same building he receives from the Merchants Bank, $350 a year for rent, alone. At Melita the postmaster cancelled a lease bringing him a net annual rental of $180 to use the building for post office purposes on an allowance of $125 for rent, fuel and light. Other similar examples could be cited. Fuel and light are costly here.

6. In the matter of securing proper assistants, we could point out that labour readily commands far larger remuneration in any market than it did a few years ago. To have experienced help available is a severe drain upon the limited exchequer of the postmaster who is unfortunate enough to require it as nearly all do. Even where help is not regularly required, competent assistance must be had if the postmaster is ever to seek recreation or relief from duty.

7. There is another matter which affects postmasters in the west more particularly, namely, the increased cost of living. This has frequently been brought to the attention of yourself and colleagues in various ways, and we note that already you have conceded the point as in the case of the 20 per cent increase allowed the letter-carriers of Winnipeg.

And I see that they get a greater increase by this new Act and the $50,000 which is voted in these estimates for the outside service.

In our opinion this does not represent the actual amount of difference, but is a recognition of that difference. In all lines the cost of living has advanced during the past few years, while the postmasters are receiving less pay for more work.

8. A comparison with salaries paid in other departments of the public service and even in other departments of the postal service give an idea of our disadvantages. For example. First class railway mail clerks receive $960 and mileage, second-class clerks, $800 and mileage. In the city of Winnipeg the assistant postmaster gets $2,000, first-class clerks, $1,500, second-class, $1,320, third-class, $880, and letter-carriers, $720. We do not think these are too highly paid, but an office with a revenue of $2,000 not only absorbs all of one person's time, but requires an additional clerk at least a portion of the year. The postmaster of such an office receives for salary, commissions and allowances an average of less than $700 or less than half the amount received by a first-class city clerk, $100 less than a second-class railway mail clerk, and a trifle less than is paid to the city letter-carriers, and out of this modest income he must employ whatever additional help is required and furnish a suitable office and office equipment. In most cases his hours are longer and his responsibilities greater than those of any of the officials referred to. In one town where the train arrived late and departed early, the postmaster until recently received $3.50 per month for overtime, while the railway agent received $19 a month extra.

In view of the conditions and facts set forth above, we would respectfully suggest the following changes as tending to bring about a redress of our grievances. 1st. That the straight salary allowance be based on 50 per cent on the first $1,000 worth of stamps sold, and 40 per cent on all additional sales. This would barely offset the loss resulting from the reduction of letter postage.

As I said before, these gentlemen understand how to properly make this calculation; and, instead of meeting that request, the Postmaster General gives them an increase of only ten per cent.

2nd. That in Manitoba a special increase of at least 20 per cent be allowed to cover extra cost of living. 3rd. That the allowance for rent, fuel and light be doubled so as to provide a reasonable rent for the office, and a provision for the cost of fuel and lignt in this country. 4th. That the money order system be simplified so as to lessen the amount of work performed for the small remuneration allowed and also to increase its popularity with the business public, who now object to the restrictions hedging it round. 5th. In addition to the regular and general scale of allowances we would request. That a special allowance be granted for each extra mail which tends to bring the public again before the wicket for individual attention during the day. That the forward allowance be materially increased to distributing offices. That a special allowance be given to postmasters who are compelled to work before 8 a.m., or after 7 p.m. Among the mechanical industries the special allowance for overtime is very marked. That in the case of offices where mails are so infrequent as to have large quantities of mail matter delivered at the office at one time, so that the public convenience really requires the employment of one or more assistants, an allowance be given towards the payment of such assistant or assistants.

I may say that in our western towns the express company to a very great extent is cutting into the business of the money-order office, almost doing the entire business, for the reason that a man can go to the express office, get his receipt and do the business in one-half the time that it takes the postmaster to accomplish the same business; and I think it is as cheap or possibly cheaper. This is a matter in which I hope the Postmaster General, when he next addresses the House, will be able to show that he has done something to better the system.

6th. In addition to the above we feel that there are a number of cases of special, minor grievances which we cannot enter into in detail, but in which we think that a little investigation would show that redress could be effected so as to relieve the postmasters concerned without in any way imparing the efficiency and safety of the public service, which grievances have probably continued to exist because they have not been brought to your honourable attention.

Now, they have been brought and placed on 'Hansard,' and the Postmaster General will have them before him, and the members of this House can refer to them.

And we would respectfully urge that the above matters be duly considered and that a large measure of redress be granted in the very near future.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

Here is another small paragraph :

Supplementary Suggestions Passed by Executive.

1. That all accounting offices be given an allowance for rent, fuel and light.

2. That twine, mucilage, pens, ink, pencils, &c., for post office use be furnished by the department and not at the expense of the postmaster as at present.

3. That the department make it more clear to all publishers that newspapers must be suitably folded and that they must be addressed plainly. That where labels are used they must be in large clear type, and that if possible uniformity of colour in labels be secured.

4. That a full list of 'Suggestions to the Public' be printed by the department and supplied to all postmasters for display in their offices as tending to make it clear that certain regulations are found necessary by the department and are not based on the caprice or convenience of the postmaster. For instance that stamps and moneys orders may not be purchased during the distribution of a newly arrived mail, and that money orders and postal notes are not available for purchase after the registered mail closes for an outgoing mail. Also some suggestions as to the age of children who are to be considered as proper persons to receive mail from the wicket.

5. That when instructions are sent out for the weighing of all mails that facilities for such weighing be afforded by the department.

6. That in view of the large sums of money at times in the mails in this country and hence often stored in the post office, and in view of the value of the stamps and the importance of the books now to be kept that safes be provided for accounting postmasters or an allowance be granted to pay for use of same when provided by the postmaster.

Now, I think these are very important suggestions which have been made by these accounting postmasters, and they should receive the close attention of the Postmaster General and his assistants. The hon. gentleman referred in his speech to the prosperity which has attended the department; but at the same time he failed to show us by what policy or by what changes, he has caused this improvement in the working of the department. Here even the postmasters make a number of practical suggestions to him which he might have thought of or acted upon. He gives $80,000 to officials, many of whom are well paid to-day, many of whom would not be able to earn the same amount of money in any other capacity in life many of whom thrown on their own resources would scarcely earn one-half of what they are getting; and yet these postmasters, the men who are bearing a great part of the burden and who have brought about this prosperity, are paid the small pittance of ten per cent. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) says that that matter has been on 'Hansard' before. Well, if it has, why was not something done before ? It was not because the hon. minister did not know that the country was prosperous. He could have satisfied those people and saved them the expense of coming here to lay their case before the House and demand redress. I think that I am within my rights in bringing to the attention of the hon. minister this matter, which he has failed to meet, although he has looked after a class which has not done anything to bring about the prosperity of his department. The men he has overlooked are the men who have brought about that increase, and they should have the support of the hon. minister, but instead, these other men, many of whom are now receiving more than they could in any other capacity, are looked after to the tune of $80,000.

Mr. CLANCY. I am sure that the Committee listened with much attention to the statement of the Postmaster General. It is quite evident that the whole thing was very well arranged. As an hon. gentleman has said, there was a little rehearsal to-night, and an opportunity given the hon. minister of making the statement he did. He said that there are $292,000 to the credit of the Post Office Department after paying the whole service. That is not a difficult matter. If the hon. gentleman has additional receipts it is because he has increased the burdens of the people. True, there has been a decrease in the postage on letters, but there has been an increase on other mail matter, and therefore it is not difficult to see how the hon. gentleman, for the first time since he has been in office, has been able to show a surplus of $292,000. What is the history of the department during the six preceding years from 1897 to 1902 ? The hon. gentleman had a deficit every year during that period and a total deficit of $2,991,896.

Mr. GOURLEY. It will take some time to pay that up.

Mr. CLANCY. Yes, the hon. gentleman has starved the service. He is not giving the supply of post offices to the rural districts and elsewhere which they should have had. Let me prove this. The number of post offices that were opened between 1890 and 1896, for a period of six years under Conservative rule, was 1,190. That was a period of great depression, but take this period of phenomenal expansion from 1896 to 1902, under the administration of the hon. gentleman, and we find that instead of the post offices being increased 1,190, the increase is only 855. Could you find more conclusive evidence that the hon. gentleman has increased the burdens of the people and starved the service at the same

time? Under such conditions, it is not difficult for the hon. gentleman to have a surplus. What was the cost per head in 1896 for the postal service? It was 93 cents, and in 1902 the cost was 96 cents per head. I need not pursue the case any further. That conclusively proves that the hon. gentleman has not kept up with our increased prosperity by giving rural districts the postal service to which they are entitled. While the postage was lowered on certain classes of mail matter, it has been, on the other hand, increased to such an extent that the cost per head to the people is larger in 1901 than it was in 1896. The hon. gentleman seeks to impress upon the people the idea that he has given Canada a better service, but the fact that the post offices have not been increased in the same ratio during his regime as they did during the previous regime disposes of that claim. It is clear that the hon. gentleman has not met the wants of the people, and that being the case, he has not very much to boast of. But what he has proved is that he has taken more money from the people and given them worse service.

Mr. SPROULE. There are certain things one would require to know before determining whether it is to the good management of the Post Office Department that we owe this increased revenue. I see in the hon. gentleman's report, at the end of page 4, appendix A, the statement that for the year ending June 30th, 1902, the net revenue of the Post Office Department was $3,888,126.10 being an increase over the revenue of the previous year of $466,933,91, or 13·64 per cent. The increase in expenditure was $45,-640.78, equal to 1·19 per cent. There was evidently a process of starving going on there, because that increase of expenditure was not an increase commensurate with the development of the country. Evidently those who carried the mails and the postmasters were not paid very extravagantly for their work. There was an item last year, which I presume is the same this year, that is about the automobiles used in Toronto? Are they in use still?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood last year that they were not charged to the Post Office Department?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are now, but the change does not amount to anything.

Mr. SPROULE. They are taken into account in the statement. There are steamship subsidies for mail service, are these taken into account?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are treated as they always were. I think most of our mails go to England by the United States. We have to pay the transit charges.

Mr. SPROULE. But we give large subsidies for mail service on the steamers. That is not, however, a matter of any great importance if treated in the same way as it was before. I see here, in the report which the Postmaster General has submitted to the House, that there was a surplus of revenue over expenditure up to 30th June, 1902 for the first time.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That was omitting the Yukon. There is a special reference to it in the report.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, you have both omitted and put it in in this instance, and with the cost of the Yukon taken out, there is still a surplus of $292,702. I do not know whether I took down the hon. gentleman's statement correctly, but I understood him to say that in 1896 there was a deficit of $781,-152. I think that was wiped out by an item put in the estimates.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The department, for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1896, had a deficit, as I have already explained, on the operations of that year, of $781,000. They failed to take a vote from parliament for that year sufficient to pay the working expenses; and when I took office I found there were about three-quarters of a million dollars of unpaid accounts for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1896, for which there was no parliamentary appropriation. I reported the matter to the Finance Minister, and in the succeeding year I took an item wherewith to pay these accounts.

Mr. SPROULE. Then after everything was paid you started afresh?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is the policy of the department to pay up everything each year, to have no arrears after the 30th of June. Last year there was a slight error, that policy was not lived up to as it ought to have been, and there was an error through the department having failed to estimate the amount correctly. They were $22,000 short, and that amount had to be carried over in the report of that year, and in the fiscal year of 1903 we paid that shortage of the preceding year. Therefore, by that amount our showing is that much worse this year. But with that exception, the policy I have mentioned has been lived up to, and we close up the year's accounts and take a vote from parliament each year, so that there can be no accumulated deficit, as was the practice for many years in former times. I say in frankness that that practice prevailed under both Liberal and Conservative governments down to 1896.

Mr. SPROULE. Then there must have been a much larger deficit than $781,000, because there was an overlapping that was brought down.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is true there were a lot of errors, and two

auditors were appointed to inquire into the accounts. In bringing out that deficit they ignored all those errors that had accumulated prior to the commencement of the fiscal year ending June, 1896. They cut those off, they were not taken into account. They simply ascertained the cost of maintaining the service during the fiscal year ending the 30th June, 1896. The difference between the revenue and expenditure for that year was $781,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to say that the policy of the Postmaster General in increasing the salaries of the postmasters throughout the country is in my judgment in the right direction. The only complaint that I have to make is that he has not gone far enough. We are not now troubled so much in hunting up postmasters since the present government came into power, because they generally leave that responsibility upon others. But I do know that I have been obliged to hunt up postmasters many times, and it was difficult to get them to take the position at all for a salary ranging from $12 to $25. As they used to say, it did not pay them for scrubbing the floor. I said at one time that the minimum salary should be $25. I think now it should be higher, I do not think any one should be expected to keep a post office for less than $35 a year. What principle does the Postmaster General follow now in striking salaries above that ? I understood him to say that they get 10 per cent more than they got before.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are paid on the same scale, but we add on 10 per cent.

Mr. SPROULE. Since there is a surplus now, I would suggest to make that increase about 20 per cent.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman would land me in a deficit at once. The various increases already provided for are very near the surplus I have spoken of.

Mr. COCHRANE. When the hon. gentleman reduced the postage on letters, what effect did it have on the pay of the postmasters throughout the country ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No postmaster had his salary reduced, because of the reduction in the rate. The salaries were allowed to remain at the rate at which they stood before the reduction. Preceding governments had reduced the rate without regard to the compensation of the postmasters. Many in this House will remember when the letter postage was five cents, perhaps more than that. But the commissions were left the same.

Mr. COCHRANE. I still think that a great many rural postmasters are underpaid. Take the case of the postmaster in my own township of Edville. There is a daily mail, for it is a populous section of country. It is five or six miles from the villages of Colborne and Brighton. He is attentive to his duty, the office is kept open from morning till night, and the postmaster only gets $30. If he had not his daughter there to attend to the post office he could not keep it open. I have heard it stated here to-night that men often keep a post office to draw custom. Well, they must have a store for that purpose. But there are many post offices in our section that have no store in connection with them. I think these gentlemen should be paid something more. I am not an advocate of extravagance, but I am favourable to a reasonable expenditure where it is necessary to pay men for attending to an office like that. I am satisfied that the amount hardly pays that man. I am at the office frequently, and I am satisfied that the amount of money will hardly pay for the wood that is consumed in keeping the place warm. I think these are men who are underpaid. They are doing what is very beneficial to the rural districts. It is a great pleasure for men living in the rural districts to realize that they can get their mail and know that they are not circumscribed as to hours, but that they can get it any time in the day.

Mr. SPROULE. When the hon. minister was devising ways and means to make his revenue and expenditure he changed the system which before that time allowed all papers and parliamentary documents of the legislative assembly to go through the post office free.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, there has been no change.

Mr. SPROULE. I am quite sure that I am not in error. I have evidence of it in my hand. Here is a letter from a clerk of the peace.

Office of the Clerk of the Peace for Leeds and Grenville,

Brockville, September 14, 1903.

Dear Sir,—I beg to inform you that I have received the Ontario Statutes, for 1903, for distribution. If you wish them sent to you by book post send me 33 cents in postage stamps to prepay postage and sign and return me the enclosed receipt.

(Sgd.) M. M. BROWN,
Clerk of the Peace.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There never was a time in the history of the country when provision was made by which clerks of the peace could transmit papers through the post office free. The Post Office Act says what may and what may not be mailed free. The Post Office Act says what local parliamentary papers may go free. The Act that was in force when we took office is in force to-day. There has been no change whatever in the application of the Act. Whatever went free then goes free to-day.

Mr. SPROULE. I am quite sure that there was a time, whether it was in the time of the Postmaster General or not, when these books went free. I am sure there was a change made. I remember it distinctly.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If every official of the local government, or if clerks of the peace all over Canada, could frank matter where would be the end of the franking privilege ? It may be that in days gone by such a practice prevailed but it has not for many years or long before we came into office. The hon. gentleman surely would not urge a policy of that kind.

Mr. SPROULE. I am talking quite properly in connection with my rights. I am not urging the policy of that kind but I am drawing attention to a complaint that is made. I am not prepared to say that the fault, if fault there is, lies with the hon. Postmaster General or that there was free delivery of this matter before through the post office. But I know that my impression is that other papers used to go through the post office free which do not now.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There was no cutting off——

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. Postmaster General may say that there was no cutting off but my memory is just as good as his and I make the statement that there was a cutting off. I have a distinct remembrance of having a controversy with the postmaster in our own locality in regard to what he should allow to go through the mails free and I know that in that case there was a cutting off.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not by me. If such a state of affairs existed in days gone by I know nothing about it. There has been no change in that respect under my administration.

Mr. SPROULE. I was about to say that in many of these lines the additional postage put on, such as for instance, the additional postage put on newspapers has helped to give the additional revenue that we have to-day, and I have no doubt a great deal was made up from the increased correspondence carried on on account of the larger amount of business done. For everything that the hon. Postmaster General has done he is entitled to credit, but I do not know whether it is in order to throw as many bouquets as the hon. member for King's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Hughes) desires to present to him because that hon. gentleman desires to give him credit for a great deal of what he did not accomplish as well as for a great deal that he did accomplish. For anything that he has accomplished he is entitled to credit. He is entitled to credit for increasing the number of post offices which I think is a step in the right direction. He has also increased the mail service. That, I think, is in the right direction as well, but I think there has not been that expansion that there should have been in the pay of the mail contractors and of the small postmasters throughout the country. I think the postmasters in the towns and cities did not fare so badly, but in the small villages throughout the country where postmasters are obliged to keep the offices for anywhere from $25 to $35 there is room for improvement.

Mr. KAULBACH. I must congratulate the hon. Postmaster General upon the generous heart he has shown towards the country postmasters in giving them an increase in their salaries. The amounts they have been receiving in the past have been very inadequate for the services they have rendered. I know several postmasters that I have had a great deal of difficulty in persuading to remain in office because of the small pittance they have been receiving, amounting to $12 a year. I am very glad to know that their salaries are now being increased. They are deserving of that increase and I would have liked if it had been still larger. I would like also if the hon. Postmaster General could see his way clear with the revenue that is now afforded to his department to allow newspapers to be distributed free. This is literature that should pass free as its distribution is advancing the knowledge of the country not only in political but in other matters. Whilst I am on my feet I may say that we have a post office on the Cornwall road at New Cornwall, with John E. Hallimore as postmaster. An application on behalf of the people in that district has been made for a tri-weekly instead of a weekly service. It is a very thickly settled district and one that is deserving of a more frequent mail service. I believe that the hon. Postmaster General, from what he said when I had an interview with him the other day, will make an arrangement to give a tri-weekly service to this parish from Mahone Bay. We have a railway passing through my county and I can see no reason why the mail could not be dropped at the different places along the line once a day instead of weekly. There is one office that is only receiving a weekly mail although the train passes by daily. Very often letters are delayed either in transit to or from the various points for want of a daily mail.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What is the name of the place to which the hon. gentleman refers ?

Mr. KAULBACH. Block House, between Mahone Bay and Bridgewater, on the main line. If a tri-weekly mail is granted to New Cornwell from Mahone Bay that office can be served tri-weekly by the courier that would serve the office at New Cornwall. This is a reasonable request and I feel satisfied that the hon. Postmaster General

will see it in the same light and give it favourable consideration.

Mr. BLAIN. In looking over the report of the hon. Postmaster General, I see that the deficit for the first year of the hon. gentleman's administration ending the 30th June, 1897, was $586,540; in 1898, a deficit of $47,602; in 1899, a deficit of $457,420; in 1900, a deficit of $553,242; in 1901, a deficit of $512,014; in 1902, a deficit of $82,376. In these six years there was a total deficit of $2,239,194. The Postmaster General claims a surplus for the year ending June, 1903, of $292,702, so that this would leave a total deficit during the hon. gentleman's administration of $1,946,492. May I ask if that includes in each and every year the figures of the deficit with reference to the Yukon?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We commenced the Yukon mail service in 1897, I think, but of course it has developed very much since. In each annual report since we established the Yukon service, the hon. gentleman will find a special reference to that service. It has been the policy of the department up to the present to show separately the revenue and expenditure on the Yukon service, apart from the general service for the rest of Canada.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister state the deficit in the Yukon postal service from its establishment up to the present?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot give you that to-night.

Mr. KAULBACH. What increase does the minister purpose to give to the town postmasters, and how will he distinguish between the town and the village postmasters?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no distinction between town and village. All postmasters who are paid by commission will now receive an increase of 10 per cent over what they were receiving before.

Mr. POPE. I congratulate the Postmaster General upon realizing his ambition of having a surplus. I trust it will not become a fad with him to go on increasing these surpluses until he wipes out the deficits that have accumulated under his administration of seven years. If he attempted such a thing the post office service would be starved to death. I congratulate the Postmaster General on the prosperity of the country which has made it possible for him to realize that surplus. I have been spending a few weeks in the sparsely settled districts of the North-west, where the people are coming in so rapidly, and where for distances of over sixty and seventy miles which I have travelled, they have no mail service. I can quite understand that when the Postmaster General thought of the expense of carrying the mails into these outlying territories, and wishing to have a surplus, he would not venture to give them an adequate mail service. I would impress upon the Postmaster General, the absolute necessity of dispelling from his mind any idea of making the Post Office Department pay in the immediate future, seeing that we have so much development of that service before us. Those who have been used to living in closely settled communities in Europe or eastern Canada, find it very lonely when they settle on the western plains. Railway development has been very slow in that territory of recent years, and settlement is going long distances away from any centre of communication. The settlers are naturally desirous of being able to communicate with their people at home, and nothing stimulates immigration so much as the giving of facilities for that purpose. Any one who visits these communities and sees the anxiety with which the people await the coming of the mail, will appreciate that fact. In the district I refer to, there were only three settlers three years ago, but now there are more than fifty families. The mail is carried in by any one who happens to be able to take it by accident, and it is tumbled about from one house to another until a store is established, when that is made the central point of distribution. The Postmaster General must see how unsatisfactory such a system is. Let me say, that while I am perfectly satisfied that the Postmaster General should increase the salaries of country postmasters, I do not know that I am so very much wrapt up in that idea, as other hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, perhaps I am not so much dependent upon them. While I have no objection to the Postmaster General increasing the salaries of these gentlemen, yet I certainly would not desire that his doing so should lead to the starvation of the mail service in western Canada, because I look upon the development of the mail service in the west as being absolutely essential to the satisfactory settlement of that country. Believing as I do, that the development of the west is more important to us than the increasing of the salaries of country postmasters, so far as I am personally concerned, I hope that the Postmaster General will see that whatever increases in salaries he makes, they will not be taken from the mail service of the west. I trust that in the future the Postmaster General will not let a few hundred dollars expense interfere with the development of our postal service.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I quite appreciate the importance of giving to the people who are coming into our North-west, the best possible mail service. When an application is made for a post office that application is referred to the inspector and he makes a report. I think I am strictly within the facts when I say, that in no instance has there been any refusal to estab-

lish a post office which has been recommended by the inspector. Indeed, in many instances I have established post offices where the inspector recommended they were not necessary. If the inspector recommends it, the office is established, and it may be relied upon that Mr. McLeod, the inspector in that territory, a capable and intelligent man will make recommendations wherever there is reasonable justification. I think no one can complain that we have not liberally extended the post offices throughout the territories.

To provide for an appointment of seven additional railway mail clerks—$3,500.

Mr. POPE. What is this for ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In Manitoba and the North-west Territories.

Telegraph lines, Yukon system—working expenses, $62,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for the maintenance and operation of these lines.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the experience of the working of these lines ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The operation costs $179,000 in round numbers, and the receipts this year, judging by the nine months, will amount to about $120,000, leaving a deficit of a little over $50,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the deficit growing smaller or larger every year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The construction account was closed only a few months ago. The revenue is increasing. Last month it was $14,000, which is a couple of thousand dollars larger than ever before. The rates had been perhaps prematurely lowered. The expenses can be cut down after this year, I think, to some extent, so that I imagine the deficit will decrease every year.

Mr. BOYD. What does the minister mean by the rates being prematurely lowered ? Last year the Minister of Public Works promised to test the question of lowering the rates.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They were lowered some months ago from $4.50, I think, to $3 for ten words, and the press rate has been reduced from 3 cents a word to ½ cent a word.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What means has the minister for repairing the lines ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are linemen at stations along the lines. This expense increases the cost of operating these lines beyond the ordinary lines.

Mr. BOYD. I understand that the increase of revenue has come about since the reduction in rates ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Of course, the line was not completed. The large branches which have been added to the line contribute to the deficit, as they do not yield much revenue.

Mr. POPE. Where do these branches run ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The longest runs to Port Simpson. The prospect is that the revenue will improve and the expenditure will decrease.

Mr. BLAIN. Can the minister give us the figures of the total construction account to date ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is a little less than $900,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Can he give us the amount paid on construction account during this year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot tell my hon. friend. The construction account is now closed.

Some resolutions reported.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL—FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE presented a message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows :

MINTO.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons Further Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1904, and in accordance with the provisions of 'The British North America Act, 1867,' the Governor General recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, 14th October, 1903.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, the Message and Supplementary Estimates were referred to the Committee of Supply.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the hon. gentleman give us any information as to when the resolution regarding the Quebec bridge will be brought down ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I hope the matter will be ready for presentation at the next sitting of the House on Friday.

Mr. SPROULE. What will be the business on Friday ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will proceed with the remaining supplementary estimates, probably with the railway estimates first.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12 o'clock midnight.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, October 16, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE—BINDER TWINE.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS (East Assiniboia) moved :

That the House do concur in the eighth and final report of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, and especially that 40,000 copies of the evidence of the inspector of binder twine be printed forthwith in pamphlet form, in the usual numerical proportions of English and French, as advance sheets of the committee's final report, for distribution to members of parliament less 100 copies for the use of the committee, and that Rule 94 be suspended in relation to the printing of the evidence.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to entirely dissent from the motion, but it seems to have two distinct features, first, that the House concur in the report and, secondly, that it concur especially in a certain part of the report. It seems to me to be a very unique form of expression. We either concur in the report or we do not concur in it. If we only desire to concur in a portion of the report, that portion should be stated, and we should not say that we concur especially in a certain part of it. I do not admire the wisdom of concurring in that report, and for the following reasons : The portion of it which we are asked specially to concur in is the publication of 40,000 copies of the evidence given by Mr. Haycock as the inspector of binder twine, to be given to the people of the country. In so far as the information contained in the evidence would be valuable to the farmers, I have not the slightest objection in the world to having it distributed, but in so far as it discloses how imperfectly the work was performed and the shortcomings of that particular individual in allowing a thing to be done which I think should not have been done, I think it is very unwise that we should disseminate that information any farther than possible. What I refer to is the manner in which Mr. Haycock has discharged his duty.

Mr. Haycock was appointed as an inspector to carry out the provisions of the Act 2 Edward VII., chapter 32 : 'An Act to amend the Act respecting the packing and sale of certain staple commodities,' in which reference is made to binder twine. He was appointed for the purpose of examining binder twine and of seeing that the binder twine offered for sale complies with the requirements of the law. What are the requirements of the law ? The requirements of the law are that :

Every manfacturer, importer or dealer who neglects to comply with the provisions of this section shall, on summary conviction, be liable to a penalty of not less than twenty-five cents per ball ; and every manufacturer, importer or dealer of binder twine which is not of the length per pound which is stamped upon the ball, shall, on summary conviction, be liable to a penalty of not less than one dollar and not more than twenty-five dollars per ball, and all such twine deficient in quantity shall be confiscated to the Crown : provided that no deficiency in the number of feet contained in any bail shall be deemed a contravention of this section unless the deficiency exceeds five per cent of the length stated upon the stamp.

Any proceedings under this section shall be taken within six months from the sale of any such ball.

The word 'dealer' whenever it occurs in this section shall be held to mean the dealer who is the direct purchaser from the manufacturer.

There were two things that Mr. Haycock was bound to look after, first, that the balls should contain the name of the manufacturer, and, second, that they should have stamped upon them the number of feet per pound. Well, Mr. Haycock went out to discharge his duties, and he found twine that did not comply with the requirements of the law. He said in his evidence before the Committee on Agriculture :

I visited a large number of places and I may just say that the first place, the first point at which I got any bad twine was at Gretna. There I found a lot of twine that was not marked in accordance with the Act and I inflicted a penalty of $25 which was paid and deposited to the credit of the Receiver General of Canada.

By Mr. Gilmour:

Q. And do you say you inflicted a penalty ?
A. I did.

By Mr. Sproule :

Q. You inflicted a penalty without bringing the party before a magistrate ?
A. I did so. The party was satisfied and would sooner pay the penalty than go before a magistrate. However, it is a matter for you people to discuss.

You went on to state that :

By Mr. Blain :

Q. Do I understand that after the fine you had the twine re-marked and that the agent went and sold it ?
A. Yes.

We contended that he had no such authority.

Q. Do you consider you would have the right and power to do that ?

A. I find the Act says that every ball of binder twine that is offered for sale shall have attached to it a stamp with the name of the manufacturer, the importer or dealer, and the number of feet per pound. This twine had the name of the manufacturer but not the number of feet per pound and I had to fine this man. I told him that all he had to do was to put the number of feet per pound on that ball and that it would comply with the Act.

Q. Surely that man would not have the power, would he ?

A. I do not know why ?

Q. I can easily understand why.

A. Not if he marks it properly. If he marks it improperly, then he is liable to a penalty of $1 per ball.

Q. Suppose that any dealer in this city had ten tons of twine ?

A. Yes.

Q. And you went and inspected it and found it did not come up to the requirements of the Act ?

A. Yes.

Q. Would you think that the dealer had any right, under your instructions to mark the twine with the number of feet and then go and sell it ?

A. He could mark it anything he liked.

Q. Not after paying the penalty ?

A. Yes.

Q. Surely, the agent would not have that power ? I would have thought that twine ought to be put off the market entirely. . . .

A. . . . . I said to this man, 'If you had the number of feet per pound, neither I nor any one else could touch it, and if you put the number of feet on the twine that it actually measured, you would be perfectly safe.'

Here is a party who was selling twine that did not comply with the law, and yet he is authorized to measure and mark it himself. This was held by many members of the Committee on Agriculture to be an authority not given to the inspector under the Act.

Q. Supposing an agent in this city was to buy ten tons of twine and it had on a tag such as you have in your hand, and bore the name of the importer. If that is put on, then the agent having the twine could decide for himself the number of feet per ton and put it on himself ?

A. Yes, and if he does not do it correctly then he is liable to a fine of $1 per ball and confiscation.

Q. Then the Act has no value because it says it must bear the statement of the manufacturer ?

A. It says the manufacturer, importer or dealer.

Q. If you allow that to go, then each man would have the right to put the number of feet per pound on himself?

Further on he was asked :

Q. Do I understand you to say that this twine shall be confiscated to the Crown or not ?

A. No, it did not make any misrepresentation. The tag does not make any representation at all as to the number of feet.

Because there was no tag on it, and therefore he could not confiscate. He says :

I had instructions from the department that I have the power to collect the penalty.

He was asked again :

Q. You consider that under the statute you are authorized to impose the penalty and collect it ?

A. I do not impose the fine ; I simply collect the penalty.

It seems to me that is a distinction without a difference.

I do not convict the man. I simply collect the penalty.

Q. You persuade him that a fine will be imposed upon him, and that he had better pay you ? Is that the case ?

A. They simply prefer it that way ? Yes, that is the way.

He goes on further :

Q. Have you a tag that was taken off certain twine that did not comply with the law ?

A. Yes. That is improperly marked too ; the name of the manufacturer is not on it.

By Mr. Sproule :

Q. Do you fine according to the Act a dollar a ball for every ball ? What did you do with that case ?

A. The Act, if you will read it carefully, says that the dealer shall be held to be the direct purchaser from the manufacturer. The gentleman in whose possession I found this twine did not purchase it from the manufacturer, so, according to the Act, I could not treat with that man.

He finds the twine in the possession of a man who is selling twine not properly marked, and he says that because this dealer is not a direct purchaser from the manufacturer, he cannot fine him, as the law does not authorize him to do so. Then, that is a lamentable defect in the Act. Then in answer to Mr. Henderson, he says :

The Act says the word 'dealer,' whenever it occurs in this section, shall be held to mean the dealer who is the direct purchaser from the manufacturer.

Now, here are two features of the case to which I wish to direct attention. In the first place, the inspector assumes that he is to fine the party who has in his possession twine that is not properly marked, without lodging a complaint before a magistrate or before any tribunal that is authorized to try the case. He collects the fine and says he hands it over to the Receiver General. That is an authority which the Act does not give him. The Act says :

Every manufacturer, importer or dealer who neglects to comply with the provisions of this Act shall, upon summary conviction, be liable to a penalty of not less than twenty-five cents per ball, or $25.

Now, I draw attention to the fact that there was no conviction before a magistrate and no complaint made. The man had no opportunity to defend himself, but the inspector comes in, imposes a fine, collects the money, and deals with it as he sees fit. He says he passes it over to the Receiver General. That may or may not be correct. I am not calling that in question ; but I am drawing attention to the fact that he is exercising an authority which he does not possess under the Act. The other

feature of the case is this, that where he finds twine in possession of the dealer, if the dealer is not prepared to say that he purchased it direct from the manufacturer, the inspector has no power to fine him. That is a defect in the Act as well as an excessive authority on the part of the inspector. I claim that he improperly exercised an authority which the Act does not give him. The authority of the inspector should be better defined or his instructions should be more explicit. I appeal to the Minister of Justice whether it is competent for any inspector to impose a fine without lodging a complaint before a competent tribunal, where the party alleged to have violated the law would have an opportunity to defend himself ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. At first sight it would appear necessary for a man to lodge a complaint before a competent tribunal and have the man tried by a summary process. Unless there is something special in the Act, there would be no authority for the inspector to impose a penalty without that.

Mr. SPROULE. There is nothing in the Act which gives the inspector such authority. What I object to is publishing 40,000 copies of this evidence, and distributing them, containing evidence which only shows either the incompetency of parliament to pass a proper Act or the improper exercise of authority by the inspector in imposing the penalty.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). Of course, I want to speak with some caution. It would appear to me that it would be necessary for the inspector to take proceedings before a competent tribunal before he could do anything. I would require to look into the matter and consider it, and would be quite willing to give an opinion to-morrow if the hon. gentleman will bring up the question then.

Mr. SPROULE. In that case, we had better postpone consideration of the motion until the Minister of Justice can look into it and give us the benefits of his judgment. I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Committee on Agriculture and Colonization were unanimous in their opinion that this evidence should be printed, and desired that I should make some remarks on the matter in order to have the printing done as rapidly as possible and the report set before the country. I hope that the House will agree, in view of the unanimous decision of the committee, that no delay should be thrown in the way of publishing this report. If we were reviewing the Act, this discussion would be opportune, but under the circumstances I do not see that it is. If the powers of the inspector require to be more fully defined, that can be done by special legislation.

Mr. U. WILSON (Lennox). I have been a pretty constant attendant at the meetings of the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, but I was absent at the particular one which adopted this report. There is one thing which pleases me in the evidence and that is that it fully establishes the fact that the only one of our Canadian manufacturers of twine was fined for shortage in measurement. All the other found short was American twine imported into this country. It is quite evident that putting twine on the free list does not tend to cheapen it or make the dealings more satisfactory.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). If the motion to adjourn should carry, this report will go on Public Bills and Orders and not be reached this session. I would suggest that the report be adopted and any information required may be obtained in supply or in any other convenient form.

Mr. SPROULE. I question the wisdom of circulating 40,000 copies of evidence which is open to the objections I have just taken. We should first have an authoritative statement from the Minister of Justice.

Mr. S. HUGHES (Victoria). If this officer, Mr. Haycock, had no authority to levy these fines and if this evidence is to be printed, containing this statement that he believes he has authority, the farmers will possibly take what he says for granted, and he will be given the opportunity of exercising very improper powers.

Mr. E. COCHRANE (East Northumberland). I was at the meeting of the committee and asked this officer a question concerning his duties. He said that all he could do under the Act when the twine was not of proper length, was to confiscate it and to fine the parties. But if he found the twine without tags, he could not do anything under the Act. In that case the law should be amended. If we are satisfied that this man has no right to impose a fine and confiscate, this report should not be circulated. If no man should be fined without a trial, and if a magistrate only has the power to fine, this officer has been exceeding his duty and we should not send out a report which would give a false impression of his powers.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I spoke to the inspector about the binder twine manufactured in American prisons, and he said it was not part of his duty to look after that, but it was for the Customs Department to deal with such twine. I do not see why that should not be part of his duties.

Mr. D. HENDERSON (Halton). If the law is defective and does not give authority to the inspector to impose a speedy remedy,

it should be amended. But I approve of the printing of 40,000 copies of this special report and sending it broadcast throughout the country. It is evident, from the report, that the farmers have been imposed upon, and they should be made aware of it. According to the evidence, out of fourteen cases in which binder twine was found to be short in measurement, one came from Mexico, one from England, one from Canada and eleven from the States. Surely that should warn farmers against purchasing American binder twine. In order to get rid of this American twine and prevent our people being imposed upon, we should go back to the old principle and put a duty on the foreign article which will keep it out of the country.

It is quite evident that if encouragement were given to the manufacture of binder twine in this country, that all we want could be made in Canada. Nearly fifty per cent of our twine is manufactured in Canada now, even under the great difficulties that exist. The United States manufacturers have access to our market free of duty and they have their own market to sell their products, in which market Canadians are prohibited from entering by the tariff duties. All that our producers have is a portion of that Canadian market. I say that more encouragement should be given to men who produce an honest article and sell the farmers honest measure, and so prevent the twine from the United States being disposed of to our farmers who unwittingly buy it thinking that they are buying an honest article. I want the farmers to be educated on this point. I think that it will result in bringing about a far better state of things; that our farmers will be guarded against buying American twine and will see that it is to their interest to encourage this industry which, we believe can be doubled in extent, thus benefiting our workmen engaged in this industry as well as our farmers who buy the goods. I look upon the report as most important, and I believe that the greater currency that can be given to it the better in all interests.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (South Leeds). I think the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) should not allow this report to be adopted in view of the information we have in that report that the government have authorized a man to go about practically compounding felony. He finds a man who has violated the law and says to him in effect: You are a violator of the law, but if you give me $25 we will say nothing about it. He has authority, apparently, to go about either blackmailing people or compounding felony. If we find a man who has violated the law why should he not be brought up and fined as provided by the law? I do not wonder at the chairman of the committee and other hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House wanting a large number of copies of this report distributed. In my opinion, if ever there was a useless office, it is that to which Mr. Haycock has been appointed. These gentlemen opposite call Mr. Haycock here specially and get his evidence in such form that it can be printed in pamphlet and sent to the country. This is done in an attempt to show that this office is of some value and the holder of it is earning his money. Yet, by his own report and admission he is going around either blackmailing the parties whom he finds violating the law or compounding felony with them. The farmers of Canada are intelligent enough to know whether they are buying good twine or not, and they can see to it that they are getting full length, without paying Mr. Haycock $1,200 a year as a salary and $1,200 a year expenses to go about doing such work as he is doing. It is evident that this man has overstepped his duties and should be called down. He finds a man with twine that is not regular in his possession, and he says: You are violating the law, but I will let you go on and sell the balance of this if you will pay me $25. I can put it in my pocket and turn it into the revenue after. On a previous occasion I brought here a statement showing that men had paid fines for illegal fishing to one of the officers of this government, and there was no record of any return of that fine to the department. I do not say that Mr. Haycock would pocket the money, but I say that if the government send out this officer and he finds the law being violated it is the duty of the government to see that those who violate the law are punished, and not called upon to pay so much money to hush it up. It is the duty of the Minister of Justice to look into the matter immediately.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I conceive that my duty is to speak with considerable care and caution, and not to talk of men as blackmailers and compounders of felony without some knowledge of the facts.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). I think the question raised by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and the remarks of the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) do not really cover the point at issue. That point is the adoption of the final report of the Committee on Agriculture, which sums up in general terms the work of the committee during the session, and gives valuable information as to the extension of the agricultural industry in Canada during the year.

Mr. SPROULE. If the minister will allow me, I stated that I did not object to the adoption of the report of the Agricultural Committee, but I questioned the wisdom of the portion of the report which recommended the printing of 40,000 copies of the evidence referred to.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. At the same time, the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Sproule's) motion for the adjournment of the debate, if carried, practically means that this report will not be adopted, printed or disributed.

Mr. SPROULE. I asked if that would prevent the adoption of the report, and finding that that might be the effect, I asked that the motion be allowed to stand or be withdrawn until the Minister of Justice could look over the matter as he desired to do. I have no desire to prevent the report being considered and being finally dealt with by the House.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Sproule's) object is to get the Minister of Justice's opinion on this question, that can be done without holding over this report. The legality of the inspector's conduct, and the general question of binder twine I do not propose to discuss. But I must say that I think it is very important that the information contained in this report should be put before the farmers.

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask the minister one question? Would he put before the farmers the statement made by the inspector that he was instructed by the department to act as he did?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think there is any objection to the evidence of the inspector going out. If it is correct, it can be remedied by the discussion which will arise when the information comes from the Department of Justice. But, for the House to interfere with the distribution of this report among the farmers, I think, would be an injury to agriculture. I coincide with the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) that this statement of the inspector showed that Canadian binder twine is up to the legal standard and that it was American binder twine almost entirely that suffered by the inspection. That is of the greatest importance to our farmers and to the binder twine industry. But in this report as it appears there is no statement as regards the legal point. That appears only in the evidence which will be printed. I do not think the statement is more important than hundreds of others which appear in the evidence which comes before the committee and which are dealt with and sifted by the inquiries of the committee at the time they are given. But I would point out to my hon. friend and to the House that this report, the adoption of which is here moved, was adopted unanimously by the committee, no objection being taken to it by any one. And that committee passed a unanimous resolution asking that this large number of the report should be printed for distribution. Under these circumstances, I think the House will be safe in adopting the report of the committee.

Mr. A. W. WRIGHT (South Renfrew). Before this vote is taken, I wish to say one word with reference to the inspection of twine and with regard to this report. Perhaps you are not aware, Mr. Speaker, that when this matter came up first in the committee they were exceedingly pleased with the evidence they had received from the inspector of binder twine, and anxious that the information which he had given should go to the farmers at large. Now in order that that might be done a motion was presented, which I had the honour to second, that 20,000 copies of this report should be printed and sent broadcast. But the member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière), who understands the workinig of these things thoroughly well in his own part of the country, at once rose and said: No, we should have at least 40,000 copies printed. Then the question arose whether 40,000 was sufficient, whether we should not have 50,000 printed and distributed broadcast, and there was a unanimous opinion in the committee that there should be not less than 40,000 printed, and that is the motion which carried. The reason we wished these to go broadcast is this, among others: It is difficult for a farmer or dealer in binder twine to tell the difference between two balls of twine where there is no more than one cent a pound difference in the price. If any one were to take a ball of Plymouth Special, say, or a ball of Blue Ribbon, and take the tag off one ball and place it on the other, and send these out, no one will be able to say which brand it was. One may have more feet in length than another, but a farmer would not know the difference, because he has no way of measuring it. But the information which was given to us the other day by this inspector gives the farmers knowledge of a way by which they can test the length of these balls of twine, information which the farmers have not got to-day. I myself who have been selling twine ever since it was placed on the market, never knew how to do it; and if a dealer who has been in the business for years could not tell how, can you expect a farmer, who has nothing of the experience that a dealer has, to tell what kind of twine or what number of yards there are in a ball? For these reasons I think it is desirable that this report as it was introduced should pass this House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was a motion to adjourn the debate. Does the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) wish to press it?

Mr. SPROULE. I do not desire to press the motion. I desired to get an authoritative statement of the Minister of Justice

regarding the question before we adopted the report. I withdraw my motion.

Motion (Mr. Douglas) agreed to.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. CHAMPAGNE moved that this House do concur in the 7th and 8th Reports of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Official Reports of the Debates of this House during the present session.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that this House do to-morrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider certain proposed railway resolutions (page 13549). His Excellency the Governor General has been made acquainted with the subject-matter of these resolutions, and recommends them to the consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

JOINT HIGH COMMISSION.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the government to the following despatch from Boston, under date of October 13th, which I find in the Toronto 'World' of October 15th:

Wm. E. Brigham, secretary of the New England Reciprocity League, has received a letter from a high official source in Canada of which the following is the most important part:

It is of course undeniable that the anxiety for reciprocity in Canada has diminished very greatly, and the country would not view the failure of negotiations in the same light as it would have done a few years ago, still I have every faith in the probability of securing the acceptance of a treaty if the Joint High Commission meets, as I think it will be likely to do, by the 1st of December. Our session is nearing a close.

So this must have come from a member of parliament.

We shall probably complete our labours some time this week. Prorogation probably will be followed by a communication between Laurier and Senator Fairbanks. If all goes well the date for the commission will then be arranged. We will then get together——

I take it this must be a member of the commission who is writing.

—and see what can be done. It will be a meeting of momentus importance, for we are either about to establish better trade relations between Canada and the United States or enter upon a career where we shall be governed exclusively by our belief as to what our own interests require. I feel anxious to see the end reached and to know which one of the roads that lead into a parting of the ways we shall enter.

I wish to ask if this statement has the authorization of the government, or their sanction, or is it made with their knowledge, or have they any information to give this House with regard to the subject?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid we cannot accept responsibility for the Toronto 'World's' editorials or correspondence, whether they be written in Boston or Ottawa. The attitude of the government on this important question was indicated at an earlier stage of the session, and that is the precise position of the government to-day.

CATTLE EMBARGO.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I wish to refer to another question. I find the following telegraphic despatch in the Ottawa 'Citizen' of this morning:

CATTLE EMBARGO.

Lord Onslow, says Restrictions on Canadian Cattle Cannot be Removed.

London, October 15.—A deputation of Scotch farmers met Lord Onslow, President of the Board of Agriculture, at Edinburgh to-day and tried to induce him to promise the removal of the restriction on the importation of Canadian cattle into Great Britain. His lordship declared this to be impracticable. He approved of the government's policy of a general restriction of cattle importation and said it should be adhered to.

(Canadian Special Cable.)

London, October 15.—Lord Onslow to-day at Edinburgh received a large influential deputation of the local authorities, of the harbour trust and agriculturists. The deputation impressed the necessity of the removal of the restrictions upon the importation of Canadian cattle. Lord Onslow said that after the vote of the House of Commons it was an impracticable suggestion to ask members of the government to bring in a Bill to repeal the restrictions. It did not appear that there was any scarcity of cattle, nor had the price of store cattle seriously risen. He thought the government was correct in adhering to the policy of retaining the restriction.

I wish to inquire whether the Minister of Agriculture has joined this deputation, or taken any steps to assist them in their effort to get the restrictions removed since Lord Onslow has become President of the Board of Agriculture instead of the late president, Mr. Hanbury?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The Minister of Agriculture is not in his seat, and I would have preferred that the answer should come from him. But I may say that a change of Colonial Secretary, or a change of a minister in England, without a change of government, does not always involve a change of policy; and the action of the imperial government as disclosed in the correspondence which was submitted to the House some time ago, indicates that Lord Onslow will adhere to the policy which the government have had on that question. I am not aware whether the Minister of Agriculture has had any important communication on the sub-

ject, but I am afraid that the report in the newspaper is well founded.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Department of Railways and Canals—salaries—to provide for an additional second-class clerk, $700.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). This is a small item of civil government to provide for an additional clerk. It is simply to meet the growing needs of the department.

Mr. SPROULE. Where is he to be employed ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He is to be employed in general clerical service in the inside service at Ottawa.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the hon. gentleman made the appointment yet ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is nobody actually appointed. I have a gentleman in mind.

Railroads and canals—chargeable to capital—Intercolonial Railway, additional sidings along line, $63,500.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to provide for a number of new sidings and enlargement of new sidings at quite a number of points along the line.

Mr. LAVERGNE. Would the hon. Minister of Finance be good enough to say if there is to be something expended at Drummondville ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are some improvements contemplated at Drummondville, but they are not contemplated under this item.

Mr. SPROULE. Where is this money to be expended ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At quite a number of different places along the line. In some cases there are new sidings to be constructed and in many cases the sidings are to be lengthened owing to the longer trains that are used.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he declares that there is nothing to be spent at Drummondville for buying grounds, enlarging the yard and improving the sidings ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This item does not include any appropriation for Drummondvillle, but there are improvements at Drummondville intended and covered by another item.

Mr. BARKER. Why is it not possible in these railway estimates to give more details than have been given ? We have one item of $63,500, another of $118,000, another of $5,000, another of $125,000, and so on. The information that is given is of very little use to us, and it does not in the least enable us in future years to see what has been done with these appropriations. In the other departments far more detail is given and it seems to be growing in the Railway Department as a custom to put the very largest sums of money down and to ask for a wholesale order. I do not think that it saves any time of the House. It certainly does not save money, because, over and over, we have been obliged to ask the minister to stand up in the House and give us details occupying the time of the House in giving these details that might have been given as well in the estimates themselves. If that course had feen followed a great many questions which have to be asked in the House would be saved.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Barker), on the best information I have, that there is no change whatever in the method of preparing these estimates and submitting them to the House. Take this item as an illustration ; although the aggregate is $63,500, it is made up of a number of small items. If you were to make a detailed estimate of each of these small items you would find yourself tied to the exact sum of each, and you would have a number of small items, which is not desirable. It is very desirable that the House should be informed of the class of work to be done, and if necessary, the places at which it is to be done, but I do not think it would be wise to make a special item of each of these works, because then you would be tied to the exact amount of each particular item.

Mr. BARKER. The explanation which the hon. minister has now given is the very best reason I could furnish for these particulars being given. It is notorious that in all departments, whether of a railway or of government, officials will endeavour to transpose money from one purpose to another. Sidings may be asked for at the beginning of the year for a particular place. During the year the departmental officials will have pressure brought to bear on them to spend the money somewhere else, and they simply cancel the appropriation as made and use it at another place. That is a kind of thing we object to. It is a thing that all railway companies have strictly stamped out, and it should be the same in parliament. If an appropriation is made to an officer of a railway company for a particular purpose the officer is not allowed to use it for any other purpose, and if the department has arranged for a certain sum of money to be expended on certain works, it is not right, though the hon. minister suggests it would be right, that there should be any transference of the money to another purpose. I therefore say again what I said last session and during the previous session, that there ought to be more

particulars given in these cases, and the only remedy we have if they are not given in the printed estimate is to ask the minister to state in the House in detail what he is going to do with the money, so that it may go on 'Hansard.' It will be cheaper to the country to put the details in print and then we need not ask the minister to give elaborate statements to go on 'Hansard.'

Mr. COCHRANE. Am I to understand the hon. minister to say that he should not always be confined to spending money in the way in which he asks the committee to vote it? For instance, I might have no doubt in my mind about the propriety of voting $118,000 for double-tracking part of the line. If I understand the hon. minister's explanation rightly, he asks the committee to consent to the expenditure of $118,000 for double-tracking the line, but he does not wish to be confined to spending the money for that purpose, but he wishes to be in a position to spend it in any other way that he sees fit. Is that the right construction to put upon the hon. minister's explanation?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly not.

Mr. COCHRANE. What did the hon. minister mean when he stated that he did not want to be confined to spending the money in a certain way?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If I conveyed that impression I was very unfortunate in my use of words. I can assure my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) that there is nothing new in this appropriation. It is the precise method of appropriation that has been followed for generations, but I do not plead that as a reason why it should be continued, because if it were a bad method I would be quite prepared to have it reformed. I am aware of no difficulty that has arisen under it. I prefer to believe that it is a wise thing to do. But this is for a special class of work; it is for additional sidings. It cannot be devoted to anything else. The vote for the double track which my hon. friend refers to can only be applied to that purpose. I can give the names of the places where we contemplate building sidings; but I do not think it would be wise to confine us to a particular amount for a particular siding. Suppose, for instance, that one siding is estimated to cost $2,000 and another $3,000, and suppose it is found that they cost about $2,500 each; I do not think it would be wrong to apply the $5,000 for the two sidings in that way. All we say is that in giving this estimate we should not be obliged to specify the amount to be spent on each particular siding. Suppose we found during the year that a siding was urgently needed which was not contemplated at the time the estimates were presented, we think we should be able to meet that particular need. The engineer's estimates for sidings vary from $2,000 up to $3,000, $4,000 or $5,000; there is one estimate of $10,000 for a siding at Campbellton; but with that exception all the sums are comparatively small, none of them more than about $6,000. The places at which new sidings are contemplated are: Assametquaghan, Millstream, Clark's Brook, Cedar Hill, St. Moise, St. Anne, between Red Pine and Bartibogue, between Bartibogue and Beaver Brook, Chatham Junction, Sackville 'Y,' Milford, Windsor Junction, Pomquet, Campbellton, Jacquet River, Belledune, Iona, and a small amount for engineering.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). These works will all be done by the ordinary railway foremen and sectionmen?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, by the usual method.

Mr. BARKER. I will persist in the point which I have made. The very thing the hon. gentleman thinks is objectionable is done by every railway company which operates a large railway, perhaps more than double the length of the Intercolonial. In other departments of the government, we find the estimates detailed. Thus in the Public Works Department, there are items from $1,000 up to $10,000, each place being given. According to the hon. gentleman's view, all that would be necessary would be to take a lump sum appropriation, and let the government spend the money where they liked. Having put down in the list at the beginning of the year $5,000 for a siding at one place, and $10,000 for another, the officials of the government or the minister may in the course of the year vary the appropriations, and spend $10,000 where it was proposed to spend $5,000 and $5,000 where it was proposed to spend $10,000, and so on. That is not what is expected. I quite admit that if you got down to spending $4 or $5, there might be some reason in what the hon. gentleman says; but when he speaks of $10,000 for a siding at one particular place not being an item that should be mentioned in the estimates, I do not agree with him. When $10,000 is put down for a siding at Campbellton or anywhere else, it should not be possible for the minister to use any portion of that appropriation for another purpose.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid that I am obliged to disagree with my hon. friend. I think that the present system is the best, and that the system he proposes would be unworkable. I think it is far better to first give the House an intimation of the places at which these works are contemplated, and then leave the government with a free hand as to the details of the work. I must not contradict my hon. friend, but I am rather of opinion that no railway company would submit to its direc-

tors, certainly not to its shareholders, a detailed statement of all such expenditures. It would submit that a certain sum was needed for certain works, and leave the details to engineers.

Mr. BARKER. When the engineer makes up his estimate of what he requires during the season, he has to submit that in detail to the management, and he is held to the expenditure as authorized. Here we are acting somewhat in the position of the manager of a railway who is allotting to the engineer a certain sum of money for a certain purpose. I do not say that there might not be a reasonable sum set apart for emergency cases which might arise during the year ; but that does not justify the minister in taking a wholesale appropriation covering points that he knows about. He mentioned several cases where he wants appropriations of $10,000, $5,000 or $6,000. Why should we not have particulars of these ? Why should we not know that $10,000 is to be expended at a particular point for sidings ? Then, in a year or two from now, when parliament will be inquiring into the expenditure, the authority will be before us. Otherwise members will have to search 'Hansard' to see what the minister had said in regard to each case.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman says that if an engineer of a great railway made his estimate of an amount required, he would have to give the details, and would be held strictly to those details. Again I must disagree with my hon. friend. What might occur is this, the engineer might make a report during the year that one of the sidings for which an appropriation was made was not pressing, but that he needed another ; or that two or three sidings would cost less than the amounts estimated, while others would cost more. It would be the duty of the chief engineer to report to the manager in these cases. I think the practice would be much the same in the case of a great railway as it is in the case of the government railway.

Mr. COCHRANE. Does the minister say that such a thing happens as that the engineer of a railway decides that he wants a siding at a certain place and makes an estimate of the cost, and that he is so far out that $2,000 or $3,000 would not be needed, and the money would be spent somewhere else ? Would the hon. minister tell the committee that there is an engineer on the railway who would make such a mistake ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would not consider it a mistake. We vote so much for sidings, and instead of spending money on one particular siding we spent it on another. Suppose we were to follow the course suggested by my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) and vote $3,000 to be spent on one siding and $2,000 on another, making a total of $5,000 for the two, and suppose that on more careful examination it turns out that the sidings would cost $2,500 each, where would be the wrong in spending $2,500 on each instead of $3,000 on one and $2,500 on the other ?

Mr. BLAIN. The committee are asked to vote money for specific purposes and the department appropriates that to other purposes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Of the same class.

Mr. BLAIN. Could the hon. minister tell us where the money was expended which was voted last year and whether the full amount was expended ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The appropriation for last year, according to the memorandum furnished me, was $50,000, and we expended $41,638.

Mr. BLAIN. But there was a revote of $135,000 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. According to the memo. given me, the appropriation in 1902-3 for additional sidings was $50,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I entirely agree with the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) that in asking parliament for money the government should specify the particular locality where it is to be expended and the purpose. That is what is done by the Minister of Public Works. There ought to be an estimate submitted for so much money to build a siding at such a place and so much at another place.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In both departments we are following out the usual system. In many cases, these details in the estimates are embarrassing to the Public Works Department, and it is not always in the public interest that they should be adhered to closely. But there is a difference between a public work and a railway. These public works are far apart and not connected the one with the other whereas a railway is one continuous property.

Mr. SPROULE. The St. Lawrence river is one continuous highway yet we have a separate vote for each harbour upon it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And you have large sums voted for dredging without specifying the places.

Mr. SPROULE. There might be a specific amount voted to meet such a case as that, but not as a general rule. There might be an amount voted which would be available for any urgent work and which the minister could use without having the place specified.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice in the estimates of last year, that on April 29th, we voted $50,000 for additional sidings along the line,

and on April the 12th there was a re-vote of $135,000, is the hon. minister correct when he says that less than $50,000 of that was expended ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would prefer, for my own satisfaction, to let the item stand until later in the day.

Mr. KEMP. Might I inquire from the minister what is the rule on the Intercolonial Railway when sidings are put in for a private individual or corporation ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The government grants some aid temporarily, which is repaid through the freights.

Mr. KEMP. What are the conditions ? Are the conditions uniform ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is the intention, and in all cases that have come under my notice the rule has been the same. The parties are required to grade the siding and prepare it for the rails, and the government usually loans them the rails or advances the price of the rails, and then a proportion is deducted from freights until the account is squared. I am not aware of any departure from that rule.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Does the government charge interest on the cost of the rails ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think not.

Mr. KEMP. It is customary on other railroads to charge interest on the material that is not perishable. I was under the impression that the government exacted less onerous conditions from its patrons than other roads did.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am advised that we do not exact the interest. The general complaint of people who come to me is that we are a little more exacting than are private corporations in the matter of sidings. I have not had an opportunity of investigating that, but I was told so quite recently.

Mr. KEMP. I do not know that the government railway should grant privileges to private individuals which it is not customary for other railways to grant. I understand that the Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk Railway charge the parties for sidings to the extent of the grading and the ties and other perishable material. Then the party has to pay the interest at 6 per cent, I think, on the rails that are used.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In our case we do not collect the interest, but we do collect the capital.

Mr. KEMP. I fancy it is on perishable material only.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The practice on the Intercolonial Railway is that the party desiring a siding must practically make the road ready for the rails, and the government contributes to the extent of the value of the rails, either by loaning the rails or giving a cash equivalent. The interest is not charged, but the capital sum itself is charged, and is repaid by the parties from time to time through the adjustment of freight account. I know they say we are harder on them than are the companies.

Double tracking parts of line (revote, $18,000), $118,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is for a portion of the double tracking of the Intercolonial Railway between Halifax and Windsor junction. That part of the road carries not only the traffic of the Intercolonial Railway, but, under an arrangement with the Dominion Atlantic Railway, which leases the Windsor branch, it carries also the whole traffic of western Nova Scotia. The department has been gradually double tracking that section, although it has possibly not been done as rapidly as we should have done it. However, it is rather an expensive work. There was appropriated for this service last year $30,000, of which we expended $11,918. That leaves an amount of $18,000 to be revoted, to which we are adding $100,000 for double tracking three or four miles between Rockingham and Windsor junction, making $118,000 for work which we propose to do during the present year. The whole work will be somewhat expensive, and we will have to ask votes for it in future years.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Has the government taken any steps to secure property along the Bedford basin for wharf accommodation ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have a vote in connection with terminal facilities at Halifax, but the particular place at which property may be taken has not been mentioned. It contemplates getting additional accommodation wherever we find property suitable and at a moderate price. Whether we should go to the Bedford basin or not we cannot at present determine.

Mr. BARKER. How many miles of double tracking are there between Halifax and Windsor junction ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The distance from Richmond—the outer portion of Halifax station—to Windsor junction is 13 miles. It is estimated that it will cost $23,000 a mile, making the total cost $299,000. It will necessitate the building of a bridge over the Sackville river, estimated to cost $50,000, so that the estimate for the whole work is $349,000. We have let a contract for a portion of the work at a more favourable price than the estimate.

Mr. BARKER. Were those contracts let in the ordinary way after tenders were called ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. The notes I have here indicate that the contractors are doing the work at reasonable prices; somewhat below the engineer's estimate.

Mr. BARKER. Although it is costing $23,000 a mile to double track ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The estimate of the engineer was that it might cost $23,000 a mile, but I find here that it will cost about $21,000 a mile for a distance of 2½ miles. When the rails are laid it will cost about $20,000 a mile. It is very rocky around the shore of the Bedford basin, and it is rather expensive work.

Mr. BARKER. What is the weight of the rails ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Eighty pounds.

Mr. KEMP. Is the government considering the propriety of double tracking the Intercolonial Railway to Truro ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The matter has occasionally been mentioned, but it is a pretty serious undertaking. While I cannot say that the matter has not been considered, yet we have not attempted to do it.

Mr. KEMP. Is that single line still sufficient for the traffic ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. The business between Truro and Halifax is very considerable, and at times some persons might think double tracking desirable, but the chief engineer tells me that we are still able to handle the traffic with reasonable promptness.

Mr. BARKER. Does the hon. gentleman say that this line is to cost $23,000 a mile with rails ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The engineer's estimate was $23,000 a mile for the whole line. There is an error here in the figures, which says that the total cost of the line under contract will be $20,000. The contractors' figures for the portion under contract would represent about $21,000 per mile, to which will have to be added the cost of the rails.

Mr. BARKER. Then the portion under contract will exceed the estimate ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The estimate was for the whole distance, but this particular portion of the road is a very heavy section.

Increased accommodation at St. John, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is for the cost of a gantry or travelling crane.

Mr. FOWLER. What is this to be used for ?

Mr. BARKER.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is in connection with the construction of the new engine-house.

Mr. FOWLER. This vote is to provide increased facilities at the port of St. John, and in connection with it, I might perhaps properly ask the minister for some information in reference to the contract which the government has with the Allan Steamship Company. I wish to know, if it is contemplated that the number of sailings of the Allan steamers between St. John and Liverpool shall be reduced this winter ? As I understand it, the government have a contract with the Allans to run five ships on that route, and the Allans have asked that instead of five ships they shall run only three during the winter. The Allan Company receive a certain subsidy, in consideration of which they are to perform a certain number of sailings between St. John and Liverpool, and I am informed that they have applied to the government to be permitted to reduce this number of sailings. I am informed that in order to back up their application they, in a sort of clandestine way, prevailed upon certain individuals in the city of St. John to sign a petition to the Minister of Trade and Commerce in support of their request. The city council of St. John got word of the matter, and a special meeting was called, and strong resolutions were passed in condemnation of the proposal to make any alteration in the present contract with the Allan Company, on the ground that it would do serious damage to the trade of St. John. What is the state of affairs with respect to this matter, and how do negotiations stand at present ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I regret that the Minister of Trade and Commerce is not here, because, as the contract with the Allan Company is a matter affecting his department, I would prefer that he should answer. However, I quite realize that my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) is entitled to the information, and if he will permit me, I will endeavour to explain the situation, though I will have to do so by more than pronouncing a simple yea or nay. Let me say at the beginning, that no change is contemplated which is likely to materially reduce the volume of business at St. John. I think I am in a position to state that there will be more steamers loading at St. John during the present winter than during any past winter season ; certainly not less, and the indications are that there will be more. The contract of the government with the Allan Company is primarily a mail contract. Years ago the mails were taken from Portland, and after the completion of the Intercolonial Railway it was decided that mails should be taken from Halifax. There was no question then of going to St. John at all ; Halifax was the mail port. The steamers still went on to Portland and loaded or unloaded their cargoes, so that

practically they continued to make Portland their winter port. Some years ago, the government came to the conclusion that that should be no longer permitted, and, that though the contract was only for mails, we could use it incidentally for the development of Canadian trade. The government, therefore, gave notice to the Allan Company, that if they wished to continue the mail service they must load their ships in Canada—not at any particular port in Canada; the government were not especially concerned in that—but that they must load wherever in Canada they were satisfied they could do so to the best advantage. The Allen Company thereupon arranged to load at St. John for the greater part of their cargoes, and to take some small part of their cargoes in Halifax in connection with the mail. That has been the arrangement for a number of years. In the existing contract with the Allan Steamship Company there is a condition, which they required—and which seemed a reasonable condition—that they would only be obliged to load at St. John when they could find cargo to load with. This year the Canadian Pacific Railway Company having acquired a line of steamers of their own, a new state of affairs arose. The Allan Line business at St. John has been carried out through an arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, over whose railway line practically the whole of the cargo came. This year, the Canadian Pacific Railway, having acquired a fleet of steamers of its own, was not able to give the Allan Line the amount of cargo which was required. It is not contemplated that St. John shall have any less business or any less number of steamers, but what the Canadian Pacific Railway Company desired was, that they should load their own steamers instead of loading the Allan Line steamers. The Allan Line people, having communicated with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and having been assured by them that they were not able to give them the traffic, inasmuch as they would require to give the greater part of it to the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers—a very natural and reasonable conclusion—the Allan Line people then applied for permission to withdraw a portion of their fleet. They proposed that, instead of running five steamers to St. John, they would run three and for the remainder they would do their best to find cargoes elsewhere. I think it will be generally admitted that for the Canadian Pacific Railway to prefer to supply traffic to their own steamers could not be regarded as unreasonable. On the other hand, if they were not able to supply the trade to the Allans it would be unreasonable to expect the Allan steamers to go to St. John and come away empty. The government, knowing that St. John would do no less business and that no fewer steamers would be there than before, this being a mere transfer from the Allans to the Canadian Pacific Railway vessels loading at St. John, saw no reason why they should not meet the request of the Allan Company that they be allowed to send to St. John only as many steamers as they could arrange to have cargoes for. Under the arrangement they propose that three out of five steamers shall load at St. John as usual. The remainder of the traffic that has been carried by the Allan Line would go to St. John as usual, and would be carried by the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers, instead of by the Allans. The Allan Line came to ask the co-operation of the Intercolonial to get them increased cargoes at Halifax; and arrangements are in progress which we hope will result in two steamers out of the five, being without cargo at St. John, coming to load at Halifax. What success will be attained remains to be seen. We are glad, on the part of the Intercolonial, to do anything we can to meet the request of the Allans as regards these shipments, as we shall be glad to meet any request for the development of trade at any of our Canadian ports

Mr. FOWLER. I cannot understand why arrangements should be made to have the Allan steamships go to Halifax and co-operate with the Intercolonial, when the freight that they will get must come from the west. Because, this is not freight from Nova Scotia that is to go in these ships across the Atlantic, but it is freight developed in the west and carried by the Intercolonial. And, to load it on the steamships at Halifax it must be carried a much greater distance than to St. John. Why, then, would it be necessary to withdraw the steamships from St. John? There are facilities at St. John for all the trade that can be taken by the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers, the Allan Line and the Donaldson or any other line that may go there. The Intercolonial has an elevator at St. John and other facilities provided by the government for the use of the road. I do not see why there should be this proposed discrimination against St. John. I do not see why steps should be taken by the Allan Steamship Line, evidently acting in collusion with the government, to get the signatures of the people of St. John for making this arrangement. These people were deceived, and many of them would be glad to have their names removed from the petition. They were asked, so I am instructed, when they signed that petition, to keep the matter secret for two days. That is a very strange proceeding on the part of the persons who circulated these petitions. I do not know who those persons were. The mere fact of being asked to keep the matter secret should have aroused suspicions that something was going to be done as against the port of St. John. I have failed to understand from the minister (Hon.

Mr. Fielding) why there should be a portion of the contract between the government and the Allans as to the sailings of their ships abrogated. If the Canadian Pacific Railway have agreed to provide freight to load three of their steamships, surely the Intercolonial, by virtue of its agreement with the Grand Trunk—and I suppose that still stands—will be able to secure freight at Montreal from the Grand Trunk, that being the very central idea of the extension of the Intercolonial to Montreal. Surely the government can enforce that understanding to get enough freight to fill two ships at the port of St. John. It does not seem to me that the minister has given such an excuse as would warrant the government in undertaking the course it has pursued. It is rather singular that this change should be made so soon after the loss of a representative from New Brunswick from the ministry. It seems to me this is a very important reason why this loss should be made up as soon as possible, that the government should have the benefit of the counsel and advice of some member from the province of New Brunswick. If this sort of discrimination is made against us because of the loss of a minister the sooner we get a New Brunswick man in the cabinet the better for the province of New Brunswick.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. From the way the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) and many of his friends treated the representative of New Brunswinck when he was in the cabinet, this present sympathy with the ex-minister comes very badly from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler).

Mr. FOWLER. I am not sympathizing with him, but with the province.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman need not sympathize with the province or with the city of St. John, for the interests of both are being well looked after.

Mr. FOWLER. The people there do not think so.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think I know the people of St. John almost as well as does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler). Perhaps that may be a little strongly put, for the hon. gentleman lives in the vicinity, and I go there only occasionally. But I know the people of St. John to be a fair-minded, public-spirited and reasonable people, and I feel sure that the majority will not symphatize with the whine occasionally put up in this House and in the press about the injustice to St. John. There is no portion of the Dominion that has received fairer consideration from this government than has the city of St. John. It has received fair-play in the past, and I believe it will be content with fair-play in the future, and that is what it will receive. And if a few people here or there want something more than fair-play for any city, St. John, Halifax or any other, they may as well understand at once that they will be disappointed. There is no such violation of the contract the hon. gentleman suggests. While the hon. gentleman from New Brunswick to whom he refers was a member of the government, the condition was inserted in the contract—a reasonable condition—that these steamers should be obliged to load at St. John only when they could obtain business. Therefore, the condition under which we are acting existed in the contract before that hon. gentleman retired from the ministry.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the hon. minister allow me to ask a question? He says that there was no change in the contract by taking the two ships away. If that is so, why is it necessary to get the consent of the government to that? Why should the Allans find it necessary to go to the government if there has been no change in the conditions? According to the hon. minister, the Allans can simply send their ships where they please, to Canadian ports.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The answer to the hon. gentleman's question is, because the contract contained the condition that when there was no freight available at St. John for these steamers they were not obliged to go there. That condition is not changed in the contract. They come forward and tell us that they cannot obtain freight at St. John. That they have a right to do under the contract. The hon. gentleman speaks about some arrangement made in secret. I do not know anything about that. The Allans came to us and informed us that the Canadian Pacific Railway in future would not give them cargo for all their steamers at St. John. If St. John were losing traffic by the arrangement proposed, I could understand some complaint being made. But when the fact is that not a pound of freight that has been going to St. John will be taken away, and that she will have all the business she had before, I cannot see the ground for complaint. The hon. gentleman asks why we do not load these steamers from the Intercolonial at St. John. Because we were not asked to do it. If the Allan Line or any other and connecting railway companies—because they must co-operate—have a proposal to make the government looking to the supply of traffic for steamers over the Intercolonial, we will deal with them as readily and as liberally as we have done in the case of their proposal I have submitted. It is for the steamship companies to make the proposal. But the Allan Line, have come and asked us to facilitate the increased shipment of their cargoes at Halifax, for the reasons stated, that they cannot get a cargo at St. John because the Canadian Pacific Railway prefer to carry it themselves. We have met their application in the right spirit, and

we will be prepared to meet a similar application in the same spirit, if it comes, as respects any other port in Canada with which the Intercolonial is connected.

Mr. FOWLER. I cannot understand why the hon. the Minister of Finance should complain of the people of St. John because this matter was brought up in the House. The hon. gentleman says there is a whine from the city of St. John——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say from the city of St. John.

Mr. FOWLER. They are not the sort of people that whine, they are prepared to stand up for their rights. They have made great sacrifices in order to establish a trade. The people of St. John have done what the people of no other portion of Canada has done, they have expended their own money. A large proportion of the money that is used for providing the facilities in the city of St. John has come out of the taxpayers. A million dollars has been expended in providing terminal facilities, and yet, because they resent the taking away of these ships, they are to be told by the acting Minister of Railways that they are whining. And that remark is applauded by some hon. members from Ontario, for instance, by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell).

Mr. CAMPBELL. The minister did not say that the city of St. John was whining; it was some members who came from that province.

Mr. FOWLER. I want to tell the hon. member for West York that the minister made no such statement. There is no whine about it. Is it to be said that members of this House are whining because they are pointing out an injustice that is being done to the province from which they come; that they are whining because, being responsible for the rights of their province, they stand up and defend them? The hon. gentleman from West York himself whines on behalf of the market gardeners of West York. That is the sort of gentleman that he is. The member for West York was ready to whine very piteously the other day, when he was talking about freight rates on flour, because that is something that affected the hon. gentleman's own pocket. It struck him very hard then, and he was ready to whine louder than any cur that ever I heard.

Mr. TALBOT. Order.

Mr. FOWLER. I am not comparing the hon. gentleman to a cur. If the member for Bellechasse wants to take it that way, all right.

Mr. TALBOT. Judging from the language of the hon. gentleman, I think that he can take the cake over me. It fits his size.

Mr. FOWLER. In size I think I will compare favourably with the hon. gentleman from Bellechasse, certainly in physical size, and I trust that my mental size would be far beyond his.

Mr. TALBOT. In ability to bark.

Mr. FOWLER. But coming back to the subject we were discussing. The hon. gentleman made a discrimination——

Mr. TALBOT. I didn't say anything.

Mr. FOWLER. I was speaking to the minister, not to the member for Bellechasse. But the member for Bellechasse holds so important a place in his own imagination, that he thinks that if anybody makes a reference to any other member, he is referring to him. Now, let me say, Mr. Chairman, that the argument the hon. gentleman uses, that because no application was made by a steamship company to carry freight over the Intercolonial to St. John was a reason why they should not use the Intercolonial, and a reason why they should not carry freight there, is a very strange argument. Shall we never use the facilities we have at those ports, unless some steamship company makes an application to use them? The minister says: Oh, we cannot use them, because we have not been applied to by the Allan Steamship Line to give them freight at St. John over the Intercolonial. Well, under an arrangement between the government and the Grand Trunk, the latter is obliged to hand over to the Intercolonial Railway the western freight at Montreal intended for export abroad. Is there not an arrangement of that sort?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, freight bound to the maritime provinces, irrespective of where it is going.

Mr. FOWLER. Certainly, it would include freight intended for export abroad. If they are obliged to give you their freight at Montreal, it would include freight intended for export abroad, and freight for local consumption as well. Now, that being the case, surely it is within the power of the government and within the management of the Intercolonial to carry that freight over the Intercolonial to St. John. Then, why should this change take place? Why take away the sailings of these two ships from the port of St. John to Halifax? In order to give them freight at Halifax, you must carry it over the Intercolonial, and you are carrying it a hundred miles further by taking it to Halifax, than if you took it to St. John, and you are doing that at additional cost. If you were bringing that freight over a distance of a thousand miles, a difference of a hundred miles would not be so important; but when you carry that freight only a distance of four or five hundred miles, it makes a very material difference to carry it a hundred miles farther than you need to. You are carrying it a hundred miles farther for the same price as if you took it to the port of

St. John. You have at the latter place your elevator, you have all the necessary facilities, and they are standing idle, and still you carry this freight a hundred miles further. Now, for what purpose I do not know. It would almost look as if the minister, being a minister from Nova Scotia, has made this discrimination against the port of St. John for the benefit of his own province. Let me say, that it is not only the people of St. John who are interested in this question, but the people of the surrounding counties. The people of the adjoining counties are interested in whatever makes for the welfare of the port of St. John. We are all interested, and, therefore, it is my right to speak on whatever interests my constituents. I do not think that because I am here attempting to defend the interests of the port of St. John and of my constituency, because I am asking why they are being discriminated against that I should be told either that the people of the city of St. John are whining, or that any one of the representatives of New Brunswick in this House is whining, because he is standing up for the interests of the people whom he represents. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the minister should give some better reason than he has given for making this change. When he says that there is nothing in the contract which compels them to take freight at St. John, that they can go wherever they please, it seems to me that is not consistent with the statement he has made, that they have come to the government and asked them to allow them to take freight elsewhere. But he says they cannot go to Halifax, except they find there is no freight at the port of St. John. How do they know there is no freight at the port of St. John ? What reason have they for knowing ? They have a guarantee that the three ships will be supplied by the Canadian Pacific Railway. They can get freight at the port of St. John as long as it comes from the west. If they can get it at Halifax, they can get it at St. John. I do not see any difference between the two, except that when you carry it to Halifax, you have to carry it a hundred miles further.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose I was discussing the withdrawal by the Allan Line Steamship Company of some of its boats from the St. John-Liverpool service. I was trying to point out that it was against the interests of St. John to have a lesser service for the ensuing season than during the past season and that it was in violation of the contract that had been made between the Allan Line Steamship Company and the government, the subsidy of which had been increased at this very session of parliament by $25,000. It occurred to me that when this increased subsidy was granted by this House it was certainly not contemplated that the service would be lessened in any way or the same justification could not have been made for the increased subsidy, because naturally, the Allan Line Company could run its service from Halifax to Liverpool much more cheaply than from St. John to Liverpool. This is not a political question nor is it so regarded by the people of St. John. This is a question that naturally affects the whole of the people and a protest has been made by the common council which is the immediate representative of the people of St. John. The common council is composed of members of both political parties as far as federal politics are concerned and it is unanimous in joining in the protest and has sent a telegraphic copy of the protesting resolution which it has passed to the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). The government therefore is acquainted with its contents. The request of the common council is not an unreasonable one. It asks that no change in this contract shall be made without giving it an opportunity of being heard by the government. It seems to me that this is only reasonable. The common council is certainly an interested party and it seems to be an unfair thing for the government to make a change, as I understand from the hon. Minister of Finance, it has already made a change in the contract. Am I correct in so understanding the hon. gentleman ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) has given permission but as the minister is not present I speak subject to correction. I think, that is correct, however.

Mr. FOWLER. Then I understand from what the hon. minister said this morning that permission has already been given by the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce to the Allan Steamship Company to withdraw two of its ships. While the common council of St. John is not directly a party to the contract yet it is indirectly a party to the contract, because it is very closely interested in the matter. The people of St. John have made very great sacrifices in an effort to build up that port. They have done more proportionately to their population than any other port of Canada along this line, and it seems to me that they are deserving of a very great deal of consideration at the hands of the government, and that the very least that the government could have done would have been to have given them an opportunity to be heard before this change took place. My interest in the matter is almost as direct as that of the people of St. John themselves. The constituency which I represent lies directly adjoining that city and whatever makes for the benefit of St. John makes

for the benefit of the county that I have the honour to represent. That is my justification, if any is needed, for bringing this matter up as I have. I trust that the permission which has already been given to the Allans will be withdrawn, and that the people of St. John will have an opportunity to be heard through their representatives in the common council, before this change is finally carried into effect.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I repeat the observation I made before the lunch hour with regard to the people of St. John. I said that I had some knowledge of the people of that city; that I believed they were a fair-minded and reasonable people; that when they found the government was dealing fairly and liberally with them they would be satisfied, and that I believed they would have no sympathy with the whine we sometimes hear in this house and sometimes in the press: that St. John was being treated unfairly by the government. Those were the words I used, and I repeat them now. I believe that the mass of the citizens of St. John who have been public spirited enough to contribute to the building up of their port, are fair and reasonable people, and when we can show that we are dealing fairly with them, they will have no sympathy with the cry that St. John is being unfairly treated by the present government. I repeat that. Now, I want to say that there has been no discrimination against St. John. There has been no interference with any privilege which St. John has ever possessed. There has been no change in the essential conditions of the contract; there has been no change in the contract such as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) alleges. Let me repeat, that so far as this contract is concerned it is chiefly and primarily a mail contract. The arrangement originally was altogether with reference to the mails. St. John was never a mail port, and therefore it originally had no connection with this contract. When the mails were taken from Portland, a provision was made that they should instead be landed at Halifax and they have been so landed and taken away from Halifax ever since. At that time, Portland continued to be used by the steamship company for commercial purposes and a good deal of their freight was carried to Portland. The government determined that they would not permit that, and that though the contract was one for a mail service, they would require that contract to be used in order that they might build up Canadian trade. They therefore demanded that the Allan Company should load their steamers in Canada—not at St. John, not at Halifax, not at any particular port—but they were to have the ships loaded in Canada. The action of the government was taken for the upbuilding of Canadian trade, and not for a preference of one port over another. The Allan Company then arranged that they would take part of their cargo at Halifax, and the chief part of their cargo at St. John. That arrangement has continued for some years. This year the Allan Company came to us and stated that they could not continue, because cargo was not available for them at St. John. It is not because there is any less cargo at St. John—there is considerably more—but the situation has been changed by the action of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in acquiring a steamship fleet of their own. Very naturally the Canadian Pacific Railway want to use their own steamers, and so they have said to the Allans: We can not give you as much freight as we gave you before; we will make a division of the business; we will will take a portion of it for our own steamers, and we will give you the balance. The Allan Company has been obliged to accept that. They have shown the communications from the Canadian Pacific Railway setting out these conditions. As a matter of fact the Allan Company have gone to the leading citizens of St. John—many of the leading citizens of St. John; I do not say all—and they have obtained the concurrence of a number of those leading business men of St. John, who have the largest and the most vital interest in the city. These men have recognized that the position of the Allan Company is fair and reasonable, and they have concurred in the arrangement, and have communicated with the Minister of Trade and Commerce to the effect that they are satisfied with the proposal of the Allan Company. Now, in doing that they are making no sacrifice, because there is not one whit less business to be done at St. John; all the business and more that was done last year at St. John will be done this year. The difference is that more of it will go out in the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers instead of in the Allan steamers. Therefore, St. John is absolutely losing nothing, and that is why I am satisfied that upon further inquiry the fair-minded citizens of St. John will understand the situation, and become as well satisfied as the leading citizens to whom I have referred and who have communicated to the Minister of Trade and Commerce their assent to the change being made. That is the whole story with regard to the contract.

The only other feature is that the Allan Company then come to the Intercolonial Railway, and say: 'We can only load a part of our ships at St. John; we have to get part of our cargo at Halifax; we ask you if you can facilitate arrangements so that we must get some more cargo at Halifax.' We will be very glad if we can do that. It is a matter to be arranged between the steamship companies and the various connecting lines of railway as to getting some additional cargo to go to Halifax. If they, or any steamship line will come forward with the same proposal for the loading of vessels by the Intercolonial Railway at St. John, and if they make the necessary con-

nections and the necessary arrangements with the several companies concerned, we shall be only too glad to deal as fairly with St. John. The only reason why we have granted the Allan Line this arrangement is because they asked for it, and if they or any other company will come and ask it as respects St. John, we will be glad to give them every fair and reasonable consideration. I have so much faith in the fair-mindedness of the citizens of St. John, that I am quite willing to let the matter rest on that.

Mr. FOWLER. It is a very singular thing to see the government going to certain private persons in the city of St. John——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We did not go to any one.

Mr. FOWLER. Some one went ; the Allan Line went.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is their business.

Mr. FOWLER. The moment the government accept that petition as voicing the sentiments of the people of St. John, then it accepts these private individuals as the spokesmen for that city, rather than the elected representatives of the people. That is the point I make. Here are the elected representatives of the people of St. John in solemn session assembled, passing a resolution against this being done, and the only excuse the government can give for doing it is, because the Allan Line, forsooth, which are getting an increased subsidy this year, prefer not to call at the port of St. John as well as Halifax. They have to call at Halifax under their contract, and they had to call at St. John, but now two of these vessels out of the five which were engaged in the service are to be withdrawn from St. John altogether, and yet you have this year given the Allans an increased subsidy of $25,000 for performing a lesser sevice than they performed last year. What justification can there be for that ? Surely it cannot be seriously contended for a moment that any number of private citizens have the right to speak for the whole city against the protest of the elected representatives of the people. It seems to me that in disregarding and ignoring the representations made by the city council, and adopting a petition signed by private citizens, you are not carrying out what we have always understood to be Liberal doctrine. These gentlemen may not be personally affected by the change, and the city itself is affected by the change, and so far as the people of St. John being fair-minded enough to submit to this, perhaps the Minister of Finance may find himself mistaken. I do not think it is any reflection on their fair-mindedness that they should protest against this ; quite the contrary. The Minister of Finance says he is quite prepared to do the same thing for any other steamship line that he has done for the Allans. If they have a subsidy for sailing between St. John and European ports he is prepared to let them abandon the port of St. John if they request it. That is the only construction you can put upon the language of the Minister of Finance. He must have a very great deal of confidence in the people of St. John, if he thinks they will tamely submit to that kind of treatment. I say right here, that if there had been a representative from New Brunswick in the cabinet, this thing would not have been permitted ; it certainly would not have been done behind the backs of the people of St. John.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I must repeat that there is no disadvantage to the city of St. John in any shape or form. The city of St. John will ship more freight this year, I believe, than it did last year, and more steamers will be running out of St. John this year than last year.

Mr. FOWLER. What additional lines ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Canadian Pacific Railway will be running a larger number of steamers. I am advised that two passenger steamers that are taken off the Allan Line will be replaced by more than two of the Canadian Pacific Railway ; and therefore the port of St. John will have more business and more steamers under this arrangement during the coming winter than it had before. That is the first point I want to emphasize, and that is the reason why I believe the people of St. John, who are fair and reasonable, when the matter is placed properly before them, will understand it. Then, the hon. gentleman said we went to the Allan Line, and did this, that, and the other. We did nothing of the sort. The Allan Line came, through its proper representatives, to the Minister of Trade and Commerce and stated that owing to the new arrangements at St. John they could not load all their steamers there, because they do not want any of their vessels to go to St. John and come away empty. This arrangement is good on its merits, no matter who supports it or who opposes it. I do not say that any of the citizens of St. John are to be taken as having better judgment than the common council. The council was called together in a great hurry, and passed the resolution, I venture to say, without being fully informed of all the circumstances. After the Allan Line have arranged for all the freight they can get at St. John, they will have to send their ships to Halifax and get the balance of their freight there.

Mr. COCHRANE. Under the contract do they not have to go to Halifax ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. COCHRANE. Then they were not under any greater obligation than they contracted for.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But they would have to go to Halifax and take the mails. They do not have to get a cargo there every week. Under the arrangement they only took part of their cargo to Halifax; they took the greater part of it to St. John.

Mr. COCHRANE. I suppose they took what they could. If they got a whole load at St. John, they would go to Halifax and get the mail?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But under the arrangement they could only load three out of the five steamers, and they thought it would be useless to compel them to take their vessels to St. John with a knowledge that there would be no freight there for them.

Mr. FOWLER. The argument of the hon. minister is unfair, for the reason that he ignores the fact that the Intercolonial runs to St. John, and that the steamers could be loaded there as well as at Halifax. There are no additional steamers put on there by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Their steamers are those of the Elder-Dempster Company, which have run there for years.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They will run more of them, I am told.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not know of any increase in their fleet. It may be possible. But the hon. minister ignores the fact of the Intercolonial Railway carrying freight from Montreal, under the agreement with the Grand Trunk, or freight that might be obtained from the Canada Atlantic Railway, for shipment at St. John and Halifax. I do not wish to take away anything from the port of Halifax. We have heard the boast made that there will be such a tremendous amount of freight that even both ports cannot handle it. There is nothing in the argument of the hon. minister. The whole thing has been done to please the Allan Line and to render it unnecessary for that company to fulfil its contract by sending two ships to St. John. So that to-day they get $25,000 additional subsidy, and only send three of their ships to St. John, whereas last year they got $25,000 and sent the whole five ships to St. John, as well as to Halifax. That is the whole gist of the matter, and the arrangement has been made by the government against the protest and without having consulted the representatives of the people of St. John. I think they had a right to be consulted; and the mere fact that eighteen or twenty gentlemen of the city of St. John signed the petition was not sufficient to justify the government in making this departure from the contract. The hon. gentleman says there is no such thing as a contract to compel them to call at the port of St. John.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say that.

Mr. FOWLER. I understood the hon. gentleman to say it. He said it was not an essential condition of the contract.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say that.

Mr. FOWLER. I think 'Hansard' will show that he did. Does he say that it is an essential condition of the contract that they shall call at St. John? If it is, then the argument is all the stronger against his contention, because the government changed an essential condition of this contract, and changed it without any consultation with the people of St. John, who are most interested in the change. It does not affect Halifax, because the vessels had to call there any way and take whatever freight was offering. Therefore in standing up for St. John, I am not reflecting on the port of Halifax or trying to injure it in any way; nor does it benefit the port of Halifax to allow the Allan Steamship Company to vary the terms of the contract entered into between them and the government. But it does directly benefit the Allan Steamship Company, because they are getting a larger subsidy for doing a less service than they performed last year for the old subsidy.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is mixing up several things. When I used the words 'essential condition,' I was referring to negotiations which took place several years ago when the Allan Company wished to make Portland their terminal port, and when the government obliged them to make their terminal port in Canada. I said that it was not an essential condition that they should call at any particular port, so long as they loaded and unloaded at a Canadian port. It was an incident of that arrangement that they should call at St. John and Halifax; but we were not so much concerned in the quarrels of rival ports as we were that the ships should call at a Canadian port, and as long as they did that, we felt that we had no right to complain. That was a mail contract, and the commercial aspect of the question came up later, when the government decided that Portland should not have the business. The contract provides that they should not be obliged to go to St. John if they found that they could not get sufficient cargo there, and upon that point the Minister of Trade and Commerce was to be the judge. I am not familiar with all that passed between the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Allan Line; but I know the substance, because I learned it from the minister and from the Allan Company. As they could not get their full cargo at St. John, they asked that that condition in their contract should be observed. If it were a question of taking away any business from St. John, I could understand that there would be need for consideration and consultation; but as it became clear that all the business done at St. John to continue to be

done, and it was only a question whether it should be done by the Allan Line or the Canadian Pacific Railway Line, it made no difference to the people of St. John whether it was done by the one line or the other. But the Canadian Pacific Railway people have their own ends and interests to look after, not inconsistent with the interests of St. John, and prefer to take a large volume of the trade themselves and give the Allan Line only a limited amount, and it would be preposterous to ask Allans to send their boats there and have them come away empty. With regard to arrangements for taking freight to Halifax, the government have not any freight to give. They have not their line connecting with the west, and are not in a position to control the traffic of the continent. All they can do is to take what traffic they get from other lines. The Allans came to us and said: 'We have to call at Halifax for the mail; we get some cargo there, and we trust you will give us whatever facilities you can, and we hope to get more cargo there than usual this winter.' If the Allans or any other company come and say that they are making arrangements with roads in the west to bring goods over the Intercolonial to St. John, I shall be happy to deal with them in a fair way. But if they do not come to us, I do not see what we can do.

Mr. FOWLER. When the arrangement was made to bring the Intercolonial to Montreal, it was stated that it would get the traffic coming over the Grand Trunk Railway in the winter season. The right hon. gentleman says we have no connection with any of the western lines.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Grand Trunk Railway has no western line.

Mr. FOWLER. It has lines all through Ontario.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Ontario has ceased to be the west.

Mr. FOWLER. Down in the maritime provinces it is still the west. At the time the Intercolonial was extended to Montreal, one of the arguments used was that it would get sufficient valuable traffic to pay for the extension, but now the Minister of Railways says that there is no freight from the west.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say that.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. minister said that we have no connections at Montreal, and the government have no way of bringing in freight over its road.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. FOWLER. It is singular that the hon. gentleman should forget so soon.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not so singular as that my hon. friend should misunderstand.

Mr. FOWLER. I am not trying to misrepresent the hon. gentleman, but am trying to reason out the matter on a fair basis. I want to have justice done. The Allan Company should not be allowed to vary their contract. They should continue to call at both ports, and there is no reason why there should be any rivalry between the two. When the hon. minister speaks of jealousy between the ports, he is not doing what he should in his responsible position. He is not endeavouring to allay jealousy, but rather to excite it. All I ask is that the Allans should go to St. John as well as to Halifax. Let them take whatever portion of cargo is offered at the port of St. John, brought over the Intercolonial, and fill up with cargo from Halifax, and when there is no new steamship line I cannot understand how by taking away the Allan steamships there will still be the same amount of freight carried.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). In connection with this debate, there is this singular circumstance, that though we have two representatives from the city of St. John supporting the government in this House, no representations have been made to them with regard to this grievance. There is another point which was overlooked, and that is that while from Moncton to St. John there are 98 miles in favour of St. John against Halifax, when you go to Halifax you can load your steamer night and day, tide in and tide out, and when she goes to sea she is 250 miles nearer London and Liverpool and 245 miles nearer Glasgow than she would be if sailing from the port of St. John.

Mr. FOWLER. The remarks of the hon. gentleman do not affect the case at all. We are not discussing which is the better port, but whether this contract with the Allans should be carried out, or whether, after receiving an additional subsidy, they should be allowed to ignore the port of St. John. I do not propose to argue the question of the advantages of Halifax over St. John. As regards the members for the city of St. John not having been consulted in this matter, I know nothing about that. Very likely they were consulted, but I do not see either of them here.

To increase accommodation at Halifax, $125,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This item was discussed the other night in connection with the main estimates. And I repeat the explanation. A considerable amount of this is a revote. The appropriation last year was $143,000, of which we expended $75,174. There is a balance to be carried over, in the form of a

revote, of $67,826. With the other works in Halifax, for which we have to provide in the supplementary estimates, we will have a total of $229,500.

Increased accommodation and facilities along line, $88,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We had before us earlier in the day an item which was allowed to stand respecting additional sidings. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) said that the vote last year was much larger than the figures I had before me. I asked him particularly if the item he had in his book was for sidings, and I understood him to say it was. I think, however, on further examination it will be found that he was reading from another vote in which sidings might be included, but not the particular vote to which I refer. The information always applies to the expenditure under that particular head, and the expenditure which I gave under the head of 'additional sidings' was the correct sum charged against that item. But there is also the item 'increased accommodation and facilities along the line,' and, last year the word 'sidings' was included in that, so the two items are not as clearly separated as they should be. This item 'increased accommodation and facilities along the line' includes a large number of small items. There is only one large item, that referring to the extension of the engine house for locomotives and to provide an office at Pirate Harbour on the Strait of Canso. This was to make a twelve stall engine house, instead of a four stall, at that point. The cost of this was estimated at $25,000.

Mr. BARKER. Why should that be brought in as part of a general item ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am inclined to think the criticism is a fair one. This item is large enough to justify a special appropriation. I am bound to say that if I were revising the estimates, I would put it that way. The other items are small, including many places along the line and running from $300 or $400 up to $6,000, which is the largest I see, except that for Pirate Harbour.

Mr. LAVERGNE. Does that include a station at Drummondville ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The amount estimated for Drummondville is $6,000. I must say I cannot give my hon. friend the assurance he would like. The item for Drummondville—speaking from recollection, as I have not the facts at hand—include a freight shed, purchase of land and improvement of the yard. My hon. friend was anxious to have, besides that, a station. For the present, I am afraid we must ask my hon. friend to be patient and trust that to come in time.

Mr. LAVERGNE. The hon. minister knows perfectly well that at Drummondville there is no station fit to receive the passengers. I hope the government will see their way clear in the near future to build a new station at Drummondville.

Mr. BARKER. When the item for additional sidings was under discussion, the acting Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Fielding) claimed that he was justified in putting that in a bulk sum because of the inconvenience that would arise if the government were not allowed, from time to time, to expend money on unforeseen requirements. But it is quite clear that the item under consideration now, $88,000, is of a general character to provide for emergency items such as he refers to. 'Increased accommodation and facilities along the line' includes almost anything and everything required by the railway which has not been foreseen. If the hon. gentleman should find that, besides all the sidings he intended to build, cases arise during the year that had not been foreseen, he has quite enough under an item like that $88,000 to meet them. The very fact that an item of $25,000 for one work could be put into such an item as this shows how loose the system is. It has become the practice with the Railway Department—I do not say that it has been confined to this government—to lump a large number of items so as to make a sum anywhere from $50,000 to $150,000, and then spend it as they please. That is not in the interest of the public. It allows very loose methods to be adopted, and puts the control of the department beyond parliament. I remember that two years ago we had an item discussed in the Public Accounts Committee. It was under this heading of 'increased accommodation.' We found that stations were being built, and sidings constructed. There was a case where a specific grant of $8,000 had been given to build a station—at Westville, I think—and the government spent over $16,000, quietly taking the balance of $8,000 out of this item of 'increased accommodation.' If the hon. gentleman wishes to have a system under which parliament will have any control over the expenses of the railway, he must have a different system from this. Whether this was adopted thirty years ago or last year, matters not. A better system should be adopted.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) that where there is an item for any considerable amount, whether for a station or anything else, that ought to be voted separately, and the expenditure should be limited to the amount set down in the item. Of course, I think it would hamper the working of the railway to attempt to carry out that system in the case of these small items.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why is it necessary to spend $88,000 in increased facilities along

the line ? Has the business increased so rapidly, or has there been depreciation of the railway ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Of course the business has grown. I gave the figures the other day.

Mr. COCHRANE. Would the hon. minister say whether the business has grown in local business, or in through freight.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think both have grown to a considerable extent. I fancy the local trade is perhaps of more immediate importance. To meet the conditions of this local trade it is necessary to increase the sidings and enlarge the stations. Whenever I go over the road, I have constant representations made to me that the station buildings are not large enough. These buildings were erected many years ago, and ought to be enlarged.

Mr. GOURLEY. I notice that the minister mentioned Brookfield. What is to be done there ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is for the enlargement of the station and extension of the plaform which requires additional land. The amount is small.

Mr. GOURLEY. It ought not to be small. That place has grown to be a leading business point ; it is the exporting centre of the whole trade of that region and the Stewiacke Valley, and ought to have the most ample facilities. Brookfield is an important trading point on the Intercolonial between Truro and Halifax, and ought to have a much larger station. I was there last year, and several persons complained of lack of room for the business, and said that accidents might happen any day in consequence. The place is crowded with timber and lumber, and I would suggest to the Minister to add $2,000 or $3,000 to the vote.

Mr. LAVERGNE. What amount is to be expended at St. Cyril ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The improvements at St. Cyril will cost $1,500.

Mr. GOURLEY. I am sorry that an amount has not been put in the estimates to raise the wages of the trackmen and all the men engaged on the Intercolonial. That is getting to be a great service, and the labouring men are paid far too little in comparison with the important services they render. I met a number of these men a short time ago, and inquired into their condition. It is impossible for a man receiving only $1.10, $1.20 and $1.30 a day to make a living. He requires to be an accurate man, he requires to go upon the railway in the morning, and walk over it, and exercise the highest human care in order to protect the safety of lives and property. The distinguished officials of this road are handsomely paid, the deputy minister and the managers. I do not begrudge it to them, but I am speaking for the poor trainmen who absolutely do the work to maintain the road and ensure the safety of the trains and passengers. These are the men whose care and diligence make it possible for the railway to be run successfully. The trainmen, the trackmen, the conductors, the drivers, the firemen, the brakemen, the station agents, the telegraphers and the gravel men—these are the men who should receive an increase of salary. The telegraphers, I think, did get an increase a short time ago, but I am told it is a very trifling thing. You add 15 or 20 cents a day to a man's wages, and what does it amount to ? It only enables him to buy a plate of apples or a pound of candy for his children. It is immediately dissipated. The whole scale of wages on the Intercolonial should be recast. In my community, the railway men, who were at one time not considered to be a very reliable class, are now highly considered. The Intercolonial Railway servants to-day, I am proud to tell the minister, so far as my community is concerned, are a splendid class of men, who occupy good positions, men of trust and men who are worthy of trust. Their families occupy good social positions. They go in for educating their children, and in the town of Truro there is no better class of citizens than the employees on the Intercolonial. How they manage to maintain their families on the wages they get is beyond my comprehension. I think every member of this House and every man in this country would be willing to see these men well remunerated. Every day large amounts of property are destroyed because we ask some of the men to work too long hours, to work when they should be asleep. A man gets worn out through long hours, and an accident takes place in consequence. These things should not be. Supposing some man is overworked whose business it is to look after the track, an accident takes place, and away the train goes. The travelling public are entirely in the hands of these people, and we should make it possible for them to give the best service they can. I ask the minister to increase the wages of these men in consonance with the growing time. I am bound to say that at the present time nothing would be more degrading to Canada than that workmen in the employ of the government should receive insufficient wages to maintain themselves and their families in respectable positions, and enable them to pay their debts. The minister would not like to hear that one of his officials was not paying his debts. It would be disgraceful for an employee on the Intercolonial not to be able to pay his debts. Yet it strikes me the government is asking from these officials more service and better service than they are paying for. These men cannot discharge their duties to their fellow men and pay their debts, and at the same time maintain their families in anything like suitable

comfort, on the wages that they are now receiving. A conductor, a trackman, a fireman is just as much entitled to a remuneration that will enable him to maintain his family in a position of comfort as any man in this House. We sometimes do not think of it. We fancy that people other than labourers or mechanics have superior rights. I say, if there is any sacrifice made, we should make this sacrifice in parliament. We should give up our indemnity and sit here free rather than that our workmen should suffer.

An hon. MEMBER. For how long?

Mr. GOURLEY. All the time that the king requires our services. I urge the hon. minister to put $100,000 into these estimates to give to the railway men reasonable rates of wages. Give a workman 50 cents a day increase and you do him some good. Give him 5 or 10 cents a day and it does him no good at all. I urge it on behalf of the railway officials of Colchester in particular, but I want the hon. minister to apply it to the whole country. There are no people in the world more deserving of fair remuneration than railway operators. They should have shorter hours, and that is one thing that must be brought before this parliament. A railway operator should not be allowed to extend his hours in any way. He should be required to work three or four hours a day. His is very exacting work. I see them sitting in the railway offices at their instruments. I do not think I could stand the worry of the ticking for more than three or four hours at a time, and I cannot understand how these men can sit there with that incessant clatter of noise and perform their duty intelligently for 14 or 15 hours a day as they are required to do. One operator on the Intercolonial Railway told me that at the time he was performing his duty he was often thinking how he was going to pay the grocer next day for the supplies of his family. He was distracted. Yet, here is the hon. Minister of Finance enjoying a very handsome salary. Of course, he cannot appreciate the position of this poor operator, but the rest of us have sometimes had these bothers ourselves, and we have a fellow feeling. I, for instance, have a fellow feeling with the telegrapher. There is no better service that the members of the committee can do than to join with me in asking the hon. minister to extend fair consideration to all the Intercolonial Railway men. They are the basis of the life of this country. The great middle class is the one to which the country looks to purify and ennoble our social life. I ask the government to treat that great body of people, the workmen and the mechanics of the country with generosity. If there is going to be any saving or paring let it be taken off the salaries of the higher officials. Let us take $2,000 off the salary of a governor or a judge, but give the labouring man, the mechanic, and especially those telegraphers, a fair rate of remuneration. I for one am prepared to insert $1,000,000 in these estimates to give an increase of pay to the Intercolonial Railway men all round.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid $100,000 would not go very far. At a rough calculation, to pay 50 cents a day to each of the employees on the Intercolonial would require $1,250,000.

Mr. GOURLEY. Well then, vote it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The trouble is that there are hon. gentlemen who sit opposite who are not as broad-minded as the kind of people we raise in the maritime provinces and perhaps they would not be so ready to vote it as my hon. friend (Mr. Gourley). But, to be serious, a question was asked the other day regarding the workmen on the Intercolonial Railway, and I promised that upon the visit that I hope to be able to pay at an early date to the maritime provinces to make some inquiry into the matter? I would not like the idea to get abroad in this country that all of the officials on the Intercolonial Railway are to get an increase of pay. A great many of the men have had their wages increased during the past few years, and I think they are fairly well compensated now. Only those who are really underpaid and who have a good claim, should be given encouragement to hope that they may get an increase of pay. I want to guard against the idea getting abroad that it is the policy of any party to give these people an indiscriminate increase. If there be cases where they are not getting fair wages by all means let us try to make them right. I think they should have about the same wages as those which can be obtained in private employment. I do not think the idea should go abroad that government employment should pay better than private employment. People who are willing to serve His Majesty should certainly not expect to get more than they could get outside. I think the government service should pay about what is paid in ordinary employment. I do not adopt the suggestion of the hon. gentleman that the great officers of the railway are too liberally paid. On the contrary, I believe they are not. I doubt if there is a large railway on the continent which pays its chief officers as little money as we pay to the chief officers of the Intercolonial Railway. The difficulty is that we are not able to deal with these gentlemen as liberally as we ought to do. When the Railway Bill was under consideration at this session of the House we had to fix the salaries of the members of the Railway Commission at a sum in excess of what we pay cabinet ministers or the higher professional men in the employment of the governent.

Therefore, while I am not willing to say that the men who are at the bottom of the ladder receive fair compensation, I cannot say that we are paying too much to the men higher up. The difficulty is to get men to fill these higher positions. Private corporations find that in order to get the services of good men to-day they have to pay them more money than we are able to pay them.

Mr. GOURLEY. I did not mean to say that the higher officials were getting too much. I do not go in for small salaries. I say that if there is to be niggardliness anywhere, I would rather have it in dealing with the higher officials than with the great body of the workingmen.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. Minister of Finance has referred to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and has suggested that we would not consent to the proposition of my hon. friend (Mr. Gourley). I firmly believe that if the government pursued the ordinary methods pursued by railway companies that are managed on commercial principles, if they avoided all possible waste and took every pains to administer the railway on business principles, they would be able to pay better salaries.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no reason to suppose that the Intercolonial Railway is not well managed in every respect, or that it is not managed in a way that will compare with any other railway in the country. I have not had a personal opportunity of investigating the matter, but from my knowledge of the officers and of the minister who has had charge of the road, I have every reason to believe that they have been doing their best to run the road in a satisfactory way.

Mr. GOURLEY. Last year three or four lamentable accidents, involving a loss of $150,000 worth of property, besides loss of life, occurred on the Intercolonial Railway, within seven or eight months. Without desiring to impute any neglect on the part of the people connected with these accidents, I am bound to say that the impression which prevailed along the line of railway was that they were the result of neglect caused by the men being overworked. I do not blame anybody, because it is the system that is wrong. We started out in Canada a few years ago endeavoring to skimp in one way or another. Instead of setting an example of generosity and fair-play in the country, we have set an example of penuriousness. But, I am glad to say, we are getting over that. It is the system I blame and not the people who have been administering it. The system is bad, and we ought to be generous and bigminded enough to change the system, no matter what it will cost.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING.

Increased accommodation at Pictou, $61,700.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There appears to have been a great deal of expenditure at this place for the last two or three years.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In 1902-3 the appropriation was $70,000, of which only $12,155.10 was expended, leaving a balance of $57,844 to be carried forward. To that extent this is a re-vote.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman told us when we were discussing the main estimates, that he would bring down information with regard to the purchase of land.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is an item of $25,000 for land which has not yet been paid. Negotiations are going forward for its purchase, and we can only give an approximate estimate. The details of the expenditure are as follows: Excavation, $1,650; Filling and grading, $5,000; Ballasting, $2,750; Sidings and tracks, $6,000; Piling and trestles, $10,000; Loading platform, $1,000; New station, $30,000; legal expenses, $1,500; Contingencies, advertising and inspection, $10,300.

Mr. BARKER. Will that complete everything?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This will complete the work at Pictou.

Mr. BELL. What area of land will be purchased there?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The land has not yet been purchased. Probably the hon. gentleman's local knowledge will enable him to form an opinion as to the area of land that will be necessary. It is proposed to acquire some land close to the present station. A valuation has been put upon it, but we are not satisfied with the amount, and it is now a matter of negotiation.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Could the hon. gentleman give us the amount of business that is transacted at that station?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, but Pictou is the point of crossing for Prince Edward Island in the winter, and the business is very considerable.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I call the attention of the minister to the very inadequate accommodation of the Prince Edward Island side at Georgetown, where the warehouse is about one-third the size of the warehouse at Pictou, and where the merchants have to pile up their goods in rain and snow. The minister should give his immediate attention to that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will promise my hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey) that that matter shall be immediately inquired into.

Mr. BELL. I suppose the intention is to remodel the entire yard at Pictou ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BELL. I may say to the House, that that work is very necessary because unquestionably the entrance to the Pictou yard is too narrow. The station building is a comparatively small one, and it is not at all suitable to a town of the importance of Pictou. While I would not be able to hold myself responsible for the economy with which the minister may be proceeding, I certainly have every reason to sustain him in asking a grant for the purpose of giving more extended accommodation at that point. Pictou has a very large traffic ; it is not only the terminus of the old Pictou branch, but it is also the point at which practically the Oxford line meets the main line of the Intercolonial Railway. It is really a junction, and a very important point to which a great deal of travel tends. I am sure that if the hon. gentlemen in this House saw the present accommodation at Pictou, they would be prepared to admit that it is necessary to improve it very considerably. At the same time, we must hope that in the course of time, the requirements of our friends on the Prince Edward Island side will be fully met. But one thing at a time ; I presume that having attended to Pictou, the shower of good things may be expected to fall on the opposite shore of the straits.

Mr. LEFURGEY. That is about the only way we get anything.

Mr. COCHRANE. I see that it is to cost $10,000 for advertising and inspection. If that is a proof of the way the money is spent there will not be much economy about it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That includes the payment of engineers.

Mr. COCHRANE. What are your own engineers doing along that railway ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the construction of new works the remuneration of the engineer is charged, in proportion, against each particular work. It is as broad as it is long, as far as the treasury is concerned.

Mr. COCHRANE. That puts the matter in a somewhat different light.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We had that point discussed the other night.

Mr. CLANCY. Did you say you had a fight ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I used the word 'night.' I would not have a fight with anybody, and least of all with my hon. friend from Bothwell.

Improvements at North Sydney, $20,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The work contemplated by this vote is as follows : loading platform, $1,200; freight shed, $5,000 ; removal of freight shed, $500 ; removal of engine house, $500 ; additional sidings and rearrangement of yards, $12,000 ; advertising and other expenses, $800. Total $20,000, in addition to $13,000 in the main estimates, leaving $33,000 to be expended on this work for the present year.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Are they putting up a new building there ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not a new station building, but a new freight shed.

Increased accommodation at Moncton, $14,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to erect a building for the express company's rooms, mails, conductors' outfit boxes and offices of the car service department—a wooden building, estimated to cost $14,000.

Mr. BARKER. We had in the main estimates a vote of $15,000 for additional work on the freight shed at Moncton. It is not fair to those who have to go over these items to take up a station two or three times during a session. It seems to me only reasonable that the officers of the department, when furnishing their requirements for the season, should give everything at once, and not in this piecemeal way.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. When the last main estimates were before the House, I think I intimated that we would have to provide for these particular things in the supplementary estimates. The main estimates were prepared a long time ago, and, as the months roll on, our knowledge of what is required becomes greater ; so that it is not unreasonable for us to come down with an amended estimate.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand that the government are constructing some large locomotives at Moncton ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The deputy informs me that we have lately undertaken to construct locomotives at Moncton. We are enlarging our shops for that purpose.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Has the minister given any contract for locomotives to the Montreal concern ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. We have a contract outstanding with the locomotive works at Kingston, which is not yet finished.

Mr. REID (Grenville). How many locomotives are being built there ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have constructed two locomotives at Moncton, and are arranging to construct two more. There are fifteen remaining undelivered by the Kingston Locomotive Works. We have not given any contract yet to the

Montreal works. I think they are just getting into operation.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Have they made any application to the government for any contract ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, I think that I had a letter recently from the manager of the company, asking me to give them an order; but, as our orders at the Kingston Locomotive Works are not yet completed, we are not yet in a position to order any more. I have no doubt that as time passes we shall be able to give the Montreal works a share of our orders.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is it the minister's intention soon to advertise for tenders for more locomotives ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are not advertising for contracts at present.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then there will be no contracts given until the next session of parliament ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say that ; I am not going to bind myself as to the future.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Will the minister promise to give the Kingston works a chance of competing ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think both of these locomotive works should have a fair opportunity of bidding. I would give them both a chance.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I understand that this Montreal company put up their works because they claimed that they could get contracts from the government to keep them running.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They have no contract with the government so far as I know ; and, beyond a simple letter written to me asking if we wanted locomotives, they have not made any effort to get any contract.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not doubt the hon. minister's statement. At the same time, I believe a great deal of pressure has been put upon the government—perhaps not on the Minister of Finance—to get contracts for these parties, and at good big prices too. If the minister will only leave these contracts for engines open to competition, so that the Kingston works and others can get a chance to tender, no person can complain ; but if these parties in Montreal claim they can get contracts from the Dominion to keep their works running practically without any tender, I think it is not a very nice state of affairs. I mention this now, because at the next session of parliament the matter will come up again. I would like the minister to be in a position to say that he will advertise for public tenders.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have never heard the rumours the hon. gentleman refers to. I do not think they have a shadow of foundation. If the gentlemen he refers to were desperately anxious about contracts with the government, then, in the few weeks during which I have been in the department, I would have heard something about it. They have made no proposal whatever beyond a simple letter asking for orders for locomotives. If I had desired locomotives, I would probably have asked these two concerns to compete. If the hon. gentleman wants me to say what I shall do in the future, I must decline to bind myself.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. minister knows well enough that these gentlemen would not approach him for the simple reason that they do not know whether he is to be the Minister of Railways or not. The general impression is that he is only holding the portfolio temporary. If he will state that he is to be the minister, he will have these gentlemen after him in a short time. Will he state now that he is going to retain the portfolio ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am sorry that I cannot gratify my hon. friend's curiosity. But I think that if these gentlemen were breaking their necks about getting contracts, they would in all probability have come to see the minister who has to submit the estimates to parliament. If they have not done so, that indicates there is no foundation for what the hon. gentleman says.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I know that they are looking for contracts.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is not discreditable.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I admit that it is not, but the hon. gentleman is only acting as minister to pass these estimates. There is to be another Minister of Railways who will spend the money, and it would be useless for these men to try and make any arrangements with the acting minister. That is the reason they have not approached him. If he will only state now that he is to be the Minister of Railways, I will venture to say that within six days they will be applying for contracts for engines.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have already told the hon. gentlemen that they have applied to me. They wrote a letter stating that they were prepared to do business and that was the beginning and end of the whole matter. As to who is to be the Minister of Railways for the next five or six years, my hon. friend should not expect me to give him any guarantee on that point.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If the hon. minister is going to give any more contracts for engines, he should call for tenders and give these Kingston works an opportunity of tendering. If he will do that, nobody will have any fault to find. But if he simply

writes a letter to a firm asking for a tender, and then awards the contract without giving any other firm an opportunity to tender, he will be acting most unfairly.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Considering that the Kingston firm has large contracts and the Montreal establishment none, nobody need waste much sympathy on the Kingston firm.

Mr. BLAIN. What do the engines at Moncton cost compared with the prices at the Kingston locomotive works ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am advised that the cost of these two locomotives is somewhat inside the prices we have been paying. I will get the figures and supply them at a later stage.

Mr. BLAIN. Are the works at Moncton completed ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, they are in condition for the building of engines at present.

Mr. BLAIN. Was the item of $50,000, voted for a workshop, expended and is the workshop completed ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no memo. of that here.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is the capacity of the engines built in the government shops the same as those built at Kingston ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the same class of engines but they cannot build so many.

Mr. COCHRANE. Could not the government increase the capacity of their shops and build all the engines they want themselves ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The suggestion is well worth looking into. As regards the question of cost, before answering definitely I would like to inquire into the particulars—for instance whether any duty was paid. A number of things have to be looked into, which enter into the cost, before I can give the information.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would like to have the power of those engines.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They are the same class as we are getting in the locomotive works at Kingston.

Mr. BLAIN. Last year we voted $30,000 for a steam boiler for heating and electric light. Is that completed ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will have that information for the evening session.

Towards improving ferry service, strait of Canso, $66,400.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The dock on the Cape Breton side of the railway at the Strait of Canso, at Point Tupper, is very much exposed to the ice and there are difficulties on that account in operating the new ferry steamer. This vote is intended to pay for the extension of cribwork protection on the Point Tupper side in order to prevent the ice entering the dock and interfering with the entrance of the steamer.

Mr. LEFURGEY. How much does this make that we have expended on the ferry service there ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will have a statement of the total expenditure made out.

Mr. LEFURGEY. It will amount to upwards of $7,000 with the supplementary estimates.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I know it is a very large expenditure.

Mr. BARKER. In the main estimates the hon. gentleman asked for $11,000 for this purpose. And now in the supplementaries we are asked for six times as much.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They are two different works. One is for an electric lighting plant and the other is for building an addition to the dock.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It must be a very big dock.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is, and it must be very strong to resist the ice.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Will the hon. gentleman give us the information later ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Let the item stand in the meantime.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will give the information to-night anyway.

Protection to Grand Narrows bridge, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have a large and expensive bridge across the Grand Narrows, Bras d'Or lake, and some difficulty is found because vessels passing through are apt to strike the piers on account of the strong tide which runs through obliquely. There is danger of the vessels being carried against the pier on which the swing span rests when closed. Some damage has already been done. To prevent further damage, and possibly, the destruction of the pier, which would cut off through railway traffic, it is proposed to construct a pier at both ends to prevent the vessels striking the pier. A large class of steamers is used carrying limestone to the works of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company. Clusters of piles will be driven, with a wide base, and they will be drawn together at the top and securely fastened, and stone will be placed around them. The depth of the water at this point is about sixty feet.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Will this, and the work we have just dealt with be done under contract by public tender ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a large work and I think it would be done by contract.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Tenders publicly advertised for ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Where tenders are asked for there is always a public advertisement.

Mr. REID (Grenville). And the lowest tender accepted ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Always.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Will that be the case here ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I can say that I do not know of any reason why tenders should not be called for. If they are called for the lowest will be accepted.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Of course the tenders are not publicly called for unless there is a public advertisement.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is always done.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Not in my constituency. Letters are sent to friends of the government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In works of this character ?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Yes, in similar works.

Mr. BARKER. The Public Works Act provides that for such a work done under the Public Works Department, tenders shall be publicly called for. Does the minister draw a distinction between a railway work, such as this and the work done under the Public Works Act ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not drawn any such distinction, and have no intention of doing so.

Mr. BARKER. The minister said 'if.'

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not wish, at the moment, to commit myself too definitely. The general policy is that works of this character are to be let by tender.

Mr. BARKER. The Act says you must.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not sure that it is so under the Railway Act.

New Glasgow—extension to freight shed and crane for loading platform, $5.000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. New Glasgow is a growing and important place. Some months ago, a deputation of the board of trade waited upon me and represented that the need of such improvements there were very great, and this appropriation is to give some extension of the freight shed.

Mr. BELL. What is the length of this extension ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. One hundred feet.

Mr. BELL. South end or north end ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The memorandum before me does not state. No doubt, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell) will know.

Mr. BELL. The crane is on the opposite side of the track ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot say as to that.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I suppose the minister will give us his word that in the case of these works of $5,000 or over, competition will be allowed after advertisement in the newspaper ? If not, I will draw attention to it next session.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. All the more reason why I should not promise.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. gentleman has stated this for a fact in one case. Will he agree to it generally ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I say that it is the general policy and I have no desire to depart from it. But I do not want to be tied with regard to any particular item. It should not be pressed that far.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. minister wants to do what is right in the public interest. Why should not he allow the public to bid for these contracts ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know of any reason.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Will he in this case ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think I shall, in all probability. But if there is any good reason to state to the contrary, I want to be free. I do not anticipate there will be.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Will the hon. minister promise that this policy will be followed while he is acting Minister of Railways and Canals ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. The hon. gentleman had better rest on what I have promised him.

Matapedia—new station and other improvements, $8,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is an improvement to the well known station of Matapedia, the centre of the sportsmen's business. That present station is not at all creditable, especially when you consider the number of people who come there from all parts of the world.

New station at Windsor, N.S., provided that the railway companies using the station make arrangements satisfactory to the Governor in Council for payment by way of interest or rental of a reasonable proportion of the cost, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Windsor is a place about forty-five miles from Halifax, reached by branch of the Intercolonial running from Windsor Junction. This is leased to the Dominion Atlantic, whose own line begins at Windsor and runs westward to Yarmouth. We, as owners of the Intercolonial are interested from Windsor to Halifax, and a new road has been constructed from Windsor known as the Midland. We think we ought to provide a better station for the town, but we do not think we ought to do it entirely at the expense of the Dominion, but that these other companies should make some arrangement to contribute to the cost. If they will make a reasonable arrangement, the station will be built. If not, we will come to parliament for further instructions.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Why should this be added to capital account? There is a station there now.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is a mere shed, built twenty years ago. Practically, there is no station of value at Windsor.

Steel rails and fastenings (revote), $580,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the minister give us some information about the old contract made by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) with the Clergues for steel rails?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I gave some information the other day, in answer to a question as to the quantity of rails furnished. It will be remembered that we made an arrangement with the Clergue Company to give them a contract for 25,000 tons immediately, and the assurance of similar contracts for a period of five years. They were not able to deliver any rails within the first year of the contract. Subsequently, they made a further arrangement and delivered about 5,700 tons out of 10,000 which they expressed the hope of being able to deliver. We have taken all from them that they have been able to supply. I believe that they are not manufacturing now—up to the date of their recent trouble and before they suspended operations.

Mr. TAYLOR. How are these rails as to quality?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There were a few, I am told, open to some objection, but in the main, they were good.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that contract closed, or does the government intend to accept the fulfilment of the contract from the new company coming in?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The contract is regarded as practically at an end, inasmuch as the company are not able to comply with the terms. At the same time, I am sure that if any company is able to come forward and make the rails, we will be glad to give them an order.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Has any one approached the government with a view to the reorganization of this company, within the last few weeks?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. BELL. Is any guarantee required from this company with regard to the quality of the rails which are delivered to the government?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They are subject to inspection, and have to come up to the recognized standard of good rails.

Mr. BELL. Are they required to stand a certain amount of use?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We pay on delivery, and of course we have to take the risk, providing the inspection certificate is satisfactory. They give a guarantee that they will stand for five years.

Mr. SPROULE. The rails that were delivered, have they been paid for and accepted?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They were paid for, I think, at the rate of $25 per ton on account. There may be a small balance due. I know that the necessary papers were passed to pay them the money, quite recently; I do not know whether they have received it. Practically it is all settled. The $32.60 per ton, but they did not deliver any rails under that contract. The arrangement was that, while $32.60 was fixed as the price for that year, the price in future was to be governed by the market conditions, it was not a continuing price for five years. They had an assurance that an order would be given to them at the current price. They did not deliver any rails at $32.60. The subsequent arrangement was at $27.75.

Mr. BARKER. How many tons of rails is it proposed to provide with this money, where is it proposed to lay them, and what is the weight of the rail?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This money is taken to cover orders which have been given, and which are now being delivered. A portion of these, 1,872 tons, they have taken from the ship railway, that is a railway on which they were laid for some years but never used. That is a very heavy rail, 110 pounds. We received that at $21 per ton. The price is low. Then we have 15,244 tons of 80-pound rails, received from the Kidston firm, in Glasgow, at $25.25 per ton. Then, there is the 485 tons of this particular item, which is a part of the Sault Ste. Marie delivery, at $27.75. This estimate also in-

cludes plates, bolts, nuts, and so forth, that have been purchased in Canada.

Mr. BARKER. Where are they to be laid?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The 110-pound rails are to replace rails of 67 pounds, the 67-pound rails are to replace those of 58 pounds. The 80-pound rails will cover 211 miles, and are to be laid between Point Tupper and Sydney, and on the North Sydney branch, on the Drummond division, between Truro and Mulgrave, on the Oxford and New Glasgow, the Pugwash branch, the Pictou Town branch, Pictou Landing branch, and the Dartmouth branch.

Mr. SPROULE. Many of these are to replace the lighter rails. What do you propose doing with the others you take up ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The lighter ones are usually sold to other roads which do not require heavy rails.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I think that any responsible Minister of Railways who would come down with items like these year after year, should be ashamed of himself. Here we are asked to pass a vote for renewing rails. I think the acting minister will admit that no railway manager in the world would ever go to his directors and say : I want so much money, to be charged to capital account. If the acting Minister of Railways were the responsible Minister, I would be inclined to censure him for coming down year after year and asking us to add to capital account amounts for railways and engines and for the renewal of those that have been worn out.

Mr. SPROULE. What does the management do with the old rails that have been taken up ? Are they piled up and kept for sale ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A price is put upon them, and many railways in Canada, wanting the lighter rails, come and buy them. The department has to fix a price which it regards as a fair selling value.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Does the minister credit to capital account the money that he gets for the old rails ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly.

Mr. BARKER. What is the total number of tons ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The total number of tons of rails represented in this item is 17,603.

Mr. BARKER. Was there not some mistake in saying that this quantity of 80-pound rails to the yard would cover 21 miles ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The figures which are given to me seem to show that these rails will lay 211 miles of track.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Although these estimates are very important we have to pass them without having a minister who will assume responsibility for them. I think the government should have appointed a minister who was prepared to do that. I would like to ask the hon. minister if there is any possible chance of having a Minister of Railways and Canals appointed before the end of the session, so that we can ask him if he will assume responsibility for these estimates ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the session lasts for three or four months longer I think I can promise my hon. friend that the office will be filled.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That is a reflection upon the government, because it shows that they are afraid to fill it now. I think the hon. minister will admit that if they had appointed a Minister of Railways when the office became vacant he could not have carried any constituency in this Dominion.

Mr. BARKER. I think the hon. minister's statement as to the mileage will have to be checked, and perhaps he will let us have it again, because I am sure it is not 211 miles.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will. The figures as given to me imply that these rails will cover 211 miles. However, I will have the information possibly at eight.

Rolling stock (revote), $590,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What are you going to purchase with this vote ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This stock will be made at the several factories in Canada engaged in that line of work.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Will you purchase any at the Montreal works ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, we have no contract with the Montreal company at all.

Mr. SPROULE. I asked what amount of rolling stock you intend to purchase for this amount of money ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A portion of this money is required to pay the balance due on fifteen locomotives and two shunting engines. We propose to purchase two hundred and seven box cars, nine auxiliary cars and one hundred and thirty ballast cars, which may be used also for coal. The locomotives have been ordered from Kingston, as already stated. The box cars are being made by Messrs. Rhodes, Curry & Company, and the ballast cars have not yet been ordered.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). This was voted last year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This was voted last year and not expended.

Mr. SPROULE. This is all the rolling stock you are going to purchase ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Will this vote cover it all ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is estimated to cover it all.

Mr. BELL. How many cars are subject to repair and condemned as unfit at the present moment ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will have to get that information.

Mr. BELL. I would like to ask the hon. minister if there are any cars or engines belonging to the Intercolonial Railway at present leased to other roads ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is one engine leased to the Baie des Chaleurs Road.

Mr. BELL. Any cars ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No cars. I have had several applications recently for the loan of cars, but we have not had any to spare.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to ask the hon. minister whether he intends to put in running order the 500 cars that are out of service before he charges this to capital, or whether this is to replace the cars out of service ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Those cars will be repaired.

Mr. BARKER. During the current year ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, as quickly as the work can be done.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. minister state the prices at which these locomotives, box cars and ballast cars were purchased ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not the price of the locomotives, but the balance required on the contract is $204,886. The locomotives were purchased at Kingston. The box cars are to cost $999 each, and the ballast cars $950 each.

Mr. BELL. Are the latter flat cars ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These are flat cars which will be used for ballast but they are constructed according to a new patent, so that they can be used as coal cars also.

Mr. BELL. The cost of box cars and ballast cars is almost the same. Ballast cars usually cost $600 or $700. These are to cost over $900.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is not the ordinary flat car ; it is a car specially constructed for dumping ballast, and it can also be used for coal.

Mr. REID (Grenville). From whom were the box cars purchased ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. From Messrs. Rhodes, Curry & Company, of Amherst, N.S.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Whose constituency is that in ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is in Cumberland county.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Were tenders asked from other concerns ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. from everybody.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Was this the lowest tender ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The lowest tender.

Mr. REID (Grenville). In the case of the engines, were tenders asked from any other parties than the Kingston Locomotive Company ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think at the time there was nobody making locomotives in Canada but the Kingston Company.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Were tenders asked from any person outside of Canada ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the minister of the day ascertained what they could be made for abroad, and having ascertained what the proper prices were, he fixed the price for the Kingston people, who were the only people manufacturing in Canada.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is the price less than the foreign price with the duty added ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I could not answer that, but it is quite satisfactory to the company.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If the engines were costing a great deal more than what they could be got for abroad with the duty added the department should know it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am sure they are not.

Mr. COCHRANE. It might be satisfactory to the company and unsatisfactory to the country.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no doubt that the Minister of Railways, in a desire to have these engines made in Canada, gave the company as liberal a contract as he could, but I take it that the price represents about what they could be purchased for abroad plus the duty.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. minister takes it for granted, but the deputy minister knows whether that is true or not. The deputy minister knows what the tenders from abroad, with the duty added, amounted to. The hon. minister should be able to give this committee the information as to whether the price is equal to or less than what these engines could have been purchased for in the foreign market, with the duty added.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot give the hon. gentleman a comparison of the price paid with the foreign price, but I can now give the cost price of the locomotives. There was a contract dated 16th June, 1902, for twenty-five locomotives with the Canadian Locomotive Company, for $20,270 each.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The Kingston locomotive works are doing a great deal of work for the government, and they are making an awful lot of money and that is the reason these Montreal works have started, because they claim, that with the government at their back, they can make an awful lot of money out of the government, and that they can get all the contracts they want to run these works for years, at almost any price they wish. I would like if the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) should remain Minister of Railways and Canals, because I have great confidence in him, and I believe he will do what is straight. He will have a say in the matter when it comes up in Council, and I would now draw his attention to the fact that these works in Montreal have been built simply because they expect, within two or three years to make enough money out of the government to pay for their whole works. That rumour is public property, and time will tell. If I have the honour of being in the House, I am going to draw the attention of the minister to this fact session after session, because I have impressed it upon him now before any work has been let. I am quite satisfied that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding), if he is minister, he will come out straight, but if he gets some of these other gentlemen that are mentioned for that portfolio, I would be a little doubtful of it myself.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will have to accept that compliment and carry the item.

Dredging at Point Tupper—to pay M. Connolly interest on $61,429.07 and $16,624.09 at 6 per cent, $5,162,61.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Payment of this account was delayed because of some difference, between Mr. Connolly and the Auditor General regarding another claim. Mr. Connolly owed some money to the government arising out of some other work, and an understanding was come to that Mr. Connolly would pay the balance which he owed to the government, and the government pay the balance which they owed Mr. Connolly, interest being calculated on both sides of the account.

Mr. REID (Grenville). These accounts are pretty well mixed up. We have a dredge purchased that is pretty hard to explain; and then we have a mix-up in these accounts.

Mr. BARKER. Was the liability of the government referred to the law department?

Mr. REID (Grenville).

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think there was no question as to the liability of the government. The point was, that the Auditor General would not pay this account until the other account was paid by Mr. Connolly. There is an item in the Public Works estimates this year which represents the other side of the transaction.

Mr. BARKER. Does the Auditor General approve of this?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. So far as I know; I think there is no question about it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). How is it that the minister votes interest to Mr. Connolly, whereas if any other poor unfortunate has a claim against the government he has to go to the Exchequer Court.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is nothing to go to the Exchequer Court with in this case. The payment of interest, of course is an act of grace on the part of the Crown. As we get interest on one side of the account, we think it only fair to pay it on the other.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That is right, but I have even a more just claim in my own county, and the government has refused to pay it. The government wanted some land belonging to a poor widow and they worried the life out of her for three or four years, at the end of which time they gave her $800 for her claim, although she was entitled to a great deal more. I refer to the case of Mrs. Morrison. They held the $800 for three or four years and they absolutely refused to pay interest on it from that day to this. They told the poor widow to go to the Exchequer Court, but in this case they pay exactly a similar claim without sending Mr. Connolly to the Exchequer Court. That is absolutely unfair.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is nothing to refer to the Exchequer here. If parliament gives the money it gives it as a matter of grace.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Why not extend your matter of grace to the case of the poor widow?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know anything about the other case.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Of course, the hon. gentleman was not in the department at the time, but he is assuming responsibility for this vote, and I say it is an act of partiality and favouritism. Mrs. Morrison has asked me to appeal to the department, but I thought there was no use as they refused the claim before. But here the department is quite willing to pay Connolly and they refuse to pay the just claim of the poor widow. Will the minister give me an opportunity of putting the case before him, and I will leave it to his own sense of honour and fair-play to say whether it is just or not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Each of these claims will have to stand on its own merits. I cannot express an opinion in advance.

Mr. REID (Grenville). This is a poor widow who cannot defend herself.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. She has an excellent defender.

Mr. REID (Grenville). This is a case of hardship. If the minister gives me his word that he will consider the case, I will leave it to his own sense of fair-play.

Mr. BARKER. Has there been any dispute with regard to this credit to Connolly on the part of the Auditor General? If the Auditor General is satisfied with this vote we have nothing more to say, but if we pass it now, the Auditor General must pay it whether he thinks it right or not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know whether the Auditor General has had before him the question of the payment of the interest, but there was no dispute whatever about the principal sum, as between the Auditor General and the department.

Mr. BARKER. Why didn't you pay it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Because the Auditor General held an account (and I do not say he was wrong) against Mr. Connolly, and he would not pay it until all the accounts were settled together.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Will the hon. minister not allow the case of this widow woman to be appealed to him?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid I have too many applications in the department already to invite others. All I can say is that each of these cases as it comes up will be dealt with on its merits.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that there were two transactions, one in favour of the government and one in favour of Mr. Connolly. Which party stood to benefit the most?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The figures which I have before me have relation only to the Department of Railways. I know that the Minister of Public Works, as disclosed by his estimates, has had some transactions with Mr. Connolly, and it was in consequence of money claimed to be due from Mr. Connolly to that department that this payment was delayed.

Mr. SPROULE. Was the same rate of interest allowed on both sides?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it is. I understand that the late Minister of Railways and Canals came to a settlement with Mr. Connolly on a basis of six per cent. I am not sure what rate of interest was computed in the transaction with the Public Works Department.

Mr. SPROULE. What was the other account for?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A contract in connection with the Kingston graving dock.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the minister get that information for us and let us know, because I presume that to be fair, the interest should be the same on both sides. I assume that this transaction could not be settled unless Mr. Connolly got the best of it, or at any rate got generous fair-play.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I think the hon. minister should be willing to give me time within the next six months, whenever it is convenient to him, to place the case of this widow woman before him, and depend upon his sense of justice.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will promise that I or somebody else will give time to every claim of any kind that is submitted to the department.

Engine house, &c., Chaudiere junction (revote), $33,500.

Mr. MORIN. On what side of the Chaudière river will this building be put up?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Prime Minister tells me that it is on the east side.

Mr. MORIN. Has the site been bought?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is being obtained at present.

Mr. MORIN. How many acres of land have you obtained for it, and how much have you paid for the site?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not the information, but I will obtain it for the hon. gentleman.

New machinery for locomotive and car shops, $9,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Will this complete the machinery for the car shops?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think this will be all at Moncton.

Mr. BLAIN. Was the amount of $49,000 voted last year for the equipment of the machine shops there?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I find that the appropriation for 1902-3 was $10,000 and the expenditure was $9,280; that is, for new machinery only.

Mr. BLAIN. What capacity have you now in the workshops at Moncton for manufacturing locomotives?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not more that half a dozen a year.

Mr. BLAIN. Is not the equipment for machinery, $50,000 or $60,000, pretty large for that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a great deal of repair work done there all the time.

To compensate the Anchor Line for salvage services to ss. 'Scotia,' $16,072.23.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The 'Scotia' is the ferry steamer in the Strait of Canso which got into difficulty on her way over from Great Britain. Assistance was given her by one of the Anchor Line steamers, and the question arose of what salvage should be paid. An action was brought by the owners of the Anchor Line steamers against the government, and the government were obliged to plead that the Crown is not liable—not because we were not willing to pay a fair amount for salvage, but because our relations with our underwriters were such that, for our own protection, we had to take advantage of any privilege we enjoyed. We, however, had no intention of not paying salvage, and the Deputy Minister of Justice, who looked into the claim, gave us the opinion that it would be wise and just to pay this amount, which the company have accepted.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The case was never tried in court?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, and judgment was given in our favour on the technical point that the Crown was not liable.

Mr. REID (Grenville). How much did the company claim ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They claimed a very considerable sum in excess of this.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We compromised with their agent, who came from New York. He agreed that the amount we offered was reasonable, and the company are perfectly satisfied. Our recourse against the underwriters still exists, and we are endeavouring to make them pay.

Additional sidings along line, $63,500.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is an item we allowed to stand over. I find that the item mentioned by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) is not the same as this, although the wording is somewhat similar. The item he read was for additional sidings and increased accommodations and facilities along the line, $135,000. That is much broader and not confined entirely to sidings.

Mr. BLAIN. What proportion of that $135,000 was expended on sidings ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. $71,727.26.

Mr. BARKER. As you have got through that item 31, I wish to say that, although no discussion has taken place on the system of charging to capital certain expenditures which should go against income, I desire once more to protest against the system adopted by the government in that respect. In the one item of steel rails and fastenings, $585,000, really not more than $100,000 should be charged against capital.

Prince Edward Island—Murray Bay harbour branch and Hillsborough bridge, $480,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This item was wholly explained in the main estimates, when I informed the House that we would have to provide an additional sum in the supplementaries.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I find that this railway cost $28,000 per mile and more; why does it cost so much ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The contract is on schedule prices, and as the quantity of work increases, the total cost is greater. The engineers say it is through a difficult country and the cost of construction is much larger than it would be in the case of a narrow gauge road, built through an easy country. The country is considerably rocky and rolling. The whole cost of the work is estimated at $2,795,113.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Who are the contractors ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The contractors for the construction of the road are Willard Kitchen, and for the bridge, M. J. Haney.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What is the contract price for the bridge ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The contract is on schedule prices. The cost is estimated at $1,494,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Did any other contractors tender ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The bridge was let after public tender and competition.

Mr. BARKER. Do those figures include the superstructure ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The cost of the bridge would include the superstructure, which is to be removed from the Intercolonial and taken over to Prince Edward Island.

Mr. BLAIN. In the discussion last year, page 2862 of 'Hansard,' the hon. minister stated that the cost of the bridge would be $1,100,000. Now he says it was let by contract at schedule prices, and the cost he estimates at $400,000 more than he did then. Would the hon. minister tell us how that comes ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There can be no change in prices but only in the quantities. Just why the engineer should have made an estimate of quantities last year, which moneyed out to $1,100,000,

when now we find the estimate $1,400,000, I cannot explain. I will have to look into it and see how the discrepancy has occurred.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Was there any change in the engineers ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, there was no change except in the quantities. In either one case or the other, they have not been estimated with sufficient accuracy.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It does seem strange that last year the engineers should have made an estimate of $1,100,000 and now they make an estimate of $1,400,000. The minister ought to allow the item to stand until he can explain it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Did these estimates read by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) include the superstructure ?

Mr. BLAIN. I will read to the hon. gentleman what the Minister of Railways and Canals said last year. 'The bridge itself will cost $1,100,000.'

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That might or might not include the superstructure.

Mr. BLAIN. It would hardly be a bridge without a superstructure.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The engineers do not always talk that way.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister would not say that the cost of the bridge without the superstructure would be $1,100,000 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I can not say that. I will look into it.

Mr. BLAIN. This is the kind of thing that causes delay in passing the estimates. Will the hon. gentleman say that the bridge will be completed for not more than $1,460,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The figures given to me of the latest revised estimate is $1,494,137. My hon. friend (Mr. Blain) asks me if I will guarantee, on my own responsibility, that the bridge will be finished for that. I will not. Nor would he if he were in my place. I am obliged to take the information that is given me by the engineers on such a subject as this.

Mr. BLAIN. I would not ask the minister to pledge his own word to the House for the completion of that work for that amount. But it does seem as if the engineers were at fault, or else, owing to hurried and incomplete explanations, it is impossible for members of the committee to understand what these works are and what they will cost. I could easily understand it, if it were a mere estimate. But here is a work under construction with a large amount of money already expended on it. And the minister, with so large an item as $500,000 before the committee, last year made the statement that the bridge would cost $1,100,000. It seems strange—and the hon. acting Minister of Railways and Canals will agree with me I am sure—that we should be told now that the bridge will cost nearly $1,500,000. I suppose the river has not got any wider, necessitating the building of a longer bridge ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think not.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Perhaps the hon. minister will give us a statement of the estimates for the superstructure and for the other work—the original estimate.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The original estimate of the bridge ought not to differ from that of to-day, because there has been no additional work, so far as I know. I cannot explain why my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals of last year gave an estimated cost of $1,100,000. I will have to learn, if I can, before the estimates are finally disposed of, what the explanation is. Sometimes, there are explanations of these things. Sometimes, two items which seem to relate to exactly the same work do not relate to exactly the same thing.

Mr. COCHRANE. The minister must see that this is not a satisfactory way to vote money. Last year the Minister of Railways and Canals asked the committee to grant a sum of money for the completion of this bridge. This year, we are asked to vote $300,000 more for the same work. And the acting Minister of Railways and Canals himself tells us that he is not going to pledge himself that this is all the bridge will cost. We cannot know what we are doing under these circumstances, we do not know where we are at. I do not know for one, and I cannot feel safe in coming to a conclusion in this matter unless the minister gives us better assurance than he has seen fit to do so far in his bland way. I do not hold the minister responsible for this increased estimate of $300,000 but the question naturally arises, how are we to know that we shall not be in the same position next year. The hon. minister tells us that when engineers speak of a bridge they do not always mean a bridge with the superstructure. If an engineer talked to me about a bridge, and I found out afterwards that he meant a bridge without a superstructure, I should think he was trying to deceive me. Surely the hon. minister was not in earnest when he spoke in that way. The minister tells us that this bridge will cost $300,000 more than the amount given last year——

Mr. BARKER. Three hundred and eighty thousand.

Mr. COCHRANE. It has gone up again. It seems to me that we are entitled to have

this question treated with more seriousness by the minister. Of course we may laugh over these things and so let them go, but we can hardly do that and deal justly by the people we represent. If anything of this kind were to occur in a municipal council, there would be a general opinion that the councillors were trying to deceive the people. We are entitled to know just what money will be required to finish this bridge.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Cochrane's) criticisms are quite fair. I say that when my attention was drawn to the fact that the engineer said last year that the bridge was to cost $1,100,000, I find now that it will cost $1,490,000. There is an explanation due, and I will endeavour to obtain it. I will let the item stand in the meantime.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) asked what the cost of this superstructure would be. That is provided for by the government and I think the government should know.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The cost of the superstructure which, of course, would include the transfer of the bridge from the Intercolonial, the carriage and construction is $275,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). And the rest of the structure.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. For the construction of the branch ?

Mr. REID (Grenville). No, I am talking of the bridge. I asked how much the superstructure of the bridge would cost, and also the other parts of the work, in order that we might get at the original estimate of the cost.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The estimated cost of the superstructure is $275,660 ; of the superstructure and approaches, $1,218,436, making in all $1,494,096.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Now give us the original estimate, I mean when the contract was given to Mr. Haney.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will find out what the original estimate was. There ought to be no difference in these estimates, because the price remains the same. It is merely a question of quantity. Mr. M. J. Haney was the contractor.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then the minister will allow this item to stand until we get full information ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Judging from the estimates since 1900 for the improvements at Hillsborough, one would think that Prince Edward Island was getting a lot of money. I find that in 1900, $700,000 was voted ; the next year, $450,000 ; the next year, $500,000 ; further supplementary estimates the same year, $450,000 ; for 1903-4, $750,000, with this present estimate of $480,000, making in all $3,330,000 voted since 1900. Now, there must be some mistake. This is certainly misleading to the people of Prince Edward Island, because they have not received all that money.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is confusing two entirely different things. The votes for public works and the actual expenditure upon them are two different things. Large sums of money in these estimates are re-votes ; therefore one gets no intelligible idea of the cost of a particularly work by merely adding up the various items of appropriation.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The minister can bring down the total amount that has been paid out on the Prince Edward Island Railway since 1900.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I can give that now. The total expenditure on this work for the last four years ending June 30th, 1903, is $1,492,525, on the Murray harbour branch and upon the bridge—the whole enterprise.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister having given us a statement of the supposed cost of the bridge, would he give us a statement of the cost of the railway ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The estimate of the railway to the point known as Murray river which was one contract, is $926,460.70. To that is to be added the cost of the line down to Murray Harbour, $104,600.32. These two items would make up the cost of the railway. In addition to that, there will be required a crib-work wharf at Murray Harbour which was estimated to cost $69,955. These three items will be the cost of the railway and the terminal facilities at Murray Harbour.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Legislation—House of Commons—to provide annual increment to ten clerks at $50 each, $500.

Mr. SPROULE. What clerks are these ?

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. L. P. Brodeur). I have not the names with me, as I did not expect my estimates to come up, but they are all clerks who are entitled to increase of salary.

Mr. SPROULE. Did they get an increase last year ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Some of them must have had increases last year. We generally give increases so long as they do not reach the maximum of their class. I suppose that those who were not transferred from one class to another received increases last year, and are this year receiving increases.

Mr. SPROULE. All those who did not reach the maximum got increases last year ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Did they the year before ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Since I have been Speaker of the House of Commons I have always given increases to all those who have not reached the maximum of their class and who are entitled to them.

Mr. SPROULE. The Speaker is more generous to his employees than some members of the government are. We are not objecting to it, because I think he has done the right thing.

Mr. BELL. I understand that some officials of this House are not included here, and I understand that in many cases, on account of the length of the session, those who are not paid for their day's service, but who are paid by the year or the session, will be at a great disadvantage. In some cases gentlemen who are at the head and in charge are receiving remuneration which in amount is less than that received by their subordinates. An example of this is the gentleman at the head of the sessional writers. While the session has been protracted to such an extent that it is necessary to increase the pay of all the temporary employees and also of all those who are employed by the day, some recognition should be made of the length of time during which these older and annual employees are obliged to work. I find that a few are provided for, but very few, and it strikes me that while it might not be advisable at this time to touch the more expensive salaries, there are some gentlemen who are receiving very small salaries which it might be well to increase. I may mention the case of Mr. Stewart.

Mr. SPEAKER. I know the case to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell) refers. The sessional writers are not on the permanent list. Those for whom provision is made in the estimates are all officers who are on the permanent list. The one to whom the hon. gentleman refers is not on the permanent list. I understand the difficulty in which those officers find themselves this year on account of the extraordinary length of the session, and probably some means will be taken by which these officers shall at least receive the same salary as those who are under them.

Mr. BELL. I suppose I am to understand that his honour the Speaker is making that definite statement, and that something will be done to put these gentlemen in a better position than that in which they are at present. I see that the further supplementary estimates contain some provision for officers of the House of Commons, but these gentlemen are not included.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may say that it is not necessary that these amounts should be included in the estimates. I think that there is already enough money voted to provide for these increases. It will be a question for the board to determine, and we expect to have a meeting of the board very soon, and the matter will be looked into.

Mr. BELL. That is the Board of Internal Economy ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). A number of years ago the regular press representatives in the press gallery were placed on the list of sessional writers, but the practice has been discontinued for some years. Inasmuch as this has been a very long session, I am satisfied that the Speaker would be endorsed by the House and by the country if he would, at all events for this session, fall back upon the old custom and allow the representatives of the leading journals who have been here during the entire session to be again placed on the list of sessional writers.

Mr. SPEAKER. The matter has never been brought to my attention. In fact, this is the first time that I ever heard that some years ago the members of the press gallery were also sessional writers. It may be so, but I have never heard of it. This is the first time also that I ever heard it proposed that something should be done in the way suggested by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes).

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I hope, Mr. Speaker, that you will take the matter up and consider it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Of course, there are some little courtesies which have always been extended to the gentlemen of the press, but do I understand that the hon. gentleman suggests that representatives of the press should be paid as if they were sessional clerks ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). They do as much as the sessional clerks.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. One is a public servant and the other is not.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I think the custom was that some years ago the members of the press gallery were on the list of sessional writers, and I think that those who have been here the entire session and given their entire time to the work of the House and of the country should be placed on the list of sessional writers. I should be pleased if the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) would go into the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER. The practice may have existed, but I have never heard that members of the press gallery were also sessional writers. I will inquire about it.

Mr. GOURLEY. I heard a young page boasting the other day in the Senate of the superiority of their House, because they pay their doorkeeper $1,000, while ours only gets $500. I want to know whether that is correct or not. I hope there is some explanation of that, because we hold the purse strings and we should see that our officers are properly paid.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question was brought to my attention some time ago, and I inquired the reason why they gave $1,000 a year, or $900, to the doorkeeper of the Senate. The reason given was that the officer they have there is a very old officer who was at one time doing something else. He became old or for some reason or other they decided to appoint him doorkeeper, and leave him at the same salary as he had received before. He wanted this position of doorkeeper, because he thought it would give him less work to do. He is a very old officer and this is why he receives more salary.

Mr. GOURLEY. I think this is a very ridiculous sum to pay our officer for a long session like this ; $500 seems to be really beneath contempt as a compensation for such an important officer as this one who preserves our House from intrusions at all times. I really think it is worthy of more serious consideration.

Tradesmen, and others, $1,000.

Mr. MORIN. There is one of the employees of the House who is only allowed $3 a day for himself and for the use of his horse. He has pointed out to me that the messengers receive $2.50 per day, and the extra 50 cents which he receives is not sufficient remuneration for the use of his horse.

Mr. SPEAKER. I will inquire into the matter.

Murray Harbour branch and Hillsborough bridge, $480,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Before six o'clock, my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) raised a question with regard to the estimated cost of the Hillsborough bridge and the Murray Harbour Branch Railway. The hon. gentleman pointed out that the minister stated last year that the cost of the bridge would be $1,100,000, while I have stated that the cost would be $1,494,096. As I then suggested, the difference arises from the fact that while the cost of the bridge itself was placed at $1,100,000, the contingencies and the superstructure would increase the estimate to the larger amount. It would have been better had the minister last year stated that his estimates did not include the superstructure, but it is quite evident that he did not intend to include it, because the sum he mentioned is almost exactly the engineer's estimate for the substructure, namely, $1,107,667. To this should be added 10 per cent for contingencies, amounting to $110,767, and for the superstructure $275,660, making the total cost of the bridge in its entirety $1,494,096.

Mr. COCHRANE. What are the contingencies in the case ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is the practice with engineers to allow a margin for contingencies in connection with such works.

Mr. BARKER. I myself thought that might be the explanation of the difference, but I am bound to say that when a minister speaks of an estimate in this House, he should include contingencies. We have reason on this side of the House to complain that there is too much looseness in the answers given to questions of this kind, and I am sorry to say that very frequently we have reason to believe that an answer is given which may satisfy the House for the moment. I do not make any personal reflection now, but I have noticed frequently a desire on the part of a minister to say something which for the time being may satisfy the House. We are entitled to know the whole truth, and no matter who the minister is, or how much I may respect him personally, I shall never hesitate to speak my mind plainly, if he is guilty of such a thing. A minister is bound to give the fullest explanation to this side of the House, and to his own followers, on every item of these estimates. The contingencies are included by every engineer in an estimate for such a work, and it is absurd for any minister to give an estimate without including contingencies in it. I had no doubt when this $1,100,000 was spoken of as the probable expenditure required for this work, it meant that the actual estimate was $1,000,000 and that the $100,000 was the 10 per cent added to it. Still, I think it is quite possible that the Minister of Finance has told us just what occurred. I have no doubt that on that occasion, owing to the want of proper care, the care which we are entitled to expect from the government of the day, the $1,100,000 was taken as the full estimate, including the contingencies, when there ought perhaps to have been 10 per cent added to that. There is no doubt, however, in my mind that this contract requires on the part of the acting Minister of Railways a very careful investigation. Assuming that the hon. gentleman was correct in telling us that this narrow gauge railway is going to cost $28,000 a mile——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, I did not say so. An hon. gentleman on the other side said that.

Mr. BARKER. I think the hon. gentleman said so, and he added that it did seem a very large amount for a narrow-gauge railway. I think 'Hansard' will show that I am correct in that. If $28,000 a mile is being spent by this government on a narrow-

gauge railway in Prince Edward Island, with all the facilities which it has for completion, such as providing steel rails from the Intercolonial Railway at practically the cost of scrap, it is a monstrous thing to suppose that such a railway will cost any such money.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say that the road would cost $28,000 a mile. The figures came from an hon. gentleman opposite, I do not remember whom.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it was I who made the calculation. I said that according to that calculation the cost was $28,000 a mile—am I correct in that? And I think the hon. minister said that it was a big price for a narrow-gauge railway.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman confirms the statement I made. I did not make the calculation per mile. I said the road was expensive, but I did not compare the figures, and they did not originate with me. As a matter of fact, the cost of the road to the point where it has reached, Murray river, not including the bridge, would be $21,056 a mile.

Mr. BARKER. No one ever heard of calculating the cost of a railway per mile and omitting all its bridges.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I suppose that if we were to take a piece of the Grand Trunk, including the bridge at Montreal, and figure its cost per mile, it would amount to a great deal. This Hillsborough bridge is a large and costly one, and any attempt to figure out the cost of a narrow-gauge road associated with the cost of that bridge, would be so manifestly unfair that I cannot imagine the hon. member for Hamilton wanting the figures to be put in that way.

Mr. BARKER. I think the cost of a road ought in every case to include the cost of the bridges. It is quite open to the hon. gentleman, when he finds that the cost is exceptionally high, to point out that there is an unusually costly bridge; but no one ever heard of the cost of a railway being estimated per mile without including the cost of the bridges.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That may be correct in the case of a long railway with ordinary bridges. On the other hand, it would be equally absurd to take a short narrow gauge railway, containing one very long bridge, and add the cost of the two together to get at the cost per mile of the railway.

Mr. COCHRANE. You could not have the railway without the bridge.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But a statement of that character would be very misleading unless you made an explanation as to the cost of the bridge.

Mr. BARKER. That is what I say, and it is open to the hon. gentleman to make that explanation. Even the railway without the bridge cost 50 per cent more than it ought.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman were doing the work as a contractor, perhaps he would not think so.

Mr. BARKER. As a government contractor I might not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is not quite prepared to say that any contractor would do it for less than the contractors are doing it for now. So far as I know, they are doing it at ordinary schedule prices. If that is so, the hon. gentleman's remark is uncalled for.

Mr. BARKER. I can probably give the reason why it is costing more than it ought to cost. This question was up last year or the year before. The fact is that the contractors got the contract for the first ten miles of this road on certain specifications at so much per yard, and the government, instead of calling for tenders for the remainder of the road, told the contractors that they could complete it at the same rates, without the least investigation as to whether the continuation of the road was of the same character or not. We complained at the time that no railway company in the world would ever think of letting contracts on such a basis. The minister at the time had to admit that he did not know the character of the work yet to be done; he had received no estimates or statements when he entered into the new contract. That is what this business government thought was the regular thing, and it was approved by every hon. gentleman opposite.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the contract had been taken for the first section at so much per mile, and if it had been extended at the same rate for a different class of work, then the hon. gentleman would have some reason to complain. But what is the fact? The first contract was made at schedule prices, and when the road was extended the contractor was allowed to continue the work at schedule prices for the same class of work, because there was no material difference in the work. It was a mere question of quantities.

Mr. BARKER. I said the first contract was let on the basis of so much per yard for the different qualities of work. But what I complained of then, and what I complain of now, is that the government, without ascertaining the nature of the work to be done, without knowing whether it was more expensive or less expensive than the part already done, simply told these contractors to go on and do the work. Did those gentlemen take it without investigation? I would like to ask any hon. gentleman in this House whether it is

reasonable to suppose that the contractors would have taken the extension without ascertaining whether it was more profitable or less profitable for them to do the work. The minister of that day admitted that he had no reports whatever from his department as to the nature of the work yet to be done; and it is absolute folly for the hon. gentleman to tell me now that the government had ascertained that the work yet to be done was of the same character as the work already done. The minister of the day, a year ago, admitted that he did not know. He simply shut his eyes and told the contractors to go ahead.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not want to contradict my hon. friend, but I question if the minister used any such language. The general conditions of the country there are well known, and I am advised that they do not differ. As the rates were schedule rates, so much for every yard of earth removed and masonry constructed, it is simply a question of quantity. Unless the contractors did a larger quantity of work, they could not get a larger amount of money. If the general conditions of the country are the same and the schedule prices were fair in the first instance, I do not think there is anything to warrant the statement that the cost is excessive.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman, I fancy, has never had to pay for any work done on a railway or he would not use such an argument. It is quite possible that you may have to handle the same earth or rock or whatever it may be, but the value of that work depends on the haulage. If you have to take up a yard of earth in one place and haul it a mile, that will cost you considerably more than if you have to haul it half a mile or less. The government should have obtained from its engineer a report as to how far every yard of earth and rock would have to be hauled. You pay a man so much per yard, not merely for digging up the earth, but for hauling it, and the rate largely depends on the length of haulage. A contractor may excavate and haul a short distance at fifteen cents per yard and charge thirty cents a yard for double the distance. How can you tell by one ten miles of the road what the next ten miles will cost. The minister of the day admitted that he had made no inquiry. I venture to say that there is not a railway company in this country who would think of letting a contract to a contractor on ten miles of road simply on the basis of what they paid another contractor on another ten miles. They would have an estimate from their engineer of the distance every yard of earth had to be hauled, and every detail, before they would give out the contract.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Has the hon. minister the plans, cuttings, specifications and profiles? He should lay these on the table? We should know how much filling and cutting had to be done and what was the nature of the cutting on every mile of road. The price paid for building a road in that country seems most extravagant and perfectly abnormal. You could build a road through the Rocky Mountains for the same money.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These plans and specifications are not in Ottawa, but they were all submitted to the House when the matter was discussed on a previous occasion. The contract is not one which has been recently let. I do not recollect the precise words used by the minister at the time, but I am assured by the chief engineer that it was well understood that the general character of the work on that line was the same and we could properly take the prices given in the first contract as a very fair criterion of the value of the work.

Mr. BARKER. The matter may have been well understood but that is not the way business men enter into contracts. I asked the question at the time if the department had had reports showing the nature of the work, and the minister admitted he had not. The idea of any one entering into a contract involving large sums of money upon what was 'well understood' as to the nature of the country!

Mr. BLAIN. What is the length of this road?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Forty-four miles to Murray river and six and a half miles thence to Murray Harbour terminus, making fifty and a half miles.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the terminus been decided upon by the department?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, but the last six and a half miles have not been constructed.

Mr. BLAIN. And the total cost of the road outside of the bridges?

Mr. BARKER. Is $1,400,000, which is nearly $28,000 per mile.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Including the bridge.

Mr. BARKER. No, excluding the bridge.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The total cost of the work down to Murray Harbour, which is the terminus, is placed in the revised estimates at $2,795,113. If from that you will deduct the estimated cost of the bridge, $1,494,097, the result will give the cost of the road without the bridge. That also includes $69,555 for terminal facilities at Murray Harbour.

Mr. BARKER. This particular harbour?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, but if you use terminal facilities on a short road,

the cost will be more per mile than on a long road. $2,795,113.17 is the estimated total cost of the work. The estimated cost of the bridge is $1,494,097.

Mr. BLAIN. That would make the total for the bridge and railway, how much ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The bridge, railway, rolling stock, and wharf at Murray Harbour, all united, cost $2,795,113.17. That includes the bridge and rolling stock and $69,000 for the wharf at Murray Harbour.

Mr. BLAIN. The Minister of Railways and Canals last year estimated the cost of the bridge at $1,000,000 and the cost of the road, including rolling stock, at $2,620,000. So that the hon. gentleman is under the estimates of the late minister.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have the same figures. They gave the cost down to Murray river, but, the road down to Murray Harbour is six miles and a half more, which could not have been included in that statement.

Mr. BLAIN. The estimate which the hon. gentleman is giving now is very much lower than that given by the Minister of Railways and Canals last year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not see how that can be.

Mr. BLAIN. The last minister gave the cost of the road, including rolling stock, at $2,620,000 and the cost of the bridge at $1,100,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The cost of the bridge was included in the cost of the road.

Mr. BLAIN. No, here are the exact words: 'The railway including the rolling stock, will cost in the neighbourhood of $2,620,000. The bridge itself will cost $1,100,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is included in the $2,620,000.

Mr. BARKER. Allow me to point out another fact. The late minister gave the figures last year at $2,620,000, omitting the last six and a half miles of railway. Now we have it up to $2,800,000 round numbers. That means an addition of $182,000 for six and a half miles of railway, which is $28,000 per mile.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend should mention that in that six and a half miles is included $70,000 for the wharf.

Mr. BARKER. I admit that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman admits it now but he did not state it.

Mr. BARKER. I am giving the average cost of the road. You can find some half miles on the road that will cost $50,000. But I am speaking of the average. The whole average is $26,000 to $28,000 per mile according to the hon. gentleman's own figures.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And in his estimate the hon. gentleman includes nearly $70,000 for a wharf. If that is understood and clearly stated, I do not object to his calculation.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman knows that you can find roads one hundred miles long with terminals worth a million. All that is included. You do not count only the cheapest or worst part of the road, but include the terminals also. You will spend sometimes on one station more than will build five miles of the road. All that is taken in in estimating the average. Taking this whole road without the bridge, the cost is $26,000. Take the last six and a half miles, the cost is $28,000, and I do not see how the hon. member for East Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) was far wrong in his estimate. The hon. gentleman seemed to think this was an excessive amount for a narrow gauge railway and I think everybody will agree with him.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) can find terminal companies with only two or three miles of railway, and terminals worth immense sums, which would make the road cost on the average, perhaps, $100,000 a mile. In the case of this railway the hon. gentleman includes a great bridge and a wharf at the end of the road, and so figures out a very high average cost for this narrow gauge railway. He may be technically right, but the statement is a very misleading one.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. minister always wished to put in this bridge. Well, if he puts that in he makes the cost of his road $55,000 a mile, and, leaving out the bridge the road costs $26,000 to $28,000 a mile, and, judging by the differences in estimates that are given us at different times, we may probably add ten or fifteen per cent to that. It is perfectly fair to count in even the cost of an expensive terminal in averaging the cost of road per mile. You can find miles that may cost $75,000 to $100,000. But that is not the way you take it—you take the average of the whole.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is still leaving out $200,000 for rolling stock which is included in this. That adds to the cost per mile.

Mr. BARKER. All that is part of your railway system. And I am not sure that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) is going to spend $200,000. He has a good deal of rolling stock already in Prince Edward Island. But, assuming that he does, he has $28,000 a mile expended in Prince Edward Island for a narrow gauge railway. Why you would not spend that to-day for a

first class railway in Ontario. And this road in Prince Edward Island is laid with second-hand rails from the Intercolonial, has a second-hand bridge from the Intercolonial and, no doubt, the rolling stock will be second-hand also. That is what Prince Edward Island gets, apparently. The government is transferring this bridge from the Intercolonial to this branch railway and charging $300,000 for it. And it is taking 67-pound rails that have been almost worn out on the Intercolonial——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Who says so ?

Mr. BARKER. We have heard from time to time from everybody who has discussed these estimates that the rails that were taken off the Intercolonial were to be sent to Prince Edward Island.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But who said they were worn out ? That is the point.

Mr. BARKER. Well, I suppose the hon. gentleman is not taking up new rails ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But that is not the point. Who said they were worn out ?

Mr. BARKER. I suppose they are not absolutely useless, but still they are second-hand rails. The minister is putting down railways for which he charges what price he pleases, using rails and bridges from the Intercolonial. And the result is that he gets a narrow gauge road which costs about $55,000 a mile, or, excluding the bridge, $28,000 a mile.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) has made his speech still more remarkable by saying that the rolling stock will be old rolling stock from the Intercolonial. I think it will take his ingenuity to show how you are going to take broad gauge rolling stock and use it on the narrow gauge railway.

Mr. BARKER. Oh, that has been done over and over again.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not know whether the minister answered my question as to the estimate of the cost of this bridge.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not aware of any other estimate than this one. If there is any other I will get it later.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then, let the item stand.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, the item has stood long enough.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. minister is not prepared to give us any information.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I may be able to give it during the evening.

Mr. REID. Then, the item should stand until he gets it. As well as I can understand there is a deal in this for some person. I think we should be told exactly what increase there has been since the original estimate, and we should have that information before the item passes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have just received information which may meet the hon. gentleman's question. The original estimate of the substructure was $605,274 with ten per cent for contingencies, $60,527. The original estimate of the superstructure was $275,000, making a total estimate of $940,801 at the time the contract was first made. The explanation of the increase given to me is that the bridge was lengthened 630 feet, with an enlarged water-way, necessitating two abutments and one pier being added. The four pneumatic piers were increased in size, increasing the cost of dredging, iron concrete and rip-rap. The earth approaches were added to the concrete. Schedule prices remain the same as in the tender and contract.

Mr. BARKER. The minister expressed surprise when I spoke of the cost being increased by over 50 per cent above the estimates. The figure he has just given, showing the original estimate of this bridge at $940,000, as against the present estimate is a little more than 50 per cent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is not what my hon. friend said. He did not say it was 50 per cent more than the estimate, he said it was 50 per cent more than the thing should have cost.

Mr. BARKER. It should have cost according to the estimate.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, if changes were afterwards made, it should cost its fair value.

Mr. BARKER. Does the hon. gentleman suppose that I know what the thing should have cost ? I have never been in Prince Edward Island. I was speaking of the estimates given by the Minister of Railways in this House, which were $940,000 for this bridge. To-day these estimates are up to $1,494,000, an increase of more than 50 per cent. That justifies what I said.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, it does not. If he was only thinking of the estimates it is unfortunate he did not say so. He said it was 50 per cent more than it should have cost. That was a question as to the value of the work in comparison with the price that we were paying for it. If he had said that it was 50 per cent more than the first estimate, that would have been a matter for discussion.

Mr. COCHRANE. When the minister comes down and tells us that the cost of a bridge is going to be so much, an ordinary mortal like myself naturally believes him. I have seen so much of this thing that I think the time has come when it should

be called by its right name, and I cannot term it anything else but deception used by the Minister of Railways. Of course, I am not accusing the minister I am now addressing. But he must see that when a minister comes down to the House and tells us that a bridge is going to cost $500,000, I have always been innocent enough to suppose that that was what it was going to cost. But I am being undeceived this last session or two. We were told, and I accepted the statement in my innocency, that this bridge was going to cost about $500,000; it has cost $1,400,000, and the end is not yet. I think the minister should have his estimates prepared with more care.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend must be mistaken when he speaks of the minister saying that this bridge was going to cost $500,000.

Mr. COCHRANE. I think the 'Hansard' will show it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think so. From the beginning it has been known that this bridge would be expensive, and would cost very much more than that.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The minister tells us to-night that the reason of this increase is that the bridge has been extended 630 feet. Now when this bridge was projected does the minister tell us that the engineer in charge of that work did not know how long that bridge was going to be within 630 feet? Now there is one reason I think why this bridge is costing a lot more money than we were told it was going to cost. I see by the estimates that the contractor for this bridge is getting $25 a cubic yard for taking out rock.

Mr. BARKER. That is three times what it ought to be.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If that is correct it refers to rock excavation in about 90 feet of water, which is very different from ordinary excavation.

Mr. REID (Grenville). But I am informed that they are paying $25 a cubic yard for concrete work with the same rock that they are taking out of that excavation for which they are paying $25 a cubic yard.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am informed that that is not true.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That the same rock is not being used?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am so informed. The prices were fixed by public tender and competition, but I cannot go into details.

Mr. BARKER. Does the hon. gentleman tell us that they are paying $25 a yard for taking rock out of 90 feet of water? What is the object of taking that rock out at 90 feet depth, if it is solid rock? If it is loose rock, why should it cost $25 a yard?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is an engineering question. It is possible the engineers would be right.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman will see that if there is no blasting or any other work, it is simply lifting up the loose rock, and $25 a yard is a magnificent sum.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The contract was given by public tender and competition, and $25 was the lowest price anybody would tender for it. I think probably the price would be a fair one.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I pointed out before recess that we had been paying on this Prince Edward Island Railway upwards of $3,000,000, and the minister replied that much of this consisted of revotes. Now I think some other explanation than revotes is required, because we find that in the estimated cost of this road by the Minister of Railways the substructure was to cost $375,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Where does the hon. gentleman get his figures?

Mr. LEFURGEY. In the debates for 1901, page 4227. It reads:

> Murray Harbour branch and Hillsborough bridge, P.E.I., $450,000.
>
> The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The estimated cost of the substructure is $375,000. The cost altogether will be $450,000. Eleven and a half miles of road are under construction, and thirty-two miles have yet to be constructed. The eleven and a half miles have cost close to $43,000, and we estimate that the total cost will be $170,000.

Now that 40 odd miles of railway that we figured out this year has cost $28,000 a mile.'

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Does that say for 40 miles? I thought the hon. gentleman said eleven miles.

Mr. LEFURGEY (reading):

> The eleven and a half miles have cost close to $43,000, and we estimate that the total cost will be $170,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The total cost of what?

Mr. LEFURGEY: (reading)

> Adding that to the estimated cost of the $450,000 will give $660,000. The $450,000 is what will suffice for the coming year.

There must be some grave discrepancy about this—$450,000 in 1901, $1,490,000 in 1903 and last year $1,100,000. I think there is some explanation due to this committee or we as well as the country will come to the conclusion that there is more engineering going on than the engineering being done by the engineers of the railway.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot imagine that any such estimate as my hon. friend has quoted was given. There must be some misunderstanding. I prefer to look

into the matter before accepting that statement.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman will see that the estimate for 11½ miles was about $16,000 a mile which is not unreasonable although high. But, this $16,000 a mile jumped up to $28,000 a mile including the 11 miles. That is the result of the unusual method adopted by the government in letting out the contracts. It was on the basis of the 11½ mile contract that they gave the contractors the next 32 miles and these contractors have managed by the yard measurements to get up the 43 miles to nearly $28,000 per mile. Then we have the bridge which was to cost, according to the minister, $375,000 costing three times that amount.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Surely the hon. minister must see at a glance that there must be something wrong. An estimate was made by the engineer, who I suppose is in charge of the work yet, that the bridge would cost $450,000, and that the railway would cost $170,000 more, making $600,000 and odd, and notwithstanding the fact that these works have cost $1,464,000 the hon. minister does not admit that this is sufficient to complete the bridge. Next year we will probably be asked to vote half a million more for this bridge and an additional amount for the railway. Surely this committee are entitled to some explanation. Surely the hon. minister cannot force the item through without giving us some explanation even though, being the acting minister, he does not understand the situation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The committee should fully understand it and the hon. minister should not try to force it through. This is a very important matter. There are rumours that there is something wrong about this whole deal. We have grave reasons to suppose that there is when the minister who was in charge of the department stated to this committee that the whole cost of the bridge and railway would not exceed six hundred thousand and some odd dollars, and when the hon. acting minister now declares that the bridge will cost $1,464,000 and that 43 miles of railway will cost $28,000 a mile. It is most unfair that we cannot get a reasonable explanation of the whole matter from the hon. acting minister or some other member of the government. Therefore, I for one protest against this item going through until the hon. minister gives us the information we are entitled to. If he has not got it to-night I think the item should stand until he can get it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am sure the statement the hon. gentleman has made respecting the engineers estimate of this work at the figures he has named must be the result of a misunderstanding. I think it is simply preposterous that any engineer could have given us the figures that he has quoted as being the cost of this work. I have given the hon. gentleman all the information I have received respecting the estimates which are given by the engineers in regard to this work. I cannot undertake off-hand to answer questions as to what the minister may have said four years ago.

Mr. BARKER. Two years ago.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Two years ago. I can only state that on these points I will be very glad to get the information later on, but in the meantime I do not see that the public business will be advanced if we hold this item over. The work has to be done no matter what it costs. We are committed to it. The government and parliament have agreed to build that road and if mistakes were made by the minister or by the engineers, which I am not prepared to admit without further inquiry, it will not alter the fact that we have to build the road. The hon. gentleman says that there are rumours afloat. He is too prone to mention rumours. He should not do that. If he has any reason to believe that there is anything about the contracts that is not fair or honourable he has had a seven months session of this parliament in which to bring his charges before the House, and if he has failed to do so until this last hour I am bound to believe that the hon. gentleman does not attach very much importance to these rumours.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It has been stated by the hon. member for East Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) that the minister in charge of the department at the time made the statement in this House that the estimated cost of this work would be so much. The minister made that statement on the authority of his department and the hon. acting minister is in a position to say to-night whether that statement was true or not. He can find out whether that was a proper estimate or not and inform the committee whether the statement was true or not. The hon. minister states that we are bound to complete the railway. There is no hon. gentleman on either side of this House but would be glad to see the railway completed, and besides that I believe that every hon. member wants to do all he can in the interests of Prince Edward Island. The opposition are not trying to prevent the building of this road, but they are trying to prevent the government from making an estimate of $600,000 odd as the cost of building the bridge and railway and then coming down here two years afterwards and informing us that $1,464,000 has been spent on the bridge and that $28,000 per mile, or another $1,000,000, would be spent on the railway. This will give the public reason to suppose that there is something wrong in this transaction. I know and I can prove to the hon. minister

that in other cases engineers have made estimates and that if the government had not given side issues to the contractors, the estimates would probably have been all right, but no sooner is a contract awarded than the whole thing is changed to suit the contractor as I believe it has been in this case and the contractor makes a good big pull out of it. I venture to say that if the acting minister will look into this contract as it was originally let and compare it with its present form he will see there is just as much difference between the two as there is between day and night. That is the reason this is costing so much. The hon. acting minister admits it when he states that this bridge is to be 630 feet longer than was originally intended. It is most unfair of the hon. acting minister to even hint that the opposition are objecting to this work. The opposition want to see this bridge and railway completed as they want to see any other necessary railway in Prince Edward Island built. While that is the case, they do not want to see three times as much paid for the work as there ought be paid, and I am sure the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) believes in his heart that this did cost three times more than it should.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, I don't.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Reid) has truly said, that the Conservative side of the House is willing that Prince Edward Island should get its full share of railway expenditure. We all know that the Island province has not had her share. From confederation up to the time of the building of this Murray Harbour branch, only a little over a million dollars was expended on our railways. We built the Prince Edward Island Railway in the first place, and it was charged to us at confederation in the sum of $3,144,000. That railway cost originally about $16,000 a mile; but according to the statement of the minister, this Murray Harbour branch is costing us $28,000 a mile. The people of Prince Edward Island should know why it is that this 42 miles of railway, through a country no more difficult to construct in than that through which the main line runs, should cost such an enormous sum, when railway construction ought to be 25 per cent cheaper now than when the main line was built. This money is all being charged against Prince Edward Island, and when we come to insist upon having these much needed branch lines on the Island, to which I have so often called the attention of the House, we will be pointed to the large expenditure which has already been made. We want railway facilities on the Island just as the other provinces have, but we want the work done economically. The very fact that the contract for the last half of this line was let to the contractors for the first half, without open competition, accounts, no doubt, for the largely increased cost. We were told in the first place that this would cost $450,000, but now we are told that it will cost $1,450,000, and it is due to the people of Prince Edward Island that they should have some explanation as to where the difference went.

Mr. REID (Grenville). We find now that the total amount to be spent on this bridge will be $2,610,000, although we were originally told that it would cost only $1,009,000. There must be something awfully wrong when any engineer could make an estimate three times less than the work would cost. If the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) were engaging in some work of this kind on his own account, and his engineer gave him such an estimate, I do not think he would keep that engineer long in his employment. I think this item should be allowed to stand until we get at the bottom of it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But we want to build the road. Give us the bridge and we will give you the information afterwards.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. gentleman will not give us the information first.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Of course I will, we have to get the bridge any how.

Mr. REID (Grenville). We are only too glad to build necessary bridges and railways in Prince Edward Island, and while we are willing to give the contractors a fair profit, we don't want to make two or three millionaires out of a work like this. We realize the embarrassing position of the Minister of Finance in regard to these estimates, but at the same time there must be an explanation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will have to get another vote next year.

Mr. REID (Grenville). You will ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Most certainly. The hon. gentleman is mixing up the cost of the bridge with the appropriation of the present year.

Mr. BLAIN. When this item was first brought before the House, the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) made this statement :

> The construction of this work includes a bridge and the building of some 44 miles of railway, and the estimated cost of the railway and all permanent works in connection with it will cost $470,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is certainly a misunderstanding somewhere. I am justified in saying that no engineer of the department ever estimated the total work at $470,000. It is not possible the minister could have been correctly reported, or else, he was only referring to some portion of the work. Nobody ever supposed

from the beginning that it could be done for $470,000.

Mr. BLAIN. I find that the Minister of Railways further said that the cost of the railway line was estimated at $470,000, and that in addition to that, the estimated cost of the bridge would be in the neighbourhood of $800,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The previous statement was supposed to have covered the whole cost, but we now find in the same sentence, that the bridge would cost over $800,000, and that the $470,000 was for the railway only.

Mr. BLAIN. What we complain of is that we have these varied estimates all through this appropriation, when it is being spoken of from year to year. When a bridge is to be built, I think the minister should be prepared to give us a reasonably close estimate of the total cost of the work. It is somewhat surprising to find the minister estimating a work at a certain amount, and afterwards to find it costing about three times that amount. Does the government of Prince Edward Island pay anything towards this work when it is completed ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It pays between $9,000 and $10,000 per annum forever.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I think it would be well for the minister to inform the House of the reason of all these discrepancies. It will certainly cause the electors of the Dominion to look with suspicion on the government undertaking the construction of a transcontinental line of railway to find a work of this kind costing three times the estimated cost.

To increase accommodation at Charlottetown (revote, $24,800), $87,000.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What work does this vote contemplate?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are proposing to have a new station with covered platform, additional freight shed accommodation, additional land required for the purpose, re-arrangement of the yard, additional siding room, additional wharf accommodation, with dredging, and the usual allowance for engineering, inspection and advertising. The largest item is the new station and platform, $55,000 ; the next, the rearrangement of the yard, $11,000.

Mr. BARKER. What is the percentage for inspecting and advertising ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A little less than 5 per cent.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What is the station to be constructed of ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Brick.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Has the contract been let for this yet ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Is it proposed to call for tenders at once.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As soon as we can make the necessary arrangements. There is a good deal to be done, and the season is far advanced. We will expedite it as much as possible.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I wish to call attention to the need of additional wharf accommodation. It is impossible at present to get to the railway station without crossing the town, as the railway only extends to the railway wharf, and the private docks are scattered all the way along the water front beyond that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The matter has been under consideration to some extent; but we think that with these improvements which we are making at Charlottetown this year, the people of that good city will be well content.

Mr. LEFURGEY. In other words, the hon. minister does not contemplate giving them any relief for their docks along the water front ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We do not contemplate the water front extension at present.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would like to call the hon. minister's attention very seriously to this matter, which has been a long-felt want to the people of Charlottetown. It would certainly facilitate their business and give the merchants and shippers an opportunity of utilizing the private docks.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It is certainly very unfortunate that the members on the Liberal side of the House are not here to try to obtain justice for Prince Edward Island, but the work is left to the members of the opposition. I would like to ask the hon. minister if this station is to be built by contract, if the tenders will be advertised in the papers, and if the lowest tender will receive the contract?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

New station at Alberton, $3,000.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Has the contract for this been let ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, nothing done yet.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Will this be proceeded with at once ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will do our best with all these works; but it takes a little time to get them going.

To provide for a survey to Montague bridge, $2,000.

Mr. LEFURGEY. There was an item in the first estimates for a station at Richmond and Northam. I would like to ask

the minister if this station is going to be proceeded with at once, and if it is going to be made a booking station ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I can only repeat the remark I made before concerning all these work, that we will do our best to have them constructed rapidly. It is not contemplated to have a booking station.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I called the attention of the minister last year to the need of a station at Kinkora, and he promised to put in an item for a station there, but I believe it is not contemplated to make it a booking station. It is a point on the railway between Emerald, on the main line, and Cape Traverse, or about midway on the branch line. They only have one train a day. That train leaves Cape Traverse at six a.m., and shippers, in order to get their goods on board, must be at the station at seven in the morning. The train connects with a train on the main line coming from Emerald at any time between twelve and two in the morning, and people receiving freight have to stand out without any shelter, and have no opportunity of getting their goods unless they stay there nearly all night. Often they cannot get their goods until they go to Emerald and make payment there, and the goods are sometimes two or three days late. This section of country, which is quite extensive, is without communication by telephone or telegraph, and the establishment of a booking station at Kinkora would be of immense advantage.

To straighten line at Blueshank, $4,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This will complete.

Station and land at Albany, $600.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This will complete.

To compensate the following municipalities for loss sustained in consequence of the amalgamation of the Canada Central Railway Company with the Brockville and Ottawa Railway Company, and also owing to a change in the route of the Canada Central Railway :—

Renfrew	$22,500
Horton	5,625
Admaston	3,750
Total	$31,875

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These municipalities claimed that by changes made by legislation in this House their interests suffered and that they were entitled to be compensated. Some municipalities were compensated in previous years but others were not, and this is to carry out what seems to have been the acknowledged policy of the day.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). This is in virtue of bonuses given by these municipalities to this Canada Central, and I am very glad that the hon. minister has established a precedent. Victoria county has given bonuses to the extent of from $350,000 to $400,000 for a system of railways and by legislation of this government, the competition which these bonuses produce was nullified and only one system of railway is now in control. I shall be pleased to ask the attention of the hon. minister to this, and I trust it is not too late—and we may prolong the session another week or two with new supplementary estimates coming down every day—for him to bring down a vote of $350,000 to recoup the municipalities of Victoria county for the sums they advanced to procure railway competition, which this House subsequently destroyed by legislation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We shall have to vote this amount without prejudice.

Mr. WRIGHT. As regards this vote I would say that originally the counties of Lanark and Renfrew gave $800,000 to construct a railway from Brockville to Pembroke. The railway got as far as Sand Point and went no further. In order that the road might be completed, the town of Renfrew gave $30,000, the township of Horton $6,500, and the township of Admaston $5,000 to the company. Then the road was completed. We had to give this in money as the company would not take our bond. This was in 1872. Finally in 1878, the Dominion Parliament passed an Act amalgamating the Brockville and Ottawa and Central Canada Railway Companies and reducing the stock. This legislation placed these municipalities in the same position as ordinary stockholders of the company, upon whose shares little over ten per cent had been paid ; and the stock held by them was by the said Act reduced so that the town of Renfrew lost the amount of $22,500 and the other municipalities in the same proportion, and we think that we should be recouped, as that loss was caused by adverse legislation.

Cornwall—to complete electrical equipment for operating lock-gates and workships, $56,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The contract is with Mr. M. P. Davis. He put the same equipment on the new locks and the work on the old was given him at the same rates.

Mr. REID (Grenville). According to the hon. gentleman's report, there were two locks into which this electrical power was put a year ago. What was the cost of those two locks ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot give information as to the cost of those locks.

Mr. REID (Grenville. What is the amount of the contract for lighting ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is not for lighting but for equipment.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. gentleman promised to bring down that information the last time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The contractor for this light is Mr. M. P. Davis. He is also the contractor for electrical power. The lighting contract was given in 1900 and is for twenty-one years. I shall lay the contract on the Table. There was a previous contract fixing the rates for this service and this is the supplementary contract dealing wth the number of lights. The rate is thirty cents per light per night.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Are they arc lights ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The annual payment on the basis of the present contract is $21,930.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Does that include running the lights in winter when the canals are not used ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is for every night they are used. I suppose that would include 365 days in the year.

Mr. REID (Grenville). But in the winter the canals are frozen up.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The contract calls for 250 lights during the season of navigation and 100 in winter. The nights of navigation are estimated at 244 and the winter at 121.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Will the hon. minister tell us what it cost to light the canal before the electric light was used ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was no general system. Nothing but oil lamps at the locks.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The canals were all lit up previous to this. There is something wrong in this payment of $21,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think there is anything wrong. The rate per light was fixed some years ago—in 1896, I think.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Does the hon. minister know of any other place in Canada where these lights are 30 cents per night ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The contract fixing the rate is one we are not particularly responsible for——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The lights are a good deal cheaper now.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are responsible for the number of the lights used, but not for the rates fixed.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There are more lights used, and that ought to make them cheaper. Is this contract for twenty-one years for $21,000 a year ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. So much per light per night, which would be about equivalent to that.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Would the hon. minister bring me down a memorandum before the further supplementary estimates come up as to the previous cost of lighting the Cornwall canal ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have already stated that I believe the only lighting was with oil lamps at the locks. But if the information is available I will bring the statement.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The superintendent passed the accounts. There is no question about the information being available. Is it the intention of the government to light up the Williamsburg canal between Morrisburg and Cardinal ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no present arrangement.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If the government undertake it, and will offer the same rate per night, I think they will have no difficulty in making a contract. But there is one thing about this lighting of the Cornwall canal. If the hon. gentleman would take a trip on the Grand Trunk at any time during the winter he would see the Cornwall canal lighted from end to end, even when it is covered with two feet of ice. I suppose we pay for these lights. There cannot possibly be use for 141 lights used on the canal during the winter time, and I defy the minister or anybody in his department to show any need for 141 lights in the winter.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. One hundred.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Well one hundred. There is no use for them. Every light must be paid for, and I would like to know why one hundred and forty lights are used.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. One hundred.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Well, one hundred lights.

Mr. TAYLOR. Are they used ?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Except to keep the canal lit up all winter.

Mr. PRINGLE. I think the lights are quite properly used in the winter months. It is only right that we should understand the subject thoroughly. The Cornwall canal is twelve miles in length. We have large locks and water-power supplying the Canadian Coloured Cotton Mills Company, the Cornwall Woollen Manufacturing Company, one or two very large grist mills, and other plants on that canal. I think it could be shown that these lights are necessary during the winter months in order to enable those in charge to regulate the water supply. I agree that there is no use for lights apart from the locks, but there are a large number of locks on the canal. There are not less than three in the town of Cornwall, and these have to have lights during the

winter and summer. West of these you have other locks, until you come to the guard lock. As to the contract, I do not know anything about the price. I understand that when the contract was entered into the price was reasonable, and was not higher than was charged in Montreal and other places for lights of a similar description. I know that the lighting of the canal has been an immense improvement to navigation. I think the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) was perfectly right in bringing this matter to the attention of the committee and bringing out the information he has done. But I think I am justified in saying that the light is a great improvement and that the government would be well advised to put the same class of lights on all our canals. Only the other day, I happened to be on the Cornwall canal. I got on one of the Wolvin steamers passing through to see how they would get through the locks under the present system. These steamers are so large that they leave only a few inches on either side going through those locks. I found the locks worked by electric power and worked easily and expeditiously.

In regard to the power, I think the government made a mistake in not putting in a complete new system instead of applying power to the old locks which were in the canal. If they had put in a system similar to that which they have now in the Soulanges canal it would have been a great improvement. But dealing with this item before us, for the expenditure of $56,000, I would like to know how much of that is for workshops and what is the necessity for these workshops. How much is for the improvement of the electrical apparatus on the canal? While I am speaking on this matter, I would like to ask the acting minister if they have ever considered the advisability of having a lock immediately east of what is known as the Sheik's Island dam, in the river St. Lawrence. I understand from those who are engaged in navigation that a saving of an hour or two could be made by having a lock immediately east of the Sheik's Island dam, which would let vessels into the St. Lawrence river without going down through three locks to the eastern end of the canal; and it would also permit all vessels to come up and enter the canal just at the foot of the dam and go through the Cornwall canal in a very short space of time. Vessel owners have told me that it would be an immense saving if that lock were put in, not only a saving of expense, but a great saving of time in passing through the canal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The matter has not been presented to me, but I am informed a proposal of that character was made some years ago, but up to the present time it has not been deemed expedient to undertake the work.

Mr. WRIGHT. I may say with reference to the price of electric light, that we are engaged in that business in the town of Renfrew, and we charge 25 cents a light where they run to midnight, and 30 cents where they run all day and night—an arc light of 2,000 candle power.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I think the government should pay for all the lights they use in the winter. Will the minister tell me where these hundred lights are situated? I do not believe there are a hundred lights used on the Cornwall canal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the exact points at which they are used. A portion of the canal lies alongside the public highway, and that would require lighting.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The public highway is entirely separate from the canal, and it was never lighted up before. These lights are away on the other side of the canal and have nothing to do with the main road. There cannot possibly be a hundred lights used on these locks.

Mr. COCHRANE. It appears to me absurd that we should pay for lights along the canal if they are not necessary. If it is necessary, light a lock where there is a water-power, that is all right. But the minister must see that we should not be called upon to light the highway. I have travelled highways in our section of the country without any other light than the light of my countenance. I do not see why we should be required to pay for these lights unless they are used where water-power is developed.

Mr. PRINGLE. Perhaps I may be able to throw a little further light on the subject. Every one of these locks requires lights during winter and summer.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Why?

Mr. PRINGLE. Because there is a constant change in the flow of the water occasioned by the usage of that water by the different manufacturing establishments. The water has got to be let from one level to another level of the canal. There are at several locks what is called a by-wash or sluice-way, and that has got to be regulated. Apart from that we have a bridge about the centre of the town which crosses the canal, and which requires to be lighted. The bridge leads to a number of manufacturing establishments. Then in the eastern portion of the town we have what we call a small canal. It is a large sluiceway which furnishes power for different mills. That also requires to be lighted both summer and winter. I do not know how many lights there are, but it does seem to to me that a hundred lights is not an unreasonable number to be used in the winter months.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It is strange that on other canals where the levels are being lowered and raised, lights are not required.

The lock-master is the only man in charge. He simply watches the water in the evening. He goes with his lantern and the level is there to be seen. But all the lights are kept going during the winter along this canal from Mille Roches to Dickenson's landing. The hon. minister has stated that this is for the purpose of lighting up the road, but the road is on one side of the canal and the lights are on the other. That is really an excuse, and it is an absurd one, as my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) says. Is it the intention of the government to continue the lighting up of this road, or is it the intention to keep these lights simply where they are really required ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will have to look into the matter. I could not give the hon. gentleman the information now.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria. Is it an ordinary operation to make a twenty-one year contract for any such thing as this ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There have been such cases.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is there anything in the contract whereby it may be cancelled ?

Mr. TAYLOR. If I understand this matter correctly some years ago under the reign of the late government as it was the policy of the government to do all they could to aid navigation, the then Minister of Railways and Canals entered into this contract for lighting.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Not this contract at all.

Mr. TAYLOR. He made a contract with Mr. Davis for lighting the Cornwall canal. The number of lights were not specified. I have travelled through the canal before the lighting was commenced, and I have been on a vessel which had to lie in the canal all night. The canal is twelve miles long. On dark nights steamers had to lay to, but since the adoption of the system of lighting by electricity it is as clear as day from one end to the other. I think the late government deserves every credit for having inaugurated this system for the benefit of navigation. I do not know but what it was the intention of the late government to extend this system to all the canals but this canal, being twelve miles long, is quite different from any other canal on the St. Lawrence except the Lachine canal, and that has always been lighted. Passenger steamers going up on dark nights require to be lighted through. I understand that the late minister entered into a contract for the purpose of lighting this canal. The contract has been renewed and the number of lights specified, but the contract was originally made by the late government and I think they deserve praise for having inaugurated the system. I hope the present government will extend it to the other canals. All the marine men travelling the St. Lawrence are loud in their praise of the way in which these canals are lighted. I do not know whether it is necessary to have them lighted in winter time or not, but I should think that on a canal having as many water-powers as there are on this canal it would be absolutely necessary to have a certain number of lights kept going.

Mr. GALLERY. I understood my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) to state that the Lachine canal is not lighted. I would inform him that the Lachine canal is lighted.

Mr. TAYLOR. I said that the Lachine canal was lighted.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Will the hon. gentleman tell us who has the contract for lighting the Lachine canal ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Canadian General Electric Company.

Mr. REID (Grenville). How much do you pay per annum for lighting the Lachine canal ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The contract is for the supply of the machinery and the government provide the light themselves.

Mr. REID (Grenville). They furnish the dynamos ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The contract is for the equipment.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What is the consideration of the contract with the Canadian General Electric Company ? I asked the hon. minister to get that information.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I gathered a lot of information in answer to questions but I do not find that one, and I do not remember that my hon. friend asked it. I will have to bring the information down at a later day.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Would the hon. minister tell us how many lights there are on the Lachine canal and how many on the Cornwall ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, I have no vote for the Lachine canal and I have therefore no information about the lighting of that canal.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Does the hon. minister state that 250 lights are used during the summer on the Cornwall canal ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is what the contract provides for.

Mr. REID (Grenville). And 100 during the winter ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). And it figures out to $21,000 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is it the intention of the hon. minister to keep the lights going in winter where they are not required ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the general tendency of the discussion is that they are required.

Galops canal—enlargement, $125,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to pay the final estimate of Messrs. Larkin & Sangster on their contract for the Iroquois section. The work is completed.

Mr. REID (Grenville). How much has been voted this session for this canal ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was in the main estimates for the Galops canal an item of $128,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Does that include the Iroquois canal ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. That item we have now is for the Iroquois canal.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There have been items voted for the Cardinal section. Does this finish the whole work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, I am advised that the estimates of the current year are expected to cover the whole expense.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I asked the hon minister to make inquiries about the employees of this canal. The work is finished as far as they are concerned and I know for a fact that some of these men are working in some other positions and yet they are being paid by the government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did have the information on that point, but I cannot find it for the moment.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Of course, the engineer and his assistants have to be employed to make the final estimates ; but there are a large number of men there who are drawing their salaries, and some of them are doing other work. The work is finished, and if you want to keep them on for charity's sake, I can understand it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Does the hon. gentleman refer to the engineering staff ?

Mr. REID (Grenville). There is an engineer in charge and he has one or two assistants to prepare the final estimates, but in addition to that there are probably a dozen men who would be employed when the work was in progress in measuring the material excavated, or inspecting stone, but they have nothing to do now. The work was completed a year ago. They are paid from $60 to $85 a month, and they are simply drawing their salaries, although some of them are filling other positions. Is that fair ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It certainly is not right, and I shall get information about it promptly.

To complete north channel (revote), $20,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Does that complete the work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. I wish to amend that item by adding the words, 'And dam between Galops and Adams islands.'

Mr. REID (Grenville). Will this complete the Cleveland work on the north channel ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, that is the report of the engineer.

Mr. REID (Grenville). And the dam, too ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, we are so advised.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I wish the minister would state now that he would abandon that other Galops work until next season.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot say that.

Installing electrical appliances for operating gates, weirs and bridges (revote), Lachine canal, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The total expenditure on the electrical installation when completed will be $105,000. The amount already expended up to the first of July was $89,235.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The government will then own the whole lighting plant other than the power ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What does it cost to furnish the power ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We use our own power.

Mr. REID (Grenville). You also own the electric light system of the Soulanges canal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We own the apparatus.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Why do you not do the same on the Cornwall canal ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Because we found a contract made many years ago by the late government giving the work to Mr. Davis.

Lachine canal, lock gate protection, $11,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to provide a protective device invented by Mr. E. A. Manny for protecting the lock gates against collision by vessels. The appliance was tested on the Beauharnois canal last year, and was found to be satisfactory. It is now proposed to apply it to the Lachine canal. There are ten locks at $900 each; cost of installation, $2,000 ; making in all $11,000.

To pay Geo. Goodwin for work in sections 4, 5, 6 and 7, Soulanges, $55,717.80.

To pay Geo. Goodwin interest at 5 per cent, $18,108.28.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is this ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The claim of Mr. Goodwin was delayed in payment for some considerable time, and ultimately he obtained a judgment, and this is to pay it.

Mr. BLAIN. Did this gentleman have a suit over this matter ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. As far as my recollection goes, this is an amount that was due to Mr. Goodwin as a balance on a contract entered into and executed previous to 1896. He took an action against the government for a portion of his claim, and it was resisted. The result was that judgment was obtained in his favour and he was paid. This item was deferred until such time as judgment was rendered in the case of Stewart, the payment of this amount being contingent on the settlement of the question that was raised in the Stewart case. After judgment was rendered in the Stewart case, the Department of Justice decided that this amount should be paid.

Mr. GOURLEY. Did the court allow interest in Stewart's case ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The practice now is, when a judgment is rendered in the Exchequer Court, to allow interest. We have strenuously contended at all times that the crown is not liable for interest; but the practice has been to allow interest, not owing to a judgment, but to the intimation given by the court that it was proper for the crown to pay interest; and since that time interest has been paid.

Mr. GOURLEY. Was interest paid from the time the suit was instituted, or from the time of the breach of the contract ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. From December 31, 1896, the date of the estimate, to June 30, 1903.

Murray canal—to purchase house from W. H. Johnson, $750.

Mr. COCHRANE. I want to draw the minister's attention to this item, which I think is worthy of his serious consideration. I would like to ask him how the department arrived at that amount. I speak feelingly in regard to this matter, because it was one of the most cruel things that any government could have done to an official on the canal, and it requires the minister's sympathetic consideration. There were two gentlemen on this canal, who built houses on the canal with the consent of the previous government, and with the understanding that they should be allowed the same rent if they built the houses as they paid when their houses were rented. When this government came into power, they turned these men off the canal, although there was no accusation or complaint against them of any kind, political or otherwise. This man Johnson got a position on the canal because he was delicate. He had a piece of land, but he was so delicate that he could not make a living from it; and he sold the land and put the proceeds into this house. There was another case, that of a man named Goodrich, who also built a house on the canal. He was removed out of his own house and placed on a bridge and another man was put into his house. This man, although he was allowed $5 a month for rent, only paid the owner $3 a month. Mr. Goodrich remained on the bridge for one year until the local election was over. He was told that if he would vote for the Liberal candidate—there is no hearsay about this, for I heard it from the gentleman's own mouth—he would be retained on the canal. But after he had sold his birthright, and after the election, he was turned off too, and was treated in a most cruel manner. The government said they would purchase the house for what it was worth, and he obtained an estimate of its value from a contractor in that part of the country; but Mr. Goodrich was refused the amount that gentleman decided he should have for the house. The matter was dilly-dallied along until last summer, he took $300 or $400 less than he should have got for it. This house has been kept in first-class repair, and could not be built for double the amount of money the owner was paid. That man should have the full value of that house. I think the minister will see that it is his duty to see that he is paid the full value of that house, because he was allowed to put it up on the understanding that I have stated. I want to ask the minister if he got the information in reference to the superintendent of that canal and the salary he receives ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I obtained the information, but I cannot find it at the moment. I will give it to the hon. gentleman later.

Mr. COCHRANE. I gave the minister notice, so that he could be prepared to give some reason why the superintendent was teated in such a partial manner. The old superintendent was turned off, and a gentleman was appointed whom I knew very well. I have nothing to say against him, only he is a cheese-maker, and does not know anything about the canal. There was a W. Bensley appointed superintendent of that canal from the back part of the riding. He gets a liberal salary, $1,000 a year, and he has $5 a month for house rent and $5 a month for office rent. Perhaps the minister does not know what the salaries are, but I think I am safe in saying that there is not a high school teacher in the riding who gets an equal salary. I see that Mr. Bensley went twice to Cornwall and charged $5.50 a trip. He went down to the canal, 255 trips, for which he charged $1.50 a trip. Why should we pay a man $1,000 a year and give him besides $5 per month for house

rent and his travelling expenses from Brighton ? He went three trips to Trenton, which is just at the eastern end of the Murray canal, and charged $3.50 per trip. Then he went six other trips to Trenton for which he got $2 per trip. Then he went down to Morrisburg nine times, and charged $8.25 per trip. He got $12 for postage, and for sundry expenses $7.75, amounting in all to $441 besides his salary. I am satisfied that that canal is not open the number of days he charged and that there is a fraud perpetrated all along, not only in connection with the superintendent, but with other gentlemen as well. We have 408 hours charged for Sabbath work. That work was never done. This water-way is between two inland waters, and is not used for anything other than pleasure trips in fine weather. Steamboats go through it on pleasure excursions. It was never intended to be used for navigation until the rough season in the fall, when vessels come to Presqu'ile harbour and take this inland water down to Kingston. We have also a charge for marine caps, five at $2.50 and four at $2. Why should these gentlemen be given marine caps and why should we pay for these caps ? I am satisfied that not half a dozen vessels went through that canal this summer on a Sunday. I trust that the hon. minister will investigate these matters, and also that he will see the justice of allowing Mr. Johnson a fair amount for his house, more especially as Mr. Johnson was dismissed from the canal without rhyme or reason. There was no accusation against him of having taken part in politics. But on the bridge now there is one of the worst heelers in that riding. There was not a man more offensive, or who spent more time canvassing against me, than the bridge-tender on that bridge. Under the late government there never was an official turned out in that riding that I remember. The riding was represented alternately by Liberals and Conservatives, until I had the honour to be elected. Under Mr. Keeler or Mr. Bigger there never was a man dismissed. There were men there who had been appointed by the Mackenzie administration, and kept their positions until their death. In fact, there never was a man turned out until this government came into power, and they acted most inhumanly towards one man. Owing to infirmity in his limbs, he was unable to do any other work, and yet they dismissed him from the canal, and to-day he is almost dependent on his wife for his living. He was put on that work just because he was weakly, and could not earn his living in any other way. I am confident that Mr. Johnson's house could not be built for double the amount in the estimates.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not prepared to discuss the matter with the hon. gentleman; because I have not a knowledge of the facts. So far as the hon. gentleman's remarks go to show that certain officers of the government receive pay and do not render any service, that should be inquired into. I will have it inquired into ; and, as for the other portion of the hon. gentleman's address, I cannot answer it, not knowing the facts.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Will the hon. minister compel the man to pay back what he illegally obtained ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will find out.

Mr. COCHRANE. It does not depend on my saying so. It is all here in the Auditor General's Report, other than the value of the house, and what was paid for it.

Mr. TAYLOR. No superintendent of this canal is required. Yet, this man draws $1,615 for salary, rent and trips. This is all in the Auditor General's Report, and it is idle to take the people's money and have an investigation of what is already known. As I say, the canal does not require a superintendent. This officer has no duties except to draw his salary.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There is no objection on this side of the House to the item going through. But, as to the statement made by the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane), surely the government would not be unfair, but would give the man actually at least what this house cost. Could not the minister agree to have the actual cost of the property ascertained by satisfactory evidence, and would not the minister agree to recompense the man for his actual expenditure ? I do not think the people of this country want to take advantage of one in the position stated by the hon. member for East Northumberland. Could not the minister assure the hon. member that the amount will be paid if the owner will produce satisfactory evidence as to the cost of the property ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If we take the man's house, of course, we ought to pay a fair amount for it. The question is what is a fair valuation. Our information is that this is a frame house, 18 x 30, in good repair, and the officer who made the valuation put it at about $700 or $750.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Who is the officer ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Stewart.

Mr. REID (Grenville). He is superintendent. Of course, the minister will agree that Mr. Stewart has no experience to enable him to estimate the value of this property. The government should have a valuation made by Mr. George Pope. He valued all the properties in our vicinity and settled with the people for the properties taken over by the government. Will the hon. minister

allow Mr. Pope to place a fair valuation on this property ? Even if it means that a little more has to be paid, it cannot amount to much. I am satisfied that Mr. Stewart is not at all qualified. As I mentioned the other night, when he was given this important position, one of the most important positions on the river, a position the occupant of which should know the marine interest thoroughly, he was a school teacher in Glengarry. I do not believe he ever saw a canal before he was placed in this important position—he was the financial agent —I will put it mildly—of the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Schell).

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no reason to doubt the correctness of the valuation made by Mr. Stewart. If he was a school teacher that is evidence of intelligence, and if he was financial agent for the hon. member for Glegarry, that is further evidence of intelligence. Of course, as I say, we should pay a fair value for the house. I will not say that I will make arrangements for a valuator, but I will have inquiry made, and, if the value is not a fair and reasonable one we can have another vote at a future session. But we can only pay what is put down here.

Mr. COCHRANE. Let the hon. minister go to any contractor or builder whose opinion on such subjects is worth having. The hon. gentleman has not stated the size of the house. A part of it may be 18 x 30, but the house is built in the shape of an L. And I will venture my reputation that no contractor will undertake to build such a house for double the amount of money that this is valued at. But, is there no consideration outside of that ? When this poor delicate man was turned off that canal, without any charge against him, he was compelled to walk from this house and to go to Trenton, where he has work which does not call for great physical exertion. Is there not reason for a good liberal allowance ? One thousand dollars for the house would be $500 less than it could be built for. It would be a shame to have this man's house taken away from him for $750.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is it built on government land ?

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes, on the canal reserve. When the man was appointed on the canal he supposed, of course, that he would be allowed to remain in the position so long as he behaved himself. I think it is the duty of the minister to see that this man is not harassed as Mr. Goderich was harassed in collecting his rents. Does the minister think it is right to pay the superintendent a dollar and a half every time he goes down to that canal, when he gets a salary of $1,000 a year ? Why should we pay him for travelling from Brighton ? If he wants to live in an aristocratic style in the village of Brighton, let him go there and attend to his business at his own expense. That man is getting more than he could earn in any other position that he is qualified to fill. He wants to live in Brighton, and he wants the electors of this country to pay him for living there, and then pay him for driving down to the canal to attend to his business. He does not want an office on the canal any more than I do. What has he to do with an office down there, for which you are to pay $5 a month rent, besides $5 a month for house rent, and then give him $1.50 a day to drive down from Brighton to his business on the canal, and $5 or $6 for every trip when he goes around the country ? Why did the government want to send him down to Cornwall and Trenton ?

Mr. REID (Grenville). At the last debate on these estimates the minister promised to bring down a return of the amount the canal tolls would have yielded if they had been collected at Cardinal from the 1st of May last up to the present month.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The deputy informs me that he has not got the information, but I will bring it down.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to find out, because this gentleman's duties are simply to drive up to his office once a month and draw a salary. I do not think that he ever keeps any return. It is absurd to keep this man in that position. I hope the acting minister, if he continues to occupy that position for some time, will look into that matter thoroughly.

Welland canal—to deepen portions of long level (or summit level), $50,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That matter was also mentioned in a previous discussion on the main estimates. The deepening already done has proved a great benefit to vessels using the canal. Dredging will have to be continued until all the shallow places are deepened. This work is necessitated by fluctuations in the level of the water in Lake Erie. It is to provide a 14-foot navigation at all stages of low water in Lake Erie. The total estimated cost of the work is $400,000. It will be completed in the next fiscal year.

To complete rock cut, Port Colborne to Humberston, $20,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to continue the blasting and dredging in the rock cut. The deepening is necessary for the purpose already explained. The work is under contract to Messrs. Hogan and Macdonald. Total estimated cost, $85,000.

To provide electric lighting plant, $45,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is for lighting the Welland canal. The total cost will be $100,000. In the main estimate we had $55,000, and we are asking for $45,000 more.

To lower mitre sills of guard-gate, $11,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Is that work under con-contract?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not yet. It will be let by contract and public tender.

To provide elevator foundations at Port Colborne, $40,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a work the necessity of which I am sure everybody will recognize. The operations at Port Colborne are now advancing, and we are looking forward to the necessity for an immediate construction of elevators so that the trade which is now going to Buffalo may be diverted to that place. As the committee is aware, two elevators have been constructed at the entrance to the canal. While for ordinary purposes they are sufficient, the foundations are not sufficient. This is a proposal to make the foundations upon which to construct elevators. It is contemplated that these piers will be leased to the transportation companies, under conditions which will properly protect public interests, and they will themselves erect the elevators. The work will be done by tender.

Williamsburg canals—to provide a gate-lifter, $10,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There is a gate-lifter there now.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, there is no gate-lifter on these canals now. There is one at Cornwall, but there is none on the Williamsburg canal, and never was one.

Mr. REID (Grenvillle). That is news to me, because I know there has been one there all the time, and it has always been used.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is stated here positively that there is no gate-lifter on these canals. It is the Cornwall lifter just moved up.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I know there is one there and always has been one there, entirely separate from the Cornwall gate-lifter. I want to know what has become of that gate-lifter ? There is what is called a buoy boat, which is used for lifting these gates, taking them up and putting them in. The steamer 'Scout' was intended to be used as a gate-lifter. It is now in the possession of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman says there is a gate-lifter, the deputy minister says positively that it is an error. The gate-lifter for Cornwall is the only one which, to the knowledge of the department, has been there.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The Williamsburg canals always were operated separately from the Cornwall canal. There was a working scow and there was a buoy boat with what is called a gin for lifting gates and putting them in place. For twenty years the former buoy boat and the present one were in charge of Robert Armstrong. He had his crew living on the boat. I have seen this buoy boat there for years. I have seen it lift up gates and put gates in, and I know this gate-lifter was built specially for this purpose. I know exactly what I am talking about. I have lived at Cardinal for twenty-five years and I have seen this gate-lifter moored at Cardinal every night unless it was taken away to put a gate in or lift one out.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In view of the hon. gentleman's statement the item might stand because it is a positive statement on his own personal knowledge.

Item allowed to stand.

Williamsburg canal — to build overseer's house, $3,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If a house costing $750 on the Murray canal is sufficient, this house costing $3,000, is rather luxurious.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is for a man of somewhat different rank. This is to build a brick house 30 by 40 feet, two stories high. We will let it stand as I have not the information.

Mr. REID (Grenville). As I may not be here when this item comes up again I would ask the hon. minister where this house is to be built ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not sufficient information about it. I want the item to stand.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. acting minister will know that there is a nice brick house on the canal at Cardinal that was taken by the government when it expropriated the property for the canal. This house is nicely situated, and in the right place for an overseer's house. I would like to know if that could not be used instead of building another house ? Is this item to stand ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Stands.

Item allowed to stand.

Farran's Point—enlargment (revote), $6,700.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is the balance due to the Canadian Construction Company.

Rideau canal—to provide for a swing bridge over canal on line of Concession street, Ottawa, $8,500.

Mr. TAYLOR. This is in the city ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will you let the work by contract ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It will be done by contract.

Murray canal—to provide for a wire fencing and land plan, $3,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Explain that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This canal was not fenced when it was built. People have been complaining of the absence of fences, and this vote is to provide for fences, and to provide for the engineer's time spent in making a plan of the land.

Mr. TAYLOR. How long is the canal ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Five miles.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is $600 a mile for fencing ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The work is to be done by the staff. Nothing is yet expended.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the farmers had to put up fences at such a cost as this they would not put up many.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Who furnishes the estimate—the superintendent of the canal ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. COCHRANE. Would the hon. minister give us any information as to what style of fence it is going to be ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. The report says wire fencing, but it does not give any further particulars.

Mr. COCHRANE. Of course the superintendent of the canal may not know any more about wire fencing than the rest of us. If it is necessary to have along the canal as expensive a fence as some farmers put up where they want to keep pigs from getting through, a very close wire fence, I do not think the estimate is too high. I know some residents about there were complaining because the property was not fenced. I sent a letter myself to the hon. minister regarding the fencing of the canal.

Chambly canal—to macadamize two and a quarter miles of road, providing the municipality undertakes to maintain it afterwards, $3,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the main estimates there was an item that was held over, and I desire that we should strike it out and that this one should be substituted for it, I therefore move :

That item No. 103 in the main estimates, 'Macadamizing tow path, $6,000,' be struck out.

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Now we have the item :

To macadamize two and a quarter miles of road, providing the municipality undertakes to maintain it afterwards, $3,000.

This road is almost impassable during wet weather. During the construction of the canal, the earth was removed from the site of the road and used in building the tow path, with the result that in some parts there is often a foot or two of water on the road. The highway is on government property.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is the minister utilizing cement in building culverts ? I think the department has found that cement is much cheaper than ordinary stone.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes ; we are using concrete.

Mr. WILSON. Does the government maintain all the bridges over the canals ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The general rule is that the government keep up the highway bridges over the canals.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I understand the rules to be, that if the bridge is over a river which had been navigated before the canal was built, the municipality has to maintain the bridge, and if not the government maintain it. In my own county the municipality of Fenelon has to maintain an enormous bridge.

Mr. WILSON. I know that on our own river we have to maintain a swing bridge.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the case of a canal the government creates the water-way and disturbs the natural condition, and I think there is much to be said in favour of the government maintaining the bridge.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am delighted to hear that, because it will be very handy in Victoria county.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Again I speak without prejudice, but that is the rule.

Mr. WILSON. I asked this question some years ago, and the Minister of Finance was not quite so clear.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). At Kirkfield the government built and maintain the swings, and the government maintains the swing on the Rosedale bridge, but the rest of the bridge which was there before the canal was constructed, has to be maintained by the municipality. The Bobcaygeon bridge is maintained by the government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That was there before the canal was constructed, and the construction of the canal imposed no obligation upon the municipality.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That is the very principle I laid down.

Lake St. Francis—to complete dam, $2,200.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The dyke extends a distance of three miles along the shore of Lake St. Francis, and it is intended to prevent the flooding of lands.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Are the floods caused by government work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes ; the water of the lake was raised by government work.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I cannot understand that. Lake St. Francis is a natural extension of the River St. Lawrence ; it is not a canal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The government work created the danger of flooding the neighbouring lands.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Were there any claims for damages ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to prevent claims for damages.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The Beauharnois canal has been built for many years.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This work was begun years ago.

Mr. LOY. In explanation of this item, I may say that after the Beauharnois canal was built, it was found that the water at the entrance of the canal was not as deep for navigation as before the canal was built. They found afterwards that they were obliged to build a dam between what is known as the Grand Isle on the mainland, which had the effect of raising the water about four feet. This caused the flooding of the dam, and this dyke is built along the south shore of the St. Lawrence in order to protect the land on that side and prevent the water overflowing the land.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Did the farmers never apply for damages ?

Mr. LOY. I think they were paid some damages. However, it has taken away the natural drainage of the land.

Mr. WILSON. How much of a dyke is there now, and how far does it extend ?

Mr. LOY. I think this will likely complete it. It is nine or ten miles long altogether.

Mr. WILSON. Is any portion of this for repairs, or is it all for extension ?

Mr. LOY. I presume it is all for extension.

Lachine canal—to complete work of paving Mill street, $33,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mill street, Montreal, is a part of the canal property, but has been used as a public street. It is owned by the government, and there have been negotiations respecting the transfer of this street to the city. The government are not prepared to give the city an absolute transfer of the property. We propose to give them a lease during pleasure. The city say that under these conditions it should be put in good condition before they take it over, after which they agree to maintain it in good order.

Soulanges canal—to repair breach in bank between locks 1 and 2, $15,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will this be done by contract or by government supervision ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The work is now being done. It had to be done on a rush, and is being done by day labour.

Williamsburg canals—to build a working scow, $2,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There has always been a scow for the repairs on these canals, and the total amount that used to be spent every year was $8,000, which included keeping the scow. Now the annual vote is $14,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is only a small scow there now of 18 feet by 55 feet. It is too small for the work. This is for a new and larger one, 70 feet long, which will be equipped with a steam hoist and derrick.

St. Ours canal—to complete landing wharfs, $4,400.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Has the minister's attention been drawn to the fact that the state of New York is spending some $13,000,000 in improving what they call the Champlain canal leading up to Lake Champlain and on down by Fort George ? I do not know whether there is any danger of it lowering the level of the water of Lake Champlain so that it will flow down the Hudson river the same as Lake Michigan now flows down the Illinois. There is no harm in the department taking it up. I believe the enlargement and betterment of the American canal would aid the St. Lawrence.

To provide for expenses in connection with investigations into railway accidents in Canada, $10,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is it intended to appoint a permanent officer ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I question whether I should press this item now or leave it to be dealt with by the Railway Commission. It is desirable that a permanent officer should be appointed, for we find it difficult to get a capable man to undertake the work when we need one. In the case of an accident recently, we applied to the gentleman who had previously performed similar work, but he was not able to attend. This work will come under the control of the Railway Commission, and more than one man may have to be employed. He will require to be a railway official of good standing.

Mr. FOWLER. I quite agree on the necessity of such an appointment. The investigations, so far as they have come under my attention, have been perfect farces. Take the investigation into the Belmont disaster, in which five or six people were killed, the inquiry was perfectly ridiculous. It is very necessary to have some competent man make a complete investigation and fix the blame on the persons really responsible.

To pay salaries and expenses in connection with the railway commission of Canada, in addition to statutory provisions, $40,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Have the commissioners been appointed ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. How many will compose the staff, what will be their salaries, and who is likely to be appointed chairman ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid my hon. friend is too curious. No appointments have yet been made. It would be necessary to have a capable staff, and we have not yet worked out a plan as to how many officials will be required. The ex-Minister of Railways said he thought not less than $100,000 would cover the cost, but we are asking less as we do not want to begin too liberally.

Mr. WILSON. Is the salary of the secretary fixed ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it is fixed by statute at $4,000.

To pay to the widow of the late W. P. Brown, a gratuity equal to two months' salary, $140.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I have no objection to the widow being compensated, but there must be other widows who have an equal claim on the Intercolonial, and I want all to be treated alike.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is quite a number of votes to be found in the estimates for others.

Farran's Point—to equip with an acetylene gas plant, $4,050.

Mr. BLAIN. Is this a new plant ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, it is to light the canal. This is the total estimated cost, and the work will be let by contract.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In the old country harbours, they have gas buoys and acetylene gas plants to light up the channels, and it would be a good idea to have the St. Lawrence lighted all through.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is being lighted by gas buoys.

Compensation to George Heath for clothing destroyed, $15 ; medical attendance, $15, and time lost in connection with injuries received in discharge of his duties as lockman, from May 25 to July 20, 1903, 56 days at $1.50—$84, $114.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This man was injured while on duty.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to me you are treating this man much better than the victims of the Belmont disaster. These men not only had their clothing destroyed, but were seriously injured. I pointed out the case of one man a brakeman, who was laid up for eight months unable to work, and received neither pay nor compensation—was not even paid in full for that day because he did not make the full trip. I press upon the minister the desirability of giving these men some compensation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Was not the case covered to some extent by the insurance fund ?

Mr. FOWLER. To the extent of $3 a week. But the man had to pay for that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the government contribute $8,000 a year to that fund.

Mr. FOWLER. But the man himself would pay about $1.30 a month.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It may be argued that the insurance fund is not the best way to compensate. But, if you have the insurance it would hardly do to have other compensation beside.

Mr. FOWLER. But what the man gets is very little. Take a man with a wife and five or six children, as every man who is doing his duty to his country ought to have, and this is a very small amount for their support. There is nothing for it but the man must run in debt, and, in eight months he would accumulate debts which would be a burden upon him for years. He was injured through no fault of his own. I have no objection to paying this man Heath, but if he is paid, much more should the sufferers in this Belmont case be paid. The accident was due to the gross carelessness in the Truro yard. I state that, and I state also that the investigation held into the case was a pure farce. The pilot of the engine became loosened and fell off at Belmont, derailed the engine, the result being that the train was telescoped. This was the cause of the accident.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Is that not disputed ?

Mr. FOWLER. It may be disputed as many truths are. The engine was supposed to be examined at Truro, where the engines are changed. But the pilot was defective before it went out of the engine shed, or it became defective before it went on its journey. That must be absolutely clear to any man. There were, I believe, seven people killed in that accident, and this man to whom I refer was severly injured. The accident arose from some cause to which he did not contribute and over which he had no control. He is a far more deserving case for compensation than this we are now discussing. I hope the hon. minister will not merely give a formal promise but will actually look into the matter and see to it that this man is compensated.

Carillon and Grenville canal—to pay Henry Tucker services as commissioner re charges against Superintendent Simpson in February, March and April, 1898, $600.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why was this not paid in 1898 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He thought we were not paying him enough and refused our previous offer.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Who is Mr. Henry Tucker ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He was a commissioner appointed to investigate.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What is his business, is he a labourer or a lawyer ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A lawyer.

Mr. FOWLER. What was Mr. Simpson charged with ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Political partisanship.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). And found guilty ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No—a Scotch verdict.

Mr. FOWLER. He must have been an honest commissioner.

Lachine canal—to pay a gratuity equal to two months' salary to the family of the late Mr. Edward Guilbault, paymaster Quebec canals, $216.66.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In connection with this item, would the minister say if the widows of the men who were killed in the railway accident at Belmont have been given a gratuity ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, all claims in connection with the Belmont accident are still under consideration.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I trust the minister will see that not only the relatives of the men in high positions are compensated, but that also the widows of every employee, every labouring man, who was injured shall also be compensated.

Canals generally—to provide for an increase of 25 cents per diem to the wages of lockmasters, lockmen, bridgemen and ferrymen of the various canals, $37,000.

Mr. GALLERY. Are the motormen on the various bridges included among the recipients of this increase ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If they are now receiving less than $1.50 per day, they will be increased to $1.50. This applies to all canals except the Welland and the Sault Ste. Marie canals, the men on which had previously received an advance.

Mr. GALLERY. The motormen are labourers, and are entitled to an increase to $1.50 a day.

Mr. WILSON. Would the minister tell us at what rate of wages per day these people are paid ? What is the maximum and minimum of their salaries ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This applies to men whose wages, as a rule, on these canals have been $1.25, and they will hereafter be $1.50, except on the two canals I have mentioned.

Mr. GALLERY. These men receive 12½ cents an hour, and work 12 hours a day. Would the minister say what he is going to do with the motormen ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If this does not provide for an increase to the motormen, we cannot give it to them under this item. We will have to take them into consideration separately.

Mr. GALLERY. The merchants and manufacturers in Montreal are not well pleased with the Wellington street bridge, commonly called the Curran bridge, and it is their intention later on to ask the government to put a tunnel there. If I am here next session the government may hear from me about it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I would direct the attention of the minister to the fact that the system of letting water in and out of locks is very tedious, speaking of the minor canals, and not of the main water-ways. It is very easy to adopt a much more expeditious mode of opening and shutting the gates than is now in force.

Some resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

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

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will continue Supply, various items that may be left on the Order paper. I understand there will be a motion made on going into Supply.

Mr. SPROULE. When will the railway resolutions be taken up ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would like to be able to give some time to them. I should think on Monday.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.05 a.m., Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, October 17, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

SUPPLY—FAST ATLANTIC SERVICE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair I want to bring to the attention of the House the question of establishing a fast Atlantic service, which has been before this country for a great many years past. I think no one of us is inclined to minimize the importance to the country of this service. Its importance has been recognized by both political parties for many years, and I believe—though I have not verified the record—that the resolution upon which the Bill was founded for the establishment of this service, and which gave to it an aid of $750,000 a year, so commended itself to the judgment of this House that there was no division taken upon it. That the service at the present time is not what the requirements of the age demand must be apparent to us all. It has been stated by members of the government, in reply to questions from this side of the House, that the greater part of the Canadian mail is sent to and from New York, for the simple reason that it can accomplish the journey via New York in about two-thirds of the time which it would take if sent by way of a Canadian port. The same is true as regards passengers, although to a lesser degree. We have had it stated by the Minister of Trade and Commerce during the present session that the average time which mails occupy in the journey from a Canadian port to a port in the United Kingdom is something like 9½, 10 or 11 days. I have under my hand a record of the length of time occupied in the voyage between Halifax and the motherland some forty years ago, and I have no doubt that the House and the country have perhaps forgotten what has been pointed out many times, that the average length of the voyage from Canada to England to-day is practically what it was forty years ago. I have a comparison between the logs of the Royal Mail steamship 'Asia' of nearly forty years ago and the length of the present day voyages. I shall take the liberty of reading to the House a statement taken from a public journal published in the city of Halifax, based upon a communication made by a gentleman who had gone to the pains of verifying the records, by examining the logs of these steamships of forty years ago. I may say that the journal to which I refer is non-partisan; it is a mercantile journal published in the city of Halifax, and, commenting on the letter addressed to it by this gentleman, it says:

> After showing that the 'Unicorn,' made her first voyage from Liverpool to Halifax,—away back in 1840,—in 16 days, which was even then complained of as three or four days longer than was expected, he proceeds to show how very little better the service is to-day. The 'Mongolian,' the first weekly boat to come here this season, took somewhat over eleven days to make the voyage! In other words she only developed about the same rate of speed that was expected of the 'Unicorn' in 1840.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

The statement made by this gentleman is:

> Let us pass on now a generation to 1866. Here is the log of the R. M. S. 'Asia' hence to Liverpool in that year, the year previous to confederation. Left Halifax 3 a.m. Friday, 2nd February, 1866, runs 70, 230, 233, 241, 251, 252, 252, 278, 287, 241, to Queenstown, arriving Sunday, 11th February, 11 a.m., say 9½ days. Take a western voyage the same spring, R. M. S. 'China' left Queenstown 18th March, 4 p.m., arrived Halifax, Tuesday, 27 March, 6 a.m., say about the same time 9 days, i.e., for mail time in both cases. These are not specially selected voyages but simply the ordinary passages of 30 years ago.

This gentleman wrote in 1896, so that instead of being thirty years ago, it is now nearly forty years ago. The newspaper comments:

> So that we now actually have a much slower service than we had 30 years ago! Since 1866 the length of the voyage between Liverpool and New York has been practically cut down one-half. Between Liverpool and Halifax it has not been reduced a particle, rather lengthened!

The record is no better now than it was in 1896, as is shown by the figures given by the Minister of Trade and Commerce this session. This writer proceeds to make the following comparison:

> Take the record of the first winter mail boat from Moville to Halifax this season, the year of grace 1896. The R. M. S. 'Mongolian' left Moville at 5 p.m. Friday, 13th November, 1896, with Her Majesty's mails, presuming everything was about as usual, delivered them at the Halifax post office at daylight on Wednesday, 25th November, 1896. An almost identical parallel mail transfer occurred with the 'Germanic' leaving Liverpool one day earlier, and Queenstown 12th November, 1896, embarking mails about 2 p.m., arriving at New York early on Friday, 20th November, her mail bags reaching Halifax at midnight Saturday, 21st November. Note the difference in round figures, the 'Mongolian's' mail covered 2,300 miles in a little over 11 days, say 11. The mails bags on the 'Germanic' travelled 2,800 miles to Sandy Hook and about 1,000 miles to Halifax, in about 9½ days. Compare the results—2,300 miles in 11 days, means say nearly 9 miles per hour; 3,800 miles in 9½ days represents nearly 17 miles per hour. The 'Germanic' is 16 years old and is looked upon as a back number on the route between Liverpool and New York, while the 'Mongolian' is a comparatively new vessel.

It will therefore be seen that a mail or a passenger can leave Liverpool by one of these New York boats two days later than by a Canadian steamer and can arrive in Halifax, or Montreal, or St. John, or Toronto, perhaps a day and a half earlier than the mail or the passenger which left Liverpool by the Canadian route two days before. We cannot regard this as a very desirable condition of affairs. As I have said, both parties are committed to the project of a fast line, by legislation and by their attitude

in the House. In 1896 the government of Sir Charles Tupper called for tenders, and tenders were received from the Messrs. Allan. The present administration came into power early in July, 1896, and it refused to submit to His Excellency, for his approval, the contract which had been prepared by the government of Sir Charles Tupper. That contract never was submitted to His Excellency, and nothing further was done with regard to the fast Atlantic service until the present administration brought down their own proposal to the House, under which they expected that the fast Atlantic steamship service would be established by Messrs. Petersen, Tate & Company. The present administration declined to entertain the proposal of the Messrs. Allan, for reasons which have been stated by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister during the present session. His reasons are to be found on page 7092 of the revised 'Hansard':

> The government did not find in 1896, on assuming office, in any of the public departments that a contract had been signed by the government or by any minister on its behalf, and the Messrs. Allan for a 20 or 21-knot service between Canada and Great Britain; nor had any Order in Council been approved authorizing such a contract. A tender for a mail service had been made by the Messrs. Allan, but they placed a construction upon the terms and conditions of the tender inconsistent with the public advertisement, as follows:—
>
> 1. That steamers are to be provided capable of performing voyages at an average speed of 20 knots per hour, and that the voyages of each vessel are to be completed within the shortest possible time consistent with prudent navigation; but that penalties will not be exacted for reduction of speed during fog, snowstorms or heavy gales, when slowed to avoid danger in the vicinity of ice or land.
>
> 2. That temporary delay or disturbance to sailings due to such causes, or to serious marine disaster, strikes of workmen, or other causes which contractors could not avert or control, shall not involve the contractor in penalties, nor be regarded as breaches of contract.

There was a further reason suggested in the debate of 1896, that is, that the Allans required a variation in the conditions. Now, whether or not the tender of the Allans was in accordance with the advertisement, it was something so reasonable that it seems to me the government should not have put it to one side simply for the reasons which have been stated by the Prime Minister. I say that in view of the contract with Messrs. Tate, Petersen & Company, which the government afterwards brought down; because, when you look at that contract, which is to be found in 'Hansard' of 1897, at page 3976 and following pages, you find that more latitude was to be given to the Messrs. Tate, Petersen & Company with regard to speed than the Allans wanted. If you look at clause 14, subclause (f) of that contract you will find the following provision:

> Provided always that should any failure or default for which the payment of damages are herein stipulated, or provided for, happen or be occasioned, or occur from any circumstance or accident beyond the control of the contractors, and not due in any way to the default or neglect on their part or on the part of any officer, agent or servant of theirs (the burden of proof of which shall be on the contractors), then and in that event the damages stipulated for, or the sum or amount forfeited shall not be payable or be forfeited notwithstanding the apparent fault.

So that the government put aside the tender of the Messrs. Allan in 1896 because they did not want to be responsible in respect to the speed to be attained by their vessels under circumstances beyond their control, such as ice or fog or storms in the vicinity of land. The government, putting aside that contract on that ground, entered into a contract in the following year with Messrs. Tate, Petersen & Company, and put in not only that stipulation, but the much wider stipulation which I have just read to the House. And that was hailed by the administration as a wonderful achievement; and we were assured over and over again, not only by my right hon. friend, but by other ministers of the crown, that the fast Atlantic steamship service had been assured to the country at a cost very much less than that which was proposed to be incurred by the government of Sir Charles Tupper. Why, my right hon. friend went to Toronto, and in his speech there he led the people of this country to believe that the fast Atlantic service was an accomplished fact—there could not possibly be any further doubt about it. His words have already been quoted to the House during the present session; but I think it might not be amiss for me to let the people of the country see on this occasion how certain my right hon. friend was that there could not be possibly any further doubt in regard to the matter. It is also useful in connection with another portion of the resolution which I am about to propose to the House, to show that my right hon. friend, speaking for the Liberal party, regarded this project as one of immense importance to the people of Canada. My right hon. friend was speaking at a banquet in the city of Toronto on the 6th of October, 1897, and his language was as follows:

> If I find anything good in the programme of my predecessors—I hope Sir Frank Smith will not accuse me of any theft if I say so, I am quite willing to put on the clothes of Sir Frank Smith, and they would be a good fit, I am sure. The government of which Sir Frank Smith was an honoured member had determined to have the fast Atlantic service, that is to say, the service to carry passengers especially, and to carry the mails. But, you know, I must say, though it be in the presence of Sir Frank Smith, that we are above all things an economical government.

That was the language of my right hon. friend in 1897. I do not wonder that he smiles at it now.

Mr. CLARKE. It is enough to make anybody smile.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know but that it would make even the proverbial horse smile :

That is a compliment which I cannot pay to the government of which Sir Frank Smith was a member.

Well, I do not know whether my right hon. friend would pay that compliment to his own government at the present time or not :

I wish I could ; but the truth, you know, must be the truth upon all occasions.

Well, I would like my right hon. friend, if the session were not so late, to discuss the economy of the present government, and above all things to tell the truth about it :

Sir Frank Smith's government had undertaken to give to that service a bonus, a subsidy, of $750,000 a year. We thought it was too much. We thought we could do it for less, and we succeeded in making a contract with a firm for a subsidy of $500,000 saving to the country therefore the sum of $250,000.

You will notice that there was no doubt about it. It was sent to the country that the Allan contract would cost the country $750,000, and that the government, within a few months after coming to office, had accomplished the fast Atlantic service, and saved $250,000 a year. And this was reported all over the country. How much will that amount to in twenty years ? $5,000,000. It was heralded throughout the country as an absolute saving of $5,000,000 :

We contracted with the firm of Petersen, Tate & Co., a Newcastle firm, a firm composed as we ascertained, of men of the highest honour, of the highest integrity, and the highest competency in their profession. Mr. Petersen and Mr. Tate have had a good many obstacles to overcome, as is always the case with men who launch a new idea into the world. Their idea was a new one, and therefore it met with objections and with discouragement from more than one class of people ; and not later than a few weeks ago, or a few days ago only, it was stated that the scheme of Mr. Petersen had fallen down, that it must be considered as absolutely a thing of the past. Mr. Petersen and Mr. Tate were at work. They work as men always work when they want to succeed. They said nothing ; they answered no accusations ; but to-day I have a telegram from my friend and colleague, Mr. Fielding, the Minister of Finance, to this effect : 'Petersen has made today the deposit required by the contract.' (Loud cheering and great enthusiasm).

And only a few days ago, Mr. Speaker, we had the pleasure in this House of returning to Mr. Petersen his deposit with interest at three per cent. But I did not observe on the part of my hon. friend's sitting to the right of the Speaker the same loud cheering and great enthusiasm as were manifested on this occasion at Toronto. Then he continued as follows :

It is with joy indeed that I welcome this explosion of satisfaction at the announcement that this scheme had not failed, but that it is to be carried through.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

We did not have any explosion of satisfaction from hon. gentlemen opposite the other day when the deposit was returned. Yet the one event was as important as the other. If the deposit of Messrs. Tate, Petersen & Company was worthy of an explosion by the great Liberal party of this country, surely we might have expected from these hon. gentlemen a similar explosion when that deposit with 3 per cent interest was returned. But no doubt the explosion in the latter event was at the other end of the line. I have no doubt that when the news of the return of the deposit reached Messrs. Tate, Petersen & Company on the other side of the Atlantic, there was the same loud cheering, the same great enthusiasm, the same explosion from them, as heralded the announcement of this deposit which was so happily timed as to reach my right hon. friend when he was on the public platform. He thus continued to dilate on the news he had received from the Finance Minister :

I know that in some quarters this idea of having this passenger traffic amongst us was not popular ; but, Sir, let me say to you that if there is a patriotic idea in the land it is the idea that we should not only carry the freight, but carry the passengers between America and Europe. (Hear, hear, and applause.) We can do it, we ought to do it, and now it is no longer in doubt.

Let me pause here for a moment to say to my right hon. friend that while he refers to certain quarters in 1897, where this idea of a fast Atlantic service was not popular, he does not seem to have to go very far at present to find quarters in which that idea is equally unwelcome, because during the present session we have had expressions of opinion, which indicate that this project of a fast Atlantic service is not very popular in the mind of an hon. gentleman who has the honour and pleasure of a seat at the right of my right hon. friend. That hon. gentleman has told us, in so many words, that it was rather a good thing this contract and scheme, which was heralded with that explosion of satisfaction in 1897, amounted after all to nothing, and that we have had during the past seven years practically a slower service between Canada and the mother country than that which this country enjoyed in the years previous to confederation. My right hon. friend continuing said :

This line of steamers shall be completed probably within two years, certainly within three years.

There is no uncertain note in that announcement.

And when we have this class of steamers afloat on the ocean I have no hesitation, such is my confidence in the scheme—and it is a confidence which must be borne by every man who has looked into the subject—that we shall have the great bulk not only of Canadian traffic, but of American traffic as well.

My right hon. friend was not modest in his expectations. We were to have the line in operation within two, or at the outside three years, and it was to carry, not only Canadian traffic, but a very large portion of American traffic as well. Well, six years have elapsed and we still have precisely the same condition of affairs as has existed for so many years. We still have practically all our mails and many of our passengers carried, not by Canadian routes, not via Canadian harbours on the St. Lawrence and Atlantic coasts, but by American lines from American seaports.

Sir, remember this, what I say is no idle boasting. Remember that the St. Lawrence route is the shortest of all routes. Now, as you know, all men have an aversion to the sea —I know I have—(laughter)—and my experience is not exceptional in this respect ; all men have a terror of the sea ; but when tourists know and are aware that upon the Canadian line, with a class of steamers having a speed of twenty knots an hour, equal in comfort to the best afloat on the ocean, there will be no more than four days between land and land—(applause)—the Canadian line will be patronized as no other. (Great cheering.) What will be the case when this line is in operation ?

My right hon. friend could afford to indulge in prophecy with regard to the results of the scheme, because no one can tell us to the present what might happen, and the prophecy is still a very safe one, under present conditions.

The case will be this : that a passenger taking the steamer at Moville, say, if Moville is to be the Irish port, within less than four days will be in the strait of Belle Isle, and then within less than one day, or twenty-four hours, will be in the harbour of Quebec, and one day's sailing on the beautiful St. Lawrence with its magic scenery and free from all discomforts of the sea. (Applause.) When we have this line with us we shall not only have the entire Canadian traffic, but we must as a necessity have the larger proportions of the American traffic. This that I say may perhaps seem presumptuous. It is not. At all events, if it is, I have such an unbounded faith in my country that I believe every word that I say now and I am sure it will come out to be true also.

There is not one of us who will not concur in the closing remark of my right hon. friend, if he applies it to the fast Atlantic service as a whole. But what a travesty on the actual facts is the whole speech of my right hon. friend. We were told over and over again that this deposit and bank guarantee furnished the most absolute security that the fast line would be completed. Years ago we gave up the bank guarantee, and we lately returned the deposit with interest, and we are not one whit nearer the establishment of a fast Atlantic service than we were seven years ago ; and that in spite of the fact that we had from a Canadian firm, one of the foremost shipping firms of this country, a contract which, if this government had seen fit to carry it out, would, in all human probability, have resulted in giving us a fast Atlantic service of 21 knots an hour, and we would have been enjoying that service during the last three or four years at least. We are told, from time to time, that we had better wait, that we had better put up with the service we have in order to get a really good service in the future. Why, we have been waiting for thirty years and have practically the same service as we had forty years ago. We had just as good a service from Canada to the mother country in 1866 as we have now. How much longer are we to wait ? Must we wait some thirty-four or thirty-five years longer, and then, at the end of that period, say to ourselves, it was not a bad thing after all that we did not make haste about the fast service, because when we do get one in the end it may be a better one than we could have expected had a contract been entered into some years ago.

Let me point out to my right hon. friend that, even if we had established an eighteen knot service twelve or fifteen years ago, it would have been better for us than to have done what we have done. And let me point out that if we had established that service fifteen or twenty years ago we could now improve it to a twenty-one or twenty-two knot service. And let us not say that a nine, ten, eleven or twelve knot service is good enough for us now and for many years to come, because it may result in giving us a better service when we eventually enter into a contract. For my part, I am not in sympathy with those who think we should establish a seventeen or eighteen knot service. I do not believe, that having been handicapped with a nine, ten, eleven or twelve knot service for so many years, there is any reason why we should now establish a second-class service.

Mr. GOURLEY. Or third-class.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Or, as my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. Gourley) would call it, and very likely with correctness, a third-class service. A gentleman who has had great experience in transportation matters in this country said to me, about a year and a half ago, that the establishment of a seventeen or eighteen knot service between Canada and the mother country under the moderate subsidy which we should have to give for that service, might, and in his opinion would, result in this—in placing on the route between Canada and the mother country boats which are now regarded as second or third-class boats on the New York route, and the subsidy we would give for the purpose would be, in reality, a subsidy for supplying new boats on the route between New York and the mother country. Now, it is far better for us to give $750,000 or $800,000 a year, or even more, and have a fast service up to the best requirements of the time, than to give $400,000 or $500,000 a

year and have only a second or third-class service, and have the subsidy which we would give apply in effect to the support of a first-class line of boats between New York and the mother country. We do not want to bring about that result. And I was glad that, when I brought this particular point to the attention of my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) he agreed at once in the view I had expressed, and said that the government were not unmindful that that result might be produced by granting a subsidy for a line of boats of the speed I have mentioned.

Now, as my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) has thrown a good deal of cold water on this proposal during the present session, and as an important journal, a journal which is supposed to be sometimes inspired, has used words of the very same character, we cannot but doubt the enthusiasm of the government or the establishment of a fast Atlantic service. An important journal supporting the government has recently said that it has :

> The best authority for stating that there is no movement in existence at the present time of which the government has cognizance aiming at the establishment of a fast Atlantic mail and steamship service between Great Britain and Canada.

The PRIME MINISTER. What paper is that ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Ottawa 'Free Press' of a recent date. I have not the exact date, but I will procure it for my right hon. friend if he desires it. The language is very significant. The journal says it has 'the best authority.' Well, the best authority would be the authority of the government. And, if this newspaper is to be believed we must arrive at the conclusion that some member of the government has seen fit to make a statement of that kind to this important journal for the purpose of making that announcement to the public. The article goes on in very circumstantial fashion as follows :

> Lord Strathcona has no special instructions to approach the imperial government on the question, for the reason that the Canadian administration has no proposition before it which would justify any action of that kind.

The statement is, in terms, very authoritative, and, in the concluding portion of it, somewhat circumstantial. Therefore, I think we should have from my right hon. friend a declaration to-day as to whether or not the attitude of the government towards this most important project is that which has been disclosed in the remarks of my hon. friend the Postmaster General during the present session.

On the 9th of March last, the government issued an invitation for tenders for a fast Atlantic steamship service, or, rather, for a fast and a slow Atlantic steamship service.

I suppose the advertisement appeared in some of the newspapers of that date, but I have not been able to lay my hand on any of the announcements. However, the tenders which were received in reply to some of these invitations have been brought down and laid upon the Table this session. The tenders are two in number. The first is a tender from the Allan Line, as follows :

> Allan Line of Royal Mail Steamships,
>
> Montreal, May 29.1903.
>
> Sir,—With reference to the invitation for tenders for a steamship service between Britain and Canada, issued by you on the 9th March, 1903, we now beg to offer to supply the service therein specified for a period of ten years from 1st May, 1905, in return for an annual subsidy of three hundred thousand pounds sterling (£300,000) payable half yearly.
>
> Routes to be as specified, except that we reserve the option of running the 21-knot steamers to Halifax all the year round instead of to Quebec in summer. Provision to be made for annual overhauls of the mail steamers. We inclose herewith accepted cheque for $48,666.66.
>
> Yours truly,
>
> (Sgd.) JAMES AND ALEXANDER ALLAN.
> H. & A. ALLAN.
>
> W. G. Parmelee,
> Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce.
> Ottawa, Ont.

The other tender is from the British and North Atlantic Steamship Company, Limited, made through Mr. J. G. Wilding, the chairman. This letter is dated the 16th of May, and offers to perform the same service for £200,000 payable half yearly, subject to certain conditions, as follows :

> In making up our estimate we have assumed that in fixing a maximum rate of passage for immigrants going to Canada under arrangements with the Canadian government, such maximum rate of passage will permit of the steamer receiving five pounds (£5) per adult for the conveyance of such passengers.
>
> We also assume that the Imperial and Canadian governments would pay the ordinary sea postage rate for the carriage of mails forwarded by these steamers.
>
> We also assume that we should have the assistance of the Canadian government in making, and would be able to make satisfactory arrangements with the Canadian railroads for the securing and forwarding of freight and passengers from and to any Canadian port, and that these arrangements would secure to this service not less favourable treatment than any other, the most favoured steamers, using such port.
>
> If we are wrong in these assumptions, or should fail to make the satisfactory arrangements contemplated in the last paragraph, we should need to revise the amount of our tender.

The invitations in answer to which these tenders were sent required the contractors to establish, not later than May 1st, 1905, and to maintain for ten years, a fortnightly service by steamers of twenty-one knots sea speed and a fortnightly service by steamers of sixteen knots sea speed. The steamers to be capable of averaging the speed stated on their best voyages across the Atlantic. The average actual speed of voyages, I sup-

pose we might expect to be somewhat less than that. Now, this service has not, in some quarters at least, received very favourable consideration. And, for my own part, I should be inclined to think that a twenty-one knot service is the service which the government should call for.

And I would expect that the great development of our western country, the great development of agriculture in Canada, the great development of our dairying industry, the great development of our grain trade in Canada, would lead to the building up of a line of suitable freight boats between Canada and the mother country which would take care of the products of this country which require to be carried to Europe. If my expectations in this regard should not be fulfilled, I would be willing to give moderate assistance to a line of freight boats for that purpose, but it must be borne in mind in this connection that the steamships which we intended to establish in 1896 were to be capable of carrying from 1,500 to 1,800 tons of freight, and that this freight accommodation would have been extremely useful for the carriage of certain classes of our products which require quick transportation. In the debate on that question which took place in 1897 that subject was very fully discussed, and it was pointed out that the utilization of these proposed fast steamers to the extent of 1,500 to 1,800 tons on each voyage for certain classes of freight requiring quick transportation was of almost as great importance as the quick transportation of passengers and mails between Canadian ports and British ports. But in addition to these classes of freight we have, of course, grain and other similar products which could not be carried by boats of that kind, and as to which there is at the present time a fairly good steamship service, which will improve and develop from year to year as the great grain trade of our western country improves and develops, and as the agricultural products of the eastern portion of Canada increase. Whatever else we may say, I am sure we can all agree in one conclusion, that the efforts of the government up to the present time with regard to the establishment of a fast Atlantic steamship service have not been very successful. I do not know that any tenders have been called for by the government between the date of the failure of the Tate-Petersen contract and the 9th day of March of the present year. It is now four years since it was known that the Tate-Petersen contract was a failure, but from that day up to the 9th of March the government took no step at all, called for no tenders, made really no attempt at progress in this matter. It may be answered from the government standpoint that the cost of building steamships had increased in the meantime and that is one important result to this country of the fact that the government in 1896 refused to adopt and carry out the contract which Sir Charles Tupper had almost consummated with the Messrs. Allan, a contract which undoubtedly could have been carried out, and which would have resulted in an enormous saving to the people of this country over and above what any such contract would cost to the country if entered into at the present time, because I observe that the Messrs. Allan now ask for £300,000 a year for a service, not of 21 knots, but a service of 21 knots and of 16 knots alternately. In 1896 we would have been able to obtain from the Messrs. Allan, for a subsidy of $750,000 from the Canadian government, coupled with a subsidy of $375,000 from the imperial government each year, a 20-knot service at least —I am not sure whether the additional amount for a 21-knot service was stated in the tender, but a 20-knot service at least could have been procured for that amount—whereas now for a 21-knot and a 16-knot service the same firm asks an annual subsidy of £300,000. Therefore, we have not altered our position for the better by the delay which has taken place. The government took no step from the time of the failure of the Tate-Petersen contract up to the 9th of March of the present year, when they called for these tenders, and we have been informed by the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce that the government do not feel disposed to enter into an agreement based on any one of these tenders, and that they regard the terms as excessive. We were told by the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce that although these tenders were not regarded as of so satisfactory a character as to justify the government in accepting them, nevertheless they might afford to the country and to the government a basis for further negotiations. We were told by the government organ to which I have already called attention, that these negotiations are not progressing at the present time; that the government is taking no steps and do not at present propose to take any steps in the premises. I regret the inaction of the government during so many years, and I regret their action at the present time, if it be true that they are taking no active steps for this purpose. We have heard of negotiations taking place for the establishment of such a service during a short period. Let me say that I do not believe it will be possible for the government to make a short term arrangement with any steamship company for a materially better service than we have at present. You cannot get a company either to take its boats off an established steamship line or to enter into the project of building boats for this service unless you give them a contract covering a substantial period, ten or fifteen years at least, and I believe that the government will make no material progress with these negotiations so long as they limit the contract to a short period. If

you attempt to negotiate for three, four or five years, as a mere makeshift in the meantime, your negotiations will amount to nothing. Why should any company, for a period of three years or a period of four years, undertake to build boats or to take boats off an established line ? But if you make up your minds in the first place as to what it will pay this country to give annually for a fast Atlantic service, and if you induce the co-operation of the imperial government so that they will give a subsidy in the same proportion as they offered to give in 1896—and we have no information that their offer in that regard is withdrawn —then, by placing your project before the established lines of this country and of the mother country, I believe that you can, within a measurable period, establish that fast Atlantic service for which the very great majority of the people of this country have been so anxious during many years past. I regret that the record of the government with regard to this matter has shown so remarkable a degree of inefficiency. They had before them in 1896 a contract that would have resulted in the establishment of a fast Atlantic service; they declined to carry that contract out; they declined to submit it to His Excellency for approval; they took up the contract with Petersen, Tate & Co., and, in the face of strong criticism from this side of the House, in the face of the opinions largely quoted from this side of the House that that service never would be a success, they persisted in assuring parliament and the people of this country that there was absolutely no doubt on that subject. Over and over again I have heard taunts from the gentlemen who occupy the treasury benches and the gentlemen on the other side of the House to the effect that the Conservatives proposed to spend $750,000 a year for this purpose and that this government had accomplished the purpose equally well at a net saving to the country of $250,000 a year. Well, the country has saved nothing ; it has lost its fast Atlantic service during these years, and the country, if it proposes, as I believe it is in favour of proposing, to establish this service at the present time, will find it necessary to pay a very much larger sum per annum than the sum for which this service could have been established in 1896. In view of this, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move :

That all the words after the word 'that' in the proposed motion be left out and the following substituted therefor:—

This House affirms its belief that great advantages would result to Canada as well as to the mother country from the establishment of a fast steamship service beween the two countries and expresses its regret that no effective steps have been been taken for that purpose by the present administration.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, all through this session there has been from the other side of the House a running fire of criticism against what it has pleased hon. gentlemen opposite to call the lavish expenditure of the government. These criticisms have also found a place in their press as well, and it was only last week that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) when honoured and banquetted by his friends made the burden of the remarks which he addressed to the faithful on that occasion, the extravagance of the government. But, it is also to be noticed, that, concurrent with this criticism, every time that supplies are asked from parliament there is a remark made by hon. gentlemen opposite to the effect that we are not spending enough and we have always a demand for some more expenditure here, there, or elsewhere. You cannot take up the debates that have taken place in this House, especially for the last fortnight, from which you cannot quote speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite to the effect that we should spend more than we are spending upon some matter as to which these hon. gentlemen say we are not asking enough money from parliament. Again and again we have been asked to make larger appropriations and upon this occasion, as being an opposite commentary upon the speech delivered a few days ago by my hon. friend to his own party, we have a request made to spend no less a sum than a million and a half of dollars per annum for a fast Atlantic service. I do not propose to discuss the question upon this point. I simply leave it to hon. gentlemen opposite to reconcile these divergent lines of criticism and I leave it to the country to judge of the consistency of such criticism. I do not propose, as I say, to discuss the matter upon this point and for my part, though we have asked for pretty large appropriations from parliament this session, I still believe that wise expenditure is the best economy. But, to come to the subject which has been introduced by my hon. friend, the burden of his accusation and charge against the government is that he regrets that the policy followed by the government has not been efficient to procure for the country a fast Atlantic service. I have to admit that in this year, 1903, we have not yet in operation a fast Atlantic service such as has been contemplated and hoped for by us for a great many years past. I have to admit that this government have not been successful. I have to admit that in this matter our record does not compare any more favourably than the records of our predecessors, and I have this to say as an excuse not only for ourselves but for hon. gentlemen opposite as well that if we have not obtained a fast Atlantic service such as every one would like to have it is not on account of any deficiency on our part but it is simply on account of the inherent difficulties of the task. This government are not the first that have applied their energies to the task

of obtaining such a fast Atlantic service as we should have between Canada and Great Britain. My hon. friend referred—I do not know if I understood him correctly—to the efforts which were made in 1896 by the efforts of Sir Charles Tupper, or to speak more correctly by the efforts of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, to obtain a fast Atlantic service and he rather created the impression upon my mind at all events, or it appeared as if he wanted to convey the impression, that this was the first effort that had been made in that direction. But, that was not the first effort that had been made by the Conservative government. That was only the third effort that had been made in that direction because the efforts in that direction go as far back as 1889. It was in 1888 that the idea of obtaining a fast Atlantic service, equal, in the language of the gentleman who was the first to give expression to the idea publicly, Mr. Foster, to the fastest and best steamships on the Atlantic ocean was mooted in Canada. In pursuance of that idea which was then expressed, a statute was passed by this House in the following words :

The Governor in Council may enter into a contract for a term not exceeding ten years with any individual or company, for the performance of a fast weekly steamship service between Canada and the United Kingdom, making connection with a French port, on such terms and conditions as to the carriage of mails and otherise as the Governor in Council deems expedient, for a subsidy not exceeding the sum of five hundred thousand dollars a year.

This is the first offer that was made and it goes back to the year 1889. The government were authorized to negotiate for the establishment of a fast Atlantic service between Canada and the United Kingdom on the condition that a call was made at a French port and the sum which the government were authorized to give for the service was $500,000.

Mr. GOURLEY. What chapter is that ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Chapter 2 of the statutes of 1889. This provision remained on the statute-book for five years, but nobody came forward to take advantage of the offer and it was thought advisable to make an amendment to the proposition. It was supposed that the sum which had been placed on the statute-book was insufficient and that it should be increased. It was increased accordingly. By the statute of 1894, chapter 8, this amendment was enacted :

1. Section 3 of chapter 2 of the statutes of 1889, intituled: An Act relating to Ocean Steamship Subsidies, is hereby repealed, and the following substituted therefor:—

3. The Governor in Council may enter into a contract for a term not exceeding ten years with any individual or company, for the performance of a fast weekly steamship service between Canada and the United Kingdom, making connection with a French port, on such terms and conditions as to the carriage of mails and otherwise as the Governor in Council deems expedient, for a subsidy not exceeding the sum of seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars a year.

By this the subsidy was increased by no less a sum than a quarter of a million dollars. Two years elapsed but nobody came forward to take advantage of this additional subsidy and in 1896 the law was again amended and new propositions were made. In the session of 1895, the following law was enacted as chapter 3 of the statutes of that year :

1. The section substituted by chapter 8 of the statutes of 1894, for section 3 of chapter 2 of the statutes of 1889 intituled: An Act relating to Ocean Steamship Subsidies, is hereby repealed and the following sections substituted therefor:—

3. The Governor in Council may enter into a contract for a term not exceeding ten years with any individual or company, for the performance of a fast weekly steamship service between Canada and the United Kingdom, on such terms and conditions as to the carriage of mails and otherwise as the Governor in Council deems expedient, for a subsidy not exceeding the sum of seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars a year: Provided that such contract shall not be binding upon Canada until it has been laid before the House of Commons and approved by a resolution of the said House.

The alteration which was made here was not in the amount. The amount was left the same as it was in the statutes of 1894 at $750,000 a year for the establishment of a fast Atlantic steamship service, but the change which was made was the leaving aside of the obligation on the part of such company as undertook the service to call at a port of France. But for all other purposes, the conditions remained as they were. Then invitations were issued for tenders. There had been an election in the interval, and the Conservative party had been defeated, and the present government installed in office. We found that in answer to the call for tenders, no tenders had been received. I emphasize the words 'no tenders had been received.' There was simply an offer made by the Messrs. Allan to undertake the service. It was an offer, not a tender ; and that offer was not in the terms of the specifications of the tender at all. The offer was from the Messrs. Allan to take the service upon conditions not mentioned in the invitation issued for tenders, but upon conditions made by themselves. One of the conditions was that they would not be bound to enter into the contract until four months had elapsed after they had signed the contract, so as to enable them to get out of it or into it just as they pleased. That would have been a minor matter, but generally speaking the conditions were very different from those stipulated, and the government did not feel justified in giving for that office such a large sum of money as was contemplated by the statute.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Was there any condition which they made which was not

substantially contained in the Petersen-Tate contract ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I am coming to that. In the following year we issued advertisements for tenders and we received a tender from Messrs. Petersen, Tate & Company. I may say at once to my hon. friend that the conditions offered by Peterson, Tate & Company were not very materially different from the conditions which had been offered by the Messrs. Allan, but there was all the difference in the world in the price asked for the service. The Messrs. Allan were demanding $750,000, whereas Petersen, Tate & Company were asking only $500,000. That was a consideration, and a valuable one which could not fail to make an impression on parliament and the government. I am bound to say, that in the light of events which have taken place since, Messrs. Petersen & Tate were oversanguine in offering to take the contract for $500,000. It has turned out that they were sadly off in their calculation. They were young, energetic, enterprising, and it is due to them to say that they were very near succeeding, relying on their activity and their enterprise. There is reason to believe that they would have brought the contract to a successful issue, but it is a matter of public notoriety that they met with tremendous opposition in some quarters, and they had to abandon the project. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) refers to a telegram sent to me by my friend (Mr. Fielding) to Toronto in the fall of 1897, in which he announced that Messrs. Petersen & Tate had deposited the sum of $50,000 as an earnest of their intention to perform their obligations. I announced that, and I was glad to announce it, to the audience in Toronto. The announcement perhaps was received with great joy, and there was reason that it should be so received. I cannot see the point in the joke of my hon. friend that the announcement that their deposit had been returned, should be received with vociferous applause on the other side of the Atlantic. On the contrary, if there would be any feeling about it at all, it should be a feeling of regret, and I would have expected that my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) instead of indulging in harsh criticism, should have considered it a matter of deep regret that the Messrs. Petersen & Tate had not been able to implement their contract. It was in 1899, I think, that Messrs. Petersen & Tate abandoned their contract. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) says, that from that time until 1903 the government has done nothing, has called for no tenders, has entered into no negotiations to carry out the enterprise which had been set forth in a solemn compact before parliament and the country. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) is mistaken, as I will show. I admit that from 1899 to 1902, the government of Canada did nothing to try to create this fast Atlantic service. But there was a very obvious reason for that. The paramount reason was, because of the existence of the Boer war for three years, 1900, 1901 and 1902. I would not say that that war demoralized the shipping world, but I do say that it so absorbed all the marine and naval resources of the British empire, that every one must acknowledge it would be absolutely impossible to launch the scheme then with any chance of success. It would have been folly to attempt to do anything towards the establishment of a fast Atlantic service under such circumstances. The Boer war came to an end in the middle of the summer of 1902. It so happened that in the summer of 1902, four of the Canadian ministers were in England for the coronation ceremony, and the ministers who were in England had several negotiations with different parties in order to secure this fast Atlantic service. We received a tender from the Canadian Pacific Railway, we received a tender, if I remember right, from the Messrs. Allan, from Sir Christopher Furness, and from Sir Alfred Jones. All of these tenders were of such an excessive character as regards the amount asked, that it was not deemed possible to ask parliament for their confirmation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). May I ask my right hon. friend if these tenders were laid before parliament ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot say at this moment. I am sorry my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce is not here to answer that, but if they have not been laid before parliament there is not the slightest objection to bringing them down, and I shall be glad to do so immediately, if my hon. friend desires. But I may say that if my hon. friend had seen these tenders he would say that the amount which was asked for such a service was—I will not say excessive, but it was very large ; so large that we thought it advisable not to accept any of them, until we had made another effort to get another service. Therefore, in the month of March last, we again issued invitations to the public for tenders. On account of the excessive subsidy which had been previously asked, we thought that we would vary the character of the service, and so we asked for two boats of a very extreme speed, and for two boats of a moderate speed. We asked tenders for two boats of 21 knots and for two boats of 16 knots. We received two tenders—one of which may be dismissed at once because it did not comply with the terms—the other tender came from the Messrs. Allan. For such a service as that, limited as it was to two fast boats and to two boats of moderate speed, the Messrs. Allan asked no less a sum that $1,500,000. We did not think that we would ask parliament to ratify a contract for such an excessive amount. When I use the word 'excessive,' I do not mean

to say that it is excessive as to the value of the service which was to be given, but it certainly is excessive in comparison with the appropriation for the purpose which was made by the Canadian parliament. The appropriation which was made by the Canadian parliament was for the sum of $750,000. The amount voted never went beyond that sum ; and we cannot have such a service as is contemplated by the motion of my hon. friend even for twice that amount. We can have only a service which is partly fast and partly not so fast—two boats of 21 knots and two boats of 16 knots. To obtain a service of four boats of 21 knots, I do not know how large a subsidy we would have to ask for ; but I think it would be very much larger than the sum asked for by the Messrs. Allan for the mixed service. Under these circumstances, I think nobody will blame us if we do not ask parliament for such an appropriation as would be necessary to carry out the tender of the Messrs. Allan.

Now, I have only this to say to my hon. friend. In my speech in Toronto I said that the service we contemplated would not be equally popular in all parts of the country. When I said that, I only uttered a truism. There are certain sections of Canada where the advantage of the service has not impressed itself so deeply as in other parts. But my position on this subject is what it has always been. I think a fast Atlantic service would be of extreme advantage to Canada ; it would advertise the country as few other things would ; it would develop our trade and procure us a trade which we have not at present, but which we ought to have. I do not know how popular such a service would be in winter time. It might or might not be popular on account of the speedy crossing of the Atlantic. As a rule, all men dread the sea ; as a rule, all men have good reason to dread the sea. From the moment a man puts his foot on board the ship, he wishes to reach the other side. The passage could be accomplished in five days instead of six of in four days instead of five, the line that would accomplish such a miracle as that would be the most popular of all lines. In summer time I have no doubt the route by the St. Lawrence would be most popular, and would be largely taken advantage of by people wishing to cross the Atlantic. Starting from Montreal or Quebec, you would have twenty-four hours or thirty-six hours on the waters of the St. Lawrence, which certainly would be a pleasure, and a good preparation for the rougher passage of the Atlantic. There is reason to believe that such a line would be patronized not only by Canadians, but by Americans, especially those from the western states. But the difficulty is to convince naval men of the profitableness of such a project. They are supposed to know the conditions of trade far better than any of us ; but even in the face of this project they have hesitated to invest their money without receiving a very large guarantee from the Canadian government.

My hon. friend has also referred to an article which has appeared in a newspaper of this city which is friendly to the government, but which is in no sense an organ of the government, because the government has no organ. The government speaks for itself, and that is the only way in which a government should be represented. There are, however, papers which are friendly to the government, and the one my hon. friend referred to is one of these. But there is no reason for saying that no project for the creation of a fast Atlantic service is in existence. On the contrary, this is a subject which is always present to the minds of the government, and is always engaging their attention. At this very moment they are negotiating with some companies which have tendered for the service ; but we have nothing tangible to present to parliament at this moment. But the project has not been abandoned, and in my opinion it should not be abandoned until it is carried to a successful conclusion. Though our efforts in the past have not been successful, there is reason to hope that at an early day we shall have a tender which we may be able to place before parliament.

There is one reason why naval men hesitate to engage in this enterprise except at the cost of a very heavy expenditure by the national government : That is, as my hon. friend knows, coming as he does from a maritime city, that there is perhaps no kind of industry which is to-day subject to greater changes than naval architecture. Almost every year some new methods are invented, some new designs brought forward, which tend to change naval architecture to such an extent that the ship of to-day may be obsolete five years hence. Even at this moment, the new ships for crossing the Atlantic are being built on what is known as the turbine system, a system from which great expectations are entertained. If this experiment proves successful, we may have a new development in naval architecture which may result in all the ships of to-day being discarded two or three years hence. For this reason the very naval men who might be expected to go into this enterprise have hesitated to do so except at a cost which I think the Dominion parliament would sustain the government in not incurring. When no less a sum than $1,500,000 is required to obtain a contract it is no wonder that the governmen should have hesitated, and should have asked for more information before coming to a conclusion. I think that is a sufficient reason, in the eyes of all men who believe in economy not only in words but in deeds, for holding the government free from the censure which my hon. friend endeavoured to cast upon it.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The right hon. gentleman has, I presume, made

the best defence the government can offer for their conduct during the last nine years in connection with this feature of their policy; and it would be quite sufficient, I think, to allow it to go to the country alongside of the speech made by the hon. leader of the opposition, and leave the country to judge of the force of that defence. But I think it is important to draw attention to some of the observations made by the right hon. gentleman. He says we have reason to hope that we may have a tender at an early day. Well, all I can say, in reply, is that the country, like the government, have been living in hope, but they have been obliged to fall back in despair. Their first hope was that they could obtain the same service for the country as was proposed by the previous government, and that they could save to the country $250,000 a year. They were sure of that, if it were only taken hold of by competent men. They said that competent men had made an offer to make a contract to that effect; and with great exaltations and blowing of trumpets, it was said: See what business men can do compared with unbusiness men; we have secured for the country a service which was declared to be so desirable, so important and so advantageous, for $250,000 a year less than our predecessors contemplated. On the strength of that we have been living in hope ever since. Speaking of tenders recently received, the right hon. gentleman said the lowest tender of Messrs. Allan & Company was $750,000 above their tender of 1896. Does not that of itself show the folly of the government in not having accepted the tender made in 1896, and in declaring that it was entirely too high? Experience has proved that they were not men of foresight, wisdom or good judgment, or they would have accepted the offer of the Messrs. Allan, and we would have had the advantage of the fast service we all desire, and besides have had that advantage at $750,000 per year less than we can get the same service for to-day.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). What was the offer of Messrs. Allan & Company in 1896? What did they offer and stipulate to do?

Mr. SPROULE. They stipulated to give a fast Atlantic service, on practically the same lines as Messrs. Tate, Petersen & Company, for $750,000 per year paid by the Canadian government and a subsidy by the imperial government as well.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). They could not know that Tate, Petersen & Company were going to offer a few years later. Tell us what the Allan Company offered to do.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. member know the offer made by Tate, Petersen & Company? The offer made by the Allan Company was practically on the same lines. They made an offer in some respects slightly differing from the request made by the government for the service. It differed with regard to stormy weather and matters of that kind. They were not to be compelled to keep up the speed in case of snow storms or ice blockades, &c., and under certain conditions, they were not to be compelled to make the service as fast as the maximum rate. Practically their offer was on the same lines as were proposed by the government to Tate, Petersen & Company when the contract with that firm was entered into. But the government, for reasons best known to themselves, refused to recommend to the Governor General the carrying out of that contract, and defended their conduct by telling the Canadian people that they could get an equally good service for very much less money. Then they announced that they had secured an equally good service for $250,000 per year less money, and boasted that in this they were carrying out their principles of economy and showing their great ability as business men. They said that they had not only received an offer but had actually entered into a contract, because the forfeit which was to be put up as guaranty that the company would keep its engagements was put up. Experience has proved, however, that in their conduct of this business, they were anything but good business men.

In reply to the charge made by the leader of the opposition, that since 1898 no effort has been made by the government to obtain a fast service, the right hon. gentleman said that the government had received a tender from the Canadian Pacific Railway in 1902. Why was not that information given to parliament? Why was parliament left in the dark. Why was not this tender put upon the Table? We know that that attempt failed because if it had not, we would have had its success heralded by a great flourish of trumpets. The right hon. gentleman has told us that the South African war prevented anything being done because the steamships were all busy; but had the government ratified the contract which was made in 1896, what an advantage would not that have been to Canada during the South African war? These hon. gentlemen, however, refused to ratify that contract, and the result is that Canada has suffered very much and we have no fast service to-day.

The right hon. gentleman said that the Allan Company did not tender but made an offer. That seems to be a distinction without a difference. They offered to do the work for a certain sum. Is that not a tender? A tender is only an offer. They offered, upon certain conditions, to do the work, and had their conditions been accepted—and they were just as favourable as those entered into with Tate, Petersen & Company, we have reason to believe that Canada would have enjoyed the advantage of a fast Atlantic service during the last

seven years at least. But the right hon. gentleman says: Oh, we are not the only parties who have failed; the Conservative party twice in six years endeavoured to secure that service. Yes, they did, and the first time they endeavoured to secure it for $500,000 per year. In this endeavour they failed, but when they tried to get it for $750,000 per year, they succeeded. Is my hon. friend like the Bourbons, who forget nothing and learn nothing. What is the best school in the world? It is that of experience. But the right hon. gentleman evidently is not disposed to profit by the lessons, otherwise he would have known that when his predecessors failed to get that service for $500,000 per year, he was not likely to get it for the same price. But his predecessors were wiser than he in this respect, that they were prepared to give $750,000 per year; and had the hon. gentleman ratified what they did, we would have had a fast service for a much cheaper rate than we can obtain it for to-day.

He began by saying that the opposition often complain that the government spend too much, but that now we complain that they are not spending enough. Our complaint has never been that the government have spent too much on a fast Atlantic service. We have backed up every effort the government has made; we have assented to everything that seemed at all reasonable or seemed to offer any hope of success. We have never found fault with their expenditure in carrying out this great project. But we have criticised, and justly criticised, this government, which came into power declaring to the people that economy was the main plank in their platform, when we found them wildly extravagant in lines which yield no return to the country.

Let me briefly refer to the various offers that have been made for a fast Atlantic service. The government of Sir Charles Tupper received a proposal from the Messrs. Allan in 1896 which they practically accepted. With regard to some details it was incomplete, but those details could easily have been arranged, and, in the main, the offer was practically accepted. The Allans agreed to furnish a twenty-knot service for a subsidy of $750,000 a year in addition to the subsidy offered by the imperial government. Had this government advised the Governor General to ratify that contract, I have no doubt that Canada would have been in the enjoyment of all the advantages which would accrue from a fast Atlantic service. But they did not see fit to do so. On March 24th, 1897, this government entered into a contract with Messrs. Petersen, Tate & Company for a fast Atlantic servoce for $500,000 a year. One year later they had that contract amended. And what was the reason given for amending the contract? Of course, when the contract was not carried out, the opposition complained of delay; and, in answer to those complaints, the government said that they had secured the same benefits to Canada for $500,000 that their predecessors had proposed to pay $750,000. They said the fast Atlantic service was an accomplished fact. But a year elapsed and there was no evidence of the contract being fulfilled. Then the government came to parliament and said that the contractors had asked for delay, that there had been a great strike in the old country, an upheaval in the labour world, and the contractors had not been able to carry out their contract. It was only reasonable, they said, that we should give them greater latitude. And there was another reason. There had been a remarkable improvement, they told us, in the kind of ships likely to be used for a fast Atlantic service in the future, and this firm would take advantage of that improvement It was called the bottle-necked steamer. This was said to be the steamer of the future, and the government said they desired to take advantage of this latest improvement, so as to give to Canada the best that the progress of the world afforded. They said: Though there has been delay, that delay will result in benefit to the people, for we shall get what our predecessors could not get in their time. And the late Hon. Mr. Dobell expatiated on the great advantages of the bottle-necked steamers and what they would do for Canada, and told us that in comparison with the advantages to be gained, the delay of a year was nothing. On April 3rd, 1898, the contract with Messrs. Petersen, Tate & Company was extended, and it was amended so as to provide for the payment of $750,000 a year—not $500,000 as in the first instance, but the same amount as was proposed to be paid by their predecessors. Against this increased amount, just as against the delay, they placed the advantage that would accrue to Canada from having in this service the bottle-necked steamer, 'the steamer of the future.' It was declared by Sir Charles Tupper, when that contract was announced, that it would never be carried out. The government asserted that it would be carried out; they said they knew these men, that they were men of great financial strength, men of great enterprise, ability and experience. And they said, moreover, that these people had put up a forfeit, which the government would not hesitate to take if the contractors failed to carry out their contract. This, Mr. Speaker, was in 1898. We have no fast Atlantic service yet. These contractors applied for the return of their forfeit, and it has been given back to them, with 3 per cent interest from the time it was placed in the hands of the government. The government failed to get the fast Atlantic service for $500,000; they failed to get it for $750,000; they failed to give us the new boats; and now we have to fall back upon the same service

that has existed for the last thirty-five years, neither better nor worse. The government, in the face of these facts, have been obliged to acknowledge failure. And now some of their organs are saying that we do not need a fast Atlantic service, that a fast service is only needed for passengers, but that what we need is a freight service, and a freight service may be a slow one. Is it the fact that we do not need a fast Atlantic service to-day? We are living in a fast age. If two railways run from one great city to another, and one railway can land its passengers in two hours less than the other, the people will take the fast road, and freight will be sent by the fast road. In our age the individual, the firm or nation that succeeds is the one of life and enterprise, while the other must fail and admit failure. Compare us with the United States, and where are we? They have steamers crossing the Atlantic in four and a half and five days, while ours average nine days. Will not the people travel by the fast line? And will not freight follow the fast line? Canadian mails, Canadian freight and the travel to and from Canada go by the New York line. We need a fast Atlantic service as much as do the American people; and to the extent that parliament fails in securing it, we fail to do our duty as representatives of the Canadian people. What does it mean to us to-day? It means that every passenger coming to Canada is landed in the great metropolis of New York. Thousands who intend to come to Canada never reach this country at all. They drift across to San Francisco, and by that way to the Orient and never see Canada. But how would it be if we had a fast Atlantic service? That traffic would come to Canada, would cross our whole country, and would take the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers at Vancouver for the Orient. We should have benefits that we cannot possibly get to-day, because the people never reach our country at all. Our mails are carried by way of New York. And by whatever way the mails are carried the commerce will be carried. If a man in Toronto orders goods in England he asks to have them shipped by the first steamer. He wants the goods at once. Is it to be supposed that he will have them sent by a steamer that will cross in nine or ten days, when he can have them sent by a steamer that will cross in five days? Not at all. He is a live, enterprising man and he is going to have those goods on his shelves at the earliest possible moment. To do that he must take advantage of the steamer that will cross the Atlantic in the shortest possible time; therefore the goods will go by New York. It is the same with passengers and mails. To-day we are denied the advantages of a fast Atlantic service, which we believe we would have had if the present government had been capable, enterprising business men who would have been able to grasp the situation and who would have ratified, as they should have done, the contract that was made with Messrs. Allan & Company in 1896. Every man, whether he is a Conservative or a Reformer, admits that we require a national policy in Canada, that we have a national policy in Canada which while it may not be carried out in its entirety is still the policy that Canada wants, a policy that is keeping the market of Canada for the Canadians. We want to develop that national policy to its fullest extent. We will never have the full complement of that national policy until we extend it to our transportation system as we now apply it to keep the home market of our country for our own people. We want a fast Atlantic service to assist the national policy in enabling Canada to develop her trade to the fullest extent, to do her own trade and to provide conveniences for the travelling of her own people, to carry her own products from country to country, advertising her productiveness and doing everything to show the world that Canada can live within herself and is quite as enterprising as the United States or any other country. If we consider the case of a man coming from Europe deciding whether he should invest his money and settle in Canada or the United States, he will have submitted to him that one fact that the Americans supply a line of steamers that cross the Atlantic in five days while the Canadians take nine. What would this suggest to his mind? That the one are a live enterprising people and the other a slow people lagging behind in the race of life. That must be the inevitable consequence of our lethargy in this matter. It must lead to failure in competition with a more enterprising rival, and the result is that in nine cases out of ten such a man would decide to make his investment in the country that shows life, enterprise, ability and progressiveness. We are told that we do not want this service; I say we do want it. It is said that we may want it for passenger traffic and for mails, but not for transporting the produce of our country. The great difficulty we have to-day in transporting the perishable products of Canada so as to lay them down in a proper condition in the markets of England is the lack of an adequate transportation service. What is needed is a faster transportation service so that these products can be laid down in a shorter time and in better condition. That would mean a better trade, larger profits, more successful operations in life, to the producers of these goods and therefore this line is of as much importance, if not of more importance, to the farmer as to any other class of the community. They are to-day losing a profit which should accrue to them, on account of the lack of proper transportation facilities. Then the merchants of the country require this service. In order to compete in the race of life with the Americans

they must be alive to the necessities of the situation, and they must be able to bring their goods as quickly to Canada as they can be brought to New York, and they must be able to send their mails by Canadian routes as quickly as the American mail can be sent. We must be able to give our trade to our own steamships, to live within ourselves as the Americans do. Our merchants require a fast Atlantic service just as much as do the American merchants. Then the travellers of the country require it: if we had such a service they would go by our routes instead of through the United States, and Canada would have the benefit of an advertisement which she could never secure in any other possible way. If we were able to compute the number of people who have started out with the intention of visiting Canada and looking into her resources with the hope of making Canada their homes, but who are to-day in the United States owing to the inadequacy of our steamship service, we would have a significant lesson as to the necessity of such an improvement, and that condition must obtain so long as we have the present inadequate service. The Canadian people must hold the government responsible for this failure. Why have they failed ? I am afraid the Canadian people will say it is because of incompetency, of inability or want of foresight and of good judgment, because if they were possessed of those qualifications we would not be without a proper service to-day. If two men started to do a piece of work and one said 'I cannot do it' and the other said 'I can do it,' the one who says, 'I can do it,' and succeeds where the other fails, shows that he has superior ability and intelligence. In this case one party made an effort and succeeded so far as it was possible for them to succeed up to the time that they left office. The other party declared that they could do better, they failed. First they made the attempt to do better, then they attempted to do it as well, now they have attempted to do it in any way and to-day Ichabod might well be written over every effort they made. They have acknowledged failure in life and it is time for the country to see it and know it and I am inclined to think that when the time comes for that great body to speak they will pronounce as their verdict, in no uncertain tones that the present government, has shown incompetence in regard to this transaction at least.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. WILLIAM ROCHE (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I regret that this question has been made to a less or greater extent a party question. I think the people of Canada are interested largely in this subject and that it ought not to be a stock subject of political argument between one party or another. I think that the subject of the fast line originated with the Liberal-Conservative party. It was used for a number of years as a sort of talisman at the elections, or before the elections, to persuade the inhabitants of the maritime provinces especially and of the rest of Canada generally to support the Liberal-Conservative party in order that they might inaugurate what they termed a fast line. They used that as a sort of a talisman, not that they had any practical scheme in view, not that they had anything definite in the construction of ships, but as something to look forward to as a result of returning the party of progress to power. This question was used to influence the public mind at an early time. I remember that previous to the election of 1887 it was alluded to in the terms to which I have referred and it was a strong factor in the election held that year. It was represented that if the government then in power were returned before the snow flew this line would be in practical operation. I ventured to predict in a somewhat iconoclastic way that probably ten years afterwards, if that party were returned to power, the same old magnificent castles of the Allan Line would be running and conveying the mails and I think I have reason to believe that I was a true prophet. As far back as 1887 the consummation of this scheme was declared to be immediately at hand. This party pledged to the consummation of the fast line, that they declared to be immediately in the foreground with such flattering prospects of its being carried out, allowed this magnificent project to remain literally glittering in the air until they went out in 1896. Then the subject came in very conveniently. At a public meeting the inevitable telegram came down that a contract had been entered into by the leader of the government with the firm of the Allans insuring the consummation of this scheme. That had its influence no doubt. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) who has preceded me, alluded to this contract. He referred to it as if it were a definite, well arranged contract entered into on both sides, binding, covering all the essential elements and one such as could have immediately been carried into effect by their successors who unhappily interrupted the even flow of all these benefits.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) would allow me, I did not represent it as a contract that was agreed upon by both sides, but an offer which that company had made, to do this service upon terms which were acceptable to the then government, and would have been entered into provided they had remained in power.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). I understand perfectly what the hon. gentleman says. I also perfectly understand the difference between what he says and what actually existed. I also refer definitely to the fact that in the course of this hon. gentleman's argument

he again and again returned to the assertion that there was a contract, that there was a proposal acceptable to both sides and such a contract as could immediately be carried into effect. Now, there was no contract covering the essential elements of a fast line and that is the question of maintaining a speed under penalties, but when the Allans entered into that proposal—not a contract—they claimed a period of four months to make up their minds whether or not they might afterwards enter into a definite contract to maintain the speed. Therefore, the argument which has been based upon the assertion of there being potentially or really a contract must fall to the ground because there was no definite proposal or contract founded upon it. Then the hon. gentleman, whether he saw the distinction or not, in the course of his argument always returned to the postulate that there was a contract, or that there was a tender, immature though it might be, yet sufficiently forwarded to be entered upon at once as a definite, binding proposition. There was nothing of the kind and no argument can be founded upon that to make this government blame-worthy or otherwise for a violation of the stipulations of a contract only awaiting a technicality to be a binding proposition on both sides. The essential element of speed was not contracted for by these gentlemen who made that tender. Therefore the government, having that immature proposal, were justified when a definite proposal was brought forward, to agree to it and to enter into a contract. That contract was entered into with the firm of Petersen, Tate & Co., of Newcastle-on-Tyne. I do not know but that I am the only person in this House except the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) who knows Mr. Petersen and who knows who Mr. Tate is. I had the honour of making Capt. Petersen's acquaintance in 1881, or thereabouts, when he was the captain of a seagoing steamer. He associated himself with Mr. Tate who had been the business manager of the firm of Lindsay, Gracie & Company of Newcastle—a large ship-owning company. With their practical knowledge of business and navigation they thought they could enter into a contract with the money patronage they had secured to inaugurate and conduct this fast line. Messrs. Petersen, Tate & Company were not the real substantial people at the back of this contract. The real substantial people were Charles Doxford & Sons, of Newcastle, who were the constructors of the bottle-necked steamers which have been so much derided in this House, and who originated that patent for the construction of those ships. This is not a novelty. They are a very extensive ship building firm in the north of England. They have built for Cayzer, Irvine & Company, the Clan Line, a line of steamships numbering twenty or thirty, and they are the much derided bottle-necked ships. They give the utmost satisfaction. They are economical vessels to operate and the company have shown their approval of the design by following the construction of one ship with another continuously with finer and larger and better ships designed upon that model. This firm are also the patentees and owners of the whale-backed cargo carrying ships. I am very well acquainted with the firm of Runciman & Company, a firm in the north of England, who own a number of these ships. I have conversed with the captains of their ships when they have come into the port of Halifax and I have been told by them that they have subjected them to the severest test that a ship could be subjected to at any time and that is the carrying of big cargoes of timber on the sides of the whale-backs. I have written to them and the captains have written back to me describing their voyages across the Atlantic, and they have told me that they did not lose one single stick of timber from the sides of these ships, so that this style of ships is entirely practicable both for carrying cargo and passengers. There is a great competition in the eastern trade. There are the Peninsula and Oriental Company and the Orient Line, and the fine ships of these lines enter into competition with the line I have described. Passengers go as freely by the bottle-necked ships as they do by the magnificent liners of these old shipping companies. Therefore, it is no novelty to enter into a contract with constructors like these for a service performed by the kind of ships that I have described. But, if a contract had been entered into at that time with the Allans, what would we have had? The fastest ships then on the Atlantic were 20-knot ships. The Atlantic service was then in its transition stage. The White Star Line were putting on the 'Majestic' and the 'Teutonic,' of about 10,000 tons; the Cunard boats were being increased in size, and the International Steamship Company was putting on the 'City of New York' and the 'City of Paris,' both of 10,000 tons and 20 knots. We possibly might have secured vessels of 20 knots then. Immediately after, the Hamburg-American Line put on fast steamers, and they are now operating the 'Deutschland,' which makes 23 knots. Their competitor, the North German Lloyds, have put on the 'Kaiser Wilhelm II.' and the 'Kronprinz,' which maintain about the same rate of speed, the latter being supposed to do 23 knots on the average at sea. These boats are of immense size and immense cost. The 'Kaiser Wilhelm II.' probably cost more than $3,000,000. The passage across the Atlantic has been accomplished by the 'Deutschland' in five days and seven hours, and by the 'Kaiser Wilhelm II.' in five days and nine hours; the average being about five days and seventeen hours. A steamer of like speed would make the passage from Halifax to either Cherbourg or Southampton in probably four days and five hours.

I designate Halifax because a vessel leaving that port is immediately upon the high seas and can maintain the highest rate of speed until she reaches the other side, a facility which does not exist, so far as I know, with respect to any other Canadian port. I believe that Petersen, Tate & Co. would have carried out their contract had they been able to raise the capital on the money market. The builders were ready, the operators were ready, but the money was not forthcoming. At the time they were endeavouring to raise the capital the money market became panicky, correspondence in the press alarmed the public mind as to the nature of this proposal, and investors held aloof and sought what they considered more attractive investments. Unfortunately there is in London and in England the reptile press. There are some gentlemen who write in monetary journals and in other papers for pay. They come to the promoter of an enterprise and say: Here is an article eulogistic of your enterprise and I want £2,000 for it or £5,000 for it; and here is another article which will be published for nothing if you do not come up with the money. People like that, operating upon the sensitive state of the money market, created an opposition which prevented Petersen, Tate & Co. from carrying out their proposal. I do not allude now to the influence of rival lines. Communications appeared in the press from practical men and steamship owners describing the route as impracticable and the scheme as Utopian, and pointing to the continental lines as an instance of how money could be lost by stockholders in having these costly advertisements; because these huge steamships which lose money are simply used by the different lines as an advertisement for the dozen freight carriers which may be owned by that same line. They can thus afford to support one or two of these fast greyhounds in order to advertise their other ships. During the pendency of the negotiations with Petersen, Tate & Co. the steamship business had made great progress, and what was considered a fast line before could be no longer classed as such. Twenty-knot boats became second-class boats, so that if we had had 20-knot steamers we still could not have entered into competition with the faster boats sailing from New York. Furthermore, the New York lines, in combination, were able to put on a fast steamer from New York every day. At the initiation of our enterprise it would be impossible for us to run a fast boat more frequently than once a week, and so the daily service from New York would afford immense advantages to the inhabitants of Canada who live west of Montreal and Quebec. I believe that now a favourable juncture has arisen for the carrying out of this proposal for a Canadian fast line. The Prime Minister to-day alluded to the turbine, which has been successfully used on yachts and the channel steamers. If the turbine could be made effective against the Atlantic waves, and if a high speed can be maintained with these turbine engines of less cost and occupying less space, the problem will be solved. If steamers of less size than the monsters now plying to New York can be built to attain the same rate of speed, then we will be able to get a line of boats not so costly and offering all the advantages we seek. The turbine engine is yet in its infancy, and probably from the fact that but few of them have been made, and that the plans and specifications and details of their economic working have not yet been wrought out, they are more costly than they will be in future. If far less space is taken up by the machinery, if the ships can be reduced to from 5,000 to 7,000 tons net and not over 10,000 tons gross, the scheme will not entail such an enormous outlay as would justify any economic man withholding his support. I do not venture to say that the turbine engines can be constructed at less cost than the ordinary engines. That has to be demonstrated. The patentees are sanguine that they will revolutionize the business upon the Atlantic. Now is the time, then, for Canadians to look for a fast line of steamers. The turbine may also solve another very important question, namely, the economic working of these ships. Not only will their first cost be reduced, but the working expenses will be curtailed as well. They will not have to carry so much coal, and consequently they will have greater cargo-carrying space, and more extensive accommodation for passengers. That will reduce the expenditure for stokers, and for crew, and for servants of all kinds, which tends so much to swell out the working expenses of these immense Atlantic liners.

I was surprised to-day to hear my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) deride the bottle-backs. I was also surprised to hear the gentlemen of the opposition endorse the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), who derided the scheme of the late member for Quebec, who had a steamer with a propeller in the middle and a propeller at the stern, which between the two was supposed to attain a great rate of speed. Scientific men should not venture on subjects of this kind, especially if they do not understand them. Gentlemen who derided that principle ran foul of the great invention of the age, the turbine propeller. It was precisely that which was the object of derision by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier and the hon. member for East Grey, who, I regret to say, has gone out of his usual course on this occasion, and has not engaged himself closely with the discoveries of modern science. It was something akin to the eminent British savant and philosopher. Gessner, who at the beginning of steam navigation on the Atlantic said it was an impossible feat, because the vessels would not be large enough to contain the coal that

would be consumed in the voyage across the Atlantic.

Mr. GOURLEY. Would my hon. friend allow me to ask him, is there any ocean-going steamship to-day navigated by the turbine, or any building ?

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). It is on the channel steamers, and I am told that the Allan Line are building a steamer with turbine engines. The turbine is also used in torpedo-destroyers, which attain an immense rate of speed. The channel, of course, is an ocean passage, the roughest in the world.

Mr. GOURLEY. What I want to know is, has the turbine been exploited so as to be used on ships crossing the Atlantic ?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). The Allans are building a steamer to run to Halifax.

Mr. GOURLEY. It has not been tried yet ; it is an experiment.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). I regret that the hon. member for East Grey did not confine this subject within its own limits, but incorporated with it the question of the national policy and other matters. The construction of such ships as I have outlined would probably solve the question he has in his mind, that is, the carriage of the more costly and delicate kinds of freight, which require the most rapid transportation. For most of the products of Canada, such as grain and cattle, the ordinary steamship would be sufficient. If we enlarge our horticultural operations so as to export grapes, plums and others of the more delicate fruits to England, fast boats would be useful ; and the simplification of their construction and the diminished space occupied by the engines would enable them to carry this high-class freight. On the large steamship lines running out of New York, the principle advocated by the hon. member for East Grey has been reversed. The large passenger steamers carry the higher classes of freight, called express freight. They do not attempt to carry the bulkier articles, such as are chiefly produced in Canada at the present time. I had an opportunity of conversing with one of the highest shipping authorities in America, Mr. Bonner, freight agent of the North German Lloyds. They own the fastest passenger ships, and a large fleet of freight-carrying steamers, and also handle the largest quantity of goods of any importing firm in America. He is an expert both in the running of ships, the kinds of cargoes, the values of goods and the possibilities of continental trade. As this subject was in agitation in the House last year, I had an opportunity of getting particulars from him on this subject which may be useful. He informed me that the American manufacturers had practically abandoned to the German and other continental manufacturers the production and sale of certain classes of goods in the United States ; that notwithstanding their development of machinery, their capital, their devotion to the production of these lines, and their patriotic sentiment, that nothing consumed in America should be produced outside of America, those manufacturers were compelled to abandon to the German and other continental manufacturers the production of a certain class of goods in the production of which they could not hope to rival them. Therefore they quit the field and directed their energies upon the production of those kinds of goods which they could produce to advantage, and allowed their exchange for the goods which they imported to pay them for the loss they sustained in consequence of those goods being produced abroad. That is the policy I would commend to my hon. friend from East Grey—to ascertain by observation, analysis and discrimination, just what goods we can produce to advantage, what goods can be better produced by the manufacturers of other countries, and how much we can advantage ourselves by the exchange of the commodities which we can produce to advantage for those in which we cannot hope to rival them. I say there are great possibilities before this fast line, and the attention of Canada should be directed towards it. Without recriminations between the two parties, and without using it as a political expedient, let us all devote our energies to its consummation, derive all the benefit we can from it, and utilize it for the development of the trade in Canada and for the attraction of passengers to Canadian routes. That we shall be able to capture the American passenger trade is very problematical. There is a great advantage in having the longer rail route and the shorter ocean route ; but for some time to come the advantage of the daily sailing of boats from New York will overcome the other advantages. I think, however, that the government are now very fortunately situated, with these advantages and the knowledge they have acquired, to take up the subject of the fast line, and to enter into a contract with a reputable firm, or otherwise to acquire the means of maintaining an Atlantic passenger service as a governmental off-shoot of the great line that is projected. We do not know how many passengers will be carried, or what facilities will be given for a transcontinental and transmarine passage. All these things are in the future. We enter upon the question now at a most favourable epoch. Looking back over the history of this question, looking back to our failures, looking back to the efforts that have been made, and keeping in view the resources of our country, which are now growing so rapidly, let us at this time acquire a line which will be equal in speed, if possible, to those other lines, and at this favourable juncture project this great facility upon the mind of Canada and the attention of the world.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). I would not like, Mr. Speaker, that this debate should pass without the House giving the subject involved a full and fair consideration. It is unfortunate that it has been left to such a late period in the session, but the press of other very important matters will perhaps furnish a very satisfactory excuse for this delay. The question is perhaps, at first view, not of such great importance to all Canada as it is to the maritime provinces, and particularly Nova Scotia ; but still I think that if it were fully discussed, and all the advantages that would result to Canada from the successful establishment of a really fast line service between Canada and the great centres of population of Europe, fully realized and understood, we would find public opinion throughout Canada supporting the government in any endeavours to realize this great improvement. I do not know that there is much advantage to be derived now from a discussion of the reasons why the project has so far not been accomplished. In my opinion, this matter, which had been for at least eight years occupying the attention of the late government, was in 1896 brought to a point where it might be looked upon as having been reduced to a very practical form. Stress has been laid on the fact that there was not a contract in existence between the Allan Company and the government for the establishment of this service, when the present administration came into power. I do not think that anybody really affirms that there was a contract, but, we, on this side of the House, are inclined to take the view that when the administration of Sir Charles Tupper went out of office and was succeeded by the present, matters were in such a position that the new government could have had a contract completed. Objection is taken to the conditions of the tender made by the Messrs. Allan, upon which that contract would have had to be based ; but if that be put forward as an excuse for the failure of the present administration, it is not one that can be successfully maintained, because the very objections that are made to the proposition of the Allan Company apply to that of the Tate, Petersen Company. The Allan Company wished for a certain delay in which to complete their arrangements. If I mistake not, they wanted a delay of four months. They further desired to have a condition inserted, which is usual with every contract dealing with business on the high seas, namely that exceptional difficulties in the matter of weather, of fog or particular moments of peril in approaching the coast, should be taken into account in estimating the rate of speed the company had to maintain. That objection could not be successfully maintained against the Allan contract, because the same objection would apply to any contract made with any company for a fast line service. But when in 1897 this matter came to be discussed in the House of Commons and the opposition desired to know why the government had made no progress, the fact was made known that the gentlemen to whom the business had been entrusted by the present government, the late member for Quebec West (Hon. Mr. Dobell), at that time a member of the administration, to the great astonishment of the members of this House, gave it as his deliberate opinion—and we may assume that he was also speaking the opinion of the government as well—that what he wanted was not what might properly be called a fast line service, but what might rather be called a fast freight service. If I am not mistaken, he said that what Canada wanted was a service which would give a speed of some eighteen knots per hour. The moment that announcement was made, the people of the maritime provinces felt that any such service would absolutely fail to accomplish the object we all desire. We do not want an eighteen knot service, as my hon. friend the leader of the opposition said to-day. We do not pretend to say that a fast line freight service, would be an injury to the country, but what we believe is that if any line of steamers were established with an average speed of only eighteen knots an hour, we would absolutely fail to realize the advantages of our geographical position, and to call such a line a fast steamship service would be an absolute misnomer. It would not represent properly the character of the line. Such a line would fail to realize the advantages which must be realized if we are to have a really fast steamship service on the Atlantic. On account of the difficulties of communication, particularly in the summer months to the end of August, there is a point some hundreds of miles south and south-east of Cape Race, at the south-eastern point of Newfoundland, which is more or less exposed to danger from floating ice and fog. Consequently at that point there is, as it were, a corner which must be turned by all steamships plying across the Atlantic, whether going to New York, Boston or Halifax, or some port in Cape Breton or somewhere on the St. Lawrence. If a vessel is not particularly anxious to maintain a great speed, she may venture to make her way through this portion of the Atlantic, which is more or less covered with fog, and in which floating ice may be encountered ; but if you are going to have a service of an average speed of 23 to 25 knots, it is clear that the one essential condition which must be complied with is to secure such a route across the Atlantic as may give almost absolute guarantee of security and avoid any danger of collision with ice or other vessels in the fog. To that corner, which must be turned by all steamers going across the Atlantic, the course is practically identical whether the steamers are going to Canadian or American ports The line is practically identical from that point in mid-Atlantic to the coasts of Great Britain and Ireland.

But from that point the courses of the steamers from New York, Halifax or Louisburg would diverge, and we would have from that point in the Atlantic, if we would secure the adoption of a line which would make its terminus at a maritime port of Canada, an advantage in distance which would be equal to 650 miles.

Now, 650 miles means at least a day, or considerably over a day, spent upon the Atlantic. And it is perfectly clear to the people of the maritime provinces who have looked into this matter closely that, if we have a line of steamers equally fast with the lines to the American ports in their passage across the Atlantic, the Canadian line will beat the American line by at least a day in every voyage westward or eastward. We find, then, that by utilizing the maritime ports of Canada you can land a passenger on the Canadian seaboard at least a day earlier than he can be landed at an American port. Fortunately, the port of Halifax, the port of Louisburg and the port of Sydney are so exceptionally free from hindrance at their entrance through fog or difficulties of a tidal nature, that delays such as constantly occur at New York need not be expected or allowed for. So, with a fairly good service maintained over the Intercolonial and other railway lines in Canada, a passenger coming by the Canadian line can be landed in Toronto as quickly as he can be landed in New York coming by the American route. But to realize this advantage we must have a Canadian line that is really a fast line. We cannot do anything to divert the great volume of travel to Canadian lines, unless the steamers that are subsidized by Canada are as fast as any that ply. If we have an advantage of one-fifth in distance, we can only realize that advantage by having steamers as fast as those of our rivals. But, if we have an advantage of one-fifth in distance and lose one-fifth in speed, it is quite evident that no outlay that the Canadian government may make will do anything to attract those for whom speed is any consideration, and so the advantage which we might hope to derive from a fast line will not be ours. Now, a fast line could not be a freight line. We cannot realize through it the advantages which the late Mr. Dobell, a member of this government, seemed to think would be realized by a line of steamers making a speed of eighteen knots. But, if we have a fast line of passenger steamers, those steamers will have a capacity of 1,000 to 1,500 tons or even more, which can be utilized for express freight and the rapid carriage of the perishable products of Canada, which are wanted in unlimited quantities in the mother country, and which, if carried across with sufficient speed, will reach the market in such a condition as to realize prices which will leave a margin for a high rate of freight. Our eggs, our butter, our fruit, and other products, if landed in Great Britain promptly and in such steady supply as could be secured by these steamers making proper arrangement with land transportation companies throughout Canada, would be able to pay a high rate for transit of the Atlantic.

It seems to me that, while this is of the highest importance to the people of the maritime provinces, this great project is one which affects every part of Canada. We have heard one gentleman speak here to-day of the advantage to be derived by Canada from this project in the mere matter of advertising. That is a point which should be considered carefully, for it is of the utmost importance. Canada is so situated to-day that the two great masses of population in the world are likely, as soon as the opportunity is afforded them, to use Canadian routes as a means of passing from one to the other. The teeming population of the Asian coasts with its great commercial centres especially in China and Japan, and the great and rapidly developing population on the continent of Europe—these being by far the greatest masses of population in the world—are so placed that the shortest line of communication between them lies through Canada. That cannot be used, its great results cannot be realized, with our present means of communication. The line is practically closed to these people who would naturally make use of it, for we have not at this moment a service upon the Atlantic such as we should have, affording the shortest, quickest and most comfortable mode of travel which modern conditions provide. Give us a fast line service from Europe to Halifax, Louisburg, or Quebec in summer, and you will put us in a position to attract to the Canadian Pacific Railway and such other transcontinental railways as we may have in Canada, the most important and lucrative travel the world affords. You will practically place Canada in a position to realize all the advantages which she ought to possess from being where she is, actually on the front street of the world, the most important and what ought to be the most used line of passenger travel. There can be no question that enormous advantages would result to this country from an expenditure of anything like a reasonable amount of money which would direct the first-class through travel of practically the whole civilized world through Canada. Who can dispute that? The advertisement to the country, the knowledge that will be acquired by those people of the highest intelligence and of the highest importance of our wealth producing capabilities in passing backwards and forwards through this country, will be of incalculable importance to us. It would be impossible for such travel to pass through Canada constantly without disseminating throughout the world, to our enormous advantage, full information as to the cap-

abilities of our country and our sources of wealth. The two things that Canada needs, in order to overcome the disadvantage of a late start, and to place her at once in the front rank of worldpowers are population and capital. And what is more likely to give us population and capital than by placing Canada in the position to attract to herself, practically throughout her whole length, all the first-class travel from the east to the west. There can be no doubt as to the character of the advertisement we might get and as to the advantage to our country which would be made accessible to the people of the whole world in consequence of such movement. I think that, as a rule, the people of the maritime provinces were anxious to see this scheme realized and looked upon it as one of the works that the government must undertake and carry out at an early day. But I think that they realize now that no fast line that is not really a fast line would be acceptable. They do not want any substitute offered to them. We must have a line that is quite as fast and quite as good as anything to be found plying to the ports of the United States. With the work accomplished of giving Canada such a line of steamers as is to be found to-day plying between the ports of Europe and New York, we shall, no doubt, find that it has been the wisest and best expenditure this country has ever made.

Now, there has been a great deal of discussion as to the ports which should be used. It is held by a great many people that in summer the terminal point should be Quebec and that in winter Halifax or some port on the Atlantic coast should be used. That is a matter which it is not necessary at this moment to discuss, and it would be a great misfortune if the discussion of the relative advantages of the different ports should be permitted to delay a settlement of this question. The question of terminals is one that will settle itself as soon as we have the fast line. When that line has been in operation for one year the practice and experience of that year's operation will satisfactorily and forever settle the question of the right port to be used by such a line. What is wanted is that the government should endeavour to realize all the advantages which would accrue to Canada from such a service and should endeavour to procure them for Canada at the earliest possible moment. One argument which has been advanced here two or three times to-day has been of a most unsatisfactory character; that is, the attempt that has been made to show the advantages that come from delay, through not proceeding too quickly. It has been pointed out over and over again that if we had proceeded to complete the contract in 1896 as it was submitted to the government we would have had a service which, in view of what has been accomplished since that time and of what is now being done, would be an inferior service, that the 18 or 20-knot service which would have been established in 1896 would not be equal to the service of 23 knots which we see on the Atlantic to-day, and that we would be, to a certain extent, committed to and involved in a line of steamers which would be slower than the best, and therefore not exactly what we want. That is a line of argument which, if applied at all, would involve us in a constant course of delay, and would induce us to go on from year to year without action. It would induce the government and the people of Canada to delay forever coming to a conclusion on this matter because the advances of the next year might render the best that we could now obtain inferior, owing to the rapid progress that is constantly taking place in matters of this kind. We cannot afford to go on forever without progress because progress is being made all about us; we must have at once a service that will enable us to realize the advantages of our geographical position and the advantages that should come to us as a rapidly growing country. The right hon. the Prime Minister to-day seemed to think that he had given an answer which ought to be satisfactory to the House and to people of Canada and to justify the government in making no progress in this matter when he pointed out that the tender submitted to the government called for an expenditure of $1,500,000. In view of the fact that this House is this session voting estimates aggregating nearly $70,000,000, it strikes me that any one who knows the importance of the fast line project and the advantages that would accrue from such a line, would feel that in view of the general expenditure of Canada, an expenditure of $1,500,000 for this fast service would not be a wasteful expenditure. If we compare the present expenditure of this country with that of 1896, when the government of the day was quite ready to undertake the expenditure of $750,000 for the purpose of securing this fast line, we will find that the general expenditure has practically doubled, and that therefore the expenditure of $1,500,000 for this service to-day would bear precisely the same proportion to the general expenditure of the country as $750,000 bore to the general expenditure in 1896. Therefore, to my mind, the cost of the service is not a sufficient reason why the government should altogether refuse to entertain this proposal. I believe and agree that they should exercise caution, and I believe, with the Premier, that economy is a good thing. In fact, I often feel that that view is not as strongly present to the mind of the right hon. the Prime Minister as it might be to the country's advantage. After all, this is a matter of enormous importance, one which involves a great expenditure, but not an expenditure which is beyond the resources of the country. It is a matter which, if the government of the country were as wideawake

as I hope to see them, and as I believe the opposition are, to the development of our industries, and particularly of our shipbuilding, they might very well utilize to induce the construction of large steamers in this country. I would like very much, when the time comes that this project is to be realized, that it should be so managed as to lay the foundation of a great shipbuilding industry somewhere in Canada, and if the government of the day were in a position to make a contract for the construction of two, or three, or four great steamships of the size and power and cost of such steamships as are now occupying the first place upon the Atlantic, they might be able, by calling for the construction of the steamers in Canada, to induce one of the great shipbuilding companies to transfer at least a portion of their shipbuilding plant from the mother country, and to establish in Canada a shipbuilding industry. It would be a most important thing to us if in addition to the fact that we have a line of steamers of the fastest speed, running over the shortest route and affording to the travelling public the greatest possible facilities in regard to comfort and speed, we could proclaim that this Canadian line of steamers, the finest and fastest on the ocean, were of Canadian construction. That would have great value as an advertisement for our country. We have had this matter threshed out in the maritime provinces. Last year a large and representative meeting was held in Halifax at which men of all shades of political opinion, men deeply interested in the commercial success of Halifax and the province, came together and in every way in their power endeavoured to impress on the government the fact that it was regarded as being of the utmost importance to the province of Nova Scotia that this project should be accomplished. They endeavoured to put their views in such a way as to show that this matter was of importance, not only to the province of Nova Scotia and to the cities by the sea, but to the whole people of Canada. We should not expect that such an outlay as is contemplated should be made in deference to the opinion of any locality. The people of the maritime provinces do not feel for a moment that they should come to the parliament of Canada and urge upon it the adoption of the scheme involving a large expenditure if it was of a local character, and if it affected merely sectional interests. Our opinion is that we have here the shortest line of communication between the greatest masses of population in the world; that we have, if we choose to realize it and to go to the expense necessary to realize it, a position that will place us in the forefront of the world's traffic, and will develop through our country the greatest amount of travel of the most wealthy people and give us all the advantages that must come from full and complete knowledge of our country by these people. No one who visits the western portions of our country can return from it without a feeling of amazement that the country is not making more rapid progress and development and receiving a larger population and without feeling that it is an undeveloped country. What is the cause of that? That there is as yet no knowledge of our country possessed by the people of the world. Even if the people of the older provinces in Canada to-day have no adequate knowledge of its resources, the extent and the possibilities of wealth to be found in Canada, and if no other advantage could be realized from the establishment of such a line of steamers as I am now advocating than the fact that it would communicate to the world knowledge of our possibilities, of our extent, of our capacity for producing wealth, then I maintain it would be scarcely possible to estimate the advantage that would be derived by this country from the expenditure we have in view.

But, if in addition to that, a mere calculation be made in the most commercial fashion, if we were to develop the commercial view to the utmost and look upon the extent to which shipping would be carried on by a fast line of steamers with the enormous outlay that would be made in connection with the operation of such a line of steamers, with the enormous amount of valuable supplies that would require to be purchased in Canadian ports for such a line of steamers and with the enormous aggregate of increased value which would be attached to all these products of an essentially perishable character of our Canadian farms and orchards which we are sending to the mother country in enormous quantities, and which we hope to send in increased quantities; then, even from the most commercial point of view which it is possible to take, it seems to me that it would be quite possible to prove conclusively that this expenditure of $1,500,000 would be repaid directly to the people of Canada in the increased wealth which would be brought about as the result of such an expenditure. There is another thing. I believe that Canada has derived in the past a great deal of credit and advantage from the fact that her conduct throughout has been, in view of her comparatively sparse population, progressive and courageous. There is no doubt that Canada has derived a great deal of advantage from the advertisement she has received the world over from the fact that though a young country, with a small population, she had the courage and ability to grapple with such enormous public works as the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to carry them to a magnificent and successful completion.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. BELL. The Grand Trunk Pacific may be, if all the hopes of hon. gentlemen are

realized, a still further proof that this country is not lacking in those qualities of courage which she has shown herself to be possessed of in the past. This line of steamers across the Atlantic is simply another step in the same course of progress, another proof of the possession of the same courage which Canada has shown in assuming the expenditure necessary for the construction of the great public works of which she has every reason to be proud. To my mind, all the transcontinental railways will fail to realize for Canada or for themselves the advantages which they should possess from the moment they are completed unless there is the connecting link, a bridge, so to speak, across the north Atlantic, which would enable us on these lines of railway to realize all the advantages that could be derived from the carriage of commodities and persons by a short route. We cannot in Canada at all realize or hope to realize all the advantages and all the returns we ought to receive from these great works until we complete that connecting link which will place us in connection with the great mass of population which to-day in Europe practically dominates and controls the whole civilized world. Why should we hesitate? Why should we pause? Why should we consider that inventors here and there are making progress, or that if we take a step to-day the progress of to-morrow might prove that even in respect to that step we are left behind? If we are to regard matters from that point of view, manifestly we will never do anything. We have no reason to hesitate any longer. We do not want to confine all the advantages of our situation to such a course as will enable them only to be realized wholly by the men who are to follow us in the next generation. I think we ought to endeavour to realize some of the advantages that we possess to-day, and it seems to me that the government should approach this matter, not in a cowardly spirit, not in any too cautious spirit, but that they should approach it with a positive determination to make it an accomplished fact at an early day. I do not think there has been anything in connection with all the history of the present government which is less to their credit than their connection with the trans-Atlantic fast line. I am perfectly willing to give them every credit for care and for caution, but it is impossible to forget the utterance of a member of the government, who, when this matter was first discussed in this House, in 1897, by his advocacy of a slow line, or of a fast freight line, showed that, in so far as he was concerned, he did not realize what the aspirations of the people of Canada were, and that the people of Canada had no right to expect that their aspirations would ever be realized by a government holding such opinions as they seemed to hold. If the administration realized what the people of Canada hope to see accomplished in this matter, they would approach it with a determination to give it effect at once, and if they do so they will succeed in satisfying the opinion of the people. They cannot do so by approaching the subject with a spirit of too great caution. They must show some kind of determination to accomplish something that the people of Canada in the past have sought to accomplish by the great public works which have given Canada such a marked and advantageous position as that which she holds in the world to-day. I would suppose that possibly the thing to be avoided most of all in connection with this matter, and I have that feeling very strongly in my own mind, is the idea that this should be made a matter of political issue. I do not think it ought to be regarded in that light, but at the same time it is impossible for those who are in earnest in favour of a fast Atlantic line to look with very much patience upon the exceedingly slow, cautious and unsatisfactory manner in which the government have been moving in connection with this great project. We would like to see it accomplished within a reasonable time, not handled in this fashion, apparently dropped for months and years entirely out of sight, but some action taken to show that the government had this matter uppermost in their minds, were making progress and were anxious to accomplish what we look upon as a public work of the very highest importance to the people, not only of Canada, but a work of particular importance and value, I may say, to the people of the maritime provinces. The different excuses that have been advanced by the government in the past for their failure to accomplish this project are to a certain extent arguable and cogent. The great strike in the engineering trades, the enormous advance in the cost of iron and the cost of construction, together with the Boer war, have been satisfactory reasons, perhaps, why so little has been done. But these are things of the past. The price of iron is falling, the price of construction is falling, the Boer war is happily and gloriously ended and now, as we stand here to-day, in the closing months of the year 1903, I know of no reason which should prevent the government from appearing before this House at the next session in a position to give us an assurance of the early completion of a contract which would guarantee to Canada possession of a line that shall be a genuinely fast line, and in a position to assure the people that not only had they made progress in negotiations that would not only be an assurance to this House and to this country of the realization of this project, but would be an assurance of the realization of the hopes of the people in respect to this project in the course of a very few months. There have been great developments in marine construction. The turbine engine, which has been referred to two or three times in the course of this dis-

cussion, marks an epoch in the history of rapid ocean travel. All these things have been accomplished and in the course of a few months will be finally settled. If the Cunard Company, in the construction of two new steamers, adopts the turbine engine, it may be taken for granted that the turbine engine is no longer a matter of doubt. If the result of the adoption of the turbine engine system be, as it is expected it will be by these great Atlantic greyhounds, then these great steamers, with the tremendous speed which they will develop from this new motive power, will increase their earning capacity, and one after another of the objections which may have stood in the way of the government proceeding to deal with this matter will have been removed. No longer will there be strikes, or the interference of a great war with business ; or the anticipated introduction of some new and approved method which might, perhaps, outclass the steamers which we at the moment were proposing to build. The government is now in such a position, that they will be unable to approach parliament again with any excuse for inaction or for failure to accomplish the end we have in view. They will be clearly open to the charge of being half-hearted in dealing with this great measure, if they do not, at the next session of parliament, submit some tangible evidence that we will have a fast line in the near future. For my own part I feel that this is a matter of importance to the whole of Canada, but apart from that, I feel that it is of particular importance to the maritime provinces. I know that there is no idea quite so cherished in the minds of the active business men of Nova Scotia, as that they may hope at some early day to see Halifax, or some other port in the maritime provinces become the terminus of a steamship line, which will be of world-wide fame, and which will turn to the shores of our country the most enlightened, the most cultured, and the most enterprising and energetic of the people of this world.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland). Earlier in the session I had the opportunity of giving my views on this fast Atlantic service, so that to-day I need not occupy but a few moments of the time of the House. I congratulate the member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), upon the fairness of his speech. He has stated his recognition of the difficulties which lie in the way of the accomplishment in the immediate future, of the object which we have in view in reference to this fast Atlantic service. I regret that the motion before the House after expressing the opinion that we are in favour of this project, has gone further and proclaimed a want of confidence in the government. The first clause of the motion reads :

> This House affirms its belief that great advantages would result to Canada, as well as to the mother country from the establishment of a fast Atlantic service between the two countries.

Had the motion ended there, it would have been accorded the unanimous approval of this House, and it would have given strength and aid to this government in the furtherance of this difficult undertaking ; but unfortunately, the resolution goes further, and it makes a party question of a matter that ought to be above politics. Personally, I am firmly convinced of the vast benefits which would be derived from a Canadian fast Atlantic service ; but I cannot declare by my vote, that the government have been derelict in their duty when I believe that they have not been, and I know that they have encountered great difficulties, some of which have been enumerated by my hon. friend from Pictou. Let me say, Sir, that my opinion is, that if we cannot get a really fast Atlantic service, then we should not subsidize a so-called fast Atlantic servince. I am opposed to subsidizing steamers of less than twenty knots. We should have a fast line in every sense of the word. I believe that one great benefit to be attained will be the advertisement which Canada will get before the world. Any one who has travelled in the old land must recognize the dire ignorance of a great many people there, as to the capabilities, the resources, and the geography of Canada. I regret to say that 95 per cent of those who come from England to Canada, come through the United States. They receive their first impressions of this continent in that great and wealthy city of New York. They enter our Dominion through the backdoor of Canada, instead of by the front door, which is to be found in the maritime provinces. The traveller when he lands at a Canadian port in the east, as he travels to the Pacific coast, learns as never before what a magnificent heritage the British empire has in this Dominion. If we had a steamship service equal to the best running to New York, we would have the travel from England diverted through Canada, and we would afford to Englishmen who came to Canada an oportunity of realizing the great extent and great natural wealth of our country. I believe, that viewed from this aspect alone, it would fully recompense us, for the granting of even a large subsidy to this service. I promised that my remarks would be brief, and I shall not enter further into an argument in favour of this proposition. I repeat, that if we cannot get a real fast line of steamers, we should not enter into competition with the private companies which are now engaged in the Atlantic trade. Let us have a fast Atlantic service in the true sense of the word ; a fast Atlantic service which will be a world-wide advertisement for Canada ; a fast Atlantic service which will be able to compete with the very fastest steamers running to United States ports.

Mr. S. E. GOURLEY (Colchester). It is unfortunate for Canada and for this parliament, that all great questions are relegated to a few moments discussion, whereas the

little petty domestic questions are dilated on for weeks and weeks. That has been the misfortune of Canada ever since confederation. A trifling question, as to whether a little wharf should cost $5,000 or $10,000, receives days and days of discussion, but a great question which makes for the life of the nation, is thrown overboard in a few minutes. That has been the weakness of Canada, and so long as I am here I shall endeavour to correct that weakness. We want to discuss national affairs here. We want to make a nation of Canada, and we cannot make a nation of Canada by discussing, for days, five thousand dollar grants to wharfs. We cannot make a nation of Canada by taking weeks in discussing the question of binder twine. These questions may be discussed in the township council; this parliament is for the discussion of great national questions. It is for us to solve the problem of how we can lay the foundations of Canada, so that she may have a controlling and dominating influence in the whole world. When such a question is under discussion here, some people make excuses for the time that they occupy. I shall make no such excuse. The debate on the transcontinental railway, and the debate on this fast Atlantic line are the only two subjects which were worthy of the consideration of the Canadian parliament this session. These other petty questions, can be discussed by school trustees, and by county councils, whose members have no ideas beyond the mere parish in which they live.

Now, Sir, I want to say, that the conduct of the Canadian people with reference to the establishment of a fast Atlantic line, has been insignificant and mean beyond all compare. We have been pretending to make progress on this continent; we have been pretending to dispute the supremacy of the United States in commerce, and, yet we have been debating for ten of fifteen years, whether we are to establish a fast steamship line.

I was pleased with one remark of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell). He said, what are we engaged in these internal developments for, what are we building lines of railway for, unless it is for the purpose of carrying the commerce of this country to the sea? And what is the use of carrying it there unless we have the most approved facilities for distributing it over the whole world? We are always beginning things in Canada at the wrong end. We are such a little, illogical people. We have been accustomed to look at public questions from such a narrow provincial standpoint that we have not an intelligent idea in our pates about the possibilities of Canada as a whole. The time is past for that kind of thing; and hereafter when I hear any man in this parliament endeavouring to bring the great public questions down to the low level of party politics, I will say he is not fit to be in this parliament. The question before us is whether Canada is to be a great commercial country. What man would ever think of party politics on a question like this? The man who would introduce politics on this question would want his mother-in-law's funeral to be run on political lines. This is a business question, and is to be discussed as such. If a great steamship or mercantile company, with the resources of Canada, wanted to establish a steamship line, it would have been established in two weeks. I think the Prime Minister ought to have blushed when he referred to the statute passed on this subject as far back as 1889; and I venture to say that that statute was not passed without a discussion for ten or twelve years previous. The people of Canada are so sleepy and so narrow that you have to talk about a question for years before it enters parliament; and although this question entered parliament in 1889, we find that statute after statute have been passed, and year after year has been wasted down to 1903, and we are not one step nearer to a fast Atlantic steamship line than we were on the day the first word was spoken on the subject. Is that creditable to the people of Canada? Does it look like the action of a dominating people? Can we ever hope, with such conduct as that, to become anything but a people who will receive the contempt of the whole world? I think the people of Canada deserve the contempt which the people of the United States have shown to us. The public men of this country should be spat upon for the mean, contemptible way in which they have treated the people of Canada. We look to them to lead the people. Instead of that, the people have had to drive them with a whip. Instead of leading, they have been, like cowards, listening to hear what this or that little man would say. The leader of a people should have at least twenty-five years of out-look beyond the ordinary man, and then he should beckon the people to come on and follow him. Instead of that, we have had the political leaders of this country, little fellows, holding back until they have been horsewhipped by the country and forced to go on. The people have been bigger than their leaders. That has been the position of affairs in this country. I for one protest in the name of Canada. I want to see this country great. I do not want to go down to the grave with this country but little greater than it was when it came from the Indians. We hear a great deal of talk, but we have been making little real progress. We have been for fourteen years talking about establishing a fast Atlantic steamship line, which a company of business men would have established in twenty-four hours. I want to refer to one remark of the Prime Minister, and in doing so I do not wish to be unkind. I think the Prime Minister made a great mistake in talking about this question of a subsidy,

when he spoke of the difference between $750,000, which was the subsidy for which the Allans offered a steamship service some years ago, and the $500,000 for which the Tate people afterwards offered to establish a line. Has it come to this, that on a great national question of establishing a steamship line to dominate the trade and travel of this country, a public man tells this House that $250,000 is going to be considered for one moment? Further, the Prime Minister said, even now this House would consider very gravely this question. I undertake to say that the right hon. gentleman misstated the character of this House, or else this House ought to be dissolved to-morrow, and a better class of men brought into it. If that statement is true, this House ought not to be permitted to represent the public feeling of Canada one hour; because it is entirely beneath the public sentiment of Canada as it exists to-day, and the sooner it is thrown to the winds the better; and let an able, cultivated, broad-minded class of men come in who will represent the public opinion of Canada as it exists to-day. I was sorry when the Prime Minister said that even now this House could debate about $250,000 on the great question of establishing a steamship line which might mean the dominating of the commerce of the Atlantic by Canada, instead of it pouring into New York and making that city one of the great commercial centres of the world. I want to say a word to the people, not of Ontario—I know no Ontario on this question—but the middle west of Canada, which is around the great lakes; I want to refer also to the west of Canada, and then I want to refer to the Pacific coast of Canada. There are no provinces on a great national question of this kind; and any man who debates this question from a provincial point of view shows that he has not got above the narrow provincial education of former days. I am not a Nova Scotian; I am not a maritime province man. I am a Canadian, and it is my duty to advocate a harbour on Lake Superior just as strongly and ardently as I would a harbour in Nova Scotia. If I did not do so, I would not be worthy of a seat in this parliament. I want to say that this is not a Nova Scotia or maritime province matter. It is a Canadian matter, and the fame and reputation of Canada depends on the exploiting of her maritime powers. No nation in the history of the world has ever achieved greatness without being great on the sea. England was almost a barbarous country three hundred years ago, and she had to whip Spain and Holland and France in succession in order to triumph on the sea. When she did that she became the great wealthy power of the world. Spain was great when she was a commercial power. So was Holland. So was Venice when all the ships of the world sought her ports. Go back to the very dawn of time, and you will find that the nations that were great were great in commerce. We ought all to be students, and there is only one book from which men can learn anything worth learning; that is the book in which human experience is put down. That book is the book of all—history. It tells us, if we will learn, that our country, in order to be great, must master the commerce of this continent; and how can we pretend to do that unless we can establish a fast line of steamships of our own and capture the passenger traffic? Here is the Prime Minister going over this country talking about our being a young nation, when he cannot secure the travel, when we cannot get the men who are going to London from Canada to take a Canadian steamer. We talk about being a nation, we are nothing but scrubs, and the United States people will some day wipe us off the face of this continent. I hope that these unfortunate rumours that we hear about the corridors are not true; because if they are, all the Yankees will have to do is to make a claim for Canada and they will get every square mile of it by their boastfulness and dishonest methods in diplomacy. I refuse to believe these rumours; but if they be true, we may as well give up all commercial aspirations. But if we are to have a line of steamers, that service should be the very best. It should not be inferior to any steamship service on this continent. We should have a steamship service which will rival the great New York lines. What is the sense of talking to-day about an 18 knot service and a 20 knot service? Why not get a half a dozen of rafts and start them from Halifax? That would be just as good as an 18 knot service. I would just as lief jump into the Atlantic and swim across as take one of your 18 knot boats. Such a proposition is an insult to the Canadian people. If you establish a service inferior to any other that exists on this continent, you will hear from the maritime provinces. We have our power in this confederation, and are not to be imposed upon by any second or third-class steamship service. Let me tell the people of Ontario that they are a maritime people and they ought to exploit their great lakes and equip them in the very best fashion. In like manner should the people of the Province of Quebec look after their maritime opportunities. Let them equip the whole line of the St. Lawrence and the Bay des Chaleurs. That whole route should be covered with wharfs and furnished with the most improved system of securities to navigation, so that ships in distress could obtain shelter at any time and the world would know that the coast of Canada is the safest place on the north Atlantic in which to seek refuge. Then look at the humiliating position which we have been placed by the boastfulness of our Yankee friends. They have boasted us out of existence. What happened in London at

the dinner of the Pilgrims Society the other day ? Our Commissioner, Mr. Aylesworth, had to get up and tell the British people that there was another country on this North American continent besides the United States. These Englishmen, these stupid Englishmen——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. GOURLEY. I speak of the Englishmen of the last sixty years. I am of English descent but of the great English breed before two generations ago. The last two generations are degenerates and cowards. They have had no leaders for sixty years. Since Pitt died, there has never been a great leader in England. But they have got Chamberlain to-day who is trying to galvanize and put life into the flesh and blood that is now going around in the old country in the form of human beings, and we will have a new breed of Englishmen, such as a generation ago roamed and dominated the whole world, to the glory of the British flag. That breed is coming back. We have it in Canada to perfection. The highest breed of the Saxon race to-day is in Canada. We have never become degenerate, but we have been overshadowed by the bluster and brag of the United States. I want to make ports in Halifax, St. John and Montreal that will overshadow New York, Boston and Portland, and we can do it. Talk about $250,000. Why, Mr. Speaker, if you are a wealthy man you should give a check and settle this thing in five minutes. Fancy the people of Canada haggling over a paltry $250,000, when considering the question of a national line of fast Atlantic steamers. No wonder we have been and will continue to be the laughing stock of this continent. One morning at breakfast last summer, I took up a newspaper and saw that a number of people had gathered to say good-by to the Countess of Minto, the beloved wife of the Governor General, and a lovely woman. But it was very humiliating to find that even the consort of our Governor General should have to leave our shores and go to a United States port to take passage for England. What could be more insulting to the high spirit and pride of the people of Canada than that the wife of our Governor General should have to go to New York to find her way to London ? I am imputing nothing or passing no criticism on that lady's conduct, but merely giving it as an illustration of the inferior position we occupy. I presume that the Governor General will do the same thing. My boy at the breakfast table asked me why this lady went by New York. That is the first question that suggests itself to the minds of the young people in this country. This kind of thing poisons the mind of the young. It tends to make them think little of their own country and to look upon Canadians as inferior to other people. Why should our Canadian merchants run to New York when they want to leave this country ? I have a letter from a young man, belonging to Truro, who crossed over to England, and he says he will never go to England again until we have a fast Atlantic line of steamers. He says that over at the Cecil Hotel in London there were a number of Canadians who appeared to view this thing in a different light; but the people of Ontario have never had the national pride that we feel in the maritime provinces, because if they had, we would never have had Portland made the terminus of the Grand Trunk Railway. There would have been a revolution first, but they had their spirits subjected and their souls depressed by subjection to the United States. We have never undergone that experience or occupied that position in the maritime provinces, and consequently we cannot understand why Canadians should submit to this inferiority. This young man was in London at the Cecil hotel a little while ago, and he found that every Canadian there intended crossing the Atlantic to New York. He was the only one who was taking a steamer to Halifax, and he said that he was reviled and laughed at by these Canadians from Ontario, just because they were in the presence of Americans. They thought it good form to laugh and sneer at the Nova Scotian who was sticking to the route by Halifax. He would have to leave two days earlier and arrive a day and a half later going by Canadian steamers, and he said : I will never go to the old country again until we have a fast line of steamers; and he begged me for heaven's sake to urge the parliament of the Dominion to remove this humiliation which the people of Canada have to suffer in the old country when they meet a lot of Yankees who boast of their splendid fast steamship service and ridicule Canadians.

I want to refer for a moment to the excuse which the right hon. the Prime Minister gave us for delay. The Boer war has been responsible for a lot of things. Just imagine the Premier giving the Boer war as an excuse for this long delay in establishing a fast steamship service ! Why, the Boer war started three years after he came into power. It did not start until October, 1899, and he had every chance during the preceding three years to establish that service. But what discourages me more than anything else is his statement that we must wait for naval changes. Why, from the earliest time naval changes have been going on from year to year, starting with the old Greek triremes. Suppose the Greeks had waited for modern steamers what progress would they have made ? The Prime Minister wants us to wait for two or three generations until we are all gone and will only be able to look down from a higher sphere at what is taking place here below. I know nothing that encourages me to think that this line of steamships is more to the

front, than it was ten or fifteen years ago. As to naval changes we ought to establish our steamship line now, in the best fashion that the world's development in navigation will allow. Of course, naval changes will take place. When they take place, adopt them. That is what the steamship lines do, and why should we not do the same? To wait for naval changes, that might take place, is no way to meet this problem. That is but a weak excuse that the Prime Minister gives us. I hope the government will not wait for the turbine. Of course, we all hope to see the turbine developed, and made practically useful, for it will make the passage across the Atlantic a mere holiday trip, of two or three days. That is one of the splendid accomplishments we may hope for, in the future. But it is a good deal like the wireless telegraph—it will come in two or three years, perhaps five or ten years; but it will take time to perfect it. Do not, for heaven's sake, delay this line for any such chimera. It will come in good time, but, in the meantime, our fast Atlantic service will be established. Get the best line that can be attained, and get it at once. The question has been raised of an expenditure of $250,000, more or less. What is $250,000, in comparison with a scheme like this? Let us spend $5,000,000, if necessary. Why, you are giving subsidies to railways, half of which, no doubt, will be stolen. I have no doubt, that enough will be stolen out of the railway subsidies, given this year to give $5,000,000 for a fast Atlantic service. I have no interest in this mean economy. The people do not mind expending money. All we ask, is for you to keep it out of the hands of the boodlers. If it is spent honestly, let it pour out in a stream. We cannot do the work we are here to do, if we are to stop to consider a question of $250,000, in connection with a scheme to join the two continents, and give Canada a precedence throughout the world. Why, it is like a rich man talking about whether he will give ten cents or twenty-five cents to his valet—what does it matter which he gives? If you are going to get the service, you must pay for it. But what has happened? I do not want to blame the Prime Minister too much, but just think what this government of business men did. They found a contract with the Allans, when they came into power—or an offer from the Allans. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Roche) made a point about the difference between a contract and an offer. Why, even lawyers do not think of these differences. If two men meet and agree, that is a contract—a clerk can look after the matters of detail. All that was necessary, in this case, was for the government to say the word, and they could have had the fast line, at once. Then, if the Allans found that their subsidy was not enough, let them come back, and we could double it. If they still found it not enough, let them come back, and we could double it again. That is the way for men to deal with a great scheme like this, at the founding of a nation. We are not deputy reeves of a township. We stand at the creation and birth of a nation, and we must have bigger and broader ideas, if we are to prove ourselves statesmen equal to our opportunities. And what has this penny-wise-pound-foolish statesmanship led to? A few years ago we had an offer from the Allans for a line of steamships for $750,000. The government, inspired by Ontario politics—for I see the hand of Ontario in all this—wanted to cut this down. They wanted to go to the public and say: We have saved $250,000; two hundred and fifty thousand dollars! What great statesmen we are. Why in any reasonable country they would have been hooted from the political platform. But the Prime Minister—and, living so near the Atlantic as Quebec, he should have had a broader outlook and wider aspiration; but I believe he was speaking in Toronto and no doubt he felt the freezing influence of Toronto around him so his ideas contracted under the chilling influence—boasted of this saving of $250,000. It is greatly to his discredit that he introduced such an argument into the consideration of a great question like this. It was beneath the dignity of the Prime Minister of this country. I say to the Prime Minister that he should not have allowed his Ontario colleagues to interfere. He should have told them to stand by while he settled this question himself. He should have said: Go into another room and sit down until I get through with this business. But, instead of doing that he listened to them. And now, instead of accepting $750,000, the Allans come back and demand $1,500,000 for the same work. That is the result of this picayune policy of saving ten cents in connection with great national issues. It is something like our fellows—and I mention this to show that I have no sympathy with this kind of thing wherever it is found—who went down to Newfoundland to negotiate the bringing of that great island into confederation. They went there and they opened a bargain as if they were buying so much old junk. They thought that a great people like the people of Newfoundland should be content to deal with a matter of this kind on the basis of figuring out with the stub of a pencil and trying to cut off five cents here and ten cents there. Why, what would a proud province like Newfoundland do? They turned them out and have been laughing at them ever since. Why, in such a matter Canada's position was like that of a man courting a girl. He may cover her with diamonds but when he marries her they are all his own. Whatever we had given to Newfoundland would have been ours after the union. But these people had not outlook enough to see that. So are our dealings with this fast line subsidy.

Now, with reference to speed, I want

first to know the speed to New York, and I want to have a line that will be one or two knots faster. It is idle for us to enter into a contract with steamers having the same speed as those to New York. That port has its advantages. It fills the mind, it fills the imagination of the world, and it will be attractive above the ports of Canada even with the same service. You have to establish in the public mind of England and Canada the fact that the service to Canada is faster than that to the United States. Therefore, I repudiate any service unless it is faster by one or two knots than that to New York. I want no more picayune, tu'penny-ha'penny bargains. Either throw the project up and say we are not equal to it, or establish it whatever it may cost. As to the port to which it is to run, let these competent steamship people determine where that is to be. We can control them, whether they go to Quebec, Halifax, Montreal or St. John. Pile on the subsidy; give them every help that they need ; let Canada settle this question, once for all, whatever it may cost. My hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) referred to the ignominy endured by the people of Canada, from the fact that the English parliamentary visitors coming to Canada, landed at New York. Of course, that is a back-handed slap at Canada. It is an advertisement to the people of Europe, and to the world, and an acknowledgment on the part of the people of Canada, that the people of the United States occupy a superior position, and we an inferior position. And that is the idea that prevails. There is no use talking about it, it prevails. The result is that to many of the English people, America is the United States. And we deserve that. Do not let us shirk our responsibility ; we are responsible for the opinion that exists in England because we have allowed the port of New York to be known all over the world. New York is in the United States and most people in the old world know of no port in America but the port of New York. That is America to them, and although we have ports here, we have stood by and let them remain unknown, and as a consequence Canada is unknown and we are responsible, we who are sitting here in parliament are responsible for the degradation of Canada, and we cannot escape that responsibility. I am determined, as far as I am concerned, to escape it ; if you want the degradation, you shall have it, but I shall have no part of it ; I shall declare to this House and to the country that we alone are responsible for the fact that Canada occupies the mean position on this continent she occupies to-day. Halifax, St. John and Montreal should be more than equal to Boston or New York if we had had men equal to Henry Clay and Daniel Webster who exploited the national resources and national fame of the United States. But we had a smaller class of men, or if we had some big men we had so many small men that they climbed on their backs and kept them from carrying out their ideas. Of course the Liberal party are more responsible for that ; the hon. gentlemen were chiefly concerned whether napkins should be washed once or twice a week, and whether a gentleman should have more than one champagne glass for each of his guests. These were the great questions that occupied the attention of parliament year by year, when these great topics to which I have referred should have been up for discussion. With regard to the term for which the contract should endure, some gentlemen say you should make this contract for ten years. That is too short. How can you expect a great company to invest millions of money on a contract that will run for only ten years ? You can scarcely get a great enterprise started inside of ten years. You should make your contract for a long period and in a liberal spirit, so that the company entering the contract would know from the start that they were in the hands of sympathetic friends, of people who desired to help them at every turn and not to worry and harass them. We should make a contract for twenty or thirty years in order that the company may feel sure of a safe and growing business and that no shortness of time would deprive them of the advantages they might expect from the exploitation of their business, and that no other company should be able to come in and for some little question of a million and a half dollars of subsidy cut their trade from under them. What a tremendous thing it would be for Canada to have a powerful company go into this business and exploit it ! Equip your ships with the greatest luxury and comfort so that they will be superior to anything in New York, and then if necessary, build one or two short lines from here to Halifax or St. John, and make your coaches and dining cars on these lines the finest in the world, so that every man from England or any European country returning from New York would say : The finest railway and steamship service in America is the Canadian service. Let us spread that idea abroad whether it costs one million dollars or ten million dollars and then we shall have done something for Canada. Would it not have been better fifteen or twenty years ago to have grasped that idea and to have borrowed $20,000,000 for this purpose? It might have given us thousands of millions of a return, given us population, given us fame and reputation and lifted us from the petty position of little provinces into a great nation. The only way in which we will ever get to be a nation is by adopting comprehensive measures of this kind. Sir, I am the smallest man in the county of Colchester, the man with the most limited vision, with the narrowest ideas ; my constituents are all my superiors in education, intellect, brain and everything of that kind, and therefore I am surprised when I find

a number of members of parliament up here who seem not the equals of the average citizen of the province of Nova Scotia. I expected when I came to this parliament to see men of vast learning, and vast outlook, and vast research, and vast capacity for statesmanship. There are such men in Canada and perhaps there are such men in this House, but they have not exhibited that liberality and breadth of sentiment in this matter that I could have desired. I hope the time will come when in discussing matters of this kind men from Ontario and from Manitoba will be the first to rise and say: This is a maritime question, let us join together to further it. A maritime question is really more important to a man in Manitoba or the inland country than to the people near the sea, because what is the use of people in the inland provinces raising vast crops if they have not the easiest communication to the sea and the best communication across the sea to carry their products to the markets of the world? I hope that hereafter we will not see maritime province members indulging in these discussions; it is wrong—gentlemen from the west, from Ontario, should be the first on their feet to urge the claims I have been urging to-day. That I hope will be the character of the public men in this country in a few years. If the question under discussion has reference to a harbour at Midland or on Lake Superior it will be the men from the maritime provinces and the men from British Columbia who will support it. It will be these men who will urge the opening of communication with the western prairies via Hudson's bay in order that the grain of the west may reach Europe by that route instead of dribbling south through the United States. That should be the ambition and the hope of every man in this country, and, so far as I am concerned, I will never cease advocating these opinions because until we accept them we can never be anything but little, scattered and disjointed provinces.

Hon. Wm. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Mr. Speaker, I protest against the expression which my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. Gourley) has used in reference to the want of intelligence of the Englishmen.

Mr. GOURLEY. I meant those of the last sixty years; of the last two or three generations.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Let us take the House of Commons and the House of Lords in England to-day and you will find there representative men equal to any House in Europe or any other place, and it would be well for us, and well also for the hon. member for Colchester, if he had the intelligence and the logical acumen that these people possess. Certainly they would not wander from Dan to Beersheba as the hon. gentleman has done.

Mr. GOURLEY. That is the trouble with them; they have blinders on and never see anything between these blinders. God help my soul there is not one of them fit to drive a band of sheep across the country.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I am pretty well acquainted with the people of Colchester county of both parties, and I must say I do not know one man of either party in Colchester county capable of making the speech which we have listened to from the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) to-day. He and I agree on one thing, that the fast line should be kept out of politics, and that both parties should unite in securing the fastest and the best service, and I think it is a most fortunate thing for the Dominion of Canada that we did not engage in a fast line eight or nine or ten years ago, because if we had done so we would now be behind the age in every respect. While the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gourley) condemns the bringing of this subject into party politics the resolution which he is going to support and for which he is going to vote makes it immediately a party question, because the resolution is brought to condemn the action of the government in not having established a fast line. I am with the hon. gentleman in his desire to keep this out of party politics, and I want to repeat that it is a fortunate thing that we did not establish a fast line before now, because now we do get it—and I think it is going to come perhaps sooner than some people expect—we will have the best and the fastest line, superior to anything that crosses from Europe to New York, and nothing else will satisfy us.

Mr. GOURLEY. If we get this fast line must we not improve it every hour and keep it up to date? If we had got it ten years ago we would have had to improve it every hour and keep it up to date. This will go on just the same. Changes will come and we will have to adopt them.

Mr. C. E. KAULBACH (Lunenburg). The subject under discussion—a fast line steamship service—is one that has engaged the attention of parliament for some years, and one which has been looked upon with much favour by many Canadians interested in having ourselves as Canadians keep pace with our neighbours to the south of us.

When we consider that Halifax is 400 miles nearer old England—the world-centre of trade—than New York and that the port of Halifax is second to none in America for approach and safety when in it, I can see no reason why we should lack in enterprise, why we should not be equal to the emergency, act upon our impulses, and have a line of steamers to compete with our neighbours. It is humiliating to find Canadians, when taking a trip to England, leaving Canada and going to New York, away from the objective point, in order to find a fast line boat to accomplish such a voyage, and the same returning, when we can so readily have a service of our own. I want to see the condition

of matters reversed, and we Canadians have a fast line of our own, with Halifax, so to speak, the New York of Canada, as well as the entrepot of trade, offering inducements for Americans to come to Halifax and embark for the old world, from that point, and vice versa, which we will find quite within our reach, if we set about it determined to have it.

If Halifax could only see herself as others see her, if she would free herself from that lethargy which has possessed her in the past, if she would think of the future which is hers, and bestir herself, with the determination to realize the duty she owes to herself and the country, with the great natural advantages within her grasp, she could be all she desires to be. She could be the chief depot of trade for Canada, and for enterprise and thrift a second New York.

But there is one thing that suggests itself to me, as a matter of vital importance, in connection with the protection of life and property, and that is the course these fast line boats should be required to take for the safety of the lives of fishermen engaged in the fisheries on the Grand Banks of Newfoundland. The ocean track for steamers at present plying between Great Britain and Halifax is across the Grand Banks of Newfoundland, which means devastation, swift and sure, to any vessels found at anchor in the track of any of these boats moving along at a fast rate of speed. When the horizon is clear, danger from these boats can be seen and averted by signals, fog trumpets or guns, but when the fog shuts down and the storm king rides with fury on the blast, preventing the sound of the fog trumpet or gun from being heard, or when the fog prevents the discernment of the lights of an approaching ship in the distance, the ship, with her speed unabated in order to accomplish a quick passage, ruthlessly presses forward when crossing the banks, regardless of the lives of the poor fishermen. Then it is that death, swift and sure to all vessels' crews in their track is occasioned.

But for this risk, the life of the fisherman is a comparatively pleasant one. The fishermen often in conversation express themselves as being regardless of danger, feeling when at sea on board their vessels, which are seaworthy, staunch and strong, such as those composing the fleet from my county, as safe as if they were on land, and to emphasize this expression of feeling, they can truthfully and with a happy, right, good, loyal, hearty ring, sing the old familiar song :

A life on the ocean wave,
A home on the rolling deep.

Or the more pathetic one, 'Rocked in the Cradle of the Deep.' Or when the fisherman returns to his domesticated home, 'The Cottage by the Sea.'

On behalf of this class of hardy, brave fishermen, to whom much of the success of Nova Scotia depends, my county in particular, I must ask if it is not possible to have the attention of other countries called to the many risks attending fishermen on the Grand Banks when pursuing their calling, and have an arrangement made with the United States and the old world, through their respective boards of trade, and they with their respective governments, with the object of having all lines of steamers traversing the north Atlantic between America and the old world, excepting those going north of Newfoundland, take a course along the southern edge of the Grand Banks, and south of Sable island, which would carry them free of all the fogs of the banks, and the risks of icebergs, and better still, avoid the risk of the destruction, as I have stated, of the lives and property of fishermen.

I would ask the government to consider this matter very carefully, so important to our fishermen, and endeavour to effect an arrangement on the lines I have suggested.

House divided on amendment Mr. Borden (Halifax).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Haggart,
Avery,	Hughes (Victoria),
Bell,	Lancaster,
Blain,	LaRivière,
Clancy,	Morin,
Clare,	Richardson,
Clarke,	Sproule,
Cochrane,	Taylor,
Fowler,	Vrooman,
Gourley,	Wilmot.—20.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Archambault,	LeBlanc,
Bazinet,	Lemieux,
Belcourt,	Lewis,
Bernier,	Macdonald,
Blair,	Macpherson,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	McCool,
Bourbonnais,	McCreary,
Bruneau,	McIsaac,
Bureau,	Madore,
Calvert,	Malouin,
Campbell,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Carbonneau,	Mignault,
Carroll,	Morrison,
Champagne,	Mulock (Sir William),
Christie,	Oliver,
Copp,	Paterson,
Demers (St. John),	Préfontaine,
Desjardins,	Proulx,
Douglas,	Reid (Restigouche),
Emmerson,	Roche (Halifax),
Fisher,	Ross (Ontario),
Fitzpatrick,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Fraser,	Scott,
Gibson,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Girard,	Talbot,
Kendall,	Tolmie,
Lang,	Tucker,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Turgeon,
Lavergne,	Wallace.—58.

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Thompson (Haldimand and Monck),	Ingram,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Tupper (Sir C. H.),
Dyment,	McCormick,
McColl,	Ward.

Sutherland (Essex),	Northrup,
Harty,	Reid (Grenville),
Wade,	Smith (Wentworth),
Riley,	Earle,
Maclaren (Huntingdon)	Rosamond,
Stephens,	Seagram,
Fortier,	Roddick,
Holmes,	Kendry,
Ross (Rimouski),	Casgrain,
McGugan,	Hackett,
Murray,	Barker,
Gallery,	Kemp,
Loy,	Kaulbach,
Schell,	Birkett,
Erb,	Brock,
Mackie,	Bruce,
Meigs,	Carscallen,
Brown,	Halliday,
Bickerdike,	Kidd,
Laurier (L'Assomption),	Léonard,
Ethier,	Maclean,
Russell,	Monk,
Matheson,	Robinson (Elgin),
Smith (Vancouver),	Sherritt,
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Hyman,	Gilmour,
Johnston (Lambton),	Simmons,
Charlton,	Tisdale,
Guthrie,	Porter,
Cowan,	Pringle,
Parmelee,	Pope,
Costigan,	Hale,
Gould,	Thomson (Grey),
Heyd,	Tolton,
Grant,	McGowan,
Tobin,	Ball,
Davis,	Roche (Marquette),
Beith,	Culbert,
Wright,	Lavell,
Fielding,	Borden (Halifax),
McCarthy,	Bennett,
Ross (Yukon),	Boyd,
German,	Broder,
Stewart,	Calvin,
Béland,	Ganong,
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Johnston (Cardwell),
Galliher,	Lennox,
McEwen,	MacLaren (Perth),
Lovell,	McIntosh,
Geoffrion,	Osler,
Mackinnon,	Robinson (Northumberland),
Harwood,	Wilson,

Amendment (Mr. Borden, Halifax) negatived.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I did not notice the absence of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan), and as I am paired with him, I ask to withdraw my vote.

Mr. CALVERT. The hon. member for Queen's and Shelburne has not voted.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am paired with the hon. the leader of the opposition, or otherwise I would have voted against the amendment.

THE USE OF MAIL BAGS.

Mr. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure). I wish to call the attention of the Postmaster General to a matter which is of sufficient importance to the Canadian public to merit the attention of this House for a few moments. During the last few days hon. members of this House will have noticed that the corridors have been flooded and covered up with an immense number of mail bags containing campaign literature. I would not object to that, if it did not interfere with the ordinary postal service of the country, but I am informed on reliable authority that the distribution of this matter through the mails is seriously interfering with our postal service. The post office of the House and the post office in the city are glutted with this matter; the railway postal cars are over-laden and, what is more serious still, newspaper publishers in Montreal have been unable to obtain mail bags in which their papers are sent to the post office for distribution to subscribers, the supply of mail bags having been 'cornered.' This is a serious state of affairs, and I would ask the Postmaster General if any complaint has come to him from newspaper publishers, or from any other citizens?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. WALTER SCOTT (West Assiniboia). It occurs to me, Sir, that this is no laughing matter at all. Several days ago I sent some correspondence through the mail to my home at Regina, and I received word last evening that it had never been delivered. I am informed that this has been caused by the congestion in the mail service throughout Canada, as a result of the flooding of the mails with tons, and car-loads, and cargoes of campaign literature, franked through this House, and samples of which we have seen for some days piled up in the corridors and incommoding the members generally. If the privilege that is given to members of this House to frank mail matter is to be so flagrantly abused, it seems to me that an amendment to the existing regulations has become imperative. It is rumoured also that one reason for the length of this session is to be found in the fact that the opposition have prolonged it purposely in order that they may have an opportunity of franking these car-loads of campaign literature during the session.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. SCOTT. This is not a laughing matter either, and the taxpayers of Canada will not consider it a laughing matter. One hon. gentleman on the other side of the House calculated that it costs no less than $28 a minute to keep the session of parliament going. When the taxpayers of Canada realize that it costs so much to keep this House in session, week after week and month after month, simply to allow the opposition to frank their campaign literature, these taxpayers will not consider it a laughing matter. We have evidence, day after day, of the purpose of gentlemen opposite to uselessly keep the House in session. It is true that such questions as the fast Atlantic service and provincial autonomy for

the North-west Territories are questions of real importance ; but is it not a fact that for the three months, from the first of May to the end of July, our friends on the other side were simply marking time by pretending to criticise the estimates. Ever since I was a boy I have heard the members of an opposition described as being the watch-dogs of the treasury ; but surely never were there watch-dogs who could satisfy the appetite of contention propensities with such small bones as the members of this opposition were picking here for three months this summer. They took one whole night discussing, hour after hour, the matter of soft pork ; for hours on another occasion they devoted their whole time to discussing the price of two wheel-barrows, and on a third occasion they gave us their views for an entire evening on an alleged exorbitant charge of 25 cents in the cost of an axe. These may be matters of interest, but we have the Public Accounts Committee for the special purpose of considering such questions, and surely it is not meet to keep an august body, such as this House, in session week after week and month after month, discussing such picayune things. I repeat that this is no laughing matter to me, and I believe that the people of the country will not consider it a laughing matter. My hon. friend (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure) has acted very properly in drawing the attention of the Postmaster General to the subject. I understand that the system followed by the Postal Department is that, as a matter of courtesy, the newspaper offices are allowed a certain number of these bags, which are the property of the Crown. They are taken to the office of publication and there utilized for the ordinary circulation of the newspaper. It seems that a newspapers publisher in Montreal, who is engaged in the laudable work of printing and publishing these tons and car-loads of campaign literature, has taken illegitimate advantage of the courtesy which is extended to newspaper publishers, and through their connivance this literature is sent in the bags to the members of the opposition here for the purpose of being franked, and we see it stacked around the corridors, and glutting the post office here and glutting the post office in the city. This is done to the detriment of other newspaper publishers who are deprived of the use of these bags which they need in their ordinary business. I trust that the Postmaster General will do his duty in this matter, and if it becomes necessary, that he shall confiscate these bags and their contents and allow each newspaper publisher to receive his fair proportion of them.

Mr. W. McCREARY (Selkirk). As a sample of the inconvenience to which the general public are put, I may state that the Winnipeg newspapers—the 'Free Press,' the 'Tribune' and the 'Telegram'—which should have been here two or three days ago, have not yet reached Ottawa. I made inquiry as to the cause of this, and I was informed that they had left Winnipeg all right, but they had failed to reach here on account of this undue over-crowding of the mail service of the country. The files have had to be put away without these copies of the Winnipeg papers, and members from the west find it a great inconvenience now, as it will be a great deprivation in the future when they have to consult these files. I trust that the Postmaster General will do something to remedy this.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). Complaint has been made to the department that certain newspaper publishers are not able to get their proportionate supply of these bags, because of the great numbers of them which are otherwise in use. I may explain to the House that for the convenience of the newspaper publishers it is the practice to allow them to have in their possession a number of these mail bags so as to enable them to forward their newspapers to the post offices in a convenient form. In that way, newspaper publishers of Canada are convenienced in the transmission of their papers to their ordinary subscribers. It appears that one leading publisher in the city of Montreal has improperly used these bags and diverted them to a purpose for which they were never intended. He has done that to the inconvenience of his fellow-publishers, and to the detriment of the rights of the public in general. The department is to-day unable to supply other publishers with bags for the transaction of their legitimate business.

Mr. CLARKE. How many bags has this Montreal publisher used in this way ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Thousands, I should say. My attention was called to the matter to-day by my officers, and I am informed that the deputy minister has been endeavouring to obtain possession of some of these bags. The publishers of 'La Presse' of Montreal cannot be supplied with bags.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Are they sending out literature too ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know what they are doing. They are engaged in the publication of a public journal, and they have their rights as well as other publishers. My hon. friends have asked for information, and I am giving it. This question has been brought to the attention of the department in the ordinary course of business. Yesterday the supply of bags available at Montreal was exhausted, and one publisher could not get a single bag because of the absorption of the supply by hundreds and thousands, I expect by the one publisher in question, who has diverted those bags from the proper use for which they were entrusted to him to this illegiti-

mate and scandalous transaction. If the hon. gentlemen who control these bags would be good enough to remove their contents and let us have the bags, then the business of the post office could be carried on. But I am not prepared to go to thousands of dollars of expense to purchase additional bags—even the making of them would involve a considerable time—simply to enable a procedure of this kind to be carried out. It does seem to me that a very grave abuse has been made of the privileges of parliament in this procedure. I doubt if parliament ever intended that tons and tons and carloads and trainloads of printed matter should be printed in different places in this country and sent post free to the city of Ottawa, to a member of parliament, under the provisions of the Act which allows such matter to come free; and that this same privilege should be so abused in the method which is now being adopted. To-day the postmaster of the city of Ottawa has made a complaint to the department that he is unable to carry on the legitimate work of his office owing to the congestion of the building by the accumulations of mail matter there—this literature, as it is called, which has been dumped there in carloads every day. Moreover, the difficulty cannot be removed by any addition to the staff at the Ottawa post office or at the House of Commons post office. The cars have not the capacity to carry away this stuff. The postal cars are of limited capacity, and we have been filling them to accommodate hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Could not some of the private government cars be used ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. And yet in spite of every effort that is being made, the accumulation is gaining upon us, and the public service is being prejudiced.

Mr. CLARKE. Mountains of information.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Whatever may be in it, I do not know. I am told that hon. gentlemen themselves made a very excellent use of a large portion of this literature, having for some reason consigned it to the flames. I do not know whether the balance is intended to be so used; but perhaps it is about as good a use as it could be put to. On that I offer no opinion. Speaking from a party standpoint, I regret what has been destroyed, because the more freely it could be circulated the better it would be for the Liberal party. Speaking departmentally, which is the only way in which I speak now, I would say that hon. gentlemen opposite are as much concerned as the government in the proper management of the postal service, and I think it is inconsiderate on their part to deluge the service with this immense quantity of mail matter, which is treated as all other mail matter without any partiality. Every letter that goes through the post office receives the same treatment, without priority; and this literature, which everybody knows is of no very great importance, is for the time being inconveniencing the officers in the carrying on of the legitimate work of the post office, which is so directly concerned with the convenience of the public generally.

Mr. INGRAM. I infer from the remarks of the hon. Postmaster General that the opposition is sending out this literature. I know that my county is flooded with the speeches of the hon. Minister of Finance, and I would like to know what channel they come through.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not heard anything about the speeches of the Finance Minister. I am now alluding to these enormous accumulations that are seen in the corridors and passages of this building, that have blocked the business of the post offices and the railway mail service of Canada. I am speaking of that literature, be it from one side of the House or the other. But this accumulation arises from the particular class of literature to which I have alluded, which has been despatched in postal bags to the whip of the opposition, to be redistributed by him throughout Canada. I want these bags, as the property of the Crown, to be forthwith returned to the Post Office Department. Unless they are delivered there, I shall have to exercise the authority of a Minister of the Crown and take possession of them. I beg to say, in all seriousness, that we are to-day without mail bags for the proper convenience of the subscribers to the press of this country. We have sufficient of that class of property, but it is unfortunately at this moment out of the control of the government. Enormous numbers of these bags are under the control of an hon. member of this House, and I ask him here to return those bags forthwith——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Lay them on the Table ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Or I will take steps to take possession of them by force of law. We do not desire in the slightest degree to interfere with the use of the franking privilege.

Mr. GOURLEY. When does the hon. gentleman propose to take possession of them ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am giving notice now. If I am asked to specify a time, I will do so. I will give the hon. gentleman to-day to deliver those bags to the proper officers, and if they are not delivered by Monday morning, I will take steps to take possession of them.

Mr. COCHRANE. Don't get mad.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not at all. I propose to try to protect the crown in its own rights, and in doing that

to protect the citizens of the country in their legitimate rights. I maintain that the public of Canada are not called upon to submit to the inconvenience and the injury to which they are now subject because of this gross violation of the privileges of parliament. When a member of this House finds himself in possession of mail bags which are marked the property of the crown, the property of the Post Office Department, it is his duty at the earliest moment to return them to the government to whom they belong; and when they come to him illegitimately, as they did in this case, that duty is a much more pressing one on his part. It was a gross violation of the privilege granted to the publisher of that newspaper to divert these bags from the purpose for which they were entrusted to him; and it is my intention not to allow that same publisher any more to be entrusted with bags until guarantees are given that they will not be diverted from the use to which they ought properly to be put.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The hon. the Postmaster General has given us an exhibition which is hardly becoming his dignity and hardly worthy of the office he fills. He has spoken of that illegitimate and scandalous use of bags.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Illegal.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it illegal or improper to do what the law provides may be done ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What does the law provide may be done ?

Mr. SPROULE. It provides that any matter may be sent free to any member of this House during the session of parliament, and any matter, franked by any member, shall go out free, whether it goes out in single papers or by the bag full.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Would the hon. gentleman contend that it is legal for a publisher, who had possession of these bags, to make use of them in the way he is doing ?

Mr. SPROULE. The law provides that publishers of newspapers shall have the right to send here mail matter, and by regulation of the department, for the sake of convenience, bags are furnished for that purpose.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They were not.

Mr. SPROULE. And he is not using them improperly or illegally.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He is.

Mr. SPROULE. Mail matter going out of the post office franked by any member of this parliament, whether it goes out in single papers or by the dozen, or in mail bags, is going out in accordance with the law and is neither illegal nor scandalous. The members of the opposition are exercising their undoubted right in sending the matter through this post office, when franked as the law provides. That is all they are doing. Reference is made to the fact that in the corridors large piles of these bags are found, may they not as well be found there as in the Public Works Department, or some of the other departments, where civil servants, who are paid by the country, are employed to address and mail them ? I am informed that such is the case.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is not one iota of foundation for that statement. Not one bag nor one-half a bag has been sent out from the Public Works Department nor has any employee of that department been engaged in any such work.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman deny that there are not employees in some of the departments sending out these speeches ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot speak, any more than can the hon. gentleman, for other parts of the city. He mentioned the Public Works Department in particular, and I say here, in the presence of everybody, that not one bag nor one-half bag, nor any literature, has been mailed from that department, and no employee connected with that department has been engaged on any such work.

Mr. SPROULE. I was credibly informed——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. SPROULE. I was creditably informed that such was the case, but of course I accept most unreservedly the denial of the hon. minister. I was told that in some of the departments this is being done, and the Department of Public Works was mentioned as one of them. However, whether they come from that department or not, we know for a fact that speeches of the leader of the government and the Minister of Finance and others were sent out by the thousands, franked by members of parliament. They are not sent through the post office in this building, and therefore are not to be found in the corridors, but they are sent out from elsewhere, and I think improperly, because they should go from this post office, if franked, which, I am told, they are. They should be sent from here, but they are not at present ; and the only difference is that in the one case you see the matter in these corridors and in the other you do not. I am told that while the Postmaster General says that these bags are being sent out by the thousand, there were only all told 140 bags in the corridors.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know whether there are more than 140 bags

there at the one time, but I am told that there are large quantities in store at Ottawa waiting until this great mass in the corridors is removed, and then they will be set in their places. They are coming up in wagon loads at all hours of the day. The accumulation may be only 140 at this moment, but I expect that thousands of them have been taken away.

Mr. SPROULE. There is not a member of this House who would believe for one moment that these bags reached the number of one thousand.

Mr. SCOTT. There are several thousands.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) should be the last man in the world to object to the distribution of knowledge, because I do not know of anybody who needs it more. And hon. members should remember that the country requires information to-day more than anything else. Are these hon. gentlemen afraid to let their light shine before the world and their deeds be known ? It is because they dare not let what is taking place in this House be made known throughout the country, that they object to this so strenuously. The hon. gentleman has said that this thing has tended to lengthen the session a month. That is not the case. What has lengthened the session ? Why, the government business has not been down until quite lately. We have been in session over seven months and the government has not got its work all down yet. Only a few nights ago the last supplementary estimates came down and we were told that there are more coming down with regard to the Quebec bridge. When did the railway subsidies come down ? Only a few days ago. Supplementaries containing over $10,000,000 only came down the last two weeks. yet forsooth the opposition are to be held responsible for the length of the session. Surely the hon. gentleman could not expect the country to take any stock in such a statement. The hon. gentleman spoke of what the increased length of the session cost the country. It does not cost the country a dollar more. An amount is voted for the session and whether the session be long or short, it practically makes very little difference. It is the poor members of parliament who have to suffer.

Mr. BELCOURT. What about employees who are paid by the day ?

Mr. SPROULE. They are paid a very small sum.

Mr. BELCOURT. Does that not increase the cost of the session ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is it true or not that the Postmaster General pays these men $25 a month at the post office for stamping and sending out that literature ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no man in the service of the Post Office Department who is paid so small a sum as $25 per month.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. SPROULE. When you left the Chair at six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, we were dealing with the question which was raised by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) with regard to what he was pleased to call, and what the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) afterwards termed, a scandalous and illegitimate use of the Post Office Department. No more ill-advised words could be spoken by a minister of the Crown. As members of parliament, we are here to do the work of the country, and what we are doing is within our undoubted right. The law provides that mail matter shall be sent free from this House to any portion of the country, when it is franked by a member of parliament and put in the custody of the Post Office Department. That done, the department is bound to take care of it until it is either delivered to the party to whom it is addressed or returned to the party from whom it is sent. In view of this, the statement made by the Postmaster General as to what he would do or would not do seemed to me rather unbecoming. I am glad that the Postmaster General, who was absent when I began to speak, is now present. I hope he is in better humour than he seemed to be before six o'clock. It was said—I think, by Mark Twain—that if you fill an Englishman up with roast beef and porter you may even venture to approach him with a subscription list. I hope that now that the Postmaster General has had a good dinner he has come here in a less belligerent and more amiable mood than he seemed to be in before recess.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am always amiable.

Mr. SPROULE. And I hope he has forgotten the threat he made that if, by Monday morning these bags are not away, he would do so and so. Any attempt on his part to carry out that threat might be attended with serious consequences. In the first place it might obstruct the corridors of the House of Commons.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am afraid it would.

Mr. SPROULE—because, as members of parliament we have certain rights. The government is bound to provide us with conveniences for doing the work of the people which we have been sent here to do. That was our stuff that is in those bags, and it has been duly franked and put in possession of the Post Office Department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not franked yet.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes a good portion of it is franked and is there waiting for the Postmaster General's Department to take it away. But, because the hon. gentleman has not provided enough assistance in the office, it cannot be taken away. But it has been handed over to his department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, it has not.

Mr. SPROULE. It is there to be taken away. Well, if the hon. gentleman's threat is carried out, what would be the result? These corridors would be blocked. We have not enough room. We have not the luxurious apartments of the Postmaster General and his friends taking up practically one-third of the room of the House of Commons. We have a little 7 x 9 room for our accommodation. Lazarus like, we are trying to subsist on the crumbs that drop from the rich man's table. If the Postmaster General should endeavour to carry out his threat, I have no doubt there would be resistence. There is too much of the Anglo-Saxon domination in this part of the country to allow that threat to be carried out without some effort to prevent it. Every man who is a man stands up for his rights. It is said that even a worm will turn if you tread upon it. Perhaps the Postmaster General feels that he can turn to his friend the Minister of Militia, and get the militia turned out to support him. But let me remind him that that would involve heavy expense which the city would have to pay, and they would hold him to serious account for it. It would hardly increase his popularity. So, I think that after serious consideration he will hardly carry out that threat. At any rate, we hope he will not.

One of the hon. members on the other side said that we had destroyed a lot of literature. We did dstroy a lot of literature—we are free to admit it. And why did we destroy it? Because, through some mistake, the figures were wrongly given, and to put those figures before the people would have been to mislead them. So, we destroyed that literature, every sheet of it. Would the Postmaster General desire that it should be sent out to mislead the people and give them a wrong impression. We thought it more honourable, more manly to destroy it.

Mr. SCOTT. Are there no mistatements in what is going out?

Mr. SPROULE. We believe not.

Mr. SCOTT. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) pointed out——

Mr. SPROULE. To the best of our knowledge and belief, the statements made in the literature now going out are correct. But we would not send out literature containing errors which we knew to be errors. Now, I say that, as members of parliament, we have a right to send out this literature. It is now the property of the parties to whom the different pieces are addressed. It is franked and addressed and in the possession of the Post Office Department, and the Post Office Department is bound to deliver it or return it to us. Why is not that literature sent away? We are told, when we endeavour to get it away, that the Post Office Department has not a sufficient number of hands to do the work, and the Postmaster General will not allow them to engage more.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is not true.

Mr. SPROULE. I believe it is absolutely true.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then the hon. gentleman believes something that is absolutely untrue. The staff of the department is ample. The trouble is that the cars are not sufficient and the train accommodation is over-taxed. It would take train after train to carry the stuff. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been sending away carloads every day.

Mr. SPROULE. I am only telling the hon. gentleman what is told us.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) often rises and says that he is credibly informed so and so. Just before six o'clock he said that he was informed something about the Public Works Department which turned out to be absolutely untrue. Yet he said he was 'credibly informed.' Now, he is 'credibly informed.' Will he give me the name of his informant?

Mr. SPROULE. That is a handsome request on the part of the Postmaster General. I wonder that he is not ashamed to ask it. Would he want to penalize one of his own employees because of a statement made by him that there were not enough hands in the Post Office Department?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will the hon. gentleman name his informant?

Mr. SPROULE. I made a statement which I believed to be true, and where I am known I will match my reputation for veracity against that of the Postmaster General any day. I do not come here and make statements that I do not believe to be correct, and I deny the right of the Postmaster General to contradict me. I made the statement on the authority of the chief whip (Mr. Taylor) who sits beside me, made to me fifteen minutes before. So, was not I justified in repeating that statement? I have a character to maintain, and I will not allow any man to call my veracity in question even though he be called the Postmaster General.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPROULE. I am within my rights. I made a statement before six o'clock, that

I was credibly informed that certain material was being sent through the mails from the Public Works Department. I have made inquiries since, and I find that the stuff is being sent out, but that I happened to be wrong about the department from which it was going. It is being sent out in large quantities, and I am told that it is being addressed by the civil servants who are paid by the country. On the other hand, we are paying for this work out of our own scanty means, and we are working night and day to send out this literature to the country. We are doing only what it is our right and our duty to do, and, instead of being abused, we ought to be commended for it. We are doing what is strictly within our legal right. But what did hon. gentlemen opposite do in this matter of abusing the franking privilege. Sir Richard Cartwright sent out, I was told, about a ton of matter. It was sent out between sessions. It was not in any sense an official document of this parliament, but a speech made on the public platform, printed here and sent out under the frank of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, sent out improperly, wrongfully, illegally. On the other hand, we are doing what the law gives us a perfect right to do, and no more. It is true we were mislead by the government. We began to send this literature out because we were mislead into believing that an election was coming on.

Mr. FRASER. Now we have it.

Mr. SPROULE. It is the right of the opposition to try to enlighten the people of the country. Are hon. gentlemen opposite afraid that the people will be too much enlightened, that the record of the government will be placed too plainly before the people. When we began to send out this literature the government got scared and backed out, and now we are told they are not going to the country. It is said that we have lengthened the session, adding greatly to the cost. Is that the case? What does the hon. gentleman know about it who made that statement? Is it not the fact that we are here practically by the job —we get $1,500 for the session, whether that session last thirty days, or nine months, or a year. We get no more and no less; it entails no additional charge on the country. The Speaker of the House gets the same salary whether the session is two months or twelve months; so do the Clerk and the Assistant Clerk and the other officials. Who gets what additional cost is imposed on the country by the increased length of the session? A few of these little pages, the messengers and the sessional clerks and writers, who are paid by the day, these poor people who are dependent upon their daily labour for their subsistence, and the government begrudges them even the few days of additional work they get by reason of the increased length of the session. The page boys get $1.50 a day, and the government would rather cut them off from that; the same thing applies to the messengers and the sessional writers. The allegation of increased cost is entirely incorrect and misleading. I said before and I say again that we should be rather commended for our industry. We are engaged in an onerous, arduous, honest and faithful work; we are distributing the records of parliament, which should be always acceptable, and no men should be more pleased to find them distributed to the electors of the country, who must after a while give their verdict, than the hon. gentlemen opposite. Is that an improper or a wrong work or one for which the opposition should be abused? I say it is not, and I only ask that the government should give us as an opposition fair-play. We are only exercising the rights to which we are entitled by virtue of our position as representatives of the people. We are doing no injustice to the government in exercising these rights. If they do not provide accommodation for us to do our work in any other place than the corridors of this building, we must do it in the corridors, and if the mail bags of the country will not hold these papers we will have to empty them in the corridors, because they must be handled by the Post Office Department whether the government likes it or not; that belongs to the people. It is unfair to blame the opposition for doing no more than what they are sent to do by the country and the stigma is cast on the electors rather than on the representatives. I can tell the Postmaster General and his colleagues that when the time comes the people will resent that stigma, and that they will have to settle with the people and not with us for the tirade of abuse they have heaped on us because we have endeavoured to enlighten the people on matters on which it is our duty to enlighten them.

Mr. R. G. MACPHERSON (Burrard). I do not think I can be charged with taking up much of the time of this House. As a representative of the west, a man who lives 3,000 miles from here, I protest at the way in which the business of the House is being kept back by people who certainly should know better. One hon. gentleman has sat in this House for five and twenty years; during this session I have sat in the House every day except three, and I have never heard any little question of business discussed that the hon. gentleman did not enlarge upon it. There is not a member in this House who took up as much time as the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman talks only about what he knows, it is no wonder he does not talk much.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I do not think it is right or fair that we who live a long distance from here and have other things to look after should be kept here to hear the empty vapourings of people who want

to air their views in which no one is interested. As far as I am concerned, I am prepared to sit here as long as any good is being done, but I cannot see how any good is being done in a case of this kind. A statement was made a few minutes before six o'clock that there are 140 bags in the corridor. To my personal knowledge there are 735 bags around this House, all full of this literature. I do not object to this literature, but I do say that it is an abuse of the franking system. Perhaps, as a young member, I should not say that kind of thing, but I do not think the law was intended to cover a case of this kind, whether the literature is sent out either by the government or by the opposition. These bags average 90 pounds each, and if the postage on their contents was paid by the men who should pay for it out of their own pockets, it would cost $2,940 to pay for what is now being franked. I am told that for the last 40 days an average of 150 bags a day, filled with this literature, have gone out. That is some 6,000 bags, and taking five bushels to the bag, we have 30,000 bushels, and with 1,000 bushels to the carload we have 30 carloads of literature which have been sent out from here at the expense of the people of this country. I have heard hon. gentlemen denounce in unmeasured terms the small salaries paid to railway clerks and employees. I quite agree that the railway clerks should be well paid, for I know many railway clerks who have to go into a car piled to the ceiling with this literature; they are expected to do work in that car and are paid a small salary for doing it. Members should pay for the literature which they send out; if I have literature to send out, I will pay for it myself, and every man should do the same thing. The franking privilege is meant to extend only to the ordinary courtesy of sending parliamentary papers to constituents.

Mr. N. BOYD (Macdonald). We have heard a good deal about the mail bags, and now we have had a lesson from what I might call one of the wind-bags.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. BOYD. I take it back, but I must say that when the hon. gentleman or any other new member of this House undertakes to belittle the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) he undertakes something that neither he nor any other man can do in this country. That hon. gentleman had a reputation in this House long before the hon. gentleman who has just spoken was ever heard of, and he will have a reputation after many who are now criticising him will have passed out of the public eye. Returning to the question, I understand that under the Act we have a right to send any parcel up to four pounds and the Post Office Department is bound to accept it and take care of it. We have not in any way exceeded the rights which we possess. If any one wishes to dispute what I am about to say, let it be submitted to the Committtee on Privileges and Elections or any other committee and see if we cannot prove that for every day almost of this session, or at least since literature commenced to be sent out, the Liberals have sent out from 25 to 50 bags. All of this has been stamped, and in every way the Liberals have been taking advantage of their rights; yet now, when our literature is being held back because we are not able to get it out on account of their literature, the hon. Postmaster General, forsooth, is going to take the bags and distribute them. We will wait until we see him. The Liberals have sent out a much larger quantity of literature than have the Conservatives. 250,000 copies of the Premier's speech on the transcontinental railway have been sent broadcast through this country, bearing the franks of hon. gentlemen opposite. We are sending out the speeches of our leader and of the hon. gentleman whom our friends opposite admired and still admire, the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, so that the people of the country may have that side of the question also. Then, in addition to the speeches that are being sent out from Ottawa, I understand that the Montreal 'Herald' is having some hundreds of thousands of the speeches of the hon. gentlemen distributed amongst other Liberal papers through the country and inclosed as a supplement, thereby taking advantage of the mails in order to distribute these speeches among the people.

Do we hear the hon. Postmaster General arising and finding fault with that? No, not at all. These are things to be investigated, and while they are emptying the bags we will be there to see. Hon. gentlemen talk about a lengthy session, forsooth. We have had a session the like of which has never been known in the history of this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite have voted away more millions than has ever been voted away in any session in days gone by. It is hard to believe that it would be possible for men in their sound senses to think of voting away $120,000,000 for a railway. Then we have had a railway Bill that took up two months of the session, followed by a Redistribution Bill, some of these important measures being brought down three months after the House met. The House was called together months after it should have assembled. It was not called together until March 12 thus subjecting to inconvenience every man coming from the outlying districts of this country. If the government did not know that, they should have known it. They have taken advantage of the members of this House in bringing them here at the time they did, yet we hear hon. gentlemen getting up and making the statements that we have listened to to-day. The Conservative party will be prepared to justify before the public

every action they have taken. Hon. gentlemen opposite may bring on the election to-morrow or the next day or the week after, and we will be prepared to go on any platform and before any public audience in this country and discuss every question, and we will also be round when they are emptying the mail bags.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will not be greatly surprised to have this question thrust upon you this afternoon by hon. gentlemen opposite who sit on the back benches, but you will be greatly surprised at the attitude assumed by the hon. Postmaster General and Minister of Labour (Hon. Sir William Mulock). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if, after reflection ; if, after he has had a few hours to think over this matter, he thinks that he has cut an unenviable figure ? I ask the hon. gentleman just where he is going to draw the line, where the franking privilege will be misused and where those using it will be within the limit ? Will the hon. gentleman be the judge as between the number of speeches that have been sent out upon this side of the House or upon that side of the House? Is there any limit that the hon. gentleman can fix, or any rule that he will submit ? I will sit down while he answers the question, because I think it would be very useful for the country to know. The hon. gentleman will not undertake to make a statement as to where the limit shall be drawn in order that one may not exceed it on one side or the other, or that there shall be no abuse of the privilege by members on either side of the House.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not aware that I have said to any hon. gentleman that he was not at liberty to exercise the franking privilege. Parliament leaves it to each hon. gentleman to exercise the franking privilege in accordance with the true spirit of the Act. That is not the real subject under discussion. The question came up as to the shortage of mail bags for the press, and I stated that the reason of the shortage was that the courtesy of the department had been disregarded by a leading paper, which had received a certain quantity of bags for the proper use of the publisher, but which had been improperly used. I say that again. I say that we have allowed this newspaper, bags for the purpose of inclosing their own papers to be sent to the post office for transmission amongst their subscribers, and that the publisher has abused that privilege, because, instead of using the bags for that purpose, he has diverted them to this other purpose, withdrawn them from circulation and thus interfered with the right of co-publishers, making it impossible for the department to supply bags to other publishers of papers for the purpose of distributing their papers. The use of bags for the purpose to which these have been put is contrary to the purpose for which they were loaned. These bags belong to the department, and unless they are returned the department will take steps to repossess itself of them.

Mr. CLANCY. We have heard the explanation of the hon. gentleman. This little piece of theatricals has all been over a few mail bags.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Thousands of them.

Mr. CLANCY. What kind of facilities is the hon. gentleman giving this country, when he has only a few mail bags ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The best it ever had ; far better than the Tories gave it.

Mr. CLANCY. He is telling us that they have a few mail bags.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Thousands.

Mr. CLANCY. He says a thousand.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I say thousands.

Mr. CLANCY. I venture to say that the hon. gentleman is again wide of the mark. Even if it is 2,000, it does not affect the question. I ask the hon. gentleman if he, as Postmaster General, and his department are not bound to furnish all the facilities necessary to carry the mail matter from any newspaper office in this country that may be legitimate mail matter ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No ; there is nothing whatever in the law compelling us to take mail matter from the publishers. We carry it from the post office when it is delivered there.

Mr. CLANCY. That is what the hon. gentleman is doing now. The hon. gentleman knows very well that the franking privilege does not belong to the members of this House alone. During the session of parliament it belongs to every elector in Canada. He may send his mail matter within the limits prescribed by the regulations of the department to this House. What has been done by this publisher ? He has complied literally with the law. He has not violated a single particle of the law, and he has done this for the convenience of the Post Office Department. Is the hon. gentleman going to confess that he has run out of a few mail bags ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Thousands.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has run out of thousands ?

Mr. COCHRANE. No, he has not.

Mr. CLANCY. The country will know that the hon. gentleman's department is

well equipped. If he is not prepared to cope with the Montreal 'Herald' and to carry the speeches of the right hon. First Minister and of the hon. Minister of Finance—all properly within the law, and no person is complaining of it—because he has a number of mail bags distributed over the country, the people of the country will understand how well equipped the hon. gentleman's department is. If these few mail bags are not returned to him, he says there will be a fuss over it.

Mr. CLARKE. Call in the police.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) says call in the police. I think the police might very well be called in to take charge of the hon. Postmaster General. I tell the hon. gentleman he has no more right to empty those mail bags than any other person has, and I do not think the hon. gentleman will undertake to empty them, notwithstanding his threat. The hon. gentleman is greatly disturbed over a few mail bags. Does the hon. gentleman know that two or three years ago in the Department of Agriculture the stamp of the hon. Minister of Agriculture was used improperly and illegally for the purpose of sending out literature? Does the hon. gentleman know that when some one stated that between 2,000 and 3,000 copies of the speech the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) had delivered at Massey Hall had been sent out, that the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce stated himself that it was more nearly 10,000 copies? Yet this was done right under the eye of the Postmaster General, and with his sanction and connivance the law was violated.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is wholly without foundation.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman had better not make that statement, or I will take occasion before this House adjourns to produce the frank of the hon. minister of whom I have mentioned.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman said, that with my knowledge and contrivance—my knowledge and connivance——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). And contrivance too.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman said that with my knowledge and connivance the Minister of Trade and Commerce had transmitted large numbers of copies of his speech at Massey Hall through the post office. I do not know what the Minister of Trade and Commerce may have done; he will answer for himself; but I do know that no minister has ever, with my knowledge or connivance violated the franking privilege.

Mr. CLANCY. I am glad that the Postmaster General made that qualification, and has found a means of escape. I will take his word for it, as I am bound to do; but I want to ask if the Postmaster General was not a little less vigilant in that case than in this. Did those who are now complaining call his attention to that matter?

Mr. CLARKE. Not a bit of it?

Mr. CLANCY. Not a bit of it. Will the Postmaster General be a little fair now. What is there wrong in this? Who has violated any law; who has violated even good taste, if it be a matter of taste? I want to tell the Postmaster General that it is not costing the country a dollar.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, it is.

Mr. CLANCY. The taxpayers are not paying one cent extra for this. The Postmaster General has not increased his staff in the post office here; there has not been an additional employee brought into the service, and therefore it has cost the people nothing. The Postmaster General knows perfectly well that a rush of matter like this passing through the mails temporarily. costs the country nothing. Therefore it costs the people of Canada not one farthing for the distribution of that literature. Where is the complaint then? Is the Postmaster General or the leader of the House going to intercept that knowledge which is going to the country?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Knowledge?

Mr. CLANCY. Yes; knowledge on a great question is being sent out broadcast, and this is the first time in the history of Canada that any one has been told they are sending out worthless literature, when they are sending out the literature of which these gentlemen opposite themselves are guilty. The hon. gentleman cannot silence public opinion or public sentiment. Neither can he intervene, and shake out this mail matter from the mail bags into the corridors. If he does, his employees will have to pick it up again and send it to the people. The House has never witnessed such a scene as we have witnessed this afternoon. I hope the Postmaster General will profit by the exhibition he made here.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Don't have any such hope.

Mr. CLANCY. He gave us an exhibition of bad taste and bad temper.

Mr. CLARKE. It was an abuse of the privileges of the House.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend says it is an abuse of the privileges of the House, and I say it is not becoming to the dignity of a minister, who only a few nights ago told us how well his department was managed, to now come down and announce that Canada has run short of mail bags, and that he

cannot possibly furnish mail bags to a great newspaper in this country. Let me tell him that it is the duty of a Postmaster General, whether he be Liberal or Conservative, to meet the demands for distributing such literature, whether he may agree with it or not. If the Postmaster General is short of mail bags he had better get more. An apology is due from him at this moment; an apology is due from him, that with all the resources at his disposal, he is not able to meet the requirements of the mail service of the country, and I trust that he and his friends will not again precipitate such a scene in a hurry.

Mr. S. HUGHES (Victoria). The members on this side of the House were watching the countenance of the Postmaster General for an hour or two before he broke loose. We could not understande what was the m atter with him.

Mr. CLARKE. He was incubating.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Possibly he was. The whole House was admiring the genial countenance of the Prime Minister, but the Postmaster General looked dumb; there was something weighing him down, and at last we discovered what it was. He told us in his speech, that we were using thousands of mail bags, that it was scandalous, that it was an abuse of the privileges of the House, and then he stated that it would take a special train to carry these circulars up and down the country. Let me tell the Postmaster General, that these circulars were put into those mail bags for the convenience of his officers, and in doing so we were conferring a favour on this country, and doing work which his officials should have done. Not only was that done in the office of publication, but they were mailed as they had a perfect right to be mailed, to a member of this House, and that member was quite within his rights when he remailed them. He could have dumped them into the post office.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He could not get them in.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Yes, he could have piled these mountains of information up in the post office, and the Postmaster General dare not attempt to stop him. It was to relieve the hard worked and poorly paid post office officials of this country, that the Liberal-Conservative party went to the trouble of putting this mail matter into sacks. But the Postmaster General finds that this scheme to supplant the Prime Minister will not work. He finds that there is not going to be an election, in order that he may have a possible opportunity of becoming Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada. We have noticed it in him on the street; we have noticed it in him in the House, and we noticed it especially this afternoon. He has shown dissatisfaction with things around him, and it is easy for us to conjecture what the cause of it all is. Now, he seeks to make a little cheap popularity in the country by attacking the Conservative party, and stating that his mail cars are overcrowded. If he is run out of mail cars, why does he not turn out two or three of the minister's private cars, and use them as mail cars ? If he has no postal cars why doesn't he take the government private cars and put his officers in them to distribute this mail, and enlighten the people of the Dominion ?

Mr. COCHRANE. Sifton's car is not doing anything now.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Oh, yes it is.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The Postmaster General complains of these mail bags being seen in the corridor. I want to tell him that the Liberal-Conservative party does not go at night to a back street office in the town, and take the Postmaster General's frank, or the frank of his deputy, and ship circulars without their going through the regular post office here. What the Liberal-Conservative party does is done in the broad light of day; right in the House of Commons and the people of the Dominion of Canada can see what is going on, and we are not ashamed of what we are doing. The Postmaster General says that he has no mail bags ? Where have they gone ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Several hundred of them are here now ?

Mr. COCHRANE. You got down from the thousands.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In the Auditor General's Report I find a list of items for repairing these mail bags. Here is the Ottawa Supply Company, and that I believe, is a made up institution especially for the occasion. Here is the account of the Ottawa Supply Company : 900 bags at $1.70; 300 bags at $1.60; 15 bags at $1.50; 45 bags at $1.20; 1,850 bags at $1.35—that would be about enough for us, according to the Postmaster General.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not half enough.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Well, here are some more : 230 bags at $1.05 ; 150 bags at $1. That is more than we have in the corridors now. Then I find : cotton duck pouches ; 140 at 30 cents, 477 at 30 cents, 114 at 25 cents. Cotton duck bags fitted with swivel, 18 at 35 cents ; cutting down jute sacks, 64 at 25 cents ; drag sacks, 6 at 95 cents ; 7,500 at 80 cents. Where have they all gone ? 4 at 85 cents ; 1 at 80 cents; 190 at 45 cents. Red striped linen bags : 48 at $1.65, 150 at $1.30, 24 at $1.25, 150 at $1.25, 150 at $1.15, 100 at $1.10. These are all from the Auditor General's Report for 1902, page S—11. If I had the report for

this year, I am sure I could pile up a mountain of them. Then, here are yellow bags. I suppose these are for the twelfth of July. I wonder if the grand master saw any of them his way.

Mr. SPROULE. I must thank him very kindly.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That shows how considerate I was. Are there any green ones ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I suppose the Postmaster General handles all kinds ; it does not make any difference what colour they are. Here are 150 at 40 cents, 100 at 25 cents, 24 at $1.16. Then I find an item : C. Warner, Ottawa, repairing cotton duck bags, 338 at 42 cents ; fitting with bars and ring, 452 at 5 cents ; repairing jute newspaper sacks, 801 at 41 cents ; fitting with cords, cases and ferrules, 481 at 9 cents. These must be some of the old patched bags which he is giving the Tory party. Then, here is a firm called William Willis & Son, Aurora. It strikes me that Aurora is a little north of Toronto.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In North York, a fine place.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In North York, which the Hon. Postmaster General represents. I find these items for William Willis & Son, Aurora : brown duck satchels, 25 at $1.80, 200 at $1.80, cotton duck folders, 73 at 45 cents, repairing mail bags, 6,732 at 25 cents, seamless cotton bags, 300 at 38 cents, 100 at 35 cents, 50 at 33 cents. I see also this item : T. H. Winter, Aurora, extra trips with mail bags between railway station and post office, 242 trips, which this gentleman made to the railway station carrying these mail bags to be sent all over the country, and he charges 25 cents a trip. And yet the Postmaster General has the hardihood to stand up here and say that he is short of mail bags. I was surprised today to see the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) get up when the Postmaster General turned his head around as if he had touched a button. You talk about the independence of parliament. Where was the independent spirit of that hon. gentleman when he would let any minister touch a button as a signal for him to get up and make an attack on the people, as he did today ? And where was the independence of the wild and woolly west, when the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) arose when the Postmaster General touched the button to say that a letter had been delayed. We all knew that the Postmaster General was possessed of a tyrannical spirit when he broke loose, but I hardly thought he could go the length he has done to day. I tell him that the hon. gentleman who put this matter in the mail bags did a service to the Post Office Department, and if he dares to take these mail bags, he and his officials will have their work cut out for them in a different manner from what he expects. He may exercise his right to seize these mail bags ; he may be within his authority if he does so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Whether he is within his authority or not, he will not dare to do it. The hon. gentleman has made such an exhibition of himself to-day that it will take a lot of smiling and cajoling to put him in the estimation of this House and the country where he stood before.

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

House of Commons—further amount required for sessional clerks, $2,330.

Mr. SPEAKER. This item is required on account of the length of the session. It provides for the payment of the sessional clerks to the 20th of this month. These estimates were prepared some time ago, when it was expected that this session would be over by that date.

Mr. CLARKE. Has any consideration been given to the representations that have been made to Mr. Speaker respecting increased remuneration for some of these men ? Are they being paid at the same rate, or is any increase being given to them ?

Mr. SPEAKER. No. The sessional clerks are divided into three classes : one class at $3 a day, another at $3.50, and those who know shorthand and typewriting, at $4.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How does the number compare with the number formerly employed ?

Mr. SPEAKER. It is just the same—25.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there any provision in this item for any extra pay for messengers and the officials about the doors ? Are they to receive any additional remuneration besides their per diem allowance ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The longer the session, the better for them, because they are paid by the day and will receive more money.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Might I ask your consideration, Mr. Speaker, to the suggestion I dropped the other evening, to the effect that the members of the press gallery should be placed on the list of sessional clerks. Of course there are a few of the reporting staff who obtain more or less extra remuneration by reporting for the committees, but that is arduous work, and I am satisfied that they are entitled to all they earn in that way and that the country would endorse the action of Mr. Speaker, and the House in placing these gentlemen on the sessional staff. They do a great deal of work for the members and in this way save the increase of the sessional staff.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have not had time to consider the matter very fully, but I find on inquiry from the officers of the House that no such remuneration was ever given in the past.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Would it not be a very good precedent to lay down ?

Mr. SPEAKER. It is a very important question and I would not like to offer an opinion just now. We would be paying persons who are not at all under the control of the House.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). They would be then.

Mr. SPEAKER. I presume that the members of the press gallery would prefer to be absolutely free as they are to-day.

Debates—amanuenses, $560.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is that for ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The amanuenses are the young men who do the type writing for the reporters of the debates.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Are the debates not reported under contract ?

Mr. SPEAKER. No, the debates reporters are officers of the House. The contract system was given up some twenty years ago.

Sessional messengers, $2,500.

Mr. SPROULE. How many have we ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Forty-nine.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Are they paid by the day ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Ottawa public buildings—further amount required for Victoria Memorial Museum and other buildings, $100,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am asking a general vote in view of the fact that last session in the main estimates there were some votes for two or three public buildings at Ottawa. I have not had a satisfactory plan made out yet ; but if we had this vote, we might during recess be able to make more satisfactory arrangements for the acquisition of sites.

Mr. SPROULE. The intention is to go on with the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Has the hon. minister any idea where it is to be located ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No definite arrangement has been made. If I were to express myself favourable to one site as against another, it would be very difficult for me to obtain satisfactory prices.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not know whether it was this building which was meant, but I understood from the Finance Minister that it was impossible to locate it on government property, but there was some adjoining property which could be had. He did not wish to say where it was because the price might be raised.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is one of the matters under consideration. I shall have a further survey made to see whether or not the architect was mistaken. I am now having a survey of the property made. We may have to buy the adjoining property.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This system of voting the money without knowing the site is not the one which is followed in England. In this country the ministers contend that if it be known they intend purchasing property in any particular locality, they will have to pay two or three times as much for it ; but, after all we are entitled to know where the site is before voting the money, and the government have always the power to expropriate and have a fair valuation made. It seems very odd to vote large sums without knowing where the money is to be expended.

Mr. BIRKETT. I hope that this vote will meet with the approval of both sides. There is hardly a member of this House who has not, either by word or act, expressed his opinon that it is necessary we should have additional accommodation for our public buildings. I think that the hon. minister of Public Works is perfectly justified in asking for this amount in the way he has done. To have asked for a more definite vote would jeopardize whatever chance he may have for the purchase of a site at a reasonable price. There are two or three different sites in the city, which the owners would be very willing to sell, and for my part I would be perfectly satisfied to leave the matter in the hand of the minister, being convinced that he has the interests of the government and the department at heart and will choose the site best suited for the building. I hope that the vote will pass without further opposition.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is this for the geological building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I may congratulate the minister. It is pretty nearly time Canada had a better Geological Museum and building generally. If he will proceed immediately with the purchase of the site and next year, if he should happen to be in office, go on with the immediate construction of the building, the House and the country will heartily endorse his action.

Mr. RICHARDSON. What progress is being made for the establishment of a mint?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The plans are being prepared and the question now is to obtain a site.

Public works—chargeable to income—public buildings, Quebec, Que., hospital for treatment of immigrants suffering from trachoma and kindred diseases, $12,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Representations were made some time ago that this building was necessary. On further consideration the matter was allowed to stand. Again the request was renewed, and it has been urged as a matter of great public interest. It has been reported that some of the immigrants are troubled with this disease, and there is danger that it will spread throughout the country.

Mr. FOWLER. Does not the hon. minister think it would be preferable to ship these immigrants back to their own country? It seems to me a very singular thing that we should be obliged to establish a hospital for immigrants coming into the country, to cure them of this disease. It is a most unheard of proposition, to my mind a most scandalous proposition. I am surprised that the Minister of Public Works should bring in an estimate of this sort.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are pretty well accustomed now to my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) using very extravagant language.

Mr. FOWLER. I am afraid I learned it from the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock).

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman is learning pretty fast apparently, for a new member. I have no doubt my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and others will understand the need for this building better than I do. It is for the purpose of ascertaining whether these immigrants have this disease. I understand from the medical officer that there is no way known to medical science to learn whether this disease is present without a careful examination. Some have been passed as free from this disease and have entered the country when they could not be sent back, though they actually had trachoma, and their being at large endangered the health of others.

Mr. FOWLER. It says that the building is for the treatment of these immigrants, not for examination.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. friend knows all about it he can hardly need my explanation.

Mr. BELL. They are there on probation?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, and it may be—though I did not I confess, ask as to that point—that, in case they have the disease to some slight extent, they may be treated and cured. But the explanation given to me by the officers was that the object was to make a test of these immigrants.

Mr. COCHRANE. How do the American officials find out whether immigrants have this disease or not?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Under the same system, I am informed; but I have no personal knowledge.

Mr. COCHRANE. I understand that the American official at that port examines immigrants and excludes those suffering from disease.

The PRIME MINISTER. They have a house of their own in Quebec.

Mr. FOWLER. If the explanation of the Minister of Public Works is correct, he is unfortunate in the choice of words in this estimate. It does not say a word about examining the immigrants to see if they are suffering from this disease, but it says 'hospital for treatment of immigrants suffering from trachoma and kindred diseases.'

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I suppose the officials of the department are responsible for the wording, and it may not convey just the idea that the officials of the immigration branch of the Interior Department conveyed to me. I have not made the detailed inquiries, that, perhaps, I should have made, but I am sure they represented to me that the first and great object was to ascertain whether the immigrants have the disease or not.

The PRIME MINISTER. As I belong to Quebec, and am more familiar than is my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) with the circumstances, I may give some explanation. This building has been made necessary in consequence of a state of facts which we discovered last year. It was found by the medical experts that we had in Quebec some of these immigrants coming from some part of Europe, who, though suffering from this disease had escaped detection at Grosse Isle. At Quebec they were suspected of suffering from trachoma and were detained at St. Rochs, where there is quite a congested population. At one time we had the house visited and found twelve patients. There was great danger of this disease contaminating the neighbourhood. It was too important a matter to be neglected, and we thought it would be better to have a house properly fitted, so that these sick people could be isolated, and the community protected from infection.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the minister to say that it was the intention to put up a building so that these people might be separated from the others until they can be sent back. This is a contagious disease, there is no doubt; and, while some cases are curable, the great majority are not curable. I frankly confess that I think the course proposed is the proper one to take. These people cannot be isolated too soon,

because you intensify the evil by allowing the disease to spread.

Quebec military buildings—new iron foundry (revote), $4,800.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This amount was voted, but lapsed at the end of the fiscal year, the accounts not being in and ready for payment. I am asking for this revote so that the accounts may be paid. The same applies to the next item, which is for the new artillery workshop, $3,000.

Mr. BELL. Are these buildings completed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think there is some more work to do in fitting them up.

Public buildings, Nova Scotia—Springhill public building, repairs, $7,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is necessary on account of the unfortunate accident by which the man who was responsible for it and one of his comrades were killed. The building was damaged and the heating apparatus wrecked.

Mr. FOWLER. What was the cause of the accident ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The man who was in charge was killed. The expert sent down to investigate reported that though everything was blown up, he found that two large valves which should have been opened were left closed, and the steam being unable to escape, had caused an explosion.

Public buildings, generally—immigrant buildings, $12,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This has been applied for by the Department of the Interior, and it is said that the need of these buildings is urgent. One of them was so urgent that we have undertaken to go on with the work. This is to be provided where the Barr colony is settled. A number of immigrants have come in late and have not provided themselves with housing for the winter. It is proposed to put up a temporary building to shelter them.

Mr. GOURLEY. The utmost care should be taken and no expenditure spared to prevent any mishap occurring to these people this winter, because if there should be any mishap to them, no matter how improvident they may be, there would be a stream of misrepresentation against Canada in the spring.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I quite recognize this, but the departments in these matters always want things done in a hurry and want a great deal of money, so that some one has to keep the brakes on. I have kept the vote as small as possible, but I recognize the truth of what the hon. gentleman has said that even if there is some waste of money it would not do to have these people suffer.

Ville Marie wharf—Lake Temiscamingue, repairs, renewals, &c., $2,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The government have a small wharf at this place. There is quite a large settlement there, and the amount of trade growing up in that district is simply wonderful. I did not believe it myself until a deputation came down here and explained it to me. This is being done in order to enlarge the wharf so as to accommodate this growing trade.

Windsor harbour—sheer dams, training dykes and deepening River Avon (revote of lapsed amount), $700.

Mr. FOWLER. Are these all the votes that are to be taken for public works in Nova Scotia ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All that I know of.

Mr. GOURLEY. I have received a letter to-day asking for a permanent light at Bass river. The hon. Minister of Finance will know that there is at this point an important manufacturing concern headed by Messrs. Fulton. They are 15 or 20 miles from the railway, yet with the assistance of the summer shipping in the Bay of Fundy and by hauling to the station in winter, they are conducting a successful business in the manufacture of furniture, which is sent all over New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. Although they have encountered many difficulties, such as fire, difficulties that would have discouraged most people, they have persevered and are doing a good deal of shipping on the Bay of Fundy. You built a wharf there a year or two ago, but Mr. Edward Fulton, who is a leading man in our county—unfortunately he is a Liberal, but in every other way he is a most distinguished man—writes me and complains that it is very difficult for the steamers to get into the wharf and that he has, in fact, to hold a lantern on the wharf in order to enable them to make it. They have to load the steamer whenever it can get in with the tide. Mr. Fulton thinks that $300 or $400 would be sufficient to put a permanent light there, which would enable the steamer to get in with less difficulty.

The PRIME MINISTER. Does the hon. gentleman say that this Liberal wants to hold a light up to them ?

Mr. GOURLEY. I do not wish to introduce any politics in the matter; Mr. Fulton is a very capable man, notwithstanding his politics, and a very good man. I would ask the hon. Minister of Public Works to see that in some way this accommodation is furnished.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Of course, it is too late to put anything in these

estimates. I know Mr. Fulton, the gentleman to whom my hon. friend (Mr. Gourley) has referred, and I know that his industry is an important one, but whether or not this light should be provided by the department is a matter which my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works will have to ascertain.

Mr. GOURLEY. What good is your harbour if the steamer cannot get into it on the tides? It cannot get in at regular hours.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think they need some light in Colchester county.

Mr. SPROULE. It takes such a trifle to provide a light of this kind that the government could take out a sufficient amount from the vote for lighthouses without having a special vote.

The PRIME MINISTER. The Minister of Finance has given a good reason; they want light in Colchester county; that is enough.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is right. I shall have to have a report made, and I will be glad to have this during the next week. There is a general vote out of which this light can be erected.

Mail subsidies and steamship subventions—steam service between Petit de Grat and the Intercolonial Railway terminus at Mulgrave, $3,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Explain this please.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is an item for the purpose of establishing a service which will be a very important feeder to the Intercolonial Railway. It is to develop the fishing business of the eastern part of Nova Scotia, which has already been the subject of discussion on one or two occasions in this House. It is to develop the business of sending fresh fish from the eastern portion of Nova Scotia to the upper provinces and even to the western states. It is an important and growing business and it has given considerable traffic to the Intercolonial Railway already. This is for an extension of the steamship service in connection with this business. I have no doubt this will give a large amount of extra business to the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. FOWLER. What steamer is going to be on this route ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know as that point has not been decided yet.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Surely we must have some finality as to subsidies. If we are going to subsidize steamers to carry trade to the Intercolonial, I think it is carrying the principle of subsidies to an absurd length.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am sure there is no subsidy that we have voted for generations which is better entitled to consideration than this one. We have had discussions in this House as to the importance of developing this fresh fish industry and perhaps we could take no step which would more directly aid that industry than by making connections between the central fishing communities and the railway terminus at Mulgrave. There is a large fishing industry at Cape Canso, which has given a great deal of business to the Intercolonial Railway. This is to bring a similar traffic from Cape Breton and I feel quite sure that there is no money that we will spend that is more likely to develop business than this subsidy.

Mr. BELL. Where is Petit de Grat ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is in Richmond county, on the island Madame.

Mr. FOWLER. How large a place is it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is a scattered fishing district. It is a community that has given a great deal of attention to the fresh fish business. The fresh fish business requires a very special organization. Where you have the ordinary fishing business, where the people cure their own fish that can be done in a small way, but if you establish a fresh fish business it needs a considerable amount of capital and organization. This subsidy is for the purpose of aiding a steamer to be put on the route for the purpose of gathering the fish and shipping it.

Mr. BELL. There are two steamers now plying in that vicinity. One of them runs from Canso to Arichat and the other one through the St. Lennox passage to St. Peters. I imagine one of them must pass Petit de Grat. I cannot at the moment recollect where Petit de Grat is. I think, though, that the steamer running through the St. Lennox passage must pass near to it.

Mr. KENDALL. This is on the other side of the island.

Mr. BELL. The Canso boat calls at Arichat.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Canso boat is so fully occupied that she cannot perform this service.

Mr. KENDALL. This business began seven or eight years ago, and the first year there was received by the Intercolonial Railway from the business furnished by the industry at Canso, between $4,000 and $5,000. During last year the Intercolonial Railway received $27,000 from this business, and from one firm in Canso. There are other firms, and we expect that before long the Intercolonial Railway will have from $75,000 to $100,000 of revenue from the transportation of fish from the Atlantic coast.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How much will come from Petit de Grat ?

Mr. KENDALL. It is more than probable that within five years a far larger revenue will be derived from that place than is derived from the Canso business at the present time.

Mr. COPP. This is a very good thing and I heartily concur in it. I believe that the only way you can gather fish for shipment to the western market is by steamer. I am going to ask the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) to go farther than he has gone. The same business is being developed in St. Mary's bay ports and in the Bay of Fundy. Fresh fish is being collected and taken to St. John for shipment over the Intercolonial Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway to Montreal. We have a boat there now which has managed to keep going as well as it can but it has not been working to advantage. It is, however, an immense accommodation to the fishermen, and while I would not ask the hon. minister for anything this session, I am in hopes that this experiment will prove so successful that next session he will be able to give a subsidy for a small boat to run from St. Mary's bay ports and the Bay of Fundy to St. John.

Mr. FOWLER. Will anybody put on a special steamer for this purpose ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This vote is taken in the hope of inducing some parties to put on an extra boat, but no arrangement has as yet been made.

Mr. SPROULE. Are there fishermen who own steamers available for this purpose ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, the arrangement will have to be made with the people who are in the steamship business.

Miscellaneous—to pay Wm. Perkins for extra copies of evidence in connection with the Lisgar election petition, $80.36.

Mr. SPROULE. What is this for ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The Order in Council providing for copies of evidence taken at election trials makes provision for the payment of ten cents a folio for the first copy and three cents a folio for each additional copy. In this particular instance there was no copy required by the judges and the only copy taken was the copy furnished to Mr. Speaker. The Auditor General in construing the Order in Council came to the conclusion that Mr. Perkins was only entitled to three cents a folio. Strictly speaking that is correct. We have amended the Order in Council so as to make provision that if the stenographer is only required to make one copy he is entitled to ten cents a folio. In view of the fact that this work was done before the Order in Council was passed, it is necessary to get parliamentary authority to pay this sum.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How does it come that the Dominion ought to pay any sum at all for election trials ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Election courts are federal courts. All the expenditure at the trial of an election petition in connection with an election to the Dominion parliament is under our control, and we are absolutely responsible for it. The question was formerly raised in the case of Valin vs. Langlois, as to whether judges of the provincial courts can try election cases and the point was finally decided by the Privy Council to the effect that judges of the provincial courts sitting for the purpose of trying federal cases are federal judges.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Surely they would make the orders and rules sufficiently binding to provide themselves with a copy of the petition.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This is not to provide for a copy of the petition. This is for a copy of the evidence taken at the trial. The stenographer took the notes of the evidence for which he was paid, but when the notes are extended, provision is made that they shall be paid for at so much per folio for each copy made. In this case the judge did not deem it necessary for the purpose of preparing their judgment to have the notes extended but it was necessary for the return to have a copy of the evidence sent here and it is for the copy of the evidence furnished to Mr. Speaker that we are asking for this vote.

Further amount required for printing Dominion notes, $30,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Hon. gentlemen have expressed the wish, that the notes should be as clean as possible, and as the circulation is increasing rapidly we find it necessary to come to the House and ask for this increased amount.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you take up the old note ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As rapidly as the bank sends us in old notes, we replace them with new ones ; it costs us a little more but I am sure the House will appreciate it.

To pay Lady Lafontaine a pension at the rate of $1,800 per annum from January 1, 1903, $2,700.

The PRIME MINISTER. This vote is required to pay a pension to the widow of Sir Louis Hippolyte Lafontaine, whose memory is revered in Canada. Sir Louis Lafontaine died in 1863, leaving a widow who was his second wife. When she married Sir Louis Lafontaine, she was the widow of an officer who had served in the garrison of Montreal. She was a Mrs. Kimpton ; her family name being Morrison. Lady Lafontaine was left, not in affluence, but in fairly comfortable circumstances ; and through reverses, she has been unfor-

tunately reduced to a state of absolute penury. Lady Lafontaine is now 82 years of age, and I am sure everybody will agree that this is the right thing to do.

Mr. SPROULE. Carried.

Expenses in connection with the conversion of the public debt. Payments may be made to members of the civil service, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service or Superannuation Acts, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have very large sums of old debts maturing this year, and to provide for their payment, and to make arrangements for replacing them with new loans so far as may be necessary, will involve some considerable negotiation in London, and probably several visits to that centre of the money market of the world. The deputy minister has been in England for some considerable time; he has left to return home, but no doubt it will be necessary later on for some one to go there again. A considerable part of this item will be necessary for travelling expenses. The balance is in order to make provision for a change in the Finance Department, which I can hardly say I desire to make, but which I will be obliged, to make. The deputy minister, who has occupied his position with great satisfaction to all parties for many years, has expressed a desire to retire, and I am making arrangements to supply his place. At the same time, in view of the very large financial operations which are to be undertaken during the current year and for the next year or two, I am anxious that we should retain Mr. Courtney's services in an advisory capacity. I deem it wise that we should have some such officer, and I shall have to take a portion of this money to apply it to the payment of Mr. Courtney in addition to the superannuation he would be entitled to receive. It is a mere temporary arrangement for a year or two, so that we may have the benefit of his services during this period when so much financing has to be done. Mr. Courtney is now on the ocean, and as it is a matter of arrangement with him I am not able to say how much we will pay him.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The law provides that you can take a superannuated officer back into the service at the same salary which he had when he retired; you will not pay him more than that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not expect we will allow him that much. We would not wish to recall Mr. Courtney back into the service to discharge the duties of a deputy; we do not want two deputies. He wishes to be relieved of the ordinary labour and responsibility of the department, but we want to retain him in an advisory capacity with regard to this special business and of course he will be valuable in instructing the new deputy minister on coming into office. The idea is to give Mr. Courtney something supplementary to his superannuation, for a year or two years.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This does not relieve him from the responsibility of having his accounts audited by the Auditor General; I think he got into some trouble with the Auditor General about his travelling expenses.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That trouble was based upon a difficulty which arose in the time of my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) when exactly a similar case occurred, and we followed the precedent.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There are some precedents you should avoid.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Auditor General, who above all things wishes to be consistent, thought that as he objected to a similar case under the administration of my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart), he ought to do likewise in our case.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the aggregate of the sums falling due this year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have over £6,000,000 falling due in England, and in addition to that we have something over $2,000,000 maturing in Canada.

Mr. BELL. The amount is stated to be $33,512,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the Minister of Finance any unused borrowing powers?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have the standing power to renew existing loans.

Department of Secretary of State—to provide for three additional junior second-class clerkships, $2,100.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Two of these are now extra clerks, and it is proposed to put them on the permanent list. The work was largely increased in the department owing to the Naturalization Act. The Secretary of State has pointed out to me, that while the expenditure in 1893 was $50,160, the present expenditure is $48,560, which shows a substantial reduction. At the same time, the revenue has increased from $12,400 to $52,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If you promote these two clerks, you should strike out the vote for their salaries from the ordinary expenditure.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These extra clerks will be included in the contingencies, which have already been voted. It must be the intention that these items should not be used for the extra clerks.

Mr. SPROULE. Why do you not strike it out of the other vote?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It has been already voted, and this item is necessary in order to make these gentlemen permanent.

Department of Justice—to increase the salaries of A. Power, K.C., and G. L. B. Fraser, K.C., by $200 each, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $400.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is this their annual increase ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No. These two gentlemen are both first-class clerks in the department. One has been there since 1874 and the other since 1879. They are now in receipt of salaries in excess of the statutory allowance. Each is receiving $2,600, and it is proposed to give them each $2,800. They are both very competent officials, and this is to give them some recognition for the valuable services they render.

To increase the salary of Miss M. Quain to $500, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $100.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Miss Quain is a stenographer. She gets a salary of $400, and is entitled to an annual increase of only $30. The result is that she says she will not remain at that salary. She is a very competent person, and I find that to retain competent officials you must pay them.

To increase the salary of A. J. McGillivray, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $50.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. He is from the maritime provinces. He has been in the department, I think, since 1890, and has never been put on the permanent list. He gives great satisfaction. Two first-class clerks have left the department and I am not going to replace them now, and I think Mr. McGillivray is entitled to this increase. He now gets $700.

To provide for employment of Thomas Morris as temporary clerk at $600, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $600.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In what we call the docket office we had a first-class clerk in Mr. Blakadar, who died some time ago. Mr. Morris is a man who is over age to come under the Civil Service Act, but he had a long experience in a lawyer's office in town and came to me highly recommended. He is a man of considerable attainments as a managing clerk, and is just the sort of man I wanted.

Office of the Auditor General—to promote B. W. Sherwood, W. Tucker, S. S. Allen and E. S. Johnston to the second class, $800, less $512.50 available from total sum included in main estimates, $287.50.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Did these parties pass the civil service examination ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think all the officials of the Auditor General have passed the civil service examination. He has the right of promotion under the statute.

Mr. FOWLER. I have no objection whatever to this vote, but I think there are other clerks in that office who should be included in this promotion. I have in mind one clerk in particular, who has performed very efficient and very faithful service—D. J. Wagner. I would suggest that the minister make inquiry and find out why he has not been included in the promotion granted to his fellow clerks ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend is invading the holy of holies. That is a privilege which I would not presume to exercise. The Auditor General has the right under the statute to promote the clerks of his department. I would not dare to question his judgment. He may be right or he may be wrong ; but we must bow our heads submissive.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Notwithstanding the opinion of the hon. Minister of Finance that the Auditor General has power under the statute to promote, I know that some of the predecessors of the Minister of Justice held that notwithstanding the statute you could not interfere with the prerogative of the Crown—that the appointment is with the government, and that they are responsible for it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In view of my hon. friend's statement as a public man of long experience, and in view of the fact that he quotes the authority of eminent Ministers of Justice, perhaps we shall have to consider the matter and see whether we have not the right.

Mr. FOWLER. I would suggest that a good opportunity for exercising that right would be the promotion of Mr. Wagner.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the Auditor General to intimate that he was short of hands in his department. The complaint was made at the time the report was got out. I think he stated in the Public Accounts Committee that if he had more hands he could get it out earlier. Has the Minister of Finance looked into that at all ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I discussed that on a previous occasion. The Auditor General has been supplied with all the staff he needs. He has made no application for any increase except in connection with the transcontinental railway. He intimated that for the auditing of the accounts of that work he would need a larger staff. I discussed that with him. I intimated that the work of auditing would come later, but that if he thought the mere auditing of the surveyors' accounts, which will be all that will be required before parliament meets again, would require further help, I would be glad to give it to him.

With respect to possible work arising in connection with that new enterprise, the Auditor General has not sought any additional staff.

Mr. SPROULE. I have heard complaints that his department is very cramped.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In that respect I think he has some cause for complaint. The whole Finance Department is very much cramped. The other ministers have been more energetic and have got new buildings, but because of my modesty I have not succeeded in getting any.

Supreme Court—to provide salary of E. R. A. Taschereau, $1,200.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This is in connection with the revision of the statutes. The ex-Chief Justice of the Supreme Court was appointed chairman and he brought his secretary with him. During his absence Mr. Taschereau, son of the Chief Justice, acted as secretary.

Mr. FOWLER. The former secretary is not receiving any additional salary ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No.

To assist L. W. Coutlee in publication of digest of judgments of Supreme Court of Canada, $500.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Mr. Coutlee is one of the reporters of the Supreme Court. He has taken upon himself the publication of a rather valuable work, and the practice has been to give assistance to those who publish books of that sort.

Further amount required for miscellaneous expenditure including North-west Territories, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In the main estimates we have asked for $37,000, and this will make the total $42,000. The expenses there have grown enormously in the last ten years. The number of criminal cases tried has increased from 353 in 1891 to 3,296. The fees for juries and witnesses have increased from $3,240 to $11,000. It will be soon time to consider whether or not we could not place the administration of criminal justice under control of the local authorities. By the Act we have made provision to hand over to them the administration of civil justice.

Mr. FOWLER. Give them provincial autonomy.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. They will soon be ready for that.

To provide salary for an additional judge of the Supreme Court of the North-west Territories, $4,000.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In the territories we are responsible entirely for the administration of justice, and the business has increased enormously. We have had demands from all over the territories, especially from the Macleod district, for additional judges. It was suggested that we should appoint two, but I made inquiry and found that one would be quite sufficient.

Mr. SPROULE. Who is going to fill the position, and where will he be stationed ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have really never thought of that. In the amendments to the North-west Territoiries Act we are giving to the local assembly the division of the districts and the arrangements of the works.

To provide salary for a junior judge of the district of Nipissing, Ont., $2,000.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is one of the cases in which the Ontario legislature provide for the appointment. After making inquiries, I found that the district is a growing one and that one judge, even if he did not do much more than travel around, would have very little time to try the cases.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems an anomaly that this parliament could not have the fixing of the district and the number of judges when we have to provide the salaries.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The remedy is in our own hands. We need not give the salary. The reason for the appointment is that, under the Ontario statute, where there is a certain population in the district, they are entitled to a senior and junior judge. Does this come up to the population ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am assuming that the Ontario legislature has taken all these matters into account. I follow the principle laid down by the late Sir John A. Macdonald, and concurred in by the present Prime Minister, that the responsibility for the administration of civil justice is with the province, and, if the province in the exercise of its authority says that it is necessary in the interest of litigants that a judge should be appointed for a certain place we—though, in the abstract we have the power—are not to interfere with the discretion on the part of the province.

Mr. CLANCY. Can the hon. minister say what the limit of population is.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think it is 80,000.

Mr. SPROULE. For 80,000 and over they might have a junior and senior judge, but for less than that only one.

Mr. CLANCY. Is this a junior judge ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. This comprises more than the district of Nipissing ?

The PRIME MINISTER. It is a group of constituencies.

Mr. SPROULE. The district, I think, is large enough.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. And rather difficult for a judge to get about in, I should fancy.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the appointment is a proper one, as the district is large and an inconvenient one to cover. I was going to say, with regard to the other point, that the Ontario legislature some time ago, passed a law providing that where a district was below 80,000 it should be entitled to only one judge. That was when the Conservative party was in power at Ottawa, and it was said to be to prevent the appointment of more judges by that government. But when the Reform party came into power, the legislature repealed that law, and it is no longer in force.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I was under the impression that it still existed.

To raise the salary of the judge of the county court for district No. 7, Nova Scotia, to $3,000, $600.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) will understand this item. Judge Dodd is the judge of district No. 7, Nova Scotia, which includes Sydney. It appears that the business at Sydney has increased enormously of recent years, and I find, on examination, that the amount of business done at Sydney is even very much greater than at Halifax, and the intention is to provide a salary equal to that paid at Halifax.

Mr. FOWLER. What constituencies does this district No. 7 include ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Victoria, Cape Breton and Richmond.

Mr. FOWLER. The salary is the same as paid at St. John ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The same as paid at St. John, Halifax and Charlottetown.

Mr. COPP. I do not object to the judge of district No. 7 receiving an increase, but I believe very strongly that the other judges of the county court of Nova Scotia should be increased also. The reason alleged for the increase is that a great deal more work is done in district No. 7 than any other district. I do not wish to be understood as doubting the accuracy of that statement. But if the judge there performs more work, it is only within the last year or two. Up to the year 1900 he did not perform anything like the amount of work done in district No. 3, or district No. 5. This matter was brought up in the local legislature of Halifax, and I have here the record of the debate which took place at the time and the remarks of Hon. Mr. Pipes, who was the leader of the legislative council in that province. That record shows that Judge Morse, of district No. 5, performed nearly double the work done by Judge Dodd of district No. 7.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Copp) kindly give details ?

Mr. COPP. District No. 5 includes the constituencies of Cumberland and Pictou. In 1900 the fees collected in Cumberland alone amounted to $365.85, or more than those of the whole district composed of Cape Breton, Victoria and Richmond, which amounted to $361.25. Besides this the county of Pictou, which forms part of district No. 5, collected fees to the amount of $224.80. This made a total for district No. 5 of $590.65, against $361.25 for district No. 7. Now, take the next district, district No. 4. We find that Judge Chipman, of that district performed nearly three times as much work as the judge of district No. 7.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is, received three times as large fees ?

Mr. COPP. Yes, that is the only guide we can have. The clerks of the county courts in Nova Scotia make a yearly return of the business done in their offices, and the debate to which I refer shows the figures given by these returns. In district No. 4 which includes the constituencies of Colchester, Hants and King's the fees were much larger than those of district No. 7. The fees in Colchester alone amounted to $439.50 or nearly $100 more than in the whole of district No. 7. In Hants, the fees were $233, and in King's $173. This made a total for the district of $846, against $361.25 for district No. 7. I am quoting from the figures given by Hon. Mr. Pipes who opposed this matter in the local legislature where it was discussed, but not in the form in which it now comes before us. It was proposed to divide district No. 7 and make one district of Cape Breton alone, leaving Richmond and Victoria to form a separate district, and to appoint a new judge. I think it is only fair to the other county court judges of Nova Scotia that I should read what Hon. Mr. Pipes had to say in reference to this very matter in 1901 :

Hon. Mr. Pipes said a Bill had been before the Committee on Law and Amendments for some time to create an additional county clerk district. The committee was of the opinion that the necessity for this Bill had not been shown, and recommended that its further consideration be deferred for three months. At the present time there were seven county court districts in the province. This Bill proposed to make eight. District No. 6 comprised the counties of Antigonish, Guysborough and Inverness.

And I wish to show that in the counties of Antigonish, Guysborough and Inverness the business was a great deal more than in district No. 7; the fees were $478 in the one, whereas they were $361 in district No. 7, or $100 more in district No. 6 than in district No. 7.

No. 7 comprised Cape Breton, Victoria and Richmond. The Bill proposed to make these two districts into three. If it passed the county

of Cape Breton would be one district. There was at present no county court district consisting of one county only, except district No. 1, the county of Halifax. It did not seem to him or to the committee that it could be argued that the county of Cape Breton, including Sydney, had reached the population of Halifax county, or that it was necessary to have a judge constantly sitting in the county of Cape Breton. As hon. members knew, returns were made to the provincial secretary's office every year of the amount of fees received by the county court clerks in each county. These returns afforded a fair test of the amount of business transacted by the courts in each county. The fees received by the county court clerks last year were: In Antigonish, $236.04 ; Guysborough, $82.35 ; Inverness, $154,20; altogether for district No. 6 $472.59. Cape Breton, the county proposed to be erected into a separate district, $288.05; Victoria, $21.90 ; Richmond, $51.30 ; altogether for the whole district No. 7, $361.25. Taking district No. 5, the fees received in Cumberland were $365.85, more than in the whole of district No. 7, and in Pictou, $224.80, in all $590.65. In district No. 4 the fees were, in Colchester, $439.50, more than in the whole of district No. 7 ; in Hants, $233.52 and in King's, $173.48, in all $846.50, more than districts Nos. 6 and 7 put together. If there should arise any pressure of business in district No. 7, it could easily be remedied by taking Richmond out of No. 7 and putting it in No. 6.

Last year an Act was passed requiring the clerks to make returns showing the amount of work done by the judge of the county courts throughout the province, with the idea, in view of possible changes and reforms in the judicial system of the country, of ascertaining the amount of work in the various districts.

That is what Hon. Mr. Pipes said in reference to this Bill in the Nova Scotia legislature. I do not object to the increase in salary at all. I consider that the county court judges of the province of Nova Scotia are entirely underpaid.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What do they receive ?

Mr. COPP. They receive $2,400.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is the same as in Ontario.

Mr. COPP. The judges were appointed in 1876, and the salary was then fixed. The jurisdiction was also fixed at that time, but since then there has been a decided change in that respect. In 1880 the Speedy Trials Act was passed, which adds most materially to the duties of county court judges in Nova Scotia, owing to the fact that they have, under certain circumstances and for certain offences the power of trying criminal cases. Again, they are now masters of the Supreme Court, and they have large duties to perform as judges of probate. The old judges of probate in Nova Scotia have been done away with and these duties fall on the shoulders of the county court judges.

Mr. FOWLER. Do they not get fees for this work ?

Mr. COPP. No. Owing to these changes the duties of the county court judges of Nova Scotia have been more than doubled since they were first appointed in 1876, but the salary has remained the same.

Mr. FOWLER. What becomes of the probate fees ?

Mr. COPP. They go to the registrar of the court, who is paid by fees. In Nova Scotia they used to have a judge and registrar both, but now the duties are performed by the county court judges. I am quite sure that the duties performed by Judge Savary, one of the ablest judges in the province of Nova Scotia, an ornament to the bench, a man of high legal attainments, although his duties were not referred to by Mr. Pipes, must be equal to the duties of Judge Morse or Judge Chipman, and I am quite positive that they are more onerous than the duties performed by the judge in district No. 7.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. How many cases did he try last year?

Mr. COPP. I do not know that, I have not the record. What I am asking is that this matter should be so dealt with that the cases of the other judges would also be considered by the minister. If this judge is entitled to an increase in salary, I say that Judge Morse in No. 5, Judge Chipman in No. 4, and Judge McGillivray, who succeeded the late Judge McIsaac in No. 6, should certainly have received larger salaries. The business in district No. 7 has not been anything like the business done by the other judges. While I do not object to this judge receiving an increase in his salary, I think it would be better if increases had been given to all the judges and not to this one alone. I have here the statistics up to 1900 of the amount of business done by the different judges. The minister states that the business of the judge for district No. 7 has increased, and that he performs more work than the judge of district No. 1. That may be true, but I would like to know what is the amount of business in Halifax. I am very doubtful if the judge in Halifax does anything like the amount of business done in Colchester, Hants and King's. What we want to know is this : Is the judge of district No. 7 at the present time performing more duties than are the judges of the other county courts; I am very doubtful if he is; I am quite positive in my own mind that he is not. Take the probate business in the large county of Cumberland and Pictou. Take the business done as master of the Supreme Court; take the criminal business or the civil business done by the judge of district No. 5 in these two large counties, and I think you will find it largely exceeds the amount of business done by the county court judge in district No. 1. The mere fact that he is performing more work than the judge of district No. 1, the city of Halifax, is no guide for us that he should receive an increase in salary in preference to Judge

Morse, Judge Savary, Judge Chipman, and the other two judges to whom I have referred.

Mr. FOWLER. How do the populations compare as between the different districts ?

Mr. COPP. The population of district No. 7, including the counties of Cape Breton, Victoria and Richmond, is 73,246 ; district No. 5, including the counties of Cumberland and Pictou, 69,627 ; district No. 6, including the counties of Inverness, Guysborough and Antigonish, 56,290 ; district No. 3, including the counties of Digby, Yarmouth and Annapolis, 62,033 ; district No. 4, including the counties of Colchester, King's and Hants, 66,893, showing that there is not much difference in population. To show that we cannot be guided altogether by population, I may say that the population of Halifax is 74,662, or nearly 10,000 more than the population of district No. 7. Mr. Pipes says that there is more business done in districts Nos. 4, 5 and 6 than in district No. 7. It is claimed that the duties of the judge of district No. 7 are largely increased. I want to say to the committee that the judge of district No. 7 is not performing more onerous duties than those which are performed by other judges, and it would appear to me to be only fair to the other judges that their salaries should be increased so as to bring them to the same level as that of the judge of district No. 7. Hon. gentlemen know perfectly well that the judge of the county court does not do all the business of the county. To-day there are a large number of criminals in the jail at Sydney who are going to be tried by the Supreme Court and not by the county court judge.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Why should they be ?

Mr. COPP. Because criminals can only be tried by the county judge who are actually in the custody of the sheriff, and then they have the right to elect. Therefore, the number of criminals to be tried cannot show us the extent of the business that is done by the county court judge. I think it would be well for the hon. minister to secure from the different county court clerks a statement of the amount of business performed in each district in Nova Scotia, and then he will have something reliable to go upon. It will be found that these other judges have been performing for the last twenty years double the amount of business that the judge of district No. 7 has been performing, for which they have not been paid extra, and still he has been receiving the same salary as they have. It does seem rather strange that he should receive an increase of salary and that the others should remain at the same salary.

Mr. FOWLER. I think the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Copp) has made out such a strong case that the hon. Minister of Justice will move at once to strike out this item. I do not see how he can defend the item after the argument which has been so ably made by the hon. member for Digby. I think he has proved that several judges of the county court are performing more onerous duties than those which are performed by the judge of district No. 7. I do not see why this judge should be distinguished from the others, nor do I see why he should receive more salary than the county court judges in New Brunswick. There are no junior judges there. Each judge has to perform the duties of the district to which he is appointed, and the same argument which the hon. member for Digby has applied in respect to the increased duties that are thrust upon these judges applies to the judges of New Brunswick as well. So that if the salary is increased in Nova Scotia it must be increased in New Brunswick. Until some uniform scale is adopted in respect to the judges of these provinces, I think it would be well to leave Judge Dodd at his old salary of $2,400.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Copp) has made out quite a strong case. He has been content to make reference to something that Mr. Pipes said in the Nova Scotia legislature in 1900, about statistics but that does not seem to be very conclusive because he discussed the amount of fees received by the clerks of the court. I have something a little better than that, and I think a little more conclusive. In Halifax the judge gets $3,000 a year. I find that in Halifax last year there were 35 speedy trials, 31 civil cases, and 87 applications in chambers disposed of, whereas, in Sydney, the speedy trials numbered 21, civil cases, 158, and chamber applications disposed of 354. So that, you will see that there is three or four times more work done in Sydney than in Halifax. I have not taken the trouble to make inquiry in respect to the other districts that my hon. friend has referred to, but this is a comparative statement between Halifax, which I thought was the most important judicial centre of Nova Scotia, and Sydney. My hon. friend must not imagine that Sydney has remained stationary. Sydney has been increasing in population and importance and in the last few years, as business has increased, the judicial necessities of the place have also increased. I have given my hon. friend the result of the comparison between the two places showing that there is four times as much business done at Sydney as at Halifax.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not know that that is a fair test to apply as to salary.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If you start in and say it is fair to give a judge at Halifax $3,000 a year, surely you cannot dispute the correctness of the proposition that a judge who does four times the work is at least entitled to the same salary.

Mr. FOWLER. That may be true, but why should the judge at Halifax get more than the judges in the rural districts ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend must ask my predecessor that.

Mr. FOWLER. Your predecessor is not here. If he were here my hon. friend would not be occupying that position. The judge of a rural district has to devote all his time to the performance of his judicial duties. He can do nothing else. He has no other way of earning a living, except by acting as judge. He does all the business that is brought before him, and he should be entitled to the same remuneration for all his time as a judge who does more business. It seems to me that if I were a county court judge I should prefer, even at the same salary, to be a judge in one of those districts in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick; they have all they can do to keep themselves out of mischief, or perhaps I should say, idleness. Their duties are not very heavy on the bench, and I think there should be a uniform scale of remuneration for judges whether the judge lives in the city or in the country. It may be that his living expenses would be greater by living in a city like Halifax than in Sydney, and I say that with all respect to my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall). Sydney, I fancy, is not as expensive a place to live in as Halifax.

Mr. KENDALL. Much more so.

Mr. FOWLER. Even if there should be a little more business in one place than another there should be no discrimination amongst the judges.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think that is right.

Mr. FOWLER. I think the hon. minister will do well to strike out this item.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It will not prevent an increase to the other judges; on the contrary, the tendency always has been to level up the others, not to level down.

Mr. COPP. Will the minister promise to look into the business done by the other judges ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I will not give any undertaking ; to depreciate one does not help the other.

Mr. GOURLEY. Although I have listened to the criticism with a great deal of interest, I think the proper view is that we had better let this $600 be voted because it will form a reason for increasing the salaries of the other judges. There is no doubt that the salaries of the county court judges are more deserving to be raised than the salaries of Supreme Court judges in Nova Scotia. A man is not badly off with a salary of $4,000, and travelling expenses, to the extent of $1,000, which practically means a salary of $4,800 or $5,000 a year. A county court judge in Nova Scotia does more work than most of the Supreme Court judges as a rule; and while $4,000 is a fair salary, with the addition of the circuit indemnity, the salary given to the county court judge is absolutely penurious. The salary of the Supreme Court judge will keep him in decency and enable him to show some moderate style of hospitality ; but a county court judge with a salary of $2,400, is required to maintain about the same social position, and while the one has a salary of $5,000 a year, the other has to skimp along with $2,400, and it becomes almost unendurable. I know Judge Dodd very well ; he is a very capable man.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I believe he is one of the most competent judges we have.

Mr. GOURLEY. He is a capable man all round. He was a member of this House; he belongs to a distinguished judicial family in Nova Scotia ; his father was an eminent judge in our province, and I do not begrudge him his addition to his salary. Take the case of Judge Morse, at Amherst. He refused a Supreme Court judgeship some years ago, because he had a large establishment in Cumberland county requiring his personal attention and did not wish to leave Amherst. He is a very eminent man in Nova Scotia, and to offer such a man $2,400 a year is an indignity. I say that the salary of the Nova Scotia county court judges ought to be raised, in preference to any other judicial salaries in Nova Scotia. I want to put myself on record on that score, because we have very capable men as county court judges. They were all good lawyers, enjoying a good practice, men of good ability ; men like Dodd and Morse, eminent men, far above the average lawyer we have in Nova Scotia.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is saying a good deal.

Mr. GOURLEY. Yes it is. We have had quite a run of big fish down there. The breed is a little run out just now, but we hope to improve it. There is too much difference between the salary of a county court judge at $2,400, and a Supreme Court judge at $5,000.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Do they not act as local judges of the Supreme Court ?

Mr. GOURLEY. They are what we call masters. They take over the chamber business of the Supreme Court and make orders and foreclosures and so on. The county court judges are very useful officers, and they do their business thoroughly. I want to be on record as favouring an increase of their salaries, to $3,000 at least.

Mr. KENDALL. I am not of the legal profession, but I am able to say that during the last three or four years the work of Judge Dodd has been very onerous indeed. The population of the district over which he has jurisdiction is not 73,000, but probably 87,000. We have had come to us, amongst the great influx of population, a large element that gives rise to a considerable amount of legal work. To my knowledge, Judge Dodd spends the greater part of his time discharging his duties, and no man of his attainments should be expected to work continuously as he does, for a salary of $2,400. I certainly think that $3,000 is little enough for the position that he occupies.

Mr. COPP. I do not wish to be understood as being opposed to this increase of salary for Judge Dodd. I believe that he is entitled to it. But I contend that the county court judges should receive the same increase.

Mr. FOWLER. When you are taking into consideration the raising of the salaries of the Nova Scotia county court judges, you must not forget an equally able body of men: the county court judges of New Brunswick, who perform just as arduous duties as do their confreres in Nova Scotia.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The salaries of all the judges throughout Canada will have to be considered together.

Yukon law library, $2,000.

Mr. SPROULE. There was money voted for this last year.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Like the poor, we always have these expenditures with us.

M. FOWLER. Who buys these books ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The request is sent by the judges, to the department. It is checked over by us, and the order is given over by the deputy minister.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you have a central library at Dawson ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes. When a judicial district in a territory is first established we provide the law library until the Bar Association is formed to take it over. Last year the Regina law library was taken over by the Regina Law Association, which will be responsible for it in the future. When the cost of freight is added, these books cost a very large sum in the Yukon. The judges have no access to public libraries, and as the cases are of considerable importance, we must supply them with law books. I hope that next year the Yukon Bar will be sufficiently important to take over the library. Including this vote we have spent altogether about $12,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Do the judges all reside at Dawson ?

Mr. GOURLEY.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, the only other place at which they occasionally hold court is at White Horse.

Mr. SPROULE. This is a large item coming year after year. It is doubtful if we use that much for the library here.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I ventured to suggest this year that we should send up the old editions of our text books which we have at the Supreme Court, where we are constantly renewing our library by putting in new editions. With a few exceptions, the old editions are as good as the new. Often a man issues a new edition simply to sell it. My suggestion was protested against, but I have made up my mind that we should do that.

Mr. LANCASTER. How much has been spent altogether on this library ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This will make $12,000.

To pay the account of the Prince Albert 'Advocate' for announcing the proclamation and notice of the Saskatchewan election of 1900, notwithstanding anything in the Dominion Elections Act, $297.48.

Mr. BLAIN. Was the payment of this account not refused by the Auditor General ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The point was that it did not come within the schedule of services specially authorized ; but the view was taken that the exceptional circumstances justified the returning officer in publishing these notices.

Mr. BLAIN. Will this complete the payment of all the election expenses of the election of 1900 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, I think not. There have been some items standing for some time which have been the subject of negotiation with the Auditor General.

Mr. GOURLEY. This seems an enormous sum of money for advertising the ordinary proclamation. In an ordinary city it costs only $15.

Mr. OLIVER. This item does not concern my constituency. Prince Albert is in the constituency of Mr. Davis, the member for Saskatchewan, and I can merely tell the committee what he told me concerning this item when the supplementary estimates first came down. In order that the people may know the boundaries between the polling divisions, it is necessary that the proclamation setting forth the boundaries shall receive the fullest possible publication, because a man votes on residence, and is entitled to vote only in the polling division in which he resides. The population varying all the time by continual increase, the boundaries are different from time to time.

In the Prince Albert district there is a mixed population of French and English, and it was thought desirable by the returning officer that the proclamation setting forth the boundaries of the polling divisions should be printed in the newspaper in French and English. It was so done, and this is the bill. I believe the payment has been delayed some considerable time on the ground, I suppose, that the bill was large.

Mr. GOURLEY. The proclamation would be only three or four inches in length ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, it sets forth every polling division. I do not know how many there were in Saskatchewan, but in Alberta there were over eighty.

Mr. SPROULE. Is not the proclamation put up also ?

Mr. OLIVER. The law provides that the proclamation shall be posted up, but in Saskatchewan it was thought that was not sufficient and that it would be desirable to put it in the newspaper. The returning officer thought it was desirable to have the boundaries of the polling divisions printed in the newspapers.

Mr. GOURLEY. I think the newspaper editor was kicking.

Mr. OLIVER. I could not tell anything about that ; but with regard to the amount charged, the description of from seventy to eighty polling divisions necessarily occupied a very large space, and when that was duplicated in French, it meant doubling the size of the newspaper. The advertisement would be as large as the newspaper in size ; and considering the number of issues from the time the writ was issued to the election, I suppose the charge would be all right at the usual advertising rates.

Mr. FOWLER. Might I ask the hon. gentleman why this should be necessary in the Saskatchewan county and not in his own ?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know that it was really more necessary in the one than in the other. It was just a matter of opinion on the part of the returning officer. He did not consider that the posting of the proclamation gave sufficiently accurate publicity, and he thought of supplementing it by this means. I may say that even in the district of Alberta, the posting of the proclamation is found rather insufficient, and for my own part, I publish the boundaries of the polling divisions in my own locality, but I do not publish the boundaries throughout the whole district. That would be altogether too much. But I considered that the posting of the proclamation was insufficient. I felt that there was the same lack of information as was felt in this case, and I published the actual boundaries in the few districts where my paper is circulated.

Mr. SPROULE. Did you charge it to the government ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, I did not.

Mr. GOURLEY. Is this a Tory paper ?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not say.

Mr. FOWLER. Was there an amount similar to this paid in connection with the election of 1896 ? I would suppose that if this was necessary in 1900, it would be more necessary in 1896, because the population would naturally then be less conversant with the boundaries of the different municipalities and the different polling sub-divisions. We should have some information why it is necessary to pay this amount in that one particular constituency when no such necessity exists anywhere else.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no personal knowledge of the matter and we will let the item stand until I can get information from the Secretary of State.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend has said that as the population increases and becomes more established, the boundaries of the polling divisions will become better known. On the contrary, as the population increases the boundaries of the polling divisions have to be changed, and it is because of the continual changes from the increase of the population that it is desirable the fullest possible information should be given immediately before each election. It was for that reason I published the boundaries in my newspaper. The differences between the conditions in Alberta and Saskatchewan are these, Throughout Alberta there are a number of centres of settlements, each of which has its local paper. My paper, which is published in the north end of the constituency, does not circulate largely in the southern or central part. The papers published at Calgary have no large circulation at either end, and the southern papers have no large circulation at either the centre or the north ; but in the case of Prince Albert, that is the chief town of the Saskatchewan district, and the Prince Albert papers cover the whole district of the Saskatchewan. But the publisher of any paper in Alberta would not cover the whole district of Alberta.

Mr. SPROULE. Any one conversant with the Election Act must know that it gives no authority to the returning officer to do this. His duty is clearly set out, and the number of proclamations which shall be posted—three in each polling sub-division. These give all the information to which the voter is entitled, and it was a gratuitous act on the part of the returning officer to order this advertisement. I do not understand how the Attorney General allowed the item to pass. With regard to the charge, even though the publications were in French and English, $300 seems an exorbitant figure. I am afraid it was only a sop given some newspaper man, who perhaps either was a strong advocate of the member elected or one of these people who are

always desirous to get as much as possible out of an election.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No objection was taken by the Auditor General to the price, as not being fair and reasonable. The only objection he took was that the returning officer had no authority to do this. But after all he was an officer of parliament and acted in good faith ; and, as the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) has explained, the posting of these publications does not give sufficient notice where so many new settlers are coming in, I am inclined to think that we should pass this item under the circumstance.

Mr. SPROULE. What the hon. minister has said would apply to every constituency in British Columbia, Manitoba and territories. They are all in a new country comparatively speaking, and the population is continually changing, but no returning officer, except in this constituency, has been so wanting in intelligence as not to keep within the law. It is just possible that between the returning officer and the proprietor of the paper, it was agreed that this advertisement should be put in on the chance of its being paid for.

Mr. GOURLEY. I am not too particular about accounts, but I have a suspicion that this claim is a pure after-thought. This gentleman was a warm supporter of the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis). They published this matter, probably, as campaign matter. I know I spend several hundred dollars for campaign work in my own constituency, and I neither know nor care what it is for.

Mr. OLIVER. Probably for the other fellow.

Mr. GOURLEY. I cannot bother with these things. But I am a little more frank in these matters than most people are. I do not see any use in being a hypocrite. Every one who runs an election knows what is done. It seems to me that in this case this was simply campaign work done in the interest of the candidate by the party paper.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It could not be campaign work. It was not partisan material.

Mr. GOURLEY. It is necessary in the interest of the candidate that there should be full knowledge on the part of the people of the constituency as to the boundaries of polling subdivisions, so that his voters may go to the right place.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Both parties would have the advantage of this advertisement.

Mr. GOURLEY. I know. But I can easily conceive circumstances under which this would be excellent campaign work. I do not think it should be paid for. It was probably published for the benefit of the party, and afterwards some ingenious fellow developed the idea of sending the account into the government to see if they could get it through. I would rather vote $1,000 that this man had honestly earned, than vote ten cents for an unjust claim.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Let it stand.

Item allowed to stand.

To pay arrears of superannuation allowances to ex-lockmaster W. J. Casselman, Williamsburg canals, from January 1, 1902, to June 30, 1903, at $97.37 per annum, $146.05 ; to increased allowance for year ending June 30, 1904 to $296.63 at which sum it shall hereafter be paid, $97.37, total $243.42.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to correct an error in the superannuation. This gentleman had been a lockmaster and his services were dispensed with by his superior. He was afterwards restored to duty, but not classed as a lockmaster. When superannuated later on, he was superannuated at a lower salary than that of a lockmaster. On further investigation, it was found that, in dispensing with his services, no Order in Council had been passed, and technically he had not ceased to be a lockmaster, and so was entitled to superannuation on a lockmaster's salary.

Dominion lands—chargeable to income—further amount required for protection of timber and tree planting, $15,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. Before I explain this item, I may say that I was asked by one of the hon. gentlemen on the other side a question with regard to the printing of maps. I have here the information about that. I am informed that with reference to the question in the House as to the purchase of maps by the Geological Survey, the usual course is pursued by the Geological Survey of forwarding all requisitions to the King's Printer, and the maps are purchased by that officer. I understand they are all supplied in Canada, some having been bought from the Burland Company, others from Mortimer & Co., Ottawa, the Federal Press Company, and also the Toronto Lithographing Company.

Mr. GOURLEY. None from the United States ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, we would not go to the United States.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose the prices are reasonable ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no reason to doubt it.

Mr. SPROULE. Were they produced in Canada or only purchased here ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I could not say. As to this item with regard to protection of timber and tree-planting, I was asked to give some information of what had

been done by the department this year. I find that 22 forest fire rangers were employed during the dry weather; eight in the railway belt in British Columbia, six in the North-west Territories, and eight in Manitoba. Also 8,790 fire notices on parchment were posted along the routes of travel warning the public against careless use of fire. In addition to this, over 5,000 circulars were distributed and a large number of copies of the Bush Fires Act of British Columbia, the Prairies Fires Ordinance of the North-west Territories, and the Fire Prevention Act of Manitoba have been circulated. Fire-guards at Banff and on the west side of the Turtle Mountain timber reserve have been constructed. The Long lake timber reserve has been explored and set aside, also the Yoho park and the Rocky Mountains park greatly enlarged. Since the adoption of the fire-ranging system we have practically lost no timber in the railway belt in British Columbia, notwithstanding two very dry seasons.

As to tree-planting on the plains, the officers of the department advise me that, in co-operation with the settlers, 918,000 seedling trees and 564 pounds of tree seed were planted. These were given free to farmers last year, the average of trees to each farmer being about 1,450. The report of the inspector is that about 80 per cent of the trees sent out that have gone through the winter are still living, and that about 90 per cent of last year's planting were living last fall. This spring 630 settlers received trees, and the number of new applicants for trees for next season is 1,649. We have set apart a reserve for tree-planting at Indian Head, and the vote is to provide also for that. There is increased work in guarding timber. This item will include additional fire rangers at forestry station at Indian Head and additional buildings.

Mr. SPROULE. The right hon. gentleman left the question of the maps unfinished. I would like to ask if the maps were printed in Canada. I am under the impression that they were printed in the United States, though I may be wrong. I understood the right hon. gentleman to say that some were supplied by the Burland Company. I take it that they would be lithographed in Canada. There were some also by an Ottawa firm.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mortimer & Co. They are engravers and lithographers, and have done work for the government for many years. They have done work also for the Post Office Department, and are very reliable officers. The firm in Toronto is also a very large lithographing firm. It is a house that would make such maps as this. I have no knowledge of this item, but I think we may fairly assume that this is their work. That company did some engraving for the Post Office Department, in making maps of some of the provinces, so that I know they do that class of work.

Mr. BLAIN. In the committee it came out that the small atlases that have been so generally circulated in Canada and the United States were produced in the United States.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the only thing we can do is to have reciprocity in this matter and to exact a promise from the Postmaster General that if we allow this to pass he will not be so belligerent in reference to our mail bags.

To compensate the Canadian Bank of Commerce for services in the Yukon, from May 1, 1902 to April 30, 1903, $19,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a vote to pay the Bank of Commerce a commission on the business they handle in the Yukon. We have been reducing the percentage from year to year and after a short time affairs in the Yukon will get down to the same order as affairs throughout Canada, and we will not have any commission to pay. We paid the bank in the first year three-fourths of one per cent, in the second year we reduced it to five-eighths of one per cent, and for this year we have reduced it to one-half of one per cent.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This is based on the one-half of one per cent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this another case where Cox won't wait ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, in this case, so far as I know, they have enough faith to wait patiently.

To pay Charles Miller, $3,713.32 and Robert Miller, $3,339.05 for amounts deposited by them in the Post Office Savings Bank at St. Scholastique and fraudulently withdrawn by the assistant postmaster, $7,052.37.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Portions of moneys handed to the assistant postmaster of this town for deposit in the Post Office Savings Bank were appropriated by him for his own purposes.

Mr. GOURLEY. What evidence have you that the money was deposited ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The case went through the courts and the man is now serving his term in the penitentiary for it. The assistant postmaster who committed the thefts and forgeries had different methods of embezzling.

Mr. GOURLEY. Was nothing recovered from him ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He had nothing whatever. He was a member of a highly respectable family and his father, I think, had been the postmaster there for

a great many years. It was a very sad case.

Mr. GOURLEY. Had he no bonds ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not for such a large amount as this ; he was, I think, covered by the insurance system but the largest amount insured is very much less than this.

Mr. GOURLEY. Was that paid ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The amount paid out of our own fund, would not cover $7,000. We have in the Post Office Department a system of insurance by assessment upon the staff. Each postmaster is assessed a certain sum and that assessment is put into a fund which is available to the extent that it is supposed to insure him. But we do not assess a man sufficiently to provide insurance to the amount of thousands of dollars. The amount of insurance for postmasters is comparatively small.

Mr. GOURLEY. This opens a grave difficulty. In Truro, for instance, there is an enormous amount deposited in the savings bank, and I would ask if there is no security for the public. Is not the custodian guaranteed by any security ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I was explaining that there are a large number of the employees in the post office service, postmasters and persons in fiduciary positions, upon whom an assessment is levied. For instance, formerly when a man was appointed, he would give the bond of a trust company for $500 or $600, which was considered a large amount. He would pay this guarantee company an annual fee and they would issue a bond in his favour. In case of loss, if you could bring the loss within the terms of the bond, you would recover from that company the amount of that bond, but any shortage above this would of course be lost, unless he had property. Of late years the system has been changed and instead of taking the bond of a company or of a private citizen the department makes an assessment on the employees. For example, if a postmaster had to give bonds for $500, instead of his paying that assessment to a guarantee company and getting the bond of that guarantee company he would pay that amount to the government.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is the limit in regard to a deposit in the post office savings bank for one depositor ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think any man can deposit $3,000 without a permit and above that he is obliged to have a permit.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That feature was considered in this case ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not recall that point.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I observe that in one case the amount was $3,713.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. These are very thrifty people. I think they are two brothers.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is not my point. My point is as to the amount of money they can deposit.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the amount includes interest.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have heard that the limit is $1,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think it is $3,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The excess is probably the interest added.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. $3,000 would meet my point. I think the hon. Postmaster General ought to be able to tell the committee the total amount that these depositors had at their credit because the House would naturally be required to vote the difference between that and the amount from that guarantee fund to which the hon. Postmaster General has referred out of which the defaulter would have a certain amount available to meet this defalcation and we should only be asked to vote the difference between that and the amount to which the depositor is entitled. What is that sum ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no information about that. If the hon. gentleman desires it the item can stand. This is a matter in the Finance Department in one sense. The officers of the Post Office Department act as agents for the Finance Department.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman has not all these particulars the item should stand because as a matter of business we ought to vote no more than the actual amount due.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This, I am assured, represents only the balance required after taking into account the sum received from the insurance fund.

Mr. FOWLER. I think this item should be allowed to stand.

Mr. GOURLEY. In answer to my hon. and learned friend from Pictou (Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) the hon. Postmaster General said that any one man could deposit $3,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The crime was not in respect to the $3,000. He cannot put in more than $1,000 in one year.

Mr. GOURLEY. He can put that in in one day. Could any number of people deposit $1,000 with the Postmaster General in one day ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. GOURLEY. Then the hon. Postmaster General might be the recipient in one day of $100,000. How long does the postmaster keep that money ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If there is a bank in the town he is obliged to deposit with the bank to the credit of the receiver general every day before the close of banking hours.

Mr. GOURLEY. Then he issues a pass book to the person making the deposit ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, the pass book is issued at Ottawa by the savings bank department here.

Mr. FOWLER. He gives a receipt ?

Mr. GOURLEY. It strikes me that the system is rather loose, because the postmaster, if he is only required to give a receipt or issue a pass book, might receive an enormous amount of money.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He does not issue a pass book.

Mr. GOURLEY. The people in the country have the utmost confidence in the Post Office Savings Bank system and there should be no slip. There has been a slip in this matter and when there has been a slip in this case it might occur in other cases unless there is something very peculiar about this case. I want to find out how this man did this ?

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He forged the depositor's name.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In some instances he forged cheques and in other instances he simply embezzled money handed in for deposit. He would make an entry in the pass book, show it to these men then put it in his pocket and erase the entry. He carried on a system of frauds for a long time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If we give too much information as to how this thing can be done we will make it easy.

Mr. GOURLEY. The hon. Postmaster General said that he made an entry in this pass book and then erased it. That would be detected when it reached Ottawa.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will get all the information in regard to the item.

Mr. GOURLEY. We might have a large deposit made every day.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There need not be any want of confidence on the part of the public because the fact that we are voting this item shows that the public are protected.

Mr. GOURLEY. But this is a matter of grace. Suppose parliament did not vote this money what would these men do ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The government would be responsible. There is no question about that.

Mr. GOURLEY. I do not suppose as a matter of law they could recover because this man has committed a crime.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, they could recover. If a depositor hands in money to the postmaster he is the agent of the government and the government are therefore responsible for the money.

Mr. GOURLEY. I think the hon. Minister of Justice would get up an ingenious defence and that he would take the ground that if an officer of the government did something outside of the government regulations the government could not be held responsible.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This is a very exceptional case. The man who was postmaster at this place was also notary and he was acting as agent for these men and a part of his fraud consisted in representing that he was investing their money for them. In one case he forged a cheque on the department for a certain amount and the money was paid out by the department on this forged cheque. In so far as that money is concerned the government are responsible for it. If they part with money without any authority they are responsible. These men were ignorant people living in the country who had by their industry amassed a sum of money and hon. gentlemen know that a notary stands in the confidence of the country people in Quebec only second to the parish priest. He had the confidence of the people, and at the same time he was postmaster. It is a fraud that would not occur in many years. It had nothing to do with the system.

Mr. GOURLEY. The Minister of Justice has pointed out a new difficulty. If the Prime Minister were the agent for these people in investing their money, it is a question whether we are responsible. If he did not receive it in his capacity as agent for the government, we would not be responsible except as a very high act of grace.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I suppose the government will make the information full enough to cover the point raised by the Minister of Justice, as to whether this man received the money as a government officer, or received it simply as the agent of these men to deposit.

Mr. CLANCY. I made a request to the Postmaster General early in the session, to bring down the correspondence and papers in relation to the dismissal of the postmistress at the village of Lambton. I would be glad if the Postmaster General would bring it down along with this other information. The hon. gentleman knows how little dis-

posed I am to give him trouble, and he will appreciate my long suffering at the delay.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I was much disappointed that the hon. gentleman was not present on Wednesday night, when I had the papers here. I will have them brought down again.

Mr. CLANCY. I will endeavour to be present when this item is up for consideration again.

To meet expenses in The King vs. British American Bank Note Company, $8,000.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The British Bank Note Company had a contract with the government for the printing of bank bills, and for the engraving of stamps. The representation was, that instead of giving us steel engraving, as the contract called for, they gave us lithograph. The court of Exchequer determined that the claim of the Crown was good, and judgment was rendered for $97,000. An appeal was taken to the Supreme Court, and we made up our mind, that possibly it would be better to compromise, and we accepted $50,000 in cash from the British American Bank Note Company, and each party agreed to pay his own costs. The principle on which the court proceeded was that we were entitled to recover the difference in the cost between steel engraving and lithographing.

Mr. GOURLEY. Did you use the stamps?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We used the stamps, and got value, and it was not detected. It occurred to me that under the circumstances, if we received $50,000 in the way of damages, we were fairly well off.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—MARINE AND FISHERY OFFICE AT HALIFAX.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BELL. I wish to call the attention of the leader of the House to this telegram which has been placed in my hands :

The following resolution unanimously passed city council last night :—

Whereas, it is rumoured that the Department of Marine and Fisheries proposes removing their quarters from this city and whereas, this council believes that such a step is unnecessary and, if carried out, would be a decided injustice to this city. Therefore resolved that this council do protest against any such removal as outlined above and further that copies of this resolution be wired to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Minister of Finance and to our Dominion representatives Messrs. Roche and Borden.

(Sgd.) L. FRED. MONAGHEN,
City Clerk.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That arises from a misunderstanding. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has taken an appropriation for a wharf in Halifax harbour, but, as I stated in connection with that item, the chief purpose of that wharf is for storage, especially for some of the stores of the department which are of a character that they cannot be stored within the city limits. The wharf which the minister proposes to acquire will be necessary for storage, and as I have intimated it may be necessary that he will have to construct further accommodation for the terminal facilities of his department at Halifax.

ALASKAN BOUNDARY COMMISSION.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Has the right hon. gentleman any definite information as to the award of the Alaskan Boundary Commission ? I heard it stated on the street that there has been a decision.

The PRIME MINISTER. There has been no decision yet ; it is expected on Tuesday.

QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. SPROULE. When will the resolutions referred to by the Prime Minister to-day, regarding the Quebec bridge, be laid before the House ? What business will be taken on Monday ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Notice of the resolution will be given, I think, not later than Monday. We will take up all the Bills that are on the programme for Monday's business.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, October 19, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

MOUNTED POLICE PENSIONS.

Mr. WALTER SCOTT (West Assiniboia) moved for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Mounted Police Pension Act, 1899. He said : Mr. Speaker, in moving for leave to introduce this Bill at this time I recognize that unless the government agree to put it on the Order paper as a government Bill, it is absolutely impossible to make any progress with it. I may explain that the intent of the amendment is to put the non-commissioned officers and men of the mounted police force in the same position as regards the calculation of their pensions as the officers are put in by the measure adopted by the House last session. At the present time the pensions of the non-commissioned officers and men of the force are calculated upon their average pay for three years preceding their retirement. By the Officers' Pension Act put through last year, the officers' pensions are now calculated up-

on their pay and allowances at the moment of their retirement.

Mr. GOURLEY. The same rule should apply to the men of the force.

Mr. SCOTT. I think so. I think the House will agree that the non-commissioned officers and men should occupy the same position in that respect as the officers. It is entirely unnecessary for me or anybody else to praise the mounted police force. Their services are recognized——

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I rise to a point of order. This appears to be a Bill to amend the Pension Act of the Mounted Police Force. The hon. member has no right to introduce a Bill of that kind. It must be introduced by a member of the cabinet, by resolution and with the consent of the Crown.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is difficult for me to decide just now whether this is a money Bill or not.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is, from the statement the hon. gentleman has made, to increase the pensions of the mounted police.

Mr. SCOTT. What I am really doing is urging that the government should take up this proposition.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that the hon. member is moving to increase the pensions ?

Mr. SCOTT. That would certainly be the effect of the amendment.

The PRIME MINISTER. As my hon. friend has already stated, the object he has in view is that the government should take charge of this Bill. The point taken by my hon. friend from South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) is certainly well taken. I may say to my hon. friend that at this late stage of the session it is impossible for us to take up any more legislation than we have ; but the point to which he has called the attention of the House is engaging the attention of the government at the present time.

The matter dropped.

CONTROL OF PUBLIC WORKS.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 269) respecting the management and control of public and other works. He said : By the statutes which we now have relating to the different departments, among others the Departments of Agriculture, Public Works, Marine and Fisheries and Secretary of State, it is provided that the Governor in Council may make regulations respecting the transfer of any duties from one department to another. It is intended to make this provision applicable to all the departments of the government.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY, CAR NO. 001.

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville)—by Mr. Talbot—asked :

1. Is it true the government paid for certain improvements to the car No. 001, belonging to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company ?
2. If so, how much did the government pay for the flooring, curtains, bedding, tinting, carpets, sofas and other improvements ?
3. For whom and by whom was that car so fitted up ?
4. When and how were those expenditures authorized ?
5. Has the government been informed that the said car is still in the possession of or used by the Honourable Joseph Israel Tarte, one of the members of this House ?
6. Is it the intention of the government to reclaim the cost of the said improvements, either from the owner of the said car, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or from the Honourable Mr. Tarte, who has the use of it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland) :

1. Yes.
2. I fear that the department is not in a position to give detailed information, but I am perfectly willing that this question should stand and be further looked into.
3. For the then Minister of Public Works.
4. By the then Minister of Public Works.
5. Yes.
6. It has not received the attention of the department.

MONTREAL HARBOUR—PERMANENT SHEDS.

Mr. BUREAU—by Mr. Talbot—asked :

1. Have the plans been prepared outside of the Department of Public Works for the construction of permanent sheds in the port of Montreal, or for other works ?
2. If so, to whom has the preparation of these plans been given ; and why has an engineer not a permanent member of the staff been employed ?
3. What was the remuneration which this engineer was to receive ?
4. What account has been filed ?
5. What amount has he received ?
6. What is the claim pending in the Department of Public Works in reference to this work ?
7. What was the total estimate of the cost of this work ?
8. Have the harbour commissioners of Montreal, under whose control the port of Montreal is, been notified that the plans of the said permanent sheds were thus ordered ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland) :

1. Yes.
2. To Mr. H. E. Vautelet, by order of the then Minister of Public Works, who has left no record in the department of his reasons.

3. No arrangements as to remuneration appear to have been made.
4. $49,343.40.
5. Nothing has been paid Mr. Vautelet.
6. Mr. Vautelet has filed a petition of right for $49,343.40.
7. $2,565,400.
8. The harbour commissioners have recently been informed that plans were prepared.

DREDGE 'W. S. FIELDING.'

Mr. BUREAU—by Mr. Talbot—asked :

1. Who has made the plans of the dredge 'W. S. Fielding,' now in course of construction at the Sorel shipyards ?
2. What has been the cost of the preparation of the plans ?
3. Why have they been prepared outside of the department, and by an engineer not belonging to the administration ?
4. What was the total estimate of the cost of the said dredge ?
5. At what exact date were the works commenced ?
6. What expenses have been incurred on the same dredge up to 1st of November, 1902 ?
7. What expenses have been incurred since ?
8. What will the dredge cost when completed ?
9. When will it be ready to commence work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland) :

1. Mr. A. W. Robinson.
2. Mr. Robinson is to receive 5 per cent on the total cost of dredge for preparation of plans and supervision ; up to date he has been paid the sum of $9,000.
3. By order of the then Minister of Public Works the preparation of the plans were entrusted to Mr. Robinson.
4. $350,000.
5. The 1st of June, 1901.
6 and 7. The total amount charged against the appropriation for dredge 'Fielding' was, on the 1st of November, 1902, $204,456.42.
8. About $520,000, less value of permanent plant and buildings remaining in shipyard after completion of dredge.
9. In the spring of 1905.

POSTAL NEWSPAPER BOXES.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. By whom are the boxes for the reception of newspapers which are placed on the streets manufactured ? And were tenders asked for the supply of the same ?
2. If tenders were asked, who were the tenderers ?
3. Are any of the same being supplied by Fleury & Sons, of Aurora, Ontario ?
4. Are the same being supplied by them under tender ?
5. If any are being supplied by Fleury & Sons, what price is being paid for each ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock) :

1. By Butterworth & Company, Ottawa, and J. Fleury's Sons, Aurora. Tenders were asked for.
2. Answered by reply to question 1.
3. Yes.
4. Answered by reply to question 1.
5. $25 per box.

EXCISE TAXATION.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

What revenue per capita was derived from excise taxation for the fiscal years ending 30th June, 1896, and 30th June, 1903, respectively ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Hon. M. E. Bernier). The revenue derived from excise taxation for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1896, was $7,836,407.26, and for the year ended 30th June, 1903, $11,940,702.77. As there is no definite information as to the population in 1896 and 1903, the excise revenue per capita for these two years cannot be accurately stated.

ST. ANDREWS RAPIDS.

Mr. McCREARY asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to send an engineer at an early date to make a report upon the works done at St. Andrews rapids, in Manitoba ?
2. Will that engineer have instructions and authority to report upon the advisability of such changes being made in the plans as to permit of the construction of a bridge, suitable for passenger and railway traffic ?
3. Will such engineer have authority to report as to the possibility of creating a water power at this point ?
4. In the event of the engineer reporting favourably for the construction of a bridge for passenger and railway traffic in connection with the works, is it the intention of the government to proceed at an early date in the construction of same ; and will the bridge be free of tolls for passenger and vehicle traffic ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland) :

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.
4. On receipt of this report the matter will receive the prompt and earnest attention of the department.

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY.

Mr. GRANT—by Mr. Talbot—asked :

1. Is the government aware that during the investigation held on the administration of the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary in 1898, under and by virtue of a royal commission, it was proved that certain persons had profited by the irregularities committed by certain officials of this institution, to the extent of several hundred dollars ?
2. If so, have these persons offered to reimburse, or have they reimbursed the sums of which they have so benefited out of public property ?
3. If not, is it the intention of the government to take legal proceedings to force them to reimburse the value of the materials they so appropriated for their own use, or the value of the work performed for their benefit by the labourers paid out of public money?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). A report, which was the result of an investigation, was made and distributed to parliament.

STEAMER 'EUREKA.'

Mr. GRANT—by Mr. Talbot—asked :

1. Is the government aware that the steamer 'Eureka,' belonging to the Department of Public Works, has been put at the disposal, or rented to some inventor, for the purpose of making an experiment of some invention, purporting to prevent collisions between steamers at sea ?
2. If so, to whom was said loan made, and upon the instructions of whom was it done ?
3. What has been the amount of expenditure made by the department, or occasioned by said experiment?
4. Is there any claim pending in the department in reference to work performed on said boat, at the request of the persons having the loan of the boat, for dockage, &c.?
5. For how many months, weeks or days was said steamer 'Eureka' kept at the expense of the government, not rendering the service assigned to her, whilst under the control of said inventor?
6. What amount was so expended by the department in keeping the boat at the disposal of the inventor?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland) :

1. Yes.
2. To Mr. A. Lacoste ; under instructions from late Minister of Public Works.
3. $11,776.
4. Yes.
5. One hundred and thirteen days.
6. Same as No. 3.

SUGAR ENTERED FOR HOME CONSUMPTION.

Mr. HENDERSON asked :

1. What was the total amount of sugar above No. 16 D.S. in colour, and of all refined sugars of whatever kinds, grades or standards, entered for home consumption during the year ending 30th June, 1903, and what was the amount of the duty paid thereon?
2. What was the total amount of sugar, N.E.S., not above No. 16 D.S., in colour, entered for home consumption during the year ending 30th June, 1903, and what was the amount of the duty paid thereon?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. William Paterson) :

1. The total amount of sugar above No. 16 D.S. in colour, and of all refined sugars of whatever kinds, grades or standards, as originally entered for home consumption during the year ending 30th June, 1903, was 26,672,033 pounds ; and the amount of duty paid thereon $330,652.03.

2. The total amount of sugar, N.E.S., not above No. 16 D.S. in colour (including sugar drainings or pumpings drained in transit, melado or concentrated melado, tank bottoms and sugar concrete) entered for home consumption during the year ending 30th June, 1903, was 361,698,799 pounds ; and the amount of duty paid thereon $2,316,622.61.

It may be explained that as a general rule sugar is originally entered for consumption at the maximum rate for its class ; subject to refund afterwards upon test ascertained by the polariscope.

FRANKING CAMPAIGN LITERATURE.

Mr. DAVIS asked :

1. Is the government aware that several car-loads of campaign literature have been shipped to Ottawa from the office of the Montreal 'Star,' and is being sent through the mails under the frank of George Taylor, M.P., and others?
2. Does the post office receive any revenue from the same?
3. Is there no limit to the franking privilege of members?
4. Can members of parliament send car-loads of literature through the mails free of charge?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock) :

1. The facts are as stated in the first part of the question.
2. No.
3. The only apparent limit appears to be the capacity of the cars and the other transportation facilities.
4. I think I may say there is no limit except what I have given as answer to the third question.

Mr. TALBOT asked :

1. How many messengers and other sessional employees are occupied parcelling, stamping and addressing literature for Mr. George Taylor, M.P.?
2. How many wagon loads of such literature have been drawn from stations to parliament buildings ?
3. Who pays for these wagons ?
4. If these messengers or other employees were not busy at this work, would they be available for other parliamentary or ordinary duties ?
5. Have any additional employees been engaged for this purpose ?
6. What is their salary ?

Mr. SPEAKER :

1. No sessional employees are so occupied except in the post office, where each envelope is stamped.
2. No record has been kept of the number of wagon loads of mail matter brought to the House of Commons.
3. The cartage in question is not paid for by the House of Commons.
4. Yes.
5. and 6. No additional employees have been added to the House of Commons staff.

Mr. TALBOT asked :

1. Do the hundreds of mail bags now being used for the transmission of political literature, with the frank of Mr. George Taylor, M.P., and others, belong to the government Post Office Department?
2. If so, by whose authority are the said mail bags used for the above purpose?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock) :

1. They belong to the government.
2. By no one's authority. They are illegally in use.

CANADIAN SOUTH AFRICA CONSTABULARY —DISCHARGE.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria) asked :

1. Is the government aware that the members of the Canadian South African Constabulary had to purchase their discharge, if they wished of their own accord to leave that force? If so, why had they to so purchase their discharge?

2. Is the government aware that those returning to Canada had to pay their own expenses home again? And if so, why?

3. Is the government aware that these constabulary members were not duly attested as South African Constabulary in South Africa ?

4. Is the government aware that these members did not take the oath of allegiance, nor were attested in Canada before leaving for South Africa?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden) :

1. The conditions under which men were invited to enlist, contain the following :

'A non-commissioned officer or man may be discharged at any time by order of the officer commanding the division with or without gratuity. Discharge may be purchased with consent of officer commanding division for $97.33 during first year, $73 during the second year, and $48.66 during third year.'

2. The conditions under which men were invited to enlist also provide for passage back to Canada only after a total of five years' service.

3. No attestation in South Africa was necessary, that in Canada being sufficient.

4. No ; on the contrary they did take the oath of allegiance and their enlistment in Canada has been held to be valid by the Department of Justice of Canada.

THE ALASKAN BOUNDARY.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the government if there is any statement to make regarding the findings of the Alaskan commission ?

The PRIME MINISTER. We have no official information, but it is expected that the award upon the reference will be made to-morrow by the commissioners.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACT.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 259) to amend the North-west Territories Act.—The Minister of Justice.

Mr. SCOTT moved to add the following clause to the Bill :

Notwithstanding anything in the North-west Territories Act, or any Act in amendment thereto, the legislative assembly may, by ordinance, repeal the provisions of sections 49, 51, 53, 55, 64, 88, 89 and 90 of the said North-west Territories Act as amended and re-enacted the said provisions or substitute other provisions in lieu thereof, but nothing in this section contained shall be construed as giving to the legislative assembly power to pass ordinances for the constitution, organization or maintenance of courts of criminal jurisdiction, or respecting procedure in criminal matters.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The effect would be to confer on the North-west assembly power to regulate all matters connected with the civil jurisdiction of the province. That is to say, they may determine the sittings of the court, the places where the court is to sit, how often it is to sit ; they may provide for the sittings of the court in banc or with a single judge; provide for the division of the territory into judicial districts ; define the territorial jurisdiction of the judges, and so on—all matters relating to the civil organization of the court. I think it is a step in the right direction.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT moved to add the following clause to the Bill :

Notwithstanding anything in the North-west Territories Act, or any Act in amendment thereof, the legislative assembly may, by ordinance, repeal the provisions of sections 7, 8, 9, 11 and 12 of chapter 19 of the statutes of 1888, and section 18 of chapter 17 of the statutes of 1894, as that section is enacted by section 9 of chapter 28 of the statutes of 1897, and re-enact the said provisions or substitute other provisions in lieu thereof.

Mr. GOURLEY. This amendment seems objectionable, not necessarily in the subject-matter, but in that it gives a local legislature power to repeal sections of a statute passed by this parliament. There must surely be some more logical way to get it than that. It would hardly be dignified for us to confer that power.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I would draw to the attention of my hon. friend (Mr. Gourley) the fact that paragraph 4, now under consideration, has reference to the organization of the North-west council itself, as the other paragraph we have been discussing has reference to the organization of the courts. Now, if we repeal the provisions and merely give authority to the North-west council to make others, we leave an interregnum during which some embarrassing conditions might arise. By this amendment we, in effect, say that in all matters affecting the North-west assembly, that body shall have the right either to adopt what we have done or to repeal the enactments which we have passed, and substitute others. My hon. friend will see the difficulty of adopting any other course.

Mr. GOURLEY. I see, but still it seems that there ought to be some other way than to give power to the local legislature to repeal our enactments.

The MINITSER OF JUSTICE. It is a little off the line, but my hon. friend will see that it is not unconstitutional.

Mr. GOURLEY. I take it for granted that we have the power to delegate our authority. It is not so much the thing itself

as the mode of doing it that I call attention to——

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The difficulty that my hon. friend suggests occurred to my mind also, but it seems there is no relief. Suppose that these provisions were repealed. The North-west council may not sit for months yet. Should a by-election occur in the meantime, how is it to be provided for ? It seemed to me better to maintain the statute in these matters and simply give the legislature power to provide for the changes necessary.

Mr. GOURLEY. Has the hon. minister's department considered this and come to the conclusion that this is the only way in which it can be done ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is our view—this is the only way to avoid a hiatus.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill, as amended, reported; read the third time, and passed.

JUDGES' RETIRING ALLOWANCES—SENATE AMENDMENTS.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that the House concur in the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 243) to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act, the Exchequer Court Act, and the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts. He said : There are two amendments to this Bill. As to the first of them, it relates to section 2 of the Bill as passed by this House. That section provided as follows :—

2. If any judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, or of the Exchequer Court of Canada, or of a Superior Court of any of the provinces of Canada resigns or has heretofore resigned his office as such judge to accept the office of lieutenant governor of a province, and if he serves or has served as such lieutenant governor, and is not otherwise eligible for any retiring annuity as such judge, His Majesty may, at any time after the expiration of the term of service of such judge as lieutenant governor, grant to such judge an annuity equal to two-thirds of the salary annexed to the judicial office which he held at the time of his resignation, to commence immediately upon the issue of such letters patent, and to continue thenceforth during his natural life.

This has been eliminated from the Bill.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the practical effect of the amendment ?

The PRIME MINISTER. At the present time, a judge can withdraw after fifteen years of service and is entitled to a pension. The present object of the Bill in addition to this was that, when a judge has reached a certain limit of age he should be entitled to a full pension. After fifteen years, he receives a pension of two-thirds of his salary, and after thirty years of service, he is entitled to withdraw with a pension equal to his whole salary. The amendment under this clause was that if the judge was appointed lieutenant governor before he became entitled to his full pension, at the expiration of his term of five years as lieutenant governor, he would be entitled to his pension as a judge. This has been eliminated by the Senate, as it was thought to be an interference with the independence of the judiciary, and we concur.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Are there any judges whom it affects ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know of any now.

Mr. SPROULE. I would draw the attention of the right hon. Prime Minister to the fact that this is a money Bill. The right belongs to this House to initiate, by resolution, and with the consent of the Crown, all Bills that provide for granting or using money belonging to the country, or imposing taxes or duties. In accordance with their rights, this House passed this Bill. The Bill was sent to the Senate, and has been by them amended. As I understand the constitutional rights of the two branches of the legislature, the Senate has no right to amend a money Bill. In amending this Bill, they have assumed a right which constitutionally they do not possess to amend a money Bill. I would ask the right hon. Prime Minister if he is not prepared, with his government, to defend the rights of the Commons, the elective chamber, which, undoubtedly has the right to deal with money Bills. When that question was being discussed in the other House, the first question raised was whether this was or was not a money Bill. I think that was completely settled by the authorities that was cited. First, it is a Bill dealing with pensions, which pensions are to be paid out of consolidated revenue. It provides for the using of a certain portion of the public revenue. It is, therefore, clearly a money Bill. The next question was raised, what is a money Bill. Edwin Gordon Blackmore's 'Procedure of the Legislative Council of South Australia,' at pages 172 and 182, says :

A Bill introduced by a resolution of the House on the report of the Committee of the House, is a money Bill.

May says, speaking of this class of Bills :

It follows accordingly that the Lords may not amend the provisions in Bills which they receive from the committees, dealing with the above mentioned subjects, so as to alter, whether by increase or reduction, the amount of a vote or charge.

Todd says :

Money Bills are of three kinds : tax Bills, Bills of supply and Bills of appropriation.

Bourinot says, on page 585 of his second edition :

As a general rule, public Bills may originate in either House, but whenever they grant sup-

plies of any kind, or involve directly or indirectly the levying or appropriation of any tax upon the people, they must be initiated in the popular branch, in accordance with law and English constitutional practice. Section 53 of the British North America Act, 1867, expressly provides :

Bills for appropriating any part of the public revenue, or for imposing any tax or impost, shall originate in the House of Commons.

And a standing order of the House of Commons declares explicitly :

All aids and supplies granted to Her Majesty by the parliament of Canada are the sole gift of the House of Commons, and all Bills for granting such aids and supplies ought to begin with the House, as it is the undoubted right of the House to direct, limit, and appoint in all such Bills, the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations and qualifications of such grants, which are not alterable by the Senate.

But the Senate alters them here by striking out one important clause, which provides for the appropriating of a certain amount of money. I draw the attention of the Prime Minister to this matter, and ask him if he is prepared to abandon the undoubted constitutional right of the House of Commons to control these Bills, and if he is prepared to accept the position taken by the Senate that they have a right to amend these money Bills.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is no doubt that under our constitution as it has come down to us through the ages during which it has been formed, the granting of supplies in any form whatever is exclusively the privilege of the Commons, and all legislation, whether to levy or expend revenue, has to be originated in the Commons and cannot be altered in the upper chamber. But the question is : What is a money Bill ? If does not follow that every Bill which leaves this House which provides either for levying or expending revenue, is a money Bill. A money Bill has no special meaning in parliamentary language, and there is very little legislation which leaves this House which does not indirectly involve the granting of money, and in which therefore the privilege of the other branch of the legislature to exercise its powers of supervision could not be exercised if the hon. gentleman's doctrine were to prevail. The practice has been well understood, and we look to that to find a definition of a money Bill. A money Bill is, in its more restricted sense, a Supply Bill. Todd, which my hon. friend quoted a moment ago, gives an answer to the very question the hon. gentleman brings up, for Todd says on page 815 of the last edition of the first volume :

We will now proceed to consider the subject of money Bills, which are of three kinds, viz., tax Bills, Bills of supply, and Bills of appropriation. All these Bills have a peculiar form of preamble, which intimates that the revenue or grant of money is the peculiar gift of the House of Commons, and such Bills are invariably presented for the royal assent by the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Mr. SPROULE.

This is what is understood by a money Bill, it is a Bill presented by parliament for the royal assent. To ascertain its character you have only to refer to an appropriation Act of any one year, and you will find that our practice conforms exactly to the rule laid down by Todd, namely, that the Supply Bill, which is a money Bill in the sense affirmed a moment ago by my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) is always preceded by a preamble which you do not find in any other Bills which go directly from the Table here to the Senate. But money Bills are presented by the Speaker, and here is the preamble which we find in the beginning of every appropriation Act which is a money Bill :

Most Gracious Sovereign :

Whereas it appears from a message from His Excellency the Right Hon. Sir Gilbert John Elliott, Earl of Minto, Governor General of Canada, and the estimates accompanying the said message, that the sums hereinafter mentioned are required to defray certain expenses of the public service of Canada, not otherwise provided for, for the financial years ending respectively the 30th day of June, 1902, and the 30th day of June, 1903, and for other purposes connected with the public service : may it therefore please your Majesty——

And so on. Here is the preamble which characterizes what is known in the restricted language of parliamentary law as a money Bill, to which no amendment can be offered by the Senate. But there are many Bills which are initiated here by the Crown and which the upper House has no power to introduce. We have in this question before us a grant or an appropriation of public money, but it is not a money Bill in the restricted sense to which I alluded, though it is on the border line between a money Bill and a Bill of a public character. It has always been allowed to the Senate under such circumstances to offer an amendment; but it does not follow that because the Senate may offer such an amendment the House of Commons are bound to accept it without inquiry or discussion. Perhaps it might be said that under such circumstances the Commons might exercise the right of refusing to accept the amendments of the Senate, not merely to reject an amendment, but to deny to the Senate the power to offer any amendment to this Bill. But that would be carrying the doctrine too far. We have innumerable precedents where legislation such as provided for in this Bill has been amended by the Senate. No longer ago than 1898 a Bill was introduced into this House : An Act further to amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts, an Act which involved the expenditure of money, and it was reported from the Senate with several amendments in which the Senate asked our concurrence. These amendments were considered by the House of Commons, some were accepted and others were rejected; at all events their

amendments were not deemed an invasion of the privileges of this House.

Mr. SPROULE. Did the clause of that Bill involve an expenditure of money directly connected with the revenue ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I could not say at this moment, because I have not had time to look into it, but there were Bills of this character, and I desire to make it perfectly clear that the point taken by my hon. friend is not absolute. May lays the practice down just as I have stated it, that the House may or may not, just as they please, consider the amendment of the Senate but that the Senate are not going beyond their privileges in offering amendments to Bills of this nature. This is what May says :

If otherwise unobjectionable, the Commons usually accept amendments by the Lords, which, though not strictly regular, do not materially infringe the privileges of the Commons; and they justify their conduct by an entry inserted in the 'Journal,' under direction from the Speaker, explaining the motives of the agreement, stating, for instance, that the amendments are verbal—further the intention of the House—carry out the intention of the Commons—make the provisions of the Bill uniform and consistent—are rendered necessary by several Acts recently passed—or that the amendment does not alter or otherwise affect any valuation or assessment of taxation.

But, May goes further, and I call the attention of my hon. friend to this authority:

Even when amendments by the Lords are an infringement of privilege, it is not the invariable practice of the Commons to assert their claim regarding amendments made to Bills that they have sent to the Lords, which dealt with the relief of the poor, or with municipal, county and local rates and assessments; more especially when those amendments affected charges upon the people incidentally only, and were made for the purpose of giving effect to the legislative intentions of the Commons. The difficulty also of separating those amendments from other legislative provisions or amendments, to which there was no objection, has frequently prompted their acceptance by the Commons.

Even if there is an infringement of the authority of the Commons by the lords, the Commons have sometimes accepted the amendments because they thought they were in the right direction, properly amending the legislation which they had sent to the House of Lords for their consideration. The position I take upon this is that the Senate in this matter have not abused their privilege. The Bill that is under consideration is not one of those money Bills which it is beyond their power to amend. They have not violated any principle and even if there has been an infringement of the privileges of the Commons it is a case in which the Commons should not insist upon their rights.

Mr. GOURLEY. I think this is an important matter and while I always listen with approval to my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) who is always industrious and thorough in his remarks he will excise me, I think, when I point out that the test of this matter is to determine whether it is a money Bill and what is the object of the Bill. I understand the object of the Bill is to settle the classes which shall enjoy a pension. I therefore do not regard it as a money Bill and the Senate have simply said : We do not wish lieutenant governors to be placed among those classes. Is it a money Bill or Bill which settles the classes who shall enjoy a pension ?

Mr. SPROULE. It provides for a pension.

Mr. GOURLEY. The Bill itself provides for a pension. The Senate amendments simply says among those who enjoy a pension we do not wish to include lieutenant governors. It is really an amendment relieving the treasury to the extent that lieutenant governors are removed from the classes of people who shall enjoy a pension.

Mr. MACLEAN. The Senate have no right to do that.

Mr. SPROULE. That would not make it any more right.

Mr. GOURLEY. This is a case that comes to my mind. Suppose we sent up a Bill increasing the number of judges in the Supreme Court to ten. It would clearly, in so far as the revenue would be concerned, be a charge upon the revenue to provide for the salaries of ten judges. Cannot the Senate amend that Bill by reducing the number to eight or nine ?

Mr. SPROULE. No.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They may take off taxes.

Mr. MACLEAN. No, they may not.

Mr. GOURLEY. I do not think that is the principle. I think there is a clearer principle than that. I have spoken of my learned and hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) as an hon. gentleman possessing an ecclesiastical mind. That is a very high compliment, but the hon. gentleman has not those nice distinctions that characterize the lay mind.

Mr. SPROULE. As this class of Bill provides for spending so much of the consolidated revenue during the life of the individual, it ought to be regarded as a money Bill and if the upper chamber have not the right either to increase or diminish the expenditure under any appropriation proposed by the House of Commons then I respectfully submit that they cannot alter this Bill even by cutting off one of the provisions whereby money shall be given by the force of statute afterwards.

Amendment agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER. I beg to move also that the third amendment be concurred

in. I will explain what the amendment is. Section 3 of the Bill as passed by the House of Commons was as follows :

Every county court judge who has attained the age of eighty years shall be compulsorily retired; and to any judge who is so retired, or who, having attained the age of seventy-five years, resigns his office, and who in either case has continued in office for a period of twenty-five years or upwards, His Majesty may grant an annuity equal to the salary of the office held by him at the time of his retirement, or, if he has continued in office as such judge for a less period than twenty-five years, equal to two-thirds of such salary; provided that to any such judge who is so compulsorily retired, or who so resigns, there may be granted an annuity equal to the full salary of the office held by him at the time of his retirement or resignation, irrespective of the number of years he has continued in office.

I will now read the amendment made by the Senate and we will see where the change is :

Every county court judge who has attained the age of eighty years shall be compulsorily retired; and to any judge who is so retired, or who, having attained the age of seventy-five years, resigns his office, and in the latter case has continued in office for a period of twenty-five years or upwards, His Majesty may grant an annuity equal to the salary of the office held by him at the time of his retirement, or resignation; or if he has continued in office as such judge for a less period than twenty-five years and become afflicted with some permanent infirmity, disabling him from the due execution of his office, an annuity equal to two-thirds of such salary ; the annuity in either of the above cases to commence immediately after his retirement or resignation, and to continue thenceforth during his natural life.

The alteration takes place by the elimination of these words from our section :

Provided that to any such judge who is so compulsorily retired, or who so resigns there may be granted, &c.

It was thought that such a provision might perhaps be an infringement of the independence of the judges. It was thought that if a judge were allowed to resign after fifteen years service, for instance, and be entitled to his pension it might lead to an abuse that the government of the day might ask a judge for his resignation as he would come within the rule entitling him to a pension. The Senate have very properly substituted these words :

Or if he has continued in office as such judge for a less period than twenty-five years and become afflicted with some permanent infirmity.

I therefore beg to move that the Senate amendment be concurred in.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not know whether a county court judge comes within the same category as all the other judges who are treated of in the British North America Act. If he does, I doubt very much our power to provide for his compulsory retirement at all. If we have the power of retiring judges there is only one way under the British North America Act and under the general law of doing it, and I doubt very much the power of this House to compel the retirement of a county judge.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is no doubt that this matter has been carefully inquired into; judges of the county court are not in the same category as judges of the Supreme Court, and we recognize this in this very Act. In this Act we have not taken the power to compulsorily retire judges of the Supreme Court; we cannot do that. The opinion offered to us by the Department of Justice is that this inability does not apply to the case of the county court judges, and that we have the power to retire them.

Mr. GOURLEY. On what does the Minister of Justice base the distinction between the Supreme Court and county court judges?

The PRIME MINISTER. Upon the terms of the British North America Act.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am speaking off-hand now ; I have not had the matter brought to my attention for some weeks——

Mr. GOURLEY. The minister will admit that we could not compulsory retire a Supreme Court judge.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Oh, no. We have always proceeded on the theory that there is a distinction between the position of high court judges and county court judges. In the Revised Statutes of Canada there is a provision that you may appoint a judge to examine into the conduct of a couty court judge, and thereupon proceed to remove him, the procedure differing in that respect from the procedure in the case of a high court judge, who can only be removed by Act of parliament except under the old provision of George III., which reserves to colonial governments the right to remove a judge under certain conditions. That is the theory upon which we have proceeded up to the present time, that the tenure of office of a county court judge is different from that of a high court judge. The British North America Act makes special reference to judges of the Superior Court and the Revised Statutes of Canada, proceeding on that assumption, makes provision for the investigation of the conduct and the removal of county court judges. My hon. friend will find in the Ontario reports, in re Sqiers, a very full discussion of this matter. One of the judges of Ontario, I think Vice-Chancellor Proudfoot, went into the subject very fully, and displayed a great deal of learning in his exposition of the subject. He came to the conclusion that a county court judge was removable at will by the Governor General in Council.

Amendment agreed to.

On amendment 3.

The PRIME MINISTER. I move that the third amendment be concurred in. The third amendment is purely verbal; it is substituting the word 'resignation' for the word 'retirement.'

Amendment agreed to.

REVISED STATUTES OF CANADA.

Bill (No. 265) respecting the Revised Statutes of Canada—(the Minister of Justice)—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 2,

Mr. GOURLEY. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that our statutes of Canada are not creditable; the clauses of statutes dealing with the same subject are different in language in almost every instance. That is not right, because it puts a counsel or an individual who wants to understand a statute to the necessity of interpreting each line of every statute, whereas if we had statutes divided into classes, and the sections of statutes dealing with the same subject couched in exactly the same language, this would be avoided. There ought not to be a comma different. Any one who is familiar with the construction of statutes knows that it is one of the nicest occupations to which a man can give his attention, requiring not only a clear comprehension of language, but also an appreciation of the niceties of grammatical construction and the construction of sentences. I may say that attention has been brought to this matter by Judge Weatherby in Nova Scotia, a man of splendid intellect, although he is rather erratic; he has one of the most perfectly analytical minds that you can meet with. It is a pleasure to hear him interpret a statute, I have been very often pained to hear him take one of our Dominion statutes and tear it all to pieces and express wonder if we have any law officer in Ottawa who knows anything about law or anything else. I must say that I concur in a great deal of what he says, and I believe we should attempt to do what they do in England, have every statute and every section of a statute dealing with the same subject couched in exactly the same language.

Mr. FRASER. I am afraid that my hon. friend is giving too high praise to English statutes. I notice that the judges there speak quite sarcastically of the English statutes.

Mr. GOURLEY. The late Lord Thring did a great deal to cure that. I am inclined to believe that there is more accuracy and nicety of expression in the English statutes than in our own, although the House will agree that I am not inclined to unduly praise the English.

Mr. GALLIHER. The Americans are your friends.

Mr. GOURLEY. They do not pretend to accuracy of language there. I would suggest to the Minister of Justice that in these acts of incorporation which we are constantly passing, clauses conferring certain powers should be kept exactly the same in every case and that no man drafting an Act should be permitted to alter the language to the extent of a comma. Therefore I think this is a very important section, that we should have good draughtsmen; we might have a very good lawyer who might not be a good draughtsman, as they are different gifts.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Absolutely.

Mr. GOURLEY. A man might be able to tear an Act to pieces but to have a Bill properly drafted requires the knack of using language to express an idea nicely. That is a gift, and if it does not appear in a statute it makes that statute hopeless of construction. I hope the Minister of Justice will impress on the commission the fact that the Acts of this parliament should be expressive of the very nicest intentions of parliament in the most apt English. I intend to assist the Minister of Justice as much as I can in having our statutes put in the fewest possible words. This habit of using many words is a loose, unscholarly habit. A man who is not a scholar is eternally using a lot of words when a few would be sufficient. If you make a long sentence in a statute, you only involve it, and you leave it doubtful how a court will interpret it. I saw a judge the other day take a section of a statute and re-write it to show the exact meaning of the language, and the meaning which the legislature evidently meant it to convey, and the two things were as different as night and day. The members of this House should be scholars enough to be able to express their meaning in the clearest and most concise language, so that no judge could have any doubt about it.

On section 12,

Mr. COCHRANE. What does that clause mean?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is taken from a corresponding section of the Act respecting the Revised Statutes of Canada, which was passed in connection with the revision of 1886. If we were to distribute the Revised Statutes, as we now distribute the ordinary statutes, that would entail very large expenditure. The statutes are now distributed to the members of this parliament and the local legislatures and to all the magistrates.

Mr. GOURLEY. When will they be distributed?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There are 154 statutes for revision, of which 48 have

been revised. Each commissioner is given several statutes to revise, then they meet every three or four months and revise the work of each, and the whole is subject to the control of the chairman, the ex-chief justice of the Supreme Court, who is probably the most competent man in Canada. I hope that within the next year all the work will be done.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

LIBRARIANS OF PARLIAMENT.

Bill (No. 267) respecting the Librarians of parliament, (the Minister of Justice) read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this not a money Bill ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Not in the strict sense of the word.

Mr. SPROULE. It provides for salaries to be paid out of consolidated revenue.

The PRIME MINISTER. According to Todd the term 'Money Bill' is very restricted. It applies only to Bills which have a peculiar form of preamble and are presented by the Speaker at the bar of the House as coming from the Commons and being its gift. The Supply Bill is of that character. But there are other Bills, which are money Bills in a certain sense but not in that particular sense. I refer my friend to page 815 of Todd.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand the right hon. gentleman to hold that the Bill dealing with pensions for the North-west Mounted Police was a money Bill and could be introduced only by the government.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is one of those Bills which affect public money and must originate from the Crown, and should be introduced by resolution assented to by His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPROULE. Why should it require the consent of the Crown ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Because it was found in England before this rule was introduced and is found in other legislatures, where there is no such rule, that any member of parliament might introduce a resolution for the expenditure of public money. My hon. friend knows that a member of parliament has to go to a minister in order to get an appropriation for a wharf, and it would be an easier matter for him to introduce a resolution in the House. It was to prevent such an abuse that it has been decided that, although the granting of money is a special privilege of parliament, still it cannot be exercised except on the initiative of the Crown.

Mr. SPROULE. If it must have the consent of the Crown because it disposes of the public revenue, every Bill which disposes of public revenues, and which must be introduced by a resolution and a declaration that it has the assent of the Crown, must be regarded as a money Bill.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is not a money Bill in the sense that it cannot be amended by the Senate. There has been a rule that the House of Lords shall not amend a Supply Bill—it has to accept it entire or reject it entire. But there are other Bills which are, in a sense, money Bills, but not in the strict sense, though they provide for the appropriation of public money, and these Bills, it has been always held, may be amended by the Lords. The rule was not very properly understood in the olden times, though I think it is clear now. But even under the circumstances, the Commons often would not insist on their privilege but would accept amendments of Bills of the class my hon. friend has in mind.

Mr. SPROULE. I have at least the consolation of knowing that the present Speaker of the Senate ruled along the same lines that I have been contending for—that it was a money Bill.

The PRIME MINISTER. Perhaps the Speaker of the Senate has an ecclesiastical mind.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The Prime Minister said a little while ago that a private member could not introduce a resolution asking for an appropriation for any special purpose. Could he not make a motion to the effect that it would be in the interest of Canada, for instance, to build a wharf at a certain place ?

The PRIME MINISTER. He could introduce a merely academic motion.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That is what I mean.

On section 2—salaries of present librarians,

Mr. COCHRANE. What are these gentlemen receiving now ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Their salary is $3,000 a year. They will rank hereafter as deputy heads. There are certain privileges of a purely social character connected with that rank.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It is possible, under this Act, for the salaries of these officers to reach the highest limit of the salaries of the deputy heads ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Except the salary of three deputy heads—Justice, Finance and Railways and Canals, who may go as high as $5,000.

Bill reported ; read the third time, and passed.

REGISTRAR OF THE SUPREME COURT.

Bill (No. 268) respecting the registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada (The Minister

of Justice), was read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1—rank and salary of registrar.

Mr. GOURLEY. What are you making Mr. Cameron's salary ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is to be $3,500 with annual increases of $100 up to a maximum of $4,000.

Mr. GOURLEY. He is an excellent officer and ought to be well paid.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Whenever the salary of any lawyer attached to any court is up for consideration, you will always find some other lawyers to rise in this House and say something complimentary. What are the requirements of this position of registrar of the Supreme Court ? Why should we have an officer who is to be paid so large a sum ?

Mr. BELCOURT. I have had considerable experience with that court, and may be in a position to say something in answer to the hon. member (Hon. Mr. Haggart). The registrar of the Supreme Court is not merely an officer of the court as that term is usually understood ; he is a judge. He is called upon, as registrar of the Supreme Court to sit in chambers, to hear and determine all applications of a routine character—with reference to printing of cases or dispensing with printing, with reference to applications for costs, for leave to appeal, and so on. He sits almost every day.

Mr. COCHRANE. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Belcourt) allow me to ask him a question ? What is this officer's business ? What does he do outside of this ?

Mr. BELCOURT. I am only explaining what the nature of his business is, and tryinig to show that those duties are more than the duties of an ordinary clerk of an ordinary court. The salaries of prothonotaries and registrars of courts throughout the land are perhaps not equal to the salary provided for, except in one or two instances. The registrar of a court, as a rule, has no judicial duties to perform ; he is simply a clerk of process, signs papers in processes of court, but does not adjudicate upon matters. But the registrar of the Exchequer Court is really one of the judges of the court, hearing and determining applications in chambers. It is true there is an appeal from his decision to a judge and from the judge to the court. The fact remains, however, that the registrar performs judicial duties every day. He is also the custodian of the library, has the responsibility of the books there and——

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We pay a librarian, whose salary I see is to be increased to a very handsome one.

Mr. BELCOURT. But the registrar has charge of and responsibility for a very large and very valuable library, probably the best legal library in Canada. Such a duty does not devolve upon the clerk of an ordinary court. I think this is the only court in the land which has a large library, the responsibility for which rests upon the registrar.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What has the librarian to do ?

Mr. BELCOURT. He furnishes books and has charge of the routine of the library, but the responsibility for the care of the library rests upon the registrar. He has to make recommendations from time to time as to additions to the library. I think I am in the judgment of every member of this House when I say that the present registrar of the Supreme Court is a very deserving officer, and, I think, fully entitled to the remuneration provided under this Bill.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. He may be a very deserving officer, but is it requisite for the administration of justice that such a deserving officer and a person of such ability should hold this position ? I do not say anything derogatory of the individual who occupies the office, I do not even know him. After all that, he says, his duties are not judicial, they are principally ministerial—applications for orders and things of that kind, which do not require a judicial mind at all. These applications do not require an intellect of the order that is required for the Supreme Court. You may have for registrar a gentleman of greater intelligence and ability than are needed for a registrar, but that is no reason why you should pay him so high a salary. We could get a man to fulfil what I might call these mechanical duties for a less salary. I have noticed continually in this country when you establish a court, that first of all we have the judges, a short time afterwards there is a library established, then soon after, three or four messengers, then a librarian, then a couple of officers of court, and every session demands for an increase of salary. There is no other country on the face of the globe that is so encumbered with a superfluity of the administration of justice. No other race but the Anglo-Saxon race would submit to it. They are improving it over in Great Britain, but on this side it is getting worse every year.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if the Minister of Trade and Commerce was consulted in this matter, or the leader of the House. These gentlemen sit complacently by and see these increases voted for every man high and low. The salary has been increased all over. How the Minister of Trade and Commerce used to sympathize with the ratepayers when he was sitting on this side of the House. We were told that the poor ratepayers and the poor farmers were being bled white by the Conservative government. Now, this government is voting millions

upon millions, and every official in this country from Dan to Beersheba is getting an increase of salary, and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce is sitting there complacently, listening to the explanation given by the Deputy Minister of Justice about this official being a very judicial man and being responsible for the library. Now, how does he reconcile that with what he told the electors of what he was going to do after his friends got into power.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Keep your face straight.

Mr. COCHRANE. Well, I can't keep it any straighter than it is. I am speaking with conscientious motives, and if hon. gentlemen can smile under the present circumstances, why they can smile upon going to the gallows. They have broken every pledge they gave to the electors in reference to economy, and how they can smile at hearing these things told them is more than I can understand. I heard tell of a man who was going to the gallows, and he met a man running that way and asked him what he was running for and when he told him: Well, he said, you need not be in a hurry, there will be no fun until I get there. But this is a serious matter. Here are broken pledges. I am not accusing the Minister of Justice of breaking his pledges, because he was not in the House then, but he is just as much responsible for it as those hon. gentlemen, because he has become one of them. He is endorsing them while they are breaking every promise they ever made to the people. I challenge the hon. gentleman to point out to me one pledge they gave to the electors when they were in opposition that they have carried out since they have been in power. The Postmaster General——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Oh, spare me.

Mr. COCHRANE—used to tell us about the iniquities of the Conservative party, he used to tell us how humiliating it was for members of parliament to be sitting in the House with promises of office and emoluments in their pockets, and he even brought in a Bill condemning the practice. Is that hon. gentleman now carrying out the pledges that he made in opposition? How many members of parliament have he and his friends appointed to office? The Minister of Customs used to make the roof of this building tremble with his sonorous voice denouncing the extravagance of the Conservative party. Now he thinks it is all right. He thinks this gentleman is entitled to a large increase because he is responsible for the library, and because he has got a judicial mind. I don't care what kind of a mind he has got. We don't require a man with such a mind. A man with a very ordinary mind would be sufficient to do that work, and have plenty of time to lark around the country besides.

Mr. COCHRANE.

Mr. GOURLEY. I always stand up for my hon. friend from East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) when he is condemning the government for breaking their pledges. His evident sincerity certainly convinces me, and I fancy it must convince hon. gentlemen opposite. But in the meantime we are discussing the salary of the registrar of the Supreme Court, and I desire to say that I think the policy of Canada has always been wrong in demeaning the public service of this country by paying insignificant salaries. The Supreme Court, if it is to be such a court as it ought to be and entitled to the respect of the people, must be a dignified tribunal, and everybody connected with it must be paid a sufficient salary to give dignity to the court. Every man in this country desires to see the Supreme Court possessed of a good library, with good officers to look after it, men competent by their legal intelligence to answer questions that may be asked them. When a man in a hurry goes into the library he wants to find a man there competent to give him assistance. The policy of paying everybody in the highest court in the country, salaries befitting the position, is one that I am sorry to say has not been followed in the past as it should be. These hon. gentlemen did not have these views when they were in opposition. We are setting them an example now of what an opposition should be in Canada; and when you gentlemen get into our position, as you will in a short time, we hope you will follow our good example. I know Mr. Cameron very well, he is a man of ability, he is a lawyer. He wrote a book some time ago, and it was so well written that it completely deceived me, because I thought I was reading the memoirs of an old member of parliament, but it turned out to be the mere creation of the imagination of our friend Mr. Cameron and a very bright little book it is. I go the full length of saying that that gentleman's salary as proposed here is not any too much for his abilities. I do not very often have the opportunity of finding myself in agreement with the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) but in this academic matter I am very happy to agree with him that Mr. Cameron is deserving of this additional salary. I want to say a word also in regard to Mr. Bligh, the librarian of the Supreme Court. I am bound to say that his salary is utterly insignificant and that he should not be required to live in Ottawa and maintain his family for the tu'penny ha'penny salary he is getting.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What is his salary?

Mr. GOURLEY. $1,200 or $1,300 a year.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Do you call that a tu'penny ha'penny salary?

Mr. GOURLEY. If you had a good kennel of dogs you would require more money a year to keep them than that. If you want

any politics the whole thing is to be blamed upon the Liberal party in this country who sat here for eighteen years and kept down the remuneration of the members of this House. The remuneration of the members ought either to be nothing or it ought to be more. It is an honourable proposition to come and serve your country freely and I will go in for that if you like, but when you come to discuss the question of indemnity and put it at $1,500 it demeans every man in this House by making him a cheap man. When I was coming up from Nova Scotia a short time ago I met a bright, intelligent young man from Massachusetts, a Harvard graduate who is taking a post graduate course in economics for the purpose of fitting himself for public life in the United States. He found out that I was a member of the House of Commons and in the course of the conversation he asked me what the indemnity of a member of the House was. I avoided the question. I refused to tell him because if I had I am persuaded he would have thought that I was coming to a fifth-class country debating society instead of to the parliament of my country. Therefore I am bound to say that everything is insignificant and mean in this country in reference to the remuneration paid to public men. If there is to be an indemnity it should be higher than it is. How can one of those civil servants who perhaps receives a salary of $4,000 or $5,000 a year have any respect for a member of parliament who is given $1,500 to put into his pocket. We should either abolish the indemnity or fix it at an amount which will be creditable to the people of this country. However, if we are going to treat ourselves meanly I do not want to treat anybody else meanly and therefore I support this increase to Mr. Cameron.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is rather invidious to discuss individual cases, but this officer, like a great many others in connection with the administration of justice, is well deserving of greater recognition at the hands of parliament than he receives now. I cannot help reminding my right hon. friend (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) how things have changed. Of course we have a great deal more money nowadays owing to the features of the national policy that have remained, but the principle surely is not affected by the exuberance of the condition of things. When I was Minister of Justice it was pointed out, that, under a very old law that had been left on the statute-book, the exceedingly small salary of the chief justice of British Columbia would be diminished by about $900 a year and owing to many considerations and many strong reasons a Bill was introduced to prevent such a result, the general feeling being that the judiciary all over Canada was very much underpaid. A modest Bill came before the House to readjust salaries, so that the incoming chief Justice of British Columbia on the death of Sir Matthew Begby would not find that he had $900 less than the very small salary of is predecessor and my right hon. friend divided this House by opposing that measure and opposing it vehemently on the principle, that, while he quite agreed that the judiciary were not well paid, it was an outrageous thing to bring forward the case of an individual and to deal with it. He was opposed to even preventing an injustice being done in this case until the government were prepared to take up boldly the whole problem and deal with the different courts of the Dominion fairly and on the same principle. Of course at that time my right hon. friend knows we could not do it. We had not enough money to go around. But, to-day, every one knows that things have changed. Here we are going to pass invidious legislation. It is not the case of the present incumbent of the office receiving less than his predecessor, but this is only one of several cases in which the administration have taken up individual claims. In this very case in British Columbia, and I do not like to refer to it as I practise at the Bar in that province and my words may be misunderstood, it was proposed to increase the salary of the judge of the Vice Admiralty Court and to appoint the chief justice as judge of the Vice Admiralty Court. That would have left the chief justice with the same income as Sir Matthew Begby had and a very small one it was, something like $5,000 a year. Chief Justice McColl died and this House will be surprised to know that the present chief justice is receiving less than Chief Justice McColl or Sir Matthew Begby because Mr. Justice Martin was appointed to be judge of the Vice Admiralty Court. So, the reduction of the salary of the chief justice actually took place. I think this is the only case in Canada since the beginning of this movement in favour of increasing salaries in which a reduction of salary has actually taken place. While I do not begrudge a high officer like the registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada receiving a salary somewhat adequate to the position, I do object to such cases as that which I have mentioned standing on the statute-books of our country. In a short time under this Bill the registrar of this high court will rank as far as salary goes very nearly as high as the chief justice of one of the provinces of Canada. While I do not object to what is proposed under the Bill, I say that the case that was proposed years ago was far stronger, and if I were disposed to follow that line of argument I would be obliged to oppose this act of justice. The case as it was then put by the right hon. gentleman in insisting upon a readjustment of the salaries of the judges generally was far stronger than the present argument in favour of dealing with individual cases. I am surprised at the course which the govern-

ment have taken because I would have expected, in view of the opinion prevailing generally throughout the country that our judges are poorly paid, that a more comprehensive measure would have been introduced and that instead of dealing with this officer only many of these cases—and I dare say there are many more such cases as that which I have mentioned—would have received due consideration.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) unfortunately, has been away a good deal and he has not evidently been made aware of what has taken place in regard to the civil service.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I was dealing with the judiciary.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am speaking of the civil service. There was an agreement on both sides of the House that the salaries of the civil service ought to be increased, but the Civil Service Act is rather a complicated one and Mr. Cameron has been left out of the provisions of the Bill which was passed by this House some time ago. We thought it only fair that the Bill should be supplemented by this one so as to include Mr. Cameron in the benefits of the disposition which we have made of the matter.

With regard to the judiciary, I think that we will have to take up the subject at some time and to take it up sooner rather than later, and to increase the salaries which are not sufficient at present. The question is not without difficulty. Here is the opinion of the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) that we are cursed with too many judges.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That may be; too many judges too poorly paid.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know that we could get on with fewer judges than we have. It may be said, in one sense, that we have too many governments in Canada, but that is the consequence of our system. On the whole, it is a good system. It has its inconveniences, but we have federal courts and we have provincial courts, and I do not think we have too many judges. We must necessarily have a large number of judges in proportion to the population, but if we consider that the population is scattered over a very large extent of territory in Canada, I think my hon. friend from Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) will agree, on consideration, that it is impossible to have fewer judges than we have, although it may so happen that at some points there will be too many judges, at other points there may not be judges enough. That is a consequence of the condition of things that prevails at the present time, and which can be remedied only by the hand of time, when time shall have distributed population more equally over Canadian territory than it is at the present moment. On the whole, there are not too many courts, but we have this unavoidable feature of our system, that at some points the judges have too much to do while at other points they have not enough to do, and the question is always brought up when these questions are under discussion. The man who is able to devise a plan by which the work will be more equally divided between the judges will have brought about a system which the government will be only too glad to adopt.

At one o'clock, committee took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to draw attention to one very ingenious feature of this Bill, and the same remark applies to the previous Bill. It provides that the party to whom it refers shall have the rank of a deputy head of a department, and that his salary shall be $3,500 per annum, with an annual increase of $100 up to the maximum of $4,000. It practically provides that he shall get $4,000 from the start, not that he gets $3,500. How much does the present occupant of the position get?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. $3,200.

Mr. SPROULE. That is a raise of $800 at one jump.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Oh, no.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, for it goes on to say that for the purpose of determining his salary he shall be credited with his period of service, and shall hereafter be paid such salary as he would by length of service be entitled to. If you assume that he was entitled to it from the start and if you credit him with his length of service, he is entitled to the maximum now, and the same thing applies in the case of the other Bill. It applies to the librarian and the assistant librarian of parliament also.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It applies in the same way as to the deputy head of a department under the Civil Service Act Amendment Act. If an officer had three years of service to his credit when this Bill goes into effect he would commence at $3,800 and would then receive $100 for each year; if he had four years to his credit he would get $3,900, and if he had five years he would commence, as the hon. gentleman says, at $4,000. That is working exactly in the same way as in the case of the salaries of deputy heads of departments under the Civil Service Amendment Act.

Mr. SPROULE. How long would it take a deputy head, starting at $3,500 to reach the maximum?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Five years.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the time of these officers count from the date of the passing of this Act or from a previous date?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. As I understand the Act, it applies from the passing of this Act except, that where an officer has been a few years in office, it applies from the time of his appointment. The gentleman in question has been in office for five years, in which case he would now receive $4,000 a year. A new appointee would commence at $3,500, and his salary would raise $100 a year.

Mr. SPROULE. It seemed to me that the Act was so worded as to show that it was intended to conceal its purpose from the general public.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is drawn in the exact terms of the Civil Service Amendment Act as it applies to the deputy heads of departments, and it is intended to treat these gentlemen in exactly the same way as the deputy heads are treated.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What will be his salary next year under this Act?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The salary of the registrar of the Supreme Court under this will be $4,000 a year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This is an increase of $800 at once. I must protest against any such expenditure as that. Here is an officer of the Supreme Court, who has none of the qualifications of a judge, starting with a salary of $4,000 a year, nearly double the amount that a county court judge gets.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Some of them have other allowances.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Some of them have not.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think all of them.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Not the juniors and some of the others. They get no allowances whatever and here is an officer of the court with a salary of $4,000 a year and a rise from last year of $800. There is no justification for such an increase.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Exactly the same as the deputy heads under the Civil Service Act amendment.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What justification is there for a man who receives an ample salary getting an increase at once of $800 a year? This will give him $4,000 a year as registrar of the Supreme Court—a clerk. It is a monstrous salary.

The PRIME MINISTER. A monstrous salary for the position?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes, for the registrar of any court.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am afraid my hon. friend has not been here while the hon. member for Ottawa has been asking for an increase for the whole civil service.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There are many of us who represent other opinions than those of the civil service. Any man representing the city of Ottawa would advocate an increase for the civil service.

Mr. SPROULE. The feature which seems to me to be entirely unreasonable is the giving of an increase of $800 in one year. I could understand an official getting an increase of $50 or $100 a year until he reached the maximum; but these last three cases together amount to an aggregate increase of $2,400 to three employees in one year.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The salary of the registrar of the Supreme Court originally fixed by statute was $2,600. Afterwards that was increased to $3,200. The object of the present amendment is to add $300 to that, making it $3,500. Then it goes up by annual increments of $100 until it reaches the maximum of $4,000.

Mr. SPROULE. He gets $4,000 immediately, because you give him credit for his back time.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. His five years of service are taken into account, just as was done a moment ago in the case of the librarians. The hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) says it is absolutely unfair to pay the registrar of the Supreme Court such a salary as this. Why, the Master in Chambers at Osgoode Hall gets $4,000, though occupying a less important position. This gentleman sometimes sits as a judge, and there is an appeal from his judgment to the Supreme Court.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If he takes any responsibility upon himself, he consults the judges of the Supreme Court before venturing an opinion.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is a matter entirely discretionary with him.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Would the hon. Minister of Justice answer this question: What is the immediate effect of this Bill upon his salary? What does he get this year?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. At the present time he gets $3,200. By this Act he will be entitled to an increase of his salary up to $4,000. He will get $3,500 now and an annual increment of $100 a year. The Minister of Agriculture directs my attention to the fact that he gets the benefit of his accrued services to the extent of five years. At that rate he gets $4,000. My hon. friend must remember that the salary is not an extraordinary one, in view of the fact that the province of Ontario pays $4,000 a year and

that the prothonotaries of Montreal and Quebec get $4,000 a year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But under this Bill it may be posible that this person will get $4,600 a year, because this Bill makes his salary $4,000 apart from $600 a year which he receives as editor and publisher of the Supreme Courts reports.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The payment to him as editor and publisher of the Supreme Court reports is not made by statute, but by Order in Council. I entertain no doubt that the statutory salary would supersede the salary paid to him by Order in Council. If the $600 is not voted each year in the appropriation Act, he does not get it ; but we will put a clause in the Bill to make that absolutely clear.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Even then it is too much. I would suggest to the Minister of Finance that it would be better to have all these amounts put in the annual Appropriation Act. It seems strange that a registrar and a deputy head of a department should have a statutory right to their salaries, as have no other persons in the civil service.

Progress reported.

GENERAL INSPECTION ACT.

Bill (No. 266) further to amend the general Inspection Act, (The Minister of Trade and Commerce) read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1—appointments of chief weighmaster and assistants east of Manitoba.

Mr. SPROULE. How many districts have we east of Manitoba ?

The PRIME MINISTER. There are only two.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it intended to make others and to appoint weighmasters in large cities like Toronto, Montreal and Quebec ?

The PRIME MINISTER. This has been asked for by the Board of Trade of Toronto and others. My hon. friend's question is answered by the section itself. The section reads :

The Governor in Council may appoint in and for any inspection district east of the inspection district of Manitoba, a chief weighmaster, whose duties and powers shall be defined by Order in Council, and may also, in any place where inspection of grain is authorized under this Act, or where is situate any public terminal elevator appoint a weighmaster and such assistants as are necessary.

Mr. SPROULE. Then at every place where there is an elevator you will appoint a weighmaster ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Not necessarily.

Mr. SPROULE. For the purpose of carrying out this Act it would be essentially necessary, because the object is to have an independent weighmaster where the grain is handled. A great deal of this grain is taken out of the elevators at Owen Sound, Meaford, Midland, Collingwood and distributed to the millers. Would there be an independent weighmaster in each of these places ? I believe that would be the right thing to do, because we often find that in taking grain you are charged with more than it is found to weigh when weighed over again. Hence arises disputes sometimes troublesome to settle and occasionally the purchaser has to pay for more grain than he has received. If an independent weighmaster were appointed, that would avoid difficulty.

The PRIME MINISTER. The intention is to do what my hon. friend recommends.

Mr. SPROULE. I am convinced, from experience, that in every locality where stuff is received from the public or sold by the public, we should have an independent weighmaster, sworn to do his duty. A great deal of dissatisfaction exists because the people think they are not getting justice, and a great many disputes arise which cannot be satisfactorily settled. If we had at every country town some person authorized to weigh cattle, grain and other products, there would be very few disputes.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I think that the proposition of my hon. friend is theoretically correct, but it would entail a heavy tax. This Bill, however, is for the purpose of weighing grain at public terminals, and chiefly concerned the handling of grain by the railway people—grain brought from the west and handled at the terminals such as Owen Sound, Goderich, Sarnia and other points. The Board of Trade of Toronto has asked for the appointment of such officers, who will be sworn to do justice between the parties, and I consider it a reasonable request.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not opposing this, because I think it right. Disputes would always be settled satisfactorily if we had a weighmaster.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is proposed that Collingwood, Midland, Owen Sound and Port Huron should have weighmasters, and I presume Toronto. We could not have one at every station.

Mr. SPROULE. You could give a man that duty to attend to, but let him attend to other duties as well. Allow him something for that work, but let him attend to his other work also.

Mr. CAMPBELL. You have not inspectors at these small places. The inspectors are at the terminal points.

Mr. SPROULE. What are the terminal points ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Toronto, Montreal, Halifax, St. John——

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose the grain never reaches one of these points. If I buy a carload of grain shipped from Owen Sound it never reaches——

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is weighed at Owen Sound.

Mr. SPROULE. If these inspectors are at every point where grain is given out, that is all right.

On section 114, powers and duties of weighmasters.

Mr. CAMPBELL. There is a good deal of American corn, for instance, that comes into the terminals at Owen Sound, Port Huron and other places, and is consumed throughout Ontario. Then there is a good deal of grain such as rejected and No. 1 and No. 2, though Manitoba grain that probably is not inspected at all. This clause provides that all that grain will be weighed. I would suggest that it would be as well to drop out the words 'inspected, subject to inspection or otherwise, or,' and leave it to read: 'The weighing of grain received into or shipped out of, from public terminal elevators.'

The PRIME MINISTER. Let that stand in the meantime.

On section 3.

Mr. SPROULE. You have no penalties in this Act. Are they provided in the other Act?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Section 114 reconsidered.

Mr. CAMPBELL. On further considering the clause, I think that, as it stands it will cover the case. I want to provide that the weighmaster shall be compelled to weigh all grain, tough, rejected or anything else that may be asked. I think that probably the section as it appears here will cover the case.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

House in committee to consider certain proposed resolutions respecting the granting of the subsidies therein mentioned to certain railways:

On resolution 1,

The Governor in Council may grant a subsidy of $3,200 per mile towards the construction of each of the undermentioned lines of railway (not exceeding in any case the number of miles hereinafter respectively stated) which shall not cost more on the average than $15,000 per mile for the mileage subsidized, and towards the construction of each of the said lines of railway, not exceeding the mileage hereinafter stated, which shall cost more on the average than $15,000 per mile for the mileage subsidized, a further subsidy beyond the sum of $3,200 per mile of fifty per cent on so much of the average cost of the mileage subsidized as is in excess of $15,000 per mile, such subsidy not exceeding in the whole the sum of $6,400 per mile.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I would like to know if there is any change as between this and the law as it was?

The PRIME MINISTER. No change.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. None whatever?

The PRIME MINISTER. None whatever.

To the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company, for a line of railway from the present terminus at Ingersoll to Woodstock, not exceeding nine miles, in lieu of subsidy granted by chapter 7 of 1899, item 26 of section 2.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Would the hon. Finance Minister explain?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I lay on the Table copies of applications with respect to these subsidies, so that anybody who wishes may look at them.

The PRIME MINISTER. The first 29 items are merely renewals. No practical change is made in them, and when there is any change I will explain it.

To the Toronto, Lindsay and Pembroke Railway Company, for a line of railway from Golden lake to Bancroft, not exceeding fifty-one miles; in lieu of subsidy granted by chapter 7 of 1901, item 6, section 2.

Mr. MACLEAN. Is this to make a new road from Ottawa to Toronto, practically?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a revote.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It is an extension of the line from Toronto north-westerly to meet the Pembroke and Golden Lake Railway. It will make a new road as far as Renfrew.

To the Strathroy and Western Counties Railway Company for a line of railway from a point at or near Caradoc station on the Canadian Pacific Railway to Strathroy and from Strathroy northerly to Forest, Thedford or Parkhill, not exceeding in all thirty-one miles, in lieu of subsidies granted by chapter 7, of 1899, item 4 of section 2, and chapter 8 of 1900, item 2 of section 2, respectively.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I move to change that so that it will read as follows:

To the Strathroy and Western Counties Railway for a line of railway from a point at Lambeth to Strathroy via the villages Delaware, Mount Brydges and Caradoc station on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and from Strathroy northerly to Forest, Thedford or Parkhill, not exceeding in all thirty-one miles.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Who applied for the change?

Mr. CALVERT. The company's solicitor applied to me for it recently—the solicitor of the Strathroy and Western Counties Railway Company.

Mr. HENDERSON. The acting Minister of Railways told us there would be no change in the mileage. I am not very sure of the geography of this locality, but I think that a line from Mount Brydges to Caradoc must of necessity increase the mileage.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We could not change the mileage without bringing down a new resolution. If this is not sufficient to cover the ground, then they can only get the miles authorized, and the addition will have to be a matter for subsequent approval. It may be that an additional mileage would be necessary to cover all the points, but the mileage would be limited to the number which the House passes.

Mr. CALVERT. We are not asking for any more miles at the present time.

Mr. HENDERSON. But the hon. gentleman is certainly asking for an increased subsidy, because he expects an additional mileage.

Mr. CALVERT. We are only asking for 31 miles, as we did in the first place, no more.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the name of the road which starts from London, and who has control of that road ?

Mr. CALVERT. I think it is called the London and Port Stanley Road, or the London and St. Thomas.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You say you start within a few miles of London. Is it the Grand Trunk who has control of that road ?

Mr. CALVERT. I am not sure.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. member must see that he is here changing a subsidy from a point starting on the Canadian Pacific Railway to a point starting on the Grand Trunk Railway, or transferring it from a branch line that was intended to be of assistance to the Canadian Pacific Railway and giving it to the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. CALVERT. This road from London to Lambeth is a private corporation. It does not belong to the Canadian Pacific Railway or to the Grand Trunk Railway, but it will connect with the Grand Trunk, that already has an entrance into the city of London. From Lambeth it will go to Delaware and thence to Mount Brydges, where it will cross the Grand Trunk.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. member must know who controls or owns that road that is already built from Lambeth to London, of which this is an extension. Surely he should give us that information, or he should not ask for a subsidy. This is an extension of a road from Lambeth to London ; it is a subsidy that was granted from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway. That was the initial point under the old subsidy Act. Now it is transferred to a point called Lambeth, which is connected by an electric railway with London. I want to know what company owns the road from Lambeth to London, and who will get this subsidy ?

Mr. CALVERT. It is an electric road from Lambeth to London instead of a steam railway.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is this going to be an electric road ?

Mr. CALVERT. No, it is a steam road.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then you go by a steam railway to Lambeth and from Lambeth to London by an electric railway ?

Mr. CALVERT. That is often done. The company will simply have running rights.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is it the intention to use this as a steam road to get the subsidy and then to change into an electric road ?

Mr. CALVERT. No, the intention is to use it as a steam road.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is this a Dominion or provincial charter ?

Mr. CALVERT. A Dominion charter.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I suppose these subsidies are only to be given to steam railways ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly, there is no subsidy given to an electric railway by any of these proposals.

Resolution, as amended, agreed to.

To the Montfort and Gatineau Colonization Railway Company to extend its railway from Arundel to a point in the municipality of the united townships of Preston and Hartwell, not exceeding thirty miles, in lieu of subsidy granted by chapter 8 of 1900, item 31 of section 2.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the committee will be good enough to turn to resolution No. 41, which is a continuation of the same vote, we can take the two together, because both refer to the same subsidy exactly. We have put it into two parts, because one is a revote of the mileage and the other is the additional mileage. Resolution No. 41 is as follows :

To the Montfort and Gatineau Colonization Railway Company for the extension of its line of railway from Morin Flats to St. Jérôme to connect with the Great Northern Railway, not exceeding twenty-two miles.

Resolutions agreed to.

For a line of railway from Jonquières to La Baie Ha Ha, not exceeding twenty miles, in lieu of subsidy of twelve miles granted by chapter 7 of 1899, item 21 of section 2.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Where is this ?

The PRIME MINISTER. This is an extension of the Lake St. John Railway from Chicoutimi to Baie des Ha Ha.

For a line of railway from Lime Ridge northerly through the county of Wolfe into the county of Megantic, not exceeding fifty miles, being a revote of subsidy granted by chapter 4 of 1894.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If hon. gentlemen will be good enough to turn to resolution No. 45 they will find the same condition. The additional mileage is given in resolution 45 which is as follows :

For a line of railway in extension of the line from Lime Ridge into the county of Megantic to the bridge over the St. Lawrence at or near Quebec, not exceeding thirty miles.

Resolutions agreed to.

For a line of railway from Joliette to or near Lake Manan, a distance not exceeding sixty miles, being a revote and in lieu of subsidies granted by chapter 4 of 1897 and chapter 8 of 1900.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does this make any change or is it simply a revote ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Simply a revote.

Mr. GOURLEY. Where is Joliette ?

The PRIME MINISTER. It is in the county of Joliette, back from the St. Lawrence.

Mr. GOURLEY. On the north side ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, on the north side.

For a line of railway from St. Eustache to St. Placide in the county of Two Mountains, not to exceed eighteen miles ; from St. Eustache to Sault au Recollet, twelve miles ; and from St. Placide to St. Andrews, eight miles, not exceeding in all thirty-eight miles, being a revote of subsidies granted by chapter 24 of 1887 and chapter 5 of 1892, respectively.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. These ought to be electric lines. I do not know whether they are or not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, these are steam roads.

For a line of railway from Roberval westward towards James bay, not exceeding sixty miles, in lieu of subsidy granted by chapter 7 of 1901, item 25 of section 2.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will that not parallel the transcontinental ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Mr. MACLEAN. How many roads are we aiding in the direction of James bay by these subsidies ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I think three.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would call the attention of the committee to resolution No. 52, to be read in conjunction with that, because the one is an extension of the other.

Mr. GOURLEY. I think it would be better to take them in order until we come to them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They are two parts of the same road.

Mr. GOURLEY. I know, but if we pass this when we come to No. 52 the hon. gentleman can state that this is complementary to the previous item.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no objection, but I thought the committee would like to have their attention called to the two items. They are related the one to the other.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes, we want to know that.

Mr. GOURLEY. I would like some information in reference to this railway from Roberval westward towards James bay. Is it an extension of the Lake St. John Railway ?

The PRIME MINISTER. At Roberval the Lake St. John Railway goes to Chicoutimi. This goes directly north.

Mr. GOURLEY. This is part of the same system ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the distance from Roberval to James bay ?

Mr. GOURLEY. It will be about 250 miles.

The PRIME MINISTER. Between 250 and 300 miles.

Mr. MACLEAN. This will be 100 miles altogther of this road ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

For a line of railway from Yamaska to Lotbinière, a distance not exceeding seventy miles, in lieu of the subsidy granted by chapter 7 of 1899, item 27 of section 2.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is this an increase ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, this is for an extension of the road already in existence between Montreal and Sorel and which follows the shore of the St. Lawrence. The road has been constructed as far as the River St. Francis, and this is for an extension to Lotbinière. This is to accommodate the parishes along the St. Lawrence.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is that the line between Doucet's Landing and Lévis ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The Doucet's Landing line is a line running north and south between Three Rivers and Arthabaska. This line follows the shore of the St. Lawrence.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I mean from Doucet's Landing. I understand there is a road already between Montreal and Sorel.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It has been extended from Sorel to a point opposite Three Rivers ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, to Lotbinière.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is this an extension of the road from Sorel to Lévis ?

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend is partly correct, but not wholly so. The road has been extended from Sorel to the River St. Francis. It has been graded between the River St. Francis and the River Nicolet, and from the River Nicolet to Doucet's Landing, but it has not been completed to Doucet's Landing yet.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This is a part of the original South Shore Railway between Montreal and Lévis ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, that is it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then, we will have this new road, we will have the Intercolonial, we have the Grand Trunk Railway, and how many more ? The Canada Atlantic Railway, I suppose, must have a terminus somewhere near Quebec ?

The PRIME MINISTER. All of these railways will have terminals at the Quebec bridge, the Grand Trunk Railway, the Intercolonial Railway and the South Shore, but they all serve different sections of the country.

Mr. GOURLEY. Where is Yamaska ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Sorel is on the Richelieu river ; the Yamaska is another river at some distance from Sorel in the county of Yamaska. The province of Quebec is a province of large rivers.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Did not the Prime Minister, in advocating the purchase of the Drummond County Road, say that the road from Sorel to Lévis had been abandoned ? I am not objecting to the construction of the road.

The PRIME MINISTER. I said nothing of the kind ; the hon. gentleman is quite in error.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I see that my friend Mr. Myers, of New York, is still interested in this piece of road from Sorel to Lévis and from Lévis to Montreal.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Nobody knows yet.

To the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company for that portion of its line from a point at the east end of the Hull station yard of the Canadian Pacific Railway to a point of junction with the Interprovincial bridge approach in the city of Hull, not exceeding one mile; and for a line of railway to the boundary line of the city of Hull from a point on the Ottawa and Gatineau Railway, now the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway, not exceeding ¼ of a mile in lieu of any balance of mileage subsidized by chapter 7 of 1899, section 2, items 12 and 39 respectively, 1¼ miles.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I propose to substitute this vote for the one which appears on the Order Paper. We intend to ask for only a mile and a quarter. It is a question of balance of subsidy due for railway constructed in the vicinity of Hull. We find, on examination, that the length of line constructed by the company exceeds the length for which subsidy has been paid to them by a mile and a quarter, and we propose to redraft this so as to include only the mile and a quarter.

Mr. SPROULE. How did you come to overlook this amount. It seems to be in connection with the bridge, and this also seems to give a connection with the Ottawa and Northern.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is a small balance of the subsidy granted. We find by actual calculation that the subsidies paid fell short by the amount of a mile and a half of what was voted, and of the length of line which they built.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why was this not paid out under the other subsidy ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I presume it has lapsed.

14. To the International Railway Company of New Brunswick (formerly the Restigouche and Western Railway Company) for a line of railway from the western end of the ten miles of its railway, as already constructed from Campbellton towards a point on the St. John river between Grand Falls and Edmundston, not exceeding 67 miles, being a revote, and in lieu of subsidies granted by chapter 4 of 1897, chapter 7 of 1899, item 42 of section 2 and chapter 8 of 1900, item 22 of section 2, 67 miles.

59. To the International Railway Company of New Brunswick for a line of railway, in addition to and in extension of the line of 67 miles mentioned in item 14 of this section, to a point on the St. John river between Grand Falls and Edmundston, not exceeding thirty-three miles, 33 miles.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If hon. gentlemen will take items No. 14 and No. 59 together they will find that they refer to the same railway.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Have you considered whether this will be a shorter line for the new transcontinental railway to Campbellton than to Moncton ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This will intersect the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. It will run right across the country.

Mr. BELL. Does this have the effect of reducing the mileage in this case ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Oh, no. The additional item (No. 59) to which I have referred, is in addition to the previous vote. I may say, generally, with regard to these votes, that they will be found to correspond almost exactly with the mileage. Where the difference has been very slight, a few miles, we have not put the additions in by special vote, but where the addition has been considerable, we have put in a separate vote to indicate it. So that the

revote substantially corresponds with the mileage previously voted. There may be a difference to the extent of three or four miles in one case, but not beyond that.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the work been actually commenced in every case of a revote, or is this just hanging out the sign ? Surely we should not vote subsidies year after year unless there has been some earnestness shown by the parties getting these subsidies in going on with the work. I would like to ask if work has actually been commenced in each case, and surveys and estimates of the cost made ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think in some cases the work has not actually commenced. But I do not think that should be a reason for refusing to subsidize a road. The work in many instances is slow, the promoters having difficulty in getting the necessary capital. We have to be patient, and give them time. If the promoters have a reasonable hope of carrying on the work, we should not refuse the subsidy, if the enterprise on its merits deserves it.

Mr. CLANCY. Is there any limit, or is it the intention to vote and revote the subsidies for all time ? There ought to be some evidence of good faith on the part of the promoters. I am not now criticising the character of the scheme at all ; but I think we should have some information as to the policy of the government in matters of that kind. I do not think the Minister of Finance would be prepared to say that this parliament should vote and revote these subsidies year after year as often as they lapse, unless something has occurred in the meantime.

Mr. EMMERSON. What harm does it do to revote them ?

Mr. CLANCY. In the first place, this parliament should only vote subsidies to the most deserving cases, and they should be bona fide cases in which men propose to go on with the work. Surely the hon. gentleman does not advocate our going on voting bonuses to parties who in many cases are endeavouring to sell them out. To vote and revote these bonuses has a tendency to give these promoters opportunities of making money out of these schemes. I do not think it is standing in the way of any proper enterprise to say that no subsidy should be voted to a railway project unless it has life in it, or unless its promoters are prepared to go on with it. I can understand cases in which unforeseen circumstances might arise ; but I do not think the hon. gentleman should ask us to pass any one of these revotes without giving us reasons for the delay in going on with the work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not merely a question between the promoters and parliament. Even where the promoters might not exercise due diligence, as some might think, the community is interested in the railway ; and if one company has failed, perhaps others associated in the enterprise might make it a success. We must not forget that these enterprises are for the benefit of those portions of the country through which they run, and the people residing and owning property there ; and if the promoters do not make satisfactory progress, that is no reason for refusing to grant aid, not merely to the promoters, but to the people of the country through which the railway runs. I am sure my hon. friend would not want to do that.

Mr. CLANCY. No, I am too good-natured for that. The hon. gentleman has made the best possible argument in support of my contention, in saying that the people are chiefly interested. Why should persons get a charter for a railway, and get a subsidy voted, and then hold back the enterprise year after year instead of giving the service to the people ? The Minister of Finance should not ask this House to revote a single subsidy where there has been ample time to go on with the work, without giving some reason why it has not gone on.

Mr. EMMERSON. With respect to the railway described in this item, I may say that the first ten miles are completed, and the remainder are under construction. That is a line running from the Baie des Chaleurs to St. John river to connect with the Bangor and Aroostook Railway.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I might point out further that a subsidy of $3,200 a mile will never tempt capitalists to build a railway unless there is good hope that the road when built will pay.

For a line of railway from Woodstock to the International boundary, not exceeding twenty-six miles, being a revote of the subsidy granted by chapter 4 of 1894.

Mr. EMMERSON. This runs from Woodstock to Centreville and the American boundary. It is intended to tap the American trade and bring it down through Canadian territory.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is there an American line from Centreville ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, not to Centreville. This will run through a rich part of the country which has no railway at present.

Mr. CLANCY. Why was that road not gone on with ? Why the delay ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think there has been some difficulty about the financial arrangements ; but the work has been gone on with to some extent, and the parties now feel that it can be put through.

Mr. CLANCY. Has any portion of the road been built ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I understand that a portion of it has been graded.

To the St. John Valley Railway Company for a line of railway from a point on the Canadian

Pacific Railway at or near Welford or Westfield or between said two points to Gagetown, not exceeding thirty miles, being a revote of the subsidy granted by chapter 4 of 1887.

Mr. WILMOT. It is very desirable that this vote should pass.

Mr. CLANCY. How many miles have been constructed ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No portion of it is under construction.

Mr. CLANCY. What are the prospects of its being constructed ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Although the corporation which has charge of this enterprise is not making rapid progress, the people would not like to see the subsidy abandoned but very much desire that it be renewed.

Mr. CLANCY. Would not the people rather have somebody else take it up who will go on with the work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If there be any discontent with the existing company or any reason to believe that anybody else would do the work better, that impression has not reached the department.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Why not simply make the vote for the line of railway without mentioning any company and give the money to any company who will build it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the matter were in doubt, that course might be pursued, but no objection has been raised to this company.

Mr. MACLEAN. When parliament is asked to renew a subsidy, the people are entitled to an official explanation why the work has not been gone on with and what prospect there is of its being done.

Mr. WILMOT. Could the hon. minister give any idea of the personnel of the St. John Valley Railway Company ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think I have that information.

Mr. CLANCY. Might I ask the hon. minister how these subsidies come to be renewed ? There must have been pressure brought upon him—I do not say improper pressure—to renew them; and such being the case he ought to be in possession of the information as to the personnel of this particular company and its ability to do the work. If not, it is a mere piece of mockery to go through the form of voting the subsidy. The hon. gentleman should explain why these revotes are asked and what are the circumstances which entitle the parties to them ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I can only say that gentlemen from New Brunswick represented to me that this road would serve a very useful purpose and would open up a section of the province. I do not think I could give a better reason. Even though the company be not making much progress, if the enterprise is in itself meritorious, we are doing right in giving the subsidy.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria. Is the charter Dominion or provincial ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Provincial.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is subsidized by the provincial government. I am not aware that the mind of the hon. gentleman from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) was at all disturbed with respect to similar votes in the first five or six resolutions, and we had no reason to think that it would be any more disturbed with respect to this or any other item for the province of New Brunswick than it was with respect to the items for Ontario. Now, this railway company is a recognized institution. The demands of the district are certainly very strong. Of course, in the summer they can get along nicely with that great highway, the St. John river; but when the river is frozen over they have no communication with the outside world except with the old fashioned vehicles.

Mr. CLANCY. I am surprised that the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) should have dealt in such small politics as to say that any hon. member in this House would make a distincton as between provinces in these matters. I certainly should not have thought of accusing the hon. gentleman ; but he himself has taken a good deal of trouble to make it plain to us that he is ready to deal in that style of politics. I hope that no other member in this House will be so small as to consider what province these votes are going to. If the scheme itself has merits, we need not inquire what particular province it is to benefit. Had I been in the House I would have raised the same question with regard to other subsidies that I ask in this case. I am disappointed in the information we have had, and I am afraid we shall have to insist upon better, whether the railway is one for Ontario, New Brunswick or any other province, for we have a right to information. A company that was voted a subsidy three or four years ago, not having earned that subsidy and desiring its renewal, would naturally be expected to place before the Minister of Finance a complete and detailed statement of the reasons for delay, the chances of going on, and the possibilities of carrying out the work in the future. If the prospects for the future were no better than they were when the subsidies were voted, I think the duty of the Minister of Finance would be to refuse a subsidy. Of course, it is a very ingenious argument to say that the people of the locality are anxious for this subsidy. But the people as a whole should be protected. There are persons so evil-minded as to say that these

things answer a good purpose in an election. I do not know whether any such idea ever occurred to the Minister of Finance——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Never.

Mr. CLANCY. Of course, the hon. gentleman is innocent of these things, but he may suspect that some people have them in mind. Perhaps the hon. gentleman had better be frank and tell the House that that is the reason he decided to give this subsidy, and that he did not ask for any other reason.

Mr. MACLEAN. When the ministers come before the House to put their estimates through, they come with accurate information and attended by their deputies. They are able, in case of a public work, for instance, to tell us what the expenditure has been to date, how the work is proceeding and what expenditure will be required for its completion. But we are asked to revote railway subsidies without any explanation of what has been done or what it is proposed to do. It is high time we ceased to vote these subsidies unless we have definite explanations concerning them. All this is an instance of the reckless way in which millions of public money are voted by this House. I have made a rough estimate, and I find that subsidies are being voted for 1,500 miles of road. No explanations are given to us, not even encouragement held out to the people in the localities affected that these roads will be built. There is either a lack of earnestness, or something held in view that we do not know about. Certainly, no minister ought to propose in this House a vote of public money without an explanation as to how that money is to be applied. And, if the money has been voted before and not spent, we want to know why it was not expended before and whether it will be expended now.

To the Shediac and Coast Railway Company for a line of railway from Shediac to Shemogue and towards Cape Tormentine, in Westmoreland county, not exceeding thirty-eight miles, in lieu of subsidy granted by chapter 8 of 1900, item 25 of section 2.

Mr. CLANCY When was that subsidy voted ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In 1900.

Mr. CLANCY. This is in the riding of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson). If you will permit me to ask a question without charging that the only reason why I ask it is that this railway is not in Ontario, I would request an explanation of this vote.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is considered a strong company. They have spent a good deal of money in surveys, but, as is well known, there have been difficulties in the way of financing such enterprises during the last two or three years. The company are in earnest. This is a section of country that certainly is in need of a railway. It is a fishing section, and perhaps one of the richest agricultural sections of eastern New Brunswick. It is quite largely populated. The people raise large quantities of potatoes which they ship to Bermuda. They have to cart them to Shediac, where they are taken by the Intercolonial Railway. This long haul by road is a very great inconvenience, which would be overcome if the people had a railway. I do not know that it would be a very promising investment, but certainly the railway would be of great convenience to the people living along that shore.

To the Mabou and Gulf Railway Company, Limited, for a line of railway from Mabou Coal Mines to a point at or near Glendyer, thence to Orangedale on the Intercolonial Railway, not exceeding thirty-four miles, a revote of subsidy granted by chapter 4 of 1894, and in substitution of the twenty-five miles subsidized thereby from Orangedale to Broad Cove.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would call attention to resolution 62, under which a subsidy is proposed for an additional four miles of this road. This railway is connected with a large coal-mining district in Mabou in the county of Inverness.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the work been commenced ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I believe the company are now engaged in the construction of the road. It is a very substantial company, chiefly of Americans who are developing the coal mines at Mabou.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. minister observe that this subsidy was granted in 1894 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not to the present company. The present company have only recently taken hold of it, and they are pushing forward the work energetically.

Mr. CLANCY. I imagine that one of the difficulties was that the former company held the charter and the subsidy until they could get their terms for disposing of both to the company that took it up. No doubt there is something in that, but after all it is not an isolated state of things. The hon. gentleman will agree that there ought to be some reasonable prospects on the part of those asking for the subsidy that the work will pay. The Minister of Finance is unable at present to give us that assurance. This business of exploiting the country in that way with the money of the people is one which we should not encourage, and I doubt whether parliament is in any case bound to make a revote to a new company, because the original promoters are bound to be benefited to some extent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a revote of the mileage of the road for that district, but it is not a revote to the same company. Whatever my hon. friend may

suspect in other cases, he would be wrong in this case, because I happen to know that the old company has no connection with the new one. This is a new company and a different name; I do not think they even received the old charter. I think the one died and the other has come up as an entirely new venture.

19. To the Nova Scotia Eastern Railway Company, Limited, for a line of railway from New Glasgow to Cross Roads, Country Harbour, thence to the town of Guysborough, and thence to the strait of Canso; with a branch from Cross Roads, country Harbour, aforesaid, down the Country Harbour river to the deep waters thereof, not exceeding 116 miles; in lieu of the subsidies of 40 and 80 miles granted by chapter 7 of 1901, items 4 and 1, respectively, of section 2.

63. To the Nova Scotia Eastern Railway Company, Limited, for a line of railway from Dartmouth through the Musquodoboit valley to a point at or near Melrose to connect there with the railway mentioned in item 19 of this section, not exceeding 120 miles.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The resolutions 19 and 63 should be read together.

These are two roads which are now being consolidated into one company. The one starts from Dartmouth, on Halifax harbour, traverses the valley of the Musquodoboit river through the county of Halifax, thence into the county of Guysborough and, passing a point called Melrose, goes to Guysborough and Mulgrave. Then there is a crossroad which leaves the town of New Glasgow and crosses this other railway at Melrose and goes on to Country Harbour. This enterprise serves the counties of Halifax, Guysborough and Pictou and runs close to Antigonish, if it does not touch it. It covers a large portion of the eastern section of Nova Scotia, which is at present without railway communication.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is there any portion of this road built or being built?

Mr. FRASER. The surveys have all been made and the people are at work on it now. There is a subsidy granted by the Nova Scotia government and a contract made with this company. The company is composed largely of Canadians: Mr. Fitzpatrick, of New Glasgow; Mr. Stratton, the Provincial Secretary of Ontario; and Mr. McCormick, a member of this House. It is an excellent company. They have made all their financial arrangements and completed their surveys. The Nova Scotia government granted a subsidy of $5,000 a mile over the whole railway.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the hon. member for Guysborough in the company himself?

Mr. FRASER. No, I am not.

Mr. GOURLEY. Is the Mr. Stratton the hon. gentleman from Guysborough refers to the gentleman of the name who is mixed up with the Gamey affair?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. FRASER. The Hon. Mr. Stratton, Provincial Secretary of Ontario, is associated with these gentlemen that I have named.

Mr. GOURLEY. At what point has construction commenced on this road?

Mr. FRASER. Between New Glasgow and Country Harbour.

For a line of railway from Debert station on the Intercolonial Railway to Debert Coal Mine, not exceeding 4½ miles, in lieu of the subsidy granted by chapter 8 of 1900, item 29 of section 2.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is in the county of Colchester. It is a new coal mine which is being opened up now.

Mr. GOURLEY. A short line like this should receive a larger subsidy. In Nova Scotia, unfortunately, the coal already discovered is north of the Cobequid Mountains; this mine in the county of Colchester is south of the Cobequid Mountains, and if we could once discover a coal mine there it would give to the southern part of the province a great advantage in giving us cheaper coal. What is the use of giving a company that is struggling to open a coal mine a little subsidy of $3,200 a mile to build a railway? You might as well send them down a pound of candy. If this parliament wants to command the respect of the people of Canada it ought to make a little vote like this at least $6,000. I supported a vote of $13,000 a mile for Mackenzie & Mann to build railways in the territories, at least we are giving them a guarantee of $13,000 a mile, and I would take that in preference to this. Down in Nova Scotia we have not the commercial development to make railways pay. What is the good of a coal mine that is ten miles away from a railway? I want to say that no railways in Canada should be more than eight miles apart, no man should be more than four miles away from a railway. If we who are members of parliament had to go four miles away to catch a train for Montreal we would think it a hardship. We want to have the trade brought to our doors. That is only a question of travel, but suppose one had sheep or cattle or other agricultural products to ship, and we had to go four miles away to ship those products. Yet members stand up in this House in opposition to the building of railways! If the members of this House want railways at their doors, what do you think of the case of a man in Nova Scotia, or in any other province, who has to go 20 miles to a railway? The thing is preposterous. You cannot expect a great province like Nova Scotia to be developed unless you give it ample railway facilities. If $3,200 a mile is not enough, give $6,000 a mile; and if $6,000 is not enough, make it $12,000 a mile. We want railway development, because, if we have railway development, we will have commercial development, and we will pay back tenfold every cent of money you have given us, but we

want, in the first instance, the hand of assistance. This coal company have entered upon a large enterprise in a locality about which there is some doubt as to the financial outcome, and if we help this company we should grant aid to the extent of $6,000 or $8,000 a mile, and not the petty sum of $3,200.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If my hon. friend (Mr. Gourley) will read the first paragraph, he will see that these people can get $6,400 a mile.

Mr. GOURLEY. Yes, if the cost exceeds $15,000 a mile. You tell me to spend $10 and then you will give me one dollar.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Would the company take $6,400 per mile rather than a guarantee of $13,000 per mile of their bonds ?

Mr. GOURLEY. I think they would rather take the guarantee. In this case, as this vote is intended to develop a large coal interest in that part of the country, I think it should be an exceptional vote, and I think the vote should be raised to double the amount.

For a line of railway from a point on the Joggins Railway near River Hebert Railway bridge to the village of Minudie, not exceeding six miles, being a revote, and in substitution of subsidy granted by chapter 4 of 1894.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is this the original Joggins Railway ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is not the Joggins Railway. It is for a line from a point on the Joggins Railway.

Mr. CLANCY. Is this being voted to any company, or being voted generally ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is being voted generally for a line of railway.

Mr. CLANCY. And up to the present time no person has taken it up ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Apparently not.

Mr. CLANCY. Is there any prospect of the road being built ?

Mr. LOGAN. Perhaps my hon. friend the Minister of Finance will allow me to answer the question as I am familiar with the circumstances of the case. I think that about the year 1885 a subsidy was voted for this same line of railway, but the coal development in Nova Scotia was not then in a flourishing condition. Within the last two or three years a number of lines have been opened up. The River Hebert mines are being operated by some Montreal capitalists known as the Minudie Coal Company, by the Strathcona Coal Company, and by some American capitalists known as the Jubilee Coal Company. They are getting out a large quantity of coal, and the purpose of this railway is to give them an outlet on the water at Minudie.

Mr. CLANCY. Is there a charter for the road ?

Mr. LOGAN. Yes, a charter has been obtained for the road, and these companies are all in active operation, but are seriously handicapped by the fact that they have not proper communication with deep water.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This is to a point on the Joggins Railway.

Mr. LOGAN. No, from a point on the Joggins Railway to Minudie.

To the Middleton and Victoria Beach Railway Company, Limited, for a line of railway from Victoria Beach to Middleton, not exceeding forty-one miles, in lieu of subsidies granted by chapter 8 of 1900, section 2, item 28, and chapter 7 of 1901, section 2, item 21.

Mr. CLANCY. We want some explanation of this.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This road starts from Middleton, in the Annapolis valley, and follows the Annapolis river down the Granville shore to Victoria Beach, which was the objective point of the original designs for railway construction in western Nova Scotia. At present this railway is being amalgamated—I do not know whether legislative proceedings have been taken—with the Mackenzie & Mann system of railways in the western part of Nova Scotia. It was originally undertaken by another company, but I understand that it is to be consolidated with the Mackenzie & Mann system. It will run through some of the finest farminig land, I think I may say, in the world, because the Annapolis valley is the garden of the world.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is this part of the road projected to Yarmouth ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, we will come to that later.

To the Halifax and South-western Railway Company for the following lines of railway:—

(a.) for a line of railway from a point at or near Halifax to a point on the Central Railway at or near Mahone bay, not exceeding sixty-eight miles.

(b.) for a line of railway from a point on the Central Railway at or near Bridgewater towards Barrington Passage, not exceeding 77 miles.

(c.) for a line of railway from a point at or near New Germany on the Central Railway to a point at or near Caledonia, not exceeding 22 miles.

(d.) for a line of railway from a point at or near Caledonia to Liverpool, not exceeding 29 miles.

The subsidies to the said lines of railway being granted in lieu of the subsidies granted by chapter 7 of 1899, items 17, 18, 35 and 36 of section 2, by chapter 8 of 1900, items 26 and 40 of section 2, and also chapter 7 of 1901, items 5 and 23 of section 2, respectively.

To the Halifax and South-western Railway Company for a line of railway to Barrington Passage, in addition to and in continuation of the 77 miles mentioned in items 23 (b) of this section, not exceeding 35 miles.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Subject to the addition of 35 miles, the vote for which you have just read, Mr. Chairman, these votes are a consolidation of a number of votes which have been given in past years for railway lines in the western section of Nova Scotia, westward of Halifax, running through the western part of Halifax county and the counties of Lunenburg, Queen's, Shelburne and Yarmouth. These roads have been chartered in times past by various companies, and subsidies have been granted from time to time to different companies. These various companies have not made very great progress. One of them built some part of one of these roads, but they were not able to carry it out. During the last year a consolidation of all these interests was effected by a company promoted by Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. They have made a contract with the government of Nova Scotia for the greater part of this enterprise on the basis of a loan which the government of Nova Scotia are making to them on the credit of the road.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How much is the loan ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Thirteen thousand per mile. Of course, they have proceeded on the assumption that they would get revotes of the Dominion subsidies. There are practically two lines, although there is a point at which they join. The main line will run from Halifax through the western part of that county, and through Lunenburg to Mahone bay. There it will form connection with the Central Railway of Nova Scotia, which is already owned by Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann and their associates. It will use the Central Railway for a few miles, until it reaches Bridgewater. It then runs down the south shore of Nova Scotia to Barrington Passage, where it meets a road built from Yarmouth eastward. For the present this road is in different hands, but it is reasonable to expect that it will come into the possession of Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. This vote, therefore, is to secure a road by the south shore of Nova Scotia from Halifax, passing through the western portion of that county, through Lunenburg, Queen's and Shelburne as far as Barrington, where it will meet a road already in existence running into Yarmouth. From Middleton, in the county of Annapolis, to Lunenburg the Central road has been in operation for a number of years. The second part of the new scheme leaves the Central road at New Germany, and runs to Caledonia. About 22 miles have been constructed, but not completed, under the charter known as the Hervey charter. That road has now been acquired by Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, who are pushing it down to the town of Liverpool. This is a revote of various amounts for railways through these counties, with the addition of 35 miles necessary to complete the whole enterprise.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How do they intend to get into Halifax ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They have no terminal facilities at Halifax as yet, but I presume they will approach the government and try to make arrangements for using the government facilities; but there is no understanding on that point yet.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the province of Nova Scotia given any subsidy ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They have given a loan of $13,000 per mile to most of the line with a provision, I think, that in the event of the loan being repaid, the usual subsidy be deducted. For the present there is no subsidy, but if the enterprise is successful and the railway can repay the loan, then they may repay the loan less the subsidy.

Mr. KAULBACH. Permit me to say, Mr. Chairman, that I am pleased that the government has fully realized how essential the completion of the work on this railway so long delayed, is to the people residing in the near vicinity of this road, running from New Germany to Caledonia.

Northern Queen's—part of the country represented by my hon. friend the acting minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Fielding)—has come into prominence as an agricultural and mining centre, the latter so far being only in its infancy. The same may be said of Northern Lunenburg, taking in Pleasant river, Ninevah, Hempford, Ohio, and New Germany, places through which this road passes, abounding in farm, forest and mineral resources; interspersed with lakes and streams, presenting a perfect panorama, and unsurpassed in any part of Canada, and it is not confined I may say to this section alone, for after leaving New Germany—a railway centre—as well as a land of promise, and passing eastward we enter a still more beautiful country with rich and varied resources. I refer to Foster Settlement, New Burn, Woodstock and New Ross, admirably adapted for agriculture, with forests, lakes and streams and thickly settled by a progressive people but without the advantages of a railway, and in this connection I must here state, that I will never feel satisfied until I can see a road built from New Germany passing through this country to New Ross, and down the valley of the Gold river, connecting with the Halifax and South-western Railway at Chester Basin, now under construction, for the purpose of giving these places the same facilities as their neighbours. There was a railway subsidy granted east from New Germany some years ago but for some reason unknown to myself it lapsed, which was unfair to these people.

In connection with construction work between New Germany and Caledonia I desire to again bring to the notice of the acting Minister of Railways and Canals and the government, that there are quite a number

of claims held by parties against the railway company for labour and material supplied on construction, and I would here ask what provision has been made for the liquidation or payment of these claims ? I contend the government have the right—nay they have the power, and they should exercise it—to see that provision is made for the payment of all such legitimate claims, and to see that they are deducted from the cash subsidies due by the government to the company, notwithstanding the company having sub-let the work of construction to others. In any case I hold the government should arrange for the payment of these bills.

The work of construction and the material supplied on the road represents the true value of the road, and the labourers and the party suppliers, as I view it, are really creditors in every sense of the term, and should have the first lien on the road for their bills, and anything short of this would be viewed by a reasonable mind as unjust.

We find the grocer or trader who supplied stores, and other commodities, to the labourers and sub-contractors during construction, remaining unpaid, as well as parties who furnished sleepers, mechanics who furnished cut stone, and numerous other commodities, remaining unpaid. I would ask, are they not to be recognized as creditors, and their claims paid before one dollar is paid over to the company, or the president of the road, by the government, in the way of subsidies ?

The law recognizes every mechanic and labourer employed in the construction of a ship as having an equitable lien on the vessel until all bills are paid, and in default of payment they can distrain or replevin the ship at will, the customs refuse a register and prevent her sailing until every bona fide claim is actually paid, or as an equivalent, a voucher shown of the claim being settled.

I contend that if claims such as I have described hold good against a ship, the same is applicable to a railway; the two are analogous, and the parties claiming bills for work performed and material furnished to this railway company, their contractors or sub-contractors, come under the same category, are creditors in every sense of the term, and entitled to the payment of all claims.

It has always been the policy of the Ontario government to withhold all subsidies for railway construction until all wages of workmen, in fact, every employee and supplier of material on construction have been fully paid, and I sincerely hope the same policy will hold and be observed by the government as respects the road from New Germany to Caledonia.

The advantage in this case as respects the New Germany and Caledonia road is that the federal and provincial governments have the matter of subsidies entirely in their own hands, in so far as the payment is concerned, and I here appeal most earnestly, on behalf of the creditors, that the government pay not a dollar to the company for construction, neither to the promoters nor contractors, nor any person else on this road, until a public notice is given by posters, and in all the county newspapers of Lunenburg and Queen's, asking that all bills unpaid be sent to an agent or adjuster, appointed by the government to receive such claims, and they to decide upon the merits or demerits of the same. The payments should be made by the government.

I may be told the government are dealing only with the present company, and have nothing to do with the original contractors. This would be unjust, as the road would really this day have no value had it not been for the hard labour bestowed by the operatives and the material and supplies, such as sleepers and cut stone, furnished by traders. Should these parties, as creditors, now be told that their claims cannot be recognized, when the government have it in their power to pay them ? I would consider it unjust. I know of some poor farmers and labourers who have had to sacrifice the little they possessed, and their families suffer, in consequence of the delay in payment of bills. I sincerely hope the government will realize the importance of this situation as respects these people, and see that the bills are paid after the manner I suggest.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have been so long in Ottawa this session that some of us may be pardoned for being a little rusty on what is going on in our provinces. I am glad to say to my hon. friend that what he suggests has actually been done and that arrangements are being perfected at the present moment to carry it into effect. There is a full understanding between the Nova Scotia government and myself that the governments at Ottawa and Halifax will have to co-operate in the construction of these roads and that we shall jointly see that whoever undertakes to carry out the new enterprise, will have to provide for the payment of the honest claims of the workmen under the old contractors. I am glad to be able to assure the hon. gentleman that in carrying out this arrangement a commissioner was appointed by the local government some time ago. He is at this moment holding investigations in order to obtain correct statements of the amounts of money due, and I am satisfied that in every case in which a claim can be substantiated to the satisfaction of the commissioner, the money will be paid.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am glad to hear the statement of the hon. acting minister. If he had only given me an inkling that such was taking place, he would have saved me the necessity of occupying the time of the House.

Mr. GOURLEY. What amount of construction has been done on this south-western Railway ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The portion of the road from New Germany, in the county represented by my hon. friend, down to Caledonia was graded and the bridges built, but the rails were not laid. The new company is now laying the rails. The portion from Halifax towards Mahone Bay has been under construction, and considerable progress in that heavy section has been made. Workmen are now employed working westward from Bridgewater in the county of Lunenburg and on other sections. There is now more evidence of good faith in pushing on the work than has ever been shown before, to the great satisfaction of the people along the line ?

Mr. KAULBACH. I am pleased to hear the statement made by the acting minister. May I ask him if they have fully settled on the location of that portion of the road near Port Medway, whether it is to go east or west of Mill Village ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have not yet been called upon to approve officially of any of the plans of this road, because until the subsidy is granted, we are not in a position to demand any plans from the new company for approval, and, we have not taken any formal action in regard to the location of the road. My impression, however, is that the line that commends itself to the people goes below Mill Village towards Port Medway.

Mr. KAULBACH. I think that would be a mistake, because there is a valuable industry in the shape of a pulp mill two miles above Mill Village, which would be a source of traffic to this road which would not be the case if it went below that point.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That matter I know has been engaging the attention of the engineers. All questions relating to location of roads are full of difficulties of that character. I think there is no finality in the location ; but the engineers have rather come to the conclusion that a line below Mill Village would be more in the general interest than one above. I am aware of the pulp mill industry to which my hon. friend refers, and will endeavour in some way to see that it gets proper accommodation.

Mr. GOURLEY. Has this road been located towards Barrington ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think there is any difference of opinion about the location of the Barrington end.

Mr. KAULBACH. Do I understand that a connection will be made with the pulp mill ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That remains to be seen. We may be able to do something in the way of providing communication by means of the river.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Have contracts yet been entered into with the different companies ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, some contracts were entered into and some construction took place ; but these contracts have all expired, and the subsidies lapsed. Therefore they have to be revoted. There has been no payment of subsidies to this company for this purpose.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Has there been any payment to other companies for this portion of the road ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, none whatever. They never got to the point of earning the subsidy.

To the Inverness Railway and Coal Company, formerly the Inverness and Richmond Railway Company, Limited, for eight miles of railway between Point Tupper and Broad Cove; and for a line of railway not exceeding thirty-seven miles from Cheticamp to a point on the line already built between Broad Cove and Point Tupper, being a revote and in substitution of the subsidy granted by chapter 4 of 1897.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the change ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a road known as the Inverness and Richmond road, now called the Inverness Railway and Coal Company, running from Port Hastings on the Strait of Canso up to Broad Cove. A portion of the road is built, up to that point, and this revote is for the portion from the terminus up to Cheticamp. It also provides a rearrangement of the mileage, without any addition, which will afford a shipping point on the Strait of Canso.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). I believe this road was originally surveyed from Broad Cove to a place called Chimney Corner and from there to Cheticamp. Is it proposed to extend the same railway from Broad Cove to Chimney Corner and thence to Cheticamp, or is it proposed to build it by way of Margaree Forks ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a question of location which I am not able to answer.

For a line of railway from a point at or near Wolfville on the Dominion Atlantic Railway to the government pier on the basin of Minas, not exceeding one mile, in lieu of the subsidy granted by chapter 7 of 1901, section 2, item 19.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is an extension from the Dominion Atlantic Railway down to the public wharf at Wolfville. There is a corresponding vote for the other side of the bay, which will be reached later on.

Mr. CLANCY. For what purpose is this to be constructed down to the wharf ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a public wharf at Wolfville. Steamers cross

the bay from Parrsborough to Wolfville, and it is proposed to make an extension on one side and on the other so that passengers may be brought direct to the wharf instead of having to travel some distance.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this a public wharf ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, it is a government pier.

To the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company for a line of railway from a point at or near Spence's Bridge on the Canadian Pacific Railway to Nicola lake, not exceeding forty-five miles, being a revote of subsidies granted by chapter 5 of 1892 and chapter 4 of 1894.

Mr. CLANCY. Why is this not proceeded with ?

Mr. GALLIHER. The company now applying for this subsidy is not the original company. It has got a charter, and I understand it will get a provincial subsidy. I am informed that it is going right ahead. It goes through a good district, and will open up the Nicola valley which at present has no railway communications, also the coal deposits at the foot ofNicola lake.

Mr. CLANCY. Did the original company dispose of its charter to the other ?

Mr. GALLIHER. No, the new company applied and procured a new charter and a Dominion charter.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What has become of the old company ?

Mr. GALLIHER. It is defunct.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the company which proposes to build this railway own the coal mine ?

Mr. GALLIHER. I am not positive, but I believe it does.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Did not the original charter run from near Kamloops to Nicola valley ?

Mr. GALLIHER. This is to run right up to Kamloops as well. It goes from Spence's bridge to Nicola, and will go eventually to Kamloops.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The vote does not say anything about running to Kamloops. I think the old charter ran from Kamloops.

Mr. GALLIHER. So does this, but the vote is only for forty-five miles of that road.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not wish to be understood as objecting to a coal company getting a subsidy. I do not know any good reason why a coal company should not have some assistance in building a railway.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The grant was originally given the Nicola Valley Railway Company, which failed to carry out its undertaking, and the petitions for this company asked that it be given the powers conferred by the charter to the old company, and that the subsidy granted to the old company should be continued to it. This is giving to a new company a grant which was given to a former company.

For a line of railway from Winnipeg Beach or Teulon to a point on Icelandic river by way of Gimli, not exceeding thirty-five miles, in lieu of subsidy granted by chapter 7 of 1901, section 2, item 26.

Mr. McCREARY. The only reason for delay in the construction of this road, I may tell the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), has been the scarcity of labour. It has been absolutely impossible for the railway company to get labour. It might surprise hon. members to know that although we were told that probably 400 miles would be built on the Canadian Northern Railway this year, there will not be more than 100 built. Some of their teams are standing in the stables without men to manage them.

Mr. MACLEAN. How will you manage to build the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There is no objection to this grant.

Mr. CLANCY. Have we a map showing that this road is not paralleling some other road, and that we are not giving grants to companies which may amalgamate ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). A year or two ago, when the charter was being considered, the Canadian Pacific Railway were obliged to construct up to Winnipeg beach, a few miles north of Selkirk. The Canadian Pacfic Railway then had the option either of running from this place or Winnipeg beach, up north to the Icelandic settlement. I think the member was anxious to have them forced to build part of that road at once. This, I presume, is an extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway charter along the west shore of Lake Winnipeg.

Mr. McCREARY. They were obliged to build this road before going on with the road to Lake Manitoba. The reason they did not is because they could not get labour.

Mr. MACLEAN. If what the hon. gentleman says be true, there is no prospect of the National Transcontinental Railway being built within the next twenty years. Some step will have to be taken. I do not know what they may be, because there is a scarcity of labour all over this country. The statement made by the hon. gentleman is well worthy the consideration of the government, and they ought to be prepared to do something in order to realize their prophecy that we will have a new transcontinental railway within five years.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is a subsidy for the Canadian Pacific Railway ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. EMMERSON. We have heard from an hon. member, who is a director of that

company, that he entirely objects to anything of this kind. I thought then that he was expressinig the opinion of the company.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Has the Canadian Pacific Railway applied for this subsidy ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, but they have applied for several others.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This session ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. This application came from the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary), who thought there was a misunderstanding with regard to the previous vote. I do not think I have any application from the Canadian Pacific Railway for it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This is a subsidy forced upon the railway company without any application at all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They are not obliged to take it.

Mr. McCREARY. If any other company will build the road, the Canadian Pacific Railway will not get it.

Mr. CLANCY. Is there only one charter over that territory ?

Mr. McCREARY. I am not sure whether the Canadian Northern has a charter there or not.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). They have not.

Mr. CLANCY. Is there just one charter covering the territory ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There is no charter covering the railway along the lake shore to Gimli. There is a charter extending up the middle of the tract of land lying between Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipegosis on the west and Lake Manitoba on the east.

Mr. McCREARY. Is there not a local charter passed last year ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I do not know about that.

Mr. SPROULE. This is an extraordinary thing. When the granting of these subsidies was first begun, one of the principles laid down was that a subsidy should be given only when a company had satisfied the government that they were possessed, not only of the desire, but of the financial ability to build the road if they were aided, but that they were unable to build it without aid. But the minister tells us that no company has applied for this subsidy. And he tells us that the company holding the charter is the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is well able to build, and they have not asked for a dollar. He says that the hon. member for the riding has asked the government to assist in building the railway, and he is handing it over, I presume, as a free gift to the Canadian Pacific Railway. In many other parts of the country where companies desire to build roads, they have not been able to get the assistance of the government. But in this case we are so lavish with our money that we are ready to give it to a company whether they ask for it or not.

Mr. McCREARY. I did not know that we were here legislating for any particular corporation. There are 5,000 people in that section who have been settled there for twenty-five years on the promise made in this parliament that they should have a railway to enable them to ship their wood, and so clear their land. That promise has never been carried out. On behalf of these people I asked that a sum of money should be offered to any company that would give the desired railway accommodation. I am not speaking for the Canadian Northern Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway, or any other corporation.

Mr. SPROULE. That was not the principle upon which these subsidies were begun. As I say, the object of a subsidy was to assist a weak corporation to build a railway that it could build with a subsidy, but it could not build without a subsidy. It is not contended that this road is to be built by a weak corporation requiring assistance. The corporation that is expected to build it is known to be strong. We have not even an application from this company for the subsidy.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have not any offer from the company to build it. It is not certain, I suppose, that they will build the road for the subsidy, but it seems reasonably certain that they will not build it without it. The fact that a company has not applied for a subsidy does not prove that one ought not to be offered. My hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Sproule) has confused the conditions. The principle is that before you enter into a contract with a company to build a road and receive the subsidy, you should have reasonable assurance that they are acting in good faith and have the resources to build the road. But it has not been said before that you shall not grant a subsidy until some company has shown itself able and willing to earn it. Again and again subsidies have been voted in order to try to find a company to build a road.

Mr. SPROULE. I say that the principle when we commenced the granting of railway subsidies was laid down in this House, and it was that when a company was prepared to build a road, but needed assistance, that assistance could be given.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That was as respects the making of the contract, but not as to the granting of the subsidy.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the general understanding under which subsidies like this are granted ? Does the first company com-

ing and showing evidence of good faith and ability to build the road receive the bonus ? Or, as between companies, does the government make a choice ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The government must be trusted with discretion, inasmuch as the object is to get the road built. We hold out the subsidy hoping that it will induce somebody to build the road. But the government must have discretion in selecting the company. In this case we do not expect to be obliged to select from half a dozen companies all ready to build the road. I fancy this road will be built by the Canadian Pacific Railway and nobody else.

To the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company for a line of railway from the town of South Edmonton, N.W.T., to North Edmonton, and thence westerly towards the Yellow Head Pass, a distance not exceeding fifty miles, in lieu of subsidy granted by chapter 7 of 1899, section 2, item 41.

Mr. MACLEAN. Does this parallel the Grand Trunk Pacific ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. MACLEAN. Is it an earnest effort to try to get into the Yukon from some point of connection with the Canadian system of railways ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman will have to ask the company as to their earnestness.

Mr. MACLEAN. Is this to go rather to the Pacific than to the Yukon ? And if so, will it parallel the Grand Trunk Pacific ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, I think the Grand Trunk Pacific leaving Edmonton will turn to the north, and my recollection is that this road runs west and south.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This must be a road that is going to the Pacific too, through the Yellow Head pass.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The charter is through to the Pacific ocean.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I suppose this is an extension of the Mackenzie & Mann system that runs from Winnipeg to Edmonton.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Very likely, because I see the application is signed by Mr. Lash.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The road is built from Strathcona, or South Edmonton, to Edmonton. It is to extend from the city of Edmonton westerly and south-westerly through the Yellow Head pass to Butte Inlet or Port Simpson.

Mr. OLIVER. I think it would be well if some of the words in this resolution were changed. There are no such places as South Edmonton and North Edmonton. There is the town of Strathcona and the town of Edmonton. I would respectfully suggest that the wording be changed so as to make it read 'Strathcona' and 'Edmonton.'

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. SPROULE. Has not this piece of railway already received a subsidy ? Is this granting another subsidy to a road already subsidized ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This road has not been subsidized. I have not inquired into it especially, but I am sure that had it been subsidized my officials would have pointed out that fact to me.

Mr. OLIVER. This refers to a piece of road that is built from Strathcona to Edmonton.

Mr. SPROULE. Without getting a subsidy ?

Mr. OLIVER. It has earned a subsidy, but I do not know whether it got it or not.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They would be entitled to the subsidy when they had built ten miles of the road and not before. Not having built that much, this is given them as a renewal of the subsidy.

To the St. John Valley and Rivière du Loup Railway Company for a line of railway from Fredericton, N.B., to Woodstock, not exceeding fifty-nine miles, in lieu of the subsidy granted by chapter 7 of 1899, item 5 of section 2.

Mr. CLANCY. Is that an extension of the Rivière du Loup Railway ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. From Fredericton to Woodstock it is an entirely different line.

Mr. EMMERSON. The company are composed of very good men, Mr. Manchester, Mr. Howard Troop, and several other gentlemen of equal prominence and financial ability in the city of St. John, are interested in this company. They have made a full survey, in fact, I think they have done some work. They propose now going on, as I am informed by their solicitor, and pushing the work through. If a revote of this subsidy is given them, they will be in a position to push the work through.

Mr. CLANCY. How far does that line run from the Canadian Pacific Railway ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a great convenience to a section of country which is now without railway facilities. It is on the western side of the St. John river, following down the banks of the river. The Canadian Pacific Railway is on the eastern or northern side, some distance from the river.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the distance between them ?

Mr. GIBSON. Twelve miles.

Mr. CLANCY. One would naturally ask what necessity there is for the road. I understand that it runs near the American boundary.

Mr. EMMERSON. It runs from Woodstock to Fredericton on what is known as the southern side or western side of the St. John river, and along the banks of the river. The Canadian Pacific Railway is on the eastern side of the St. John river, but some distance back of it, with hills between.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The member for Sunbury (Mr. Wilmot), who is not in his seat at present, explained the necessity of this road to me, and pointed out that the company was a fine corporation, and the road would be a great benefit to a large section of that province.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This company is composed of some of the best men in the country—like Mr. James Manchester, a gentleman who communicated with me on the subject, and Mr. W. H. Thorne, a particularly worthy citizen of St. John, although wrong in his politics, and other gentlemen, very eminent citizens of St. John. This application is one of the best before us as regards the men who are behind it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is a road at the present time from Fredericton to Woodstock. Will this road be any shorter? Although it is on the other side of the river, it starts from the same point. Will the distance be any shorter by the new road?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There is a distance of 30 miles between the two roads according to the map.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The map of the country is all wrong.

Mr. GIBSON. This Canadian Pacific Railway road is 65 miles long. It runs along on the east side, and is from 5 to 20 miles from the valley route. This road will serve another part of the country altogether, and is badly needed by the people along the valley of the St. John river. It is a fine country along the route.

Mr. CLANCY. How far will this be from the proposed Grand Trunk Pacific?

The PRIME MINISTER. The Grand Trunk Pacific will be on the eastern side of the St. John river, this will be on the western side.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Before we take up the new subsidies, I wish to make a few observations. We have been passing subdies for railways which come under the purview of the parliament of Canada for which subsidies have been granted and for which revotes are asked to-day.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) allow me to read the item?

For a line of railway from Hawkesbury, Ontario, to South Indian, not exceeding thirty-five miles, in lieu of subsidy granted by chapter 7 of 1899, item 22 of section 2.

Mr. CLANCY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This has been placed under the wrong heading. This is a revote in lieu of another subsidy and item 31 would therefore be the first of the new votes.

Mr. CLANCY. We want some information about this. Surely the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) does not expect the chairman to declare this carried until we have some explanation of the item. It is intolerable that we should be expected to run through the items in this manner. The committee is entitled to some information.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a revote of a subsidy granted in 1899 to connect Hawkesbury with the Canada Atlantic at South Indian. I am advised that the road passes through a very fine part of the country.

Mr. CLANCY. If it is a revote what is the reason for the delay?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot tell that.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The intention is to make a cut-off from the Canada Atlantic Railway to connect with the Great Northern at Hawkesbury.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. They have a road from Hawkesbury to the Canada Atlantic Railway already subsidized by this parliament.

The PRIME MINISTER. At the present time there is a bridge across the Ottawa river at Hawkesbury. There is a road connecting with the Canada Atlantic Railway by way of Vankleek Hill. This is another line proposed from South Indian to Hawkesbury. It serves a large portion and shortens the connection between the Canada Atlantic and Hawkesbury by some thirty miles.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is a road from Hawkesbury connecting with the Canada Atlantic Railway at Glen Robertson. That is intended of course to go southerly towards Montreal, while this, as I understand, is intended to give a more northerly connection between Hawkesbury and South Indian thus shortening the route to Ottawa.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The distance beween Hawkesbury and South Indian via Glen Robertson is a great deal more than the distance between Hawkesbury and South Indian via this cut-off.

Mr. CHRISTIE. This will shorten the present connection between Hawkesbury and the Canada Atlantic Railway by about 28 miles.

Mr. GOURLEY. I am sure that I will be happy to support this vote.

Mr. RICHARDSON. As it is almost six o'clock I will reserve my remarks until after recess.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

To the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company for a line of railway from Woodstock northerly to a point on the Grand Trunk Railway at Berlin, or from Ingersoll to Stratford, or to any point on the Grand Trunk Railway between these places, not exceeding thirty-five miles, being in addition to, and continuation of the nine miles mentioned in item one of this section.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think it oportune at this point to offer a few remarks on the policy of subsidizing railways in the older provinces of Canada. We have just gone through a list of railways which are applying for renewals of subsidies, which I presume, in many cases, have lapsed, covering mileage of some 1,500 miles, aggregating in cost something like $6,000,000. We now come to the consideration of subsidies for new lines of railways, making a total mileage of some 4,000 miles, and aggregating in cost to this country in subsidies from $16,000,000 to $20,000,000. It is not necessary to make any remarks on the large amount that is here involved, but we may notice that this is altogether outside and independent of the huge scheme we are facing of building a transcontinental railway. In face of this, I think it is time that we should call a halt and consider whether it is in the best interests of this country that the policy which has been pursued in the past should be continued. Occasionally when we ask the question why we should continue the policy of subsidizing railways in the older provinces, we are sometimes told in reply: Well that has been the policy in the past; it has been in vogue for a great number of years, and we suppose it will have to go on. If there was ever a time when we should call a halt, in order to give this question a full and further consideration before we go further, this is the time. It is questionable whether it is good policy to build a railway anywhere that cannot be built without a government subsidy. It may be a fair proposition that any railway which requires a government subsidy in order that it may be built is not required by the business of the country, or in the interests of the country, and probably would not be a paying enterprise. At this time capital is seeking investment in any enterprise that will pay reasonably well in this country, and where there is really business to be done and a commercial need for the railway, there will be no need to go asking the various governments, federal, provincial and municipal, for subsidies to build railways. Any scheme of that kind that has a fair proposition to place before the capitalists of this country, is one which if brought under the consideration of men capable of looking into it, will not lack necessary capital for its construction. It may be argued that railways in the older provinces cannot be built without government subsidies; I thinik it is a question whether they should be built at all or not. I know that it is said that this is the old policy. It does not follow that because it is a policy that has obtained in the past that with the changed conditions of the country, with the growth and development of the country it should still continue. It was perhaps necessary to build railways when the country was new, in order to open up the country, and it may be that in opening up new territories and new sections of this country, the policy of subsidizing may still be a wise policy, but in the older provinces, which are already supplied with the necessary transportation facilities, there is no call for further building of railways; or if they are built, they should be built on such a sound business basis as would invite capital of its own accord to seek investment in them. It is not a sufficient defence to say that for many years we have subsidized railways. The changing conditions in this country remind us of a line of Lowell's that 'new occasions teach new duties,' and we might fairly consider whether it is not a proper time to depart from the old policy which has obtained in the past. The enormous amount involved in the subsidies we are asked to vote on this occasion, will only be added to from year after year; a new batch will come up next year. The business of railway promoting has become a distinct profession, and men enter upon it, not for the benefit of the country, and not even in the interests of capitalists, but as charter mongers, or promoters of railways in order that they may pull out of any scheme all they are able to get and leave the scheme to sink or float. We have had some notable examples of that in this country; railways have been exploited by the promoters, who secured subsidies from the federal, provincial and municipal governments, pulled all the money they could out of them, and then allowed the railways to become bankrupt enterprises, not needed by the country, and with not sufficient business tributary to them to make them paying enterprises. In this connection, respecting railways to which subsidies have been granted and those to which subsidies will be granted in the future, I think it well to call the attention of the government to the fact that the interests of the workingmen, the men who put their labour, time and money into schemes of this kinid, should be protected in every way. We have had examples during this session of parliament in which men have supplied materials, &c., for the building of railways and in one or two instances have been left without pay, while the men who exploited the railways made all they could out of them and went away, you might say, with the government subsidies in their pockets. I think it would be a good policy for the government to call a halt and grant no more subsidies to railways, at least in the older provinces, until they have had

fuller and freer consideration, by a full parliament during the next session. A large number of the members have now gone to their homes, and the parliamentary representation of the country is at present very much depleted. A subject of the importance of this one should not be dealt with at this late period of the session, but should have a full and fair consideration. These estimates ought to be brought down for the opinion of the House earlier in the session. It is not fair to parliament to ask them to consider the expenditure of such enormous sums of money in the dying hours of the session, in order that they may be rushed through without that full discussion which all subjects of this kind should receive. I believe that the good common sense of this country is largely opposed to subsidy granting. I know that in the section which I represent, among the farmers, public opinion is opposed to the granting of subsidies even for railways that may be constructed through the country in which they are living, and I speak as representing them. The burdens of this country ought to be lightened, and not so enormously increased as they are being. It is a question whether the best interests of the country are considered or the interests of the government. It is government patronage which requires these enormous subsidies more than the requirements of the country. These railways are, perhaps, being exploited more for that purpose than for the benefit they will be to the country at large.

While I am on this subject I might refer for a moment to the question of giving charters to railways. We have now had a railway commission appointed which we may presume will be of a non-political character. It would be but fair that every company seeking a charter to build a railway should have their project submitted to that railway commission, and thoroughly examined by them before parliament meets, in order to see whether such a railway would be in the interests of the country, whether it was demanded by the requirements of the country, and whether there would be business tributary to it sufficient to make it pay. We might then have good, solid legislation along this line, and not have railway enterprises such as have been brought before this House during this and the last session. I do not intend to occupy the House any longer, but I throw out these few suggestions in the interest of my own constituency, and I believe that in doing so, I represent largely the good common sense of this country.

Mr. HENDERSON. This afternoon we somewhat hurriedly passed some thirty resolutions granting subsidies to railways, all of which, however, are revotes, renewing grants which had been made in former years, perhaps chiefly under the direction of the present government, but some of them extending back beyond their advent to power. Possibly the same exception could not be taken to the renewal of subsidies that can be taken to new subsidies. No doubt in many cases men have entered into large financial obligations under promises from the government of the day that they would be aided in the enterprises in which they had interested themselves, and consequently it might seem unfair for the government to refuse now to carry out in good faith what was promised to railway incorporators in days gone by, and on which they proceeded to invest their own money and the money of the shareholders they had secured throughout the country. Therefore, it may fairly be argued that the passing of these revotes is justifiable, and could not well be refused by the House. But when we come to the new subsidies, I think we can look at the matter in a very different light. It has been well said by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Richardson) that it is time that we called a halt in the granting of railway subsidies. Many of these railways which we are about to deal with pass through well settled sections of the country, and therefore ought to be self-sustaining. I fail to see that the country at large is called upon to supplement what the promoters of these railways may be able themselves to put into the enterprises in order to make them paying speculations. Some of them I have no doubt have merit. I do not for a moment say that we should in every instance refuse a subsidy to a railway. I think there are meritorious cases—roads which may be strictly called colonization roads, going into and opening up new sections of country. But to my mind the great bulk of them are roads which have no claims, and for which no subsidy should be granted by the government. It has now come to this, that you cannot build a mile of railway in this country without coming to the government for assistance. In this list of subsidies which we are to deal with to-night, we have railways down to one mile in length, two and a half miles, three miles, four miles. Surely it is not necessary for the promoters of these schemes to come to the government for assistance. These short lines of railway do not lead into new districts; they cannot be classed as colonization roads. One of them is referred to as a road leading to a wharf. Surely it is not necessary for the government of this country to be called upon to use the public money to assist enterprises of that kind. Therefore, whilst there may be meritorious cases to which aid may be granted, I think the great bulk of these cases which we are about to deal with should not receive aid. I think the principle of subsidizing railways should not be continued to the same extent as in the past. I think the time has arrived in this country when most railways can be constructed and made to pay without the intervention of the government. I therefore

desire to place on record my protest against the passing of these resolutions. I do not suppose for moment that will prevail. The government have apparently adopted this policy, and have gone very far afield in widening it. It seems to me that they might have narrowed it down to cases of real merit. In saying this, I know I am voicing the sentiments of my constituents. The feeling is very strong, not only in the county I represent, but I believe throughout western Ontario. Some may say that it is a rather selfish view and that western Ontario, having been well provided with railways, should not complain if other sections of the country are aided in the same way. I do not say that every case is lacking in merit; but I think that the government should exercise a great deal more judgment in the promises they are making to the promoters of railways, and that the number should be very much limited. I hope and trust that the government will take this view of the matter, and will consider the sentiments of the people of this country. If they do that, I am quite sure that a good many of these resolutions which we have before us to-night will not receive the endorsation of the committee.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Richardson) has in a general way protested against the granting of railway subsidies for the older parts of the country—I suppose having in mind particularly the older parts of Ontario. I hold in my hand a petition from a number of the electors of the county of Grey asking for the construction of a railway through that county. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) also protests against the granting of subsidies. These two gentlemen have the distinguished honour of representing constituencies which have been eminently served by railways, and those railways have received pretty liberal public aid. I am not aware that these gentlemen ever recorded their opposition to the construction of any railways projected through or calculated to assist their particular constituencies; but their constituents having got all they think they can profitably use, their representatives arise in this House and protest against other constituencies receiving as equitable a measure of treatment. My hon. friend from Halton probably thinks he is discharging his full duty by uttering a general protest against these subsidies. May I be permitted to point out to him a much more effective way of recording his objection? If he is sincere, and I am sure he is, let him at the right time, before these subsidies are granted, arise in his place and point out by a distinct motion which subsidies in this list he objects to, and let him challenge the vote of this House, and place upon record by yeas and nays the views of those who are either against or for these subsidies. We then will know where we stand. There is scarcely a subsidy we have passed which has not been supported more or less by hon. gentlemen opposite, and I venture to say that of those which are to come we will see the same liberal action on the part of members of the opposition. Until they by their votes challenge a particular subsidy, they cannot escape responsibility by entering a general protest against all subsidies. There is only one way in which my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) can put himself properly on record, and I now await with great interest to see whether he will take that proceeding—there is only one way in which he and his friends can put themselves on record and that is by recording their votes.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am certainly grateful to the hon. Postmaster General for the fatherly advice he has given me—I might almost call it a lecture. But after an experience of fifteen sessions in this House, I am inclined to doubt that I require the special counsel which the hon. gentleman has offered. I have my own opinion on the question. I am quite willing to name the resolutions I object to and which I consider have no merit, and I will undertake to move a resolution, if the hon. gentleman will second and support it. That is the position I take.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. A very safe position.

Mr. HENDERSON. If the hon. gentleman will support my resolution, I will be happy to vote with him. I fear, however, that I shall be obliged to limit very materially the number of resolutions condemning these subsidies, if I desire to get the hon. gentleman's support. With regard to the mode of entering my protest, I know of no stronger way in which a member of this House can declare himself than by making a speech. It is an old saying that an hon. member can very easily explain away a vote, but he cannot explain away a speech. I think the Postmaster General will agree with me on that point and perhaps regret having made some of the speeches he did in this House, particularly not later than Saturday last, which he will have a great deal more difficulty in explaining away than if he had given a vote. I consider that I have given the strongest protest I can against this wholesale granting of subsidies, even though I may not have the privilege of voting for a resolution condemning it. The hon. gentleman knows that all the resolutions I could move here would be voted down by himself and his friends, and it would be useless for me to propose resolutions which would not have the slightest chance of being accepted by the majority of this House.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman, for once in his life, manifests a desire to become an humble follower

of the Postmaster General. I was not aware until this moment that he was ever prepared to take his views on public matters from any one on this side. He now says he is prepared to propose a motion to strike out all of these subsidies, if I will second it. But I am not of his opinion. I am in favour of these subsidies and am prepared by my vote to support them. If my hon. friend is opposed to them, let him make his motion. He does not require to seek me for a seconder. He has his friends, let him see if he can get a corporal's guard of his own people to support him. He would like to go before the people and point out that he had made a protest against these subsidies, but he dare not call for a vote on any of them. He asks what is the use of proposing a motion which will be voted down. Since when did the hon. gentleman become so modest? We have had vote after vote during these last seven months, called for by hon. gentlemen opposite, although they knew perfectly well that their propositions would be defeated. They regarded the taking of the yeas and nays as the proper way to place on record their views for or against any policy. How comes it now that my hon. friend changes his views and tactics? I tell him and every member of the opposition that each one of them is responsible for every one of these subsidy votes unless he challenges a division. Let each man stand up and record his vote for or against. They cannot escape responsibility under cover of a general disapproval. They cannot escape responsibility to their own constituents by simply giving utterance to an idle protest. Let them place themselves on record. Let them come out like men. Fancy my hon. friend apologizing to the people of Halton for not presenting a motion because the Postmaster General would not second it! Would he not be asked whether he was sent to parliament to do what the Postmaster General approved? He would be told that he was elected to oppose the Postmaster General. Yet to-night, under cover of a plea of that kind, he seeks to escape the responsibility which devolves upon him, as upon every other individual member of this House. I repeat that until he challenges by his vote any subsidy submitted to this House, he will be held responsible for having granted it.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman has suggested that I wished to take him as my leader. I desire to disclaim any impeachment of that kind. What I did say was that I should become the leader of the Postmaster General, and I hope that before this debate closes I may find in him an humble follower.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Try me.

Mr. HENDERSON. I repeat again that the protest I have made is the strongest I can possibly make. The Postmaster General has instanced cases in which we on this side have challenged the policy of the government by moving resolutions. That I consider to be a very good plan, because it does not require every member to stand up in his place and enter a protest against the government policy when all of one mind, that can be done much more quickly by voting on the question. I do not know what is the policy of hon. gentlemen on this side on the question of railway subsidies. I do not know if they have any general policy, nor do I know whether hon. gentlemen opposite have such a policy. Perhaps there is not on that side behind the Postmaster General a united opinion. If he would test his own followers, he would find hon. gentlemen behind him who would much rather that we on this side did not move resolutions condemning these railway subsidies. If we did, some of his followers would be compelled to give a vote which they would much prefer not giving at this time. I desire to say nothing further. I desired merely to give expression to the sentiments of my constituents. My constituents know my sentiments and I know theirs, and so far as I am able, both by voice and by vote, if a vote should be taken, I am prepared without hesitation to put myself on record in favour of what I believe to be the sentiments of the people I represent.

Mr. BROCK. As one of the corporal's guard, to which the hon. the Postmaster General alluded in his somewhat magniloquent manner, also I am prepared to make a general protest.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Hear, hear.

Mr. BROCK. And I base that general protest upon the minute of council passed by these hon. gentlemen themselves appointing a responsible commission to investigate and pass upon the great transportation questions of this country. We should not touch the question of bonusing a single mile of new railway that should come within the purview of that commission until that commission has reported. And, as to any railways that do not come within the purview of that commission we have no right to deal with them at all. Our business here is to legislate with regard to matters for the general benefit of Canada, and local matters we should leave to local authority. Instead of that, we find ourselves called upon to deal with a variety of schemes about which even the government themselves know nothing. They are asked questions as to when charters were granted, why granted, to whom granted, and the hon. gentleman in charge of this measure knew nothing at all about these matters. And I do not think that the Postmaster General (Hon Sir William Mulock), with all due respect to him, knew any more. The government, so far as railway matters are concerned, is going merely

at haphazard. I may be mistaken, and they may know more than they appear to know; but I do not believe that the government really know anything about the schemes they have placed before us. We have heard to-day of one railway that was projected in the province of New Brunswick on one side of a river. It turned out that there was another railway a short distance away on the other side of the river. And the members of the government did not know how many miles these railways would be apart and did not know where the new railway was going.

I take the government to task upon their dealing with these questions after the appointment of a transportation commission. They have talked a great deal about that commission. Why should not all these questions be placed before them for consideration ? But the course we are now taking is that we appoint respectable gentlemen as a commission and then give them nothing to do. During to-day's sitting, before six o'clock, we had passed, I believe $6,000,000 of railway subsidies; and we are asked to pass now somewhere in the neighbourhood of $7,000,000 more. This government have become so accustomed to dealing in large figures that $13,000,000 is a mere bagatelle to them. But I am sure that the country is taking a very different view of it. And if the government wish to make the impresssion they desire to make, they should be prepared, when proposing to give $3,200 a mile for a certain length of railway, to give full information as to what that money is being granted for and why the road should be built. Without such information, we do not know but that instead of subsidizing a railway we are subsidizing a constituency. We know very well that most of the votes this morning were revotes, some of them eight and ten years old. Do you mean to tell me that you are subsidizing railways in such cases as these ? I make the general statement, as my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) made it, that in many cases these are subsidies to constituencies and not to railways. These railways were subsidized years ago and never built, yet these subsidies are renewed. And the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) endeavoured to terrorize members into voting for these subsidies. 'Challenge the vote,' he said. What does that mean ? It means that members should place the government in a position to say : These miserable fellows in opposition are opposing a vote of $3,200 a mile for a railway to run through this constituency; they are opposing the spending of that money in the constituency; but the government is quite willing that that money should be spent : Glorify the government ! Why, it is mere child's play to deal with him in this matter, because we know his style of argument. Usually he is strong; but this evening he is remarkably weak. I think he was not himself at all in arguing this railway question.

Now, the government are face to face with another difficulty, a difficulty which they must feel. How are government debentures going in the financial market at the present day. Are governments, even endorsers of railway bonds, able to raise all the money they want ? And great railway systems, when they want to raise money, instead of paying 3 per cent, are they not obliged to go to New York and Great Britain and pay 5½ per cent ? And this country is going to spend $100,000,000 or $150,000,000 upon a railway and then rent it at 3 per cent for fifty years, when very likely we shall have to pay 5 per cent or 6 per cent for the money with which to build it. I do not think I am misleading the House or the country when I make the statement that the government are face to face with a very serious financial difficulty, and they are running their heads against it more and more every day. Take these votes that we are now passing—$13,000,000 of subsidies to railways. We are not going to give these people cash; you are going to give them the credit of the country, and they will go into the financial market and raise money upon that credit. Of course, you say $13,000,000 is only a small matter. But you have several times $13,000,000 that you are guaranteeing, and you have millions coming due that you have to provide for. I think it time to call a halt, as the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Richardson) says. We are here to criticise, but the government are here to act. Their actions at the present time are not creditable to themselves as managers of the financial affairs of this country. They have debts to meet, yet they are going on increasing their indebtedness for the sake of subsidizing constituencies and pleasing gentlemen who are going back for re-election. It is very, very serious; and I wish to say to this House through you, Mr. Chairman, that, as a business man, one not brought up to politics or in the atmosphere of politics, that I feel very seriously the position that the government are rushing this country into at the present time. I know that it is unpopular to go to the people, as we expect to have to go, and have it said that we have opposed the expenditure of money in their county. But I say that that is the most contemptible kind of politics. And I am astonished that a gentleman occupying the position before this country that the Postmaster General does, should be willing to make the reply he did to the hon. member for South Grey and the hon. member for Halton. Their remarks are such as have been called for, loudly called for, by the people for years past. The evidence that such words needed to be spoken is seen in the very votes that we have been passing. These subsidies were voted years ago, yet the promoters of these railways have not been able to raise the money, over and above the subsidies, to

build roads. I know that from the province of British Columbia, and from what some Reform politicians at one time called the shreds and patches of confederation,' the cry comes for money. And we have ever been willing to grant that money, so long as it was to be spent solely in the public interest, to build up every part of the Dominion, including these shreds and patches. I do not call them that, for we on this side have always had sympathy with every part of the Dominion, from end to end. We are even in full sympathy with this 'rolling back of the map,' spoken of the other day by the opening up of the northern regions of Canada, if it can be shown that there is anything practical in what the government propose.

But why need they be afraid to put it off till the end of the session ? Why not have the surveys made and bring down a business system, not mountains of information, by which we are absolutely humbugged ? We want information by prominent engineers. By our course with regard to these transportation systems, we are making ourselves a laughing stock from one end of the country to the other in the financial markets of the world ; we are making ourselves ridiculous by proposing schemes without knowing anything about them, floating them on the market to the detriment of a great many schemes that would be beneficial to this country. Each one of these schemes has a certain bearing upon the others. If we go to the financial markets of the old country, or of this country, or of New York, and they ask us : What are you going to do with this eighty millions of money ? Why, we are going to build a railway from Moncton through to Quebec, and from Quebec to Winnipeg, on a line 200 or 300 miles north of civilization. Well, that is a big scheme, what kind of information have you to go upon ? Well, the Premier of the Dominion of Canada, a gentleman for whom we all have great respect, says that he has mountains of information, and he has brought them down. We find them in a little pamphlet that is perfectly ridiculous. Under these circumstances, I join with my hon. friends from South Grey (Mr. Richardson) and from Halton (Mr. Henderson) in appealing to the government on the general principle. The Postmaster General says : I bring down a vote for so much money that is going to Centre Toronto, and if you dare to vote against it I will leave you in the hands of your constituents. Mr. Chairman, he dares the wrong man. I will vote against anything that I consider is wrong. I may make mistakes, no doubt I have made a great many, but there is one mistake I won't make, I will not lay before the great financiers of Great Britain, of Canada and of the United States such a scheme as has been propounded by the government without one single particle of information. I say here advisedly that there is not one member of the government who knows anything at all about that country, not one who has any information from a man that does know anything about building a railway with a grade of four-tenths of one per cent per mile, and with this magnificent want of curves. All the grades and curves are in the imagination of the government, who want to discover something to save them from the contempt of this whole country. What have they done ? They have never, since they have been in power, done anything but to go back on their records. The Postmaster General knows they have no policy, and those hon. gentlemen whom they took to their bosoms seven years ago have finally become disgusted with them, and they know it. Therefore, I contend that when the Postmaster General gets up to lecture an old member of this House like my hon. friend from Halton, he makes one of the mistakes of his life. The hon. member for Halton is known to this House and to this country as a safe man. He has advocated no wild cat schemes in this country, but, as an old and prominent business man, he has asked the government to halt.

Now, with the old votes revoted and the new votes we are asked to pass, we are entering upon an expenditure of several millions of dollars. I have looked through these items and I do not see a vote for the Quebec bridge—another very important matter that should be discussed by this House. We are led up to these things little by little, not all at once ; we get them in small homeopathic doses, which gradually approach to allopathic doses ; and I think that by the time we get the big bonuses all through, the country will not put up with it. But the great mistake, I contend, is made in the Railway Committee of this House. We are all at fault on both sides. We give charters to individuals to whom we would not lend a dollar bill ; we give charters to a number of people because some genial member from British Columbia or somewhere else comes forward and jollies us into giving the charter. Now, that is altogether wrong. I contend that this great transportation commission that was heralded with such flourish of trumpets by the Finance Minister should pass upon every one of these charters before they come before the Railway Committee and see whether they are for the general advantage of Canada. Then again these charters should not be granted unless there is some reasonable financial ability behind them to carry them out. Before granting a charter we want to know what bonuses are being granted by the Dominion, by the provincial government and by the municipalities. These are matters so serious that I make no apology in taking up the time of the House in discussing them, even in these last days of the session. These are matters that should be discussed from one end of this country to

the other. It is generally thought that politics is a very different thing from business. When we come here to transact the business of the country we should do it upon the same principles of honour that we transact our private business. I contend that the same principles of justice and right should guide us in the conduct of the affairs of the country as should guide us in the conduct of our individual affairs. What is there more important than drawing upon the revenues of this country, in taking money out of the pockets of the people and using it for public purposes ? In such a serious matter we should exercise the same prudent business principles, the same ideas of rectitude, that we desire to use in the conduct of our private business. We should not be deterred from so doing by the threats of the Postmaster General or anybody else, that we are flying in the face of our constituents if we vote against this or that railway subsidy. I say we must rise above that kind of consideration if we are going to fulfil the national destiny which has been so graphically described by the Prime Minister. I desire to place myself on record along with my hon. friends from South Grey and from Halton, on the general principle which they have advocated. Let us once settle down upon some safe and just general principle, and we cannot go far astray in details. But when we attempt to do what is fair and just, and dare to express our opinions on the floor of this House, are we to be told by the Postmaster General that we are opposing the interests of our constituents in holding back railway subsidies from them ? If I thought for one moment that I was sent here to advocate subsidies or anything else for my constituents that were coming out of the pockets of the rest of the people, I would not remain here. I think there is nothing so contemptible as to be continually scheming to get something for your constituents at the expense of other people. I contend there is too much of that kind of thing going on. We have voted this afternoon subsidies, I believe, covering in the vicinity of 4,000 miles of railway. Besides that, I am given to understand that we have got to make arrangements about the Quebec bridge. We have not got that before us yet, but I wish to include that in the protest I am making. Whatever is going to be done must be done above board, and in the face of the whole country. It must not be done seemingly for one interest when it is in reality for another. Mr. Chairman, I may not have another privilege of addressing you here. I wish now to enter my protest generally against the policy of this government, against the system upon which railway bonuses are granted, upon which bridges are built, railways are built and harbours are subsidized from one end of this country to the other. We are within a few days of the end of the session, when in all probability hon. gentlemen opposite are preparing to appeal to the country for support or for condemnation, and I desire to take this last opportunity of placing my views on record.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) addresses his remarks to a criticism of what he describes as the general system of bonusing. The general system of bonusing is not the question before the committee. The subject before the committee relates to a number of separate propositions to grant aid to certain railways, some in existence and some not yet in existence. He joins with the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Richardson) and the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) in protesting against these subsidies. May I ask the hon. gentleman if he objects to all of the subsidies that are proposed here ?

Mr. BROCK. I think I was pretty plain. I believe that every subsidy that comes before the House should first of all come before the transportation commission appointed by the right hon. leader of the government.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is a very large committee. This is a Committee of the Whole House and supersedes all the other committees in Canada in dealing with these propositions at this stage. The hon. gentleman dare not answer that question categorically. He knows that he himself has been pressing the government to grant aid to a railway this session. He knows that he has a mandate from the city of Toronto to use his best endeavours to promote the granting of a subsidy to the James Bay Railway and other railways to aid the city of Toronto. The hon. gentleman will not deny that.

Mr. BROCK. I mean to say that I have no such mandate, and that I have made no such demand. I will always support the granting of a bonus to a railway through a new country, but I would never ask for a bonus for Toronto to secure the building of a railway into that city—never. The city of Toronto got a charter to build a railway. Their experts went up into the James Bay country, through which hon. gentlemen opposite talk of building a transcontinental railway, they found it an impossible country to build through and they dropped it. I know the threat. You need not be at all alarmed about that. I am prepared to say that I would oppose the granting of a subsidy for any railway to be built from Toronto up to the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman stated in this House on a certain occasion that he was one of a commission appointed by the city council to consider the scheme of constructing a railway from Toronto to James bay or in that vicinity. He made a mistake on that occasion, because he gave this House to understand that the commission's report was adverse to that scheme. A delegation com-

posed of the city council and the leading citizens of Toronto to a very large number came down to Ottawa—interviewed the government and presented the correct version of what occurred——

Mr. BROCK. I——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not want to misrepresent the hon. gentleman, and he will correct me if I do. We were told by this committee composed of the mayor and the leading representatives of the city, the persons who were voicing the views of the city of Toronto, that the events in connection with the commission were not such as the hon. gentleman's recollection led him to think them to be, but that when the commission had presented their report to the city council, the city council were so enamoured of the proposition which had been made that they directed that steps should be taken to obtain an Act of incorporation and to proceed with the scheme of building the James Bay Railway. That is the statement which was made to the government by the mayor and the city council and the leading citizens in the city of Toronto.

Mr. BROCK. Why was it not built ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That delegation was heard about six months ago.

Mr. BROCK. This was three or four years ago.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We cannot build a railway in six weeks. They pressed upon the government the advisability of aiding a railway from the city of Toronto northerly to intersect the Canadian Pacific Railway in the vicinity of Sudbury. That request from the hon. gentleman's constituents was made to this government, we have given effect to that view, and I ask the hon. gentleman if it is not fair that he should either join with us in supporting that proposition or put himself on record against it ?

Mr. BROCK. I put myself most positively on record against it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Against that proposal ?

Mr. BROCK. Against the proposal to build to James bay.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am speaking of the scheme before the committee. There is a proposition before the hon. gentleman and he may vote for or against it, and that is to build a railway which may be called the James Bay Railway, but which is to aid a railway to be constructed from the city of Toronto proceeding northerly to Sudbury, and a few miles north of it, perhaps a dozen or twenty miles north. It is in the direction of a line which will ultimately connect with the Grand Trunk Pacific. Is the hon. gentleman for or against the granting of a subsidy to the James Bay Railway or to some other railway from Toronto either to intersect the Canadian Pacific Railway in the vicinity of Sudbury, or to be continued northerly until it meets the Grand Trunk Pacific ? Would the hon. gentleman kindly give me his opinion on that question ?

Mr. BROCK. Go on and make your speech and I will reply.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Very well. Of course, if the hon. gentleman says that he does not again seek to represent the city of Toronto, that he has no regard for public opinion in Toronto, it does not matter.

Mr. BROCK. I did not say anything of the kind.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am asking whether we are to take the views of those citizens who came here claiming to represent the opinions of the people of Toronto, or whether we are to take his views.

Mr. BROCK. You can please yourself. You have your choice.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman has told us his opinion of the proposition that is now before the committee. This is not a vague scheme. It is definite. It is not dealing with an abstract proposition. It is not dealing with a system, but it is dealing with a project to construct a railway from Toronto to Sudbury.

Mr. BROCK. The scheme is not before me.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will refer the hon. gentleman to item No. 39.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It is time to take it up when we come to it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (reading) :

To the James Bay Railway Company for a line of railway from Toronto, via the east side of Lake Simcoe, Parry Sound and Sudbury, towards James bay, not exceeding 265 miles, in lieu of two subsidies granted by chapter 8 of 1900, of 35 and 20 miles respectively, from Parry Sound towards James bay.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The hon. Postmaster General is discussing a specific item which is on the paper, but which we have not yet reached, and concerning which the hon. Minister of Finance has made no explanation. I would like your ruling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. When the committee commenced deliberations after dinner, I stated that we were now entering upon the consideration of new subsidies, and that the hon. member who rose before six o'clock to engage in a general discussion upon them would be at liberty to do so. I regard this as a general discussion upon the principle of granting subsidies, and I take it that if any particular item is referred to

it is simply referred to as an illustration of the general principle.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then, Mr. Chairman, prosecuting this inquiry a little further, permit me to say that the city of Toronto has expressed a desire that the government shall aid the Irondale and Bancroft Railway in the extension of its line westward. Is the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) in favour of our listening to the prayer of the city of Toronto in that respect? There are some others of a like nature that are in the interests of the city of Toronto, and which the city pointedly asked for. I think the city is interested in what is known as the Pembroke Railway, a railway that will ultimately connect the Pembroke Railway with the Toronto system. Toronto is also interested in what is known as the Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway, and Toronto is interested in several of these railways under consideration.

Mr. BROCK. In what way is the city of Toronto interested?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They will help to bring traffic to the city of Toronto.

Mr. BROCK. Financially they are not interested in the building of these roads.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are desirous of having these roads prosecuted and built, and thus you will see that a very considerable portion, probably one-tenth of the mileage which is to be aided, is in respect of railways that are centering in Toronto or leading towards Toronto, and yet we have an hon. gentleman representing one of the ridings of that city making a general protest against subsidies. Are we not entitled to know where he stands in regard to those particular subsidies for which his constituency is asking?

Mr. BROCK. Just where I stand in regard to all other subsidies for railways which are not in the new sections of the country.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I suppose he will then be in the same position as the other members whose constituencies are sufficiently served with railways and who have become virtuous and economical; until his city is so situated, I presume he will support these particular subsidies. I will say to him that the government is in favour of the subsidies that are here mentioned and if the hon. gentleman is against these subsidies it is his duty in fairness, and in vindication of that declaration of courage which he says he possesses, to put himself on record, yes or no, for or against these particular subsidies. Until he has done that I say that he has failed to take the only effective course of putting himself on record. He will not find any support for such a resolution on his side of the House. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) for example, would differ from him. The hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) would differ from him; he is an enterprising gentleman, and so we could run the gamut of the members and they would all vote for the subsidies that are given to help their own constituencies. Perhaps they will not vote for others, but the country is entitled to know where they stand on each proposal. We are not discussing an abstract proposition here, but a particular proposal, to do or not to do something; it is not a mere academical discussion, but a question of contributing public moneys towards certain public enterprises. Each one of these proposals is separate and distinct from the others and it is quite competent for the hon. gentleman to support some and to vote against others. But the country is entitled to know which, if any, of these the hon. gentleman favours or opposes. Toronto particularly is entitled to know from him frankly and fairly whether he is supporting or opposing this scheme, and I will ask him now whether he will take the responsibility on behalf of the city of Toronto of standing up here in this House and requesting the government to strike out all the subsidies for which the city of Toronto has asked.

Mr. BROCK. I think that nothing more contemptible has ever been performed in this country than the speech which has just been made by the Postmaster General. He asks are all the subsidies in which Toronto has any interest whatever to be struck out. What do you mean? Toronto is interested in every subsidy that is granted to every railway from the North Pole to the American line. Toronto is cosmopolitan but Toronto is not prepared to advise the government or to advise itself to vote for subsidies for railways not only those in which Toronto has no interest, but simply those in which political knavery alone has an interest. The hon. Postmaster General is not doing himself any credit by the way in which he is attacking me in this matter. He knows what my opinion is in regard to the granting of subsidies and I have stated my opinion very positively to my constituents, that no grant of subsidies ought to be made in the thickly settled parts of this country. But when a grant is made to a railway in British Columbia, Toronto has to pay her share and a very large share it is. Do I object? No, I do not object to building railways through the sparsely settled districts and Toronto is ready to pay her share, but Toronto has not asked, at least not officially, to build a railway from Toronto north to Lake Simcoe. The hon. Postmaster General thinks that in a very clever and politic way he is going to force me into a corner. He is much mistaken; the country know him and know the petty means and petty kind of politics to which he is willing to descend in the effort to place a political opponent in a corner. I

am not afraid of any corner into which hon. gentlemen opposite can shove. I went into Centre Toronto in the face of a very large adverse majority and of every influence that every member of the two governments, federal and provincial, could bring against me. I had a gentleman opposing me on the platform with a judgeship in his pocket, but the electors turned his majority into a majority for myself. The threat of the hon. Postmaster General has no influence with me at all, and I would be very glad indeed if he dared to come into Centre Toronto and meet me there. I will meet him and every argument he can advance in Centre Toronto in any constituency of Toronto. I do not go into York because I suppose that I would have to pose as a farmer there, but even so I would not be very much afraid of him, notwithstanding several great advantages which he possesses, financially and otherwise. In the attempt he has made this afternoon to corner me he has made a mistake. I stand where I stood before my constituents and say that I oppose subsidies to railways through thickly settled districts, but that I will support subsidies given to railways to open up new territories for Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the Postmaster General was hardly fair to the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Richardson). He challenged the hon. member for South Grey to oppose his individual resolutions because there was an application or petition from Grey asking that a railway should be subsidized that was calculated to help that district. The hon. member for South Grey, as he had a perfect right to do, took exception to certain features of the government's policy. He complained of the lateness in the sesison of the bringing down of these resolutions. There are seventy-eight resolutions here, although there are not seventy-eight railways being subsidized, and the hon. member had a right to criticise the general policy without attacking any particular resolution. The contention of the hon. Postmaster General was that the hon. member for South Grey, or the hon. member for Halton, or the hon. member for Centre Toronto, had no right to oppose this in a general way, but could only successfully oppose the government's policy in this regard by opposing every individual resolution. The Postmaster General opposed the hon. member for South Grey because he said there was an application from his own county and answered him by saying that it is the case with him as with many others, after a constituency has been liberally supplied by railway subsidies, then the people of that constituency oppose other subsidies. Is that the case with the county of Grey, one of the largest and best settled districts in the province, with 78,000 inhabitants ? Is it a fact that it was liberally subsidized by this parliament ? All the subsidies which that county ever got from this parliament covered only twenty-eight miles of railway, at the rate of $3,200 a mile.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Where did the rest come from ?

Mr. SPROULE. From the municipalities and the provincial government, chiefly from the municipalities. There were only two short sections subsidized by this parliament in that county ; 13½ miles from Owen Sound to Hepworth, and 14 or 15 miles of the Grand Trunk Railway from the county line of Simcoe to Meaford, which was built before confederation. Although the county of Grey is a large county, there is only one railway running through it, and two others touch it ; so that it has not been liberally supplied with railways, and it would not be unfair if the people of that county asked for a little additional aid. The hon. gentleman complained because the hon. member for South Grey took the position he did. That hon. gentleman represents an agricultural constituency, and I respectfully submit that it was eminently his duty to voice the sentiment of his constituents on this subject. His constituents are farmers. If you take up the 'Farmers Sun' for the past year, which fairly voices the sentiments of the agriculturists of this country, you will find that it has distinctly and consistently opposed the subsidizing of railways by the government. It is true, there is an application from the county of Grey for a subsidy for a railway—the very next item which we are to take up ; and I can only say that while in the main the people of the country are opposed to railway subsidies, it is a fact that certain localities have not yet been very liberally supplied with railways, and are quite willing to receive assistance from the government to build them ; and it would not be unnatural or unreasonable for the people of the county of Grey to entertain the same views as the people of other sections of the country that are not yet supplied. I may say that I intimated to the government that I was in favour of assistance being granted to that railway. I did so because I know the conditions and circumstances, and I believe it is proper that assistance should be given, in view of the fact that we are assisting railways all over the country, and that the county of Grey has not yet a good supply. Were I to voice the sentiments of the people of Ontario today, I would oppose entirely the granting of railway subsidies ; but I have never gone that far. I believe we ought to discriminate. I believe there are localities for which the government would be justified in subsidizing railways. But in many cases subsidies are given for localities which are already more than supplied. I have always held that the newer sections of the country and localities not already supplied with the conveniences of railways might properly receive government aid for the purpose of obtaining railway facilities. I have endeavoured to discriminate to that extent.

The Postmaster General contended that every member of the opposition who does not by a resolution and vote oppose every item he objects to, tacitly acquiesces in it. That is not a fact. Is an opposition expected to challenge every item in the estimates and have a vote upon it. If so, parliament instead of sitting six months, would sit twelve months in the year. That is not the duty of the opposition. Its duty is to crystallize its policy in an abstract resolution if you like, and vote on that. That conveys the policy of the opposition just as forcibly as though they opposed every single item to which they objected.

Mr. CLANCY. I cannot let this opportunity pass without calling the attention of the courageous Postmaster General to some of his attitudes in the past. The hon. gentleman has taken the very opposite courses on more than one occasion in this House. He is very courageous now when he wants to challenge the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) to tell just the precise number of miles of railway construction to which he is opposed. There was a time when the hon. gentleman and his leader had grave fears that the money voted for railway subsidies was stolen and went into an election fund. I want to ask the hon. gentleman if he will vote for a resolution that was proposed in this House in 1894, when a large batch of railway subsidies came down ? Did he ever protest against any railway grant ? The hon. gentleman, I am sure, will give a deaf ear to a suggestion of that kind. Does the hon. gentleman lay down a course of conduct for this side of the House which he himself refused to pursue in opposition ? Does the hon. gentleman think that a fair or manly game of politics ? I do not think he will say that it is. There is nothing more idle than for an hon. member on either side of the House to get up and challenge the other side to do what he himself refused over and over again to do. But that is what the Postmaster General does. I am coming now to the hon. gentleman's nightmare about the possible pillage of the public treasury by those who received railway subsidies in the past ; and, if he has not become more honest himself or if he does not regard others as more honest, if I propose the same resolution to-night, I would have his support. If it was a good proposition then, it is an equally good proposition now. This is the resolution that was proposed in this House by no less a person than the Prime Minister, and that was supported energetically by the Postmaster General with the ability he displays when he is wrong, though I will assume he was right on that occasion.

Mr. Laurier moved that the said resolutions be not now read the second time, but that they be referred back to committee to consider the following amendment :—

That within four days after the opening of each session, the Minister of Railways shall lay upon the Table of the House, copies of all agreements made by any of the companies with the government together with a statement of all payments made by the government up to date, for subsidies earned by any of the said companies, and the Orders in Council authorizing such payments.

That within a month after the payment to any company of any portion of the subsidies, the president and manager of said company shall furnish to the Auditor General a statement under oath showing if the whole of the subsidies so paid to the company have been applied in the manner herein intended, and that a similar statement shall be supplied by every contractor of the company who is to receive or has received the payment out of any such subsidies or out of the proceeds thereof, and that, within four days after the opening of each session, the Auditor General shall lay all such statements upon the Table of the House.

That all such documents thus laid upon the Table of the House shall be referred to the Committee on Public Accounts to be by them investigated in the same manner as the public accounts.

That every officer and director of the said companies and every person having a contract with any of the companies for the performance of any work, the doing of anything, or the furnishing of any goods, effects, or materials, and having or expecting to have any claim or demand against the company by reason of such contract, who either directly or indirectly, by himself or by any person on his behalf, subscribes, furnishes or gives, or promises to subscribe, furnish or give, any money or other valuable consideration for the purpose of promoting the election of any candidate to a legislature or to parliament, or with the intent in any way of influencing or affecting the result of a provincial or Dominion election—is guilty of a misdemeanour and liable to a fine of not less than one hundred dollars and not exceeding one thousand dollars ; unless the value of the amount or thing paid, offered, given, loaned, promised, received or subscribed, as the case may be, exceed the last mentioned sum, in which case the fine may be raised to a sum not exceeding such value, and also to a term of imprisonment not exceeding one year and not less than one month, and in default of payment of such fine, to imprisonment for a further term not exceeding six months.

My hon. friend the Postmaster General supported that in a very vigorous speech. I ask him now if he is prepared to characterize as a farce both the motion of the Prime Minister and my hon. friend's speech in support of it ? Would he support such a resolution now ? The hon. gentleman will not answer.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When the hon. gentleman takes his seat I will answer.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman would scarcely repeat the farce he acted on that occasion. He then pretended to believe and sought to make his friends believe, inside and outside of this House, that the money which was voted for railway subsidies during that period was diverted in part to other purposes, that a portion of it went into the hands of individuals for the purpose of controlling the elections and securing the

return of government candidates. Will he say that the danger is less great now than it was then ? If not, I shall be curious to ascertain whether he would be prepared to support such a resolution coming from this side now ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not hear the whole resolution. I tried to listen to it, but could not catch it all. The hon. gentleman asked me if I would endorse its leading principle, namely, that companies or directors should be prevented from using government bonuses or aid for election purposes. That is the point the hon. gentleman puts.

Mr. CLANCY. The point I put is the resolution.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not hear the whole of the resolution. When he came to that part of it, he asked me if I would vote for such a resolution. All I have to say is that since that time we have enacted a statute which covers that ground by making it penal for directors to contribute to election funds.

Mr. CLANCY. That is not all. The hon. gentleman has, when he likes, very acute hearing. And he must remember in any case what resolution he voted for.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I voted for so many.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman voted for so many absurd resolutions that he is now trying, not to remember them, but to forget them. One part of that resolution declared that the accounts should be audited by the Public Accounts Committee and investigated in every case.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What was the view of the government of that day on that point ?

Mr. CLANCY. The view was that the hon. gentleman had moved an absurd resolution.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then surely my hon. friend would not ask me to do an absurd thing and vote for an absurd resolution ?

Mr. CLANCY. I ask him to recall his absurdity or repeat it. I am not saying that the resolution should have been moved, but I am pointing to the part which the hon. gentleman then played. If my memory serves me right, a resolution was passed at the Liberal convention, held in this city in 1893, declaring that no bonuses or subsidies should be granted to railways.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There never was any such resolution passed.

Mr. CLANCY. I am speaking subject to correction. I think there were speeches made in that direction. But resolutions never did bind these hon. gentlemen. The very resolution I have just read does not bind him in any way, and I only read it for the purpose of calling his attention to the absurd course he took in the past. It was then urged that it would be very dangerous to mix up railway matters with the Criminal Code, and the then Minister of Justice pointed out that the resolution was an absurd one. Coming to the general railway resolutions before us, I desire to say that we have reached a time in the history of Canada when we may well consider whether we are to continue a policy of granting aid to every railway in Canada, long or short, no matter what the conditions may be. There is no hon. gentleman on either side who will not say that we are living under very different conditions now to those existing twenty years ago, and therefore a policy which might have been pursued in the past to advantage might be an unwise policy to-day. I am not prepared to say that it was at any time a proper policy to vote aid indiscriminately to every railway, whether meritorious or not. There may be some cases in which, in a growing country such as this, it would be very proper to give aid to railways, but the general principle ought to be just the other way. We should only provide for the exceptional cases, and not lay down a broad policy which, as my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) has pointed out, can have but this result, that not one mile of railway will ever be built without a subsidy. In my judgment, that is going entirely too far. I think we have come to the time when we may well call a halt, and treat the subsidizing of railways as the exception and not the rule. I have no doubt that some of the grants proposed in these resolutions will aid colonization roads and accomplish a very good purpose. I have not less doubt that there are other cases that are not sufficiently meritorious to justify us in assisting them from the public treasury. When the hon. gentleman tells us that we must point out the particular railway we are opposed to, and not only that, but how much we are opposed to it, he is laying down a rule that he would not follow himself ; and if any one shows a lack of courage, it is one who lays down for others a rule which he would shrink from having applied to his own conduct.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I listened with some astonishment to the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) in his cross-examination of the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock). I notice that his cross-examination took place in the absence of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). Those who recollect the days of other Liberal leaders and other Liberal principles, I think, will share my astonishment at that cross-examination. Should the Postmaster General ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce such questions, or summon to his chamber Hon. Edward Blake, and subject him to a similar cross-examination, the answers they would give would be

very interesting, I am sure, to the whole committee. If he should ask Mr. Blake what he thought of this policy of government subsidies to local railways, that gentleman would tell him—if he has not entirely gone back on his old principles—that they were absolutely unconstitutional, that it was contrary to the British North America Act to spend a dollar of federal money on local railways. And hon. gentlemen who followed Mr. Blake at that time agreed with him to a man; and they are recorded in the journals of this House as agreeing to that principle which he put in the form of a resolution and proposed as the Liberal view. That would be Mr. Blake's opinion. The right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has never recanted, so far as I am aware—except by his silence now giving consent to the government proposition—the very terse description he gave of this sort of policy. When dealing with votes for railway subsidies brought down by the government of the day, though for a good deal smaller amount than these, he stated that each and every one of these votes was a bribe to the constituencies, that these railway subsidies were mere rat holes for public money. I think that would have been a very interesting addition to the examination of the Postmaster General. And, perhaps, before these resolutions are carried we may be able to carry on the system of the Postmaster General and have the privilege of cross-examining the Minister of Trade and Commerce on the subject and see whether he maintains his former attitude. And this reminiscence is rather interesting too for another reason. I think a large number of gentlemen on this side of the House still favour the principle that was put in force by the Conservative government and bitterly opposed at the outset by the Liberal party. Many of these subsidies are for railways in districts already supplied with railway accommodation, and so not of such a nature as those proposed when the principle was introduced. It is interesting to observe these gentlemen coming down with such magnificent figures and such generosity, after the years that have elapsed and the work that has been done. I think there is a great deal of room for criticism in regard to the carrying out of that policy in certain portions of the province of Ontario. But I am sure that in other provinces on the Atlantic and the Pacific, the quarrel with the government will be—and I am frank to say it—that they have not been sufficiently generous. I do not think the people there would be opposed to this principle if it were applied properly. And, I think the contrast between the policy of the Liberal government and the policy of the Conservative government is that, under the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, the outlying portions of the Dominion do not receive the consideration they should receive, consideration that, under the present policy, appears to be given to the older and more settled parts of the country.

Mr. BELL. I think it might not be amiss to call attention to the fact that there is a good deal of justification for the discussion that has taken place in connection with these railway subsidies. I entirely sympathize and agree with the opinion expressed by my hon. colleague (Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) that, so far as some of the smaller and less developed provinces and parts of the Dominion are concerned, there is, to my mind, a demand for some system of railway subsidies. There can be no question about the value of railway construction, and there can be no question that many parts of the country are not supplied with railway facilities as they should be. Nor can there be any question as to the value to these localities and to Canada as a whole from the legitimate and proper expanding of our railway system. But while I believe, that, I believe also that there are objections to the mode in which these subsidies are voted. For instance, we are to-night voting subsidies to a sum the magnitude of which many hon. members do not seem to realize. Take $3,200 a mile as a basis, and allow five per cent additional for the fact that a larger sum is promised to such roads as cost over $15,000 a mile. The mileage here subsidized is 3,928 miles. At $3,200 a mile, this would be $12,569,600. Add to that five per cent, as I have suggested, $628,480, and you find that the total subsidies now before us is $13,198,080.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Does that include revotes ?

Mr. BELL. Including everything. Here is a sum that we are voting in the course of one evening; and it is more than one-third of a sum which my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) declared not so many years ago was too large to be expended upon all the services of Canada. The time is not remote when the hon. gentleman pronounced $38,000,000 an extravagant sum to be expended on the services of Canada in every direction, and here to-night he and other hon. gentlemen who sympathized with him at that time, many of them associated with the government, are cheerfully and, apparently with a great deal of pleasure and satisfaction, as evidenced by their laughter, voting more than one-third of that sum for railway construction alone, and that in a direction which they cannot fail to remember, they uniformly condemned when in opposition. I do not mean to say that the views of these gentlemen were right when they condemned that course. It seems that they themselves have come to the conclusion that they were mistaken. They have set themselves with great assiduity to reverse their position upon all subjects upon which they expressed themselves. Their conduct during the years they have had a chance to show how they

would really act must convince us that their opinions when in opposition do not now meet with their approval. Their conduct now is entirely at variance with those opinions. But we cannot hope that any government or opposition will be altogether wise. The most that we can hope for is that they shall do their best to govern the country honestly and well, and that the opposition will criticise as honestly and capably as they can the conduct of the government in power. Therefore, I do not think there is great profit to be derived from pointing out the fact that the course hon. gentlemen opposite are entering upon with such satisfaction is at variance with their opinions of the past. But at the time when we were to vote railway subsidies to the amount of over $13,000,000, there was an opportunity for the government to consider whether or not this was a proper system and the proper way to aid in the construction of such railway works as are still necessary.

Now to my mind it is a very grave question whether the country gives a sufficient amount of attention to this large portion of our national outlay. It seems to me doubtful if the government has fully and carefully considered whether in following the old method in which the example has been set to them by their predecessors, they are not perhaps continuing a method which might be superseded by a better one. To my mind the great purpose of railway subsidies is the economical construction of railways in portions of the country where they are wanted, and the point that ought to be kept clearly in view is whether any return for the large outlay which the country is asked to make can be expected; and secondly, whether the localities in which the expenditures are being made will get as much benefit under this system as they might under a different one. Now there was an opportunity at this time, in view of the large extent of these subsidies, to have given a careful consideration to this matter. I think it is to be regretted that there is not evidence to show that the government has studied this subject. I am of the opinion that the government of Canada, instead of subsidizing by a cash bonus, roads at random, in great numbers, which are pressed upon their attention by interested corporations or even by prominent supporters, should have introduced a different method altogether, should have inquired carefully into these several propositions, and only given their support to such railway propositions as conveyed to them a reasonable assurance that they were likely to be carried out successfully at an early period, to all the rest turning for the time being a deaf ear.

I would further suggest that it would be to the advantage of the country if, instead of aiding these selected and favoured railways by a cash subsidy, the government should give their aid in the form of a guarantee upon a certain percentage of the bonds of the corporations which came to them and asked for support. That system has been to a certain extent adopted this year in the very extensive bonuses which have been promised to the Mackenzie & Mann system in the west, and those which are promised to the Grand Trunk Pacific. In these cases the government have entered upon that course; instead of giving the cash subsidy we have given a guarantee. To my mind the great point to be kept in view is what the burden upon the country is going to be that will be created by carrying out these railway propositions. If it can be proved, or if it appeared to the satisfaction of the government, that the capital required to complete these railways would be lessened by a government guarantee as compared with the system of giving a cash subsidy in aid of these roads. then I think it would be better for the country and better for the localities in which these roads are built that the former principle should be substituted. The great purpose that ought to be kept in view is to bring the cost of these public works down to the lowest possible point, and in that way the burden which they subsequently impose upon the locality for which they are constructed and which must be met from the tolls collected by these roads, would be reduced to the lowest point. The result would be that we would derive the benefit of railway construction at the least possible cost, and upon the most advantageous terms. Now here was a great opportunity, because we are spending a very large amount of money, we are bonusing nearly eighty different lines of road over every part of Canada; and here was a great opportunity for the government to give this matter full consideration, and if they were satisfied that a better system could be discovered, to have introduced that system. There is not, I regret to say, any evidence before us to show that the government has bestowed any great amount of study upon this question. Therefore, to my mind, they have lost a valuable opportunity for giving very full and careful consideration to this matter.

Then again there is this to be said. This vote, aggregating over $13,000,000, is introduced at a time of the session when it cannot receive the discussion which this kind of expenditure, with the burden which it is imposing upon the country, would seem to warrant. These resolutions might have been much better introduced at an earlier period of the session, when they could have been fully and carefully discussed. There is no question to-day of more importance to this country than that of railway construction. We know that we have to build in the course of a few years to come, a great many miles of road all over Canada. We know we must do that, therefore, it is to my mind, most important that if we are not proceeding upon the best possible course

we should turn from that course and adopt a better one at the earliest moment. It is idle to expect this time to engage in a discussion extending over a week or two weeks of time that might be required in order to thresh this subject out thoroughly, to collect all the necessary information, and to arrive at a satisfactory and final decision upon this question. I say we cannot hope to have that at this stage of the session; therefore, I regret that these resolutions have been brought down at so late a period.

That brings to my mind what is perhaps the strongest objection, from all points of view, to such resolutions as we have before us to-day. I regretted very much the tone and substance of the speech made by the Postmaster General to-night. I regretted it, because I saw a manifest disposition on his part to make prominent a feature in this discussion that to my mind is not creditable to this parliament, and that is his assumption that members of parliament in voting upon these resolutions are not free agents, that they are not giving to this subject their best judgment, their independent judgment; that they are voting, on the other hand, entirely in the fear of their constituents in every case in which the constituents of any member are interested parties. That may well be the case. To be perfectly frank, in these railway subsidies there are votes in which my constituents are interested, and which I would, if necessity required, support with my vote. In respect of these matters, I feel that I have a mandate here to support these particular resolutions. Every other gentleman in this House whose constituents are interested in a particular vote, must feel the same stress. I do not like to see that, in this matter, the government are relying upon what can be called nothing else than log-rolling on a gigantic scale, in depending for support of hon. gentlemen in this House because each one of them is interested in one or more of the resolutions. It is practically organizing a log-rolling operation on a wholesale system for the government of the day to bring in seventy or eighty resolutions and rely for their passage upon the fact that individual members of the House on both sides are interested in one or more of these resolutions, and therefore, will vote for the whole lot because each one is interested in one or more. It is not seemly to make that idea prominent, and to my mind it is not fair. It is not to the advantage of the people that the independence of members of the House should be lost from the fact that their constituencies are interested in one or more of these resolutions. To my mind, if these resolutions cannot receive the sanction of the independent judgment of individual members, then that is a great reason why they should not be introduced at all. They should not be brought down in batches and voted through simply because individual members cannot oppose some of them and therefore have to accept them all. There is a further serious objection. There can be no question that, to a certain extent, while the objects for which these votes are made, while the purpose for which this money is being asked and received is laudable, nevertheless in the mode, and manner, and selection of these subsidies, the government in giving to the several corporations interested has a direct opportunity for the exercise of political interference in favour of the government. For instance, to-night we have nearly eighty railway resolutions brought down in one session; at the last session of parliament not one was introduced.

There cannot be any one in this House who would argue that there was absolutely no necessity for these railways last year and an overpowering necessity this year. It is perfectly clear that the voting of money in this particular fashion places it in the hands of the government of the day to bestow great largesses upon great corporations and people at such times as they think they can bestow those largesses to the best advantage to themselves. This to my mind gives an opportunity to the government of the day to exercise enormous political influence and therefore it is not to the advantage of the country that it should be done in that way. It may be to the advantage of this government but it is not to the advantage of the country. One may say that if the country were entirely opposed to that mode of doing business, it would show it, in the manner in which it would receive these votes or proposals and that until there is such a body of independent opinion among the electors who are not favourable to the exercise of political pressure by the government in this fashion we may expect to see things go on as they are going. But, that does not make the matter right. If by this system of giving subsidies at such times and in such a way and under such modes as the government of the day adopts, leads to political influence being exerted on a great scale, I believe that every hon. gentleman will agree with me in saying that it is a bad thing, that it is not in the interests of the people of the country, that it is not in the interest of the government and that it will not have a tendency to strengthen the parliament of Canada. Generally speaking we must be favourable to the development of our railway system and I am prepared to support the government of the day in extending our railway system. I maintain that there are large portions even of the older provinces where we must have a great and rapid extension of the railway system if we are going to have a rapidly developing population and a rapid increase in wealth but I think it is an unfortunate thing that successive governments should bestow large sums of money in the form of subsidies when the individual members of those governments while sitting on the opposite side of the House had previously opposed

them all through. If expenditures that are wrong in the view of successive oppositions are going to be right in the view of successive governments, then I say that there can be no question in the mind of any reasonable man that our system is not such a system as we should adopt in a country like this. For that reason I would like very much if the government of the day had introduced these resolutions at an earlier period of the session and if they had brought them down and submitted them to parliament at such a time and with such information as to make parliament feel that a strong case might be made out for a better system of expenditure, one which would be more absolutely free from all suspicion of the desire to exert political influence. I would have welcomed it. I believe it would not be a difficult matter for parliament to devise a method by which we would have the most important work of railway construction carried on more successfully and more economically than it is to-day and at the same time eliminate from the work of carrying on railway construction those objectionable features from which this system should be altogether free. We do not want to have it in the mouths of successive oppositions in this House to say that the ministers of successive governments have been promoting their own ends by the aid of this system, either as individual members of the government or as a party. This is not attaining to the highest possible plane of statesmanship or politics in this country that we can attain to, and in the meantime it will always remain an open question as to whether the governments which do make these large expenditures in the hope of personal advantage are not therein deceived. I am pleased to see that the government is not going to lose sight of the important work of railway construction but it seems to me that I might also express my regret that this enormous expenditure has not been submitted to us at a time when we could discuss it fully with some possibility of arriving at a decision on the subject and with a chance of discovering perhaps some better way in which this expenditure could be made.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There can be no objection, as we are now in committee, that each of these items should be discussed on its merits and there is no reason for alleging that the committee should rise until there has been an ample opportunity given for that to be done. I only rose to point out to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Bell) that if the committee approve of all these subsidies and they should be granted it is not only improbable, but it is not possible that the $13,000,000 which he says they will cost will have to be paid in any one year. Perhaps they will not be paid in one, two, three or four years. Long lines of railway will take some time to construct and as he knows it is only as construction proceeds that they are to be paid. Therefore, he must not look upon it in the light of our incurring a liability which during any given financial year will amount to $13,000,000 and which will have to be defrayed. We must proceed in a business-like way in developing the country and we are all anxious to see it developed, but, we must at the same time have regard to the revenues of the country and to the ability of the country to carry out these undertakings. There may be schemes other than those proposed which would be in the interest of the country, but you might not be able to accomplish everything in one year. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that some years ago, before the Liberal party came into power, some members of that party took exception to an expenditure of $38,000,000 and said it was time to cry a halt and that there should be economy practised. That is quite true and there was a reason for it. In those days the revenues of the country were not paying the ordinary expenditure and all the works on capital account that were being entered into were being undertaken with borrowed money. Therefore, under these circumstances it was a wise and prudent thing to say that we should be careful, and that we should not proceed as they were proceeding at that time. But what are the conditions now ? Hon. gentlemen opposite know what the position was then and they know what it is now. There have been a great many millions of expenditure made, but the revenue that came in and the revenue that came in under a lower rate of taxation than prevailed in those days——

Mr. GOURLEY. No, no.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. A lower rate of taxation than prevailed in those days has sufficed not only to pay the ordinary expenditure of the government, but it has paid the capital expenditure of government and left a surplus over and above. Therefore, I would feel, such being the condition of things, when trade was stagnant and population not increasing, when the revenue was not sufficient to meet the ordinary expenditures of government, not to speak of doing nothing else, that it was desirable to call a halt, but now, under the changed conditions, when, under a lower rate of taxation, you have a revenue enough not only to pay your ordinary expenditure, but as I have said, to pay all of your capital expenditure, your bonuses for iron and for railway construction, your expenditure on capital account for canals and other works and something over that besides, hon. gentlemen will see, that, this being the state of things, this government while they are making generous expenditures, or rather proposing to parliament that the country is in a position to make generous expenditures, can do that without alarm on sound business principles and that it is a wise principle for

parliament to proceed upon having regard for the resources of the country. They have regard to the development of the country, and they submit their opinions for the judgment of this committee ; they believe in the development of the country in the directions that are indicated that they can do this out of the revenue of the country without entailing burdens on the people, and if our friends opposite will consider the operations of the last few years they will arrive at the same conclusions as we do, and, therefore, I would ask them to look upon the expenditure proposed by the government in the light of the present condition of the country and of its prospective development and advancement. I think they will agree with the government, that while we are making these expenditures, looking towards the development, nevertheless we are proceeding in a wise, prudent, businesslike way, having regard to the needs and improvements of this country. As to whether the country is in a position to do this or not, for my own part I believe that the country can well afford to do it. I believe the country can meet the obligations parliament is assuming through the legislation of this session without unduly increasing the burdens of the people, and will be able to carry out the great schemes of development that parliament has so far sanctioned or may still sanction.

Mr. GOURLEY. The junior member for Pictou (Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) said there was a political stress upon members of this House. I agree with that, but I do not agree that the political stress is on this side of the House; the political stress is on the other side of the House. I am a supporter of subsidies. Ever since I entered this parliament and long before, I was a supporter of subsidies, because the Conservative party of this country adopted it as their policy to develop this country by encouraging the building of railways by subsidies. All that I have to complain of is that you gentlemen who adopted that policy along with all the Conservative policies, do not come frankly into this House and confess that you stole that policy. I think you should clothe yourselves with sackcloth and ashes and make a frank, open confession that you have stolen our policy on railways, as you have stolen the national policy and the bounty on iron. If you should frankly acknowledge this, you would escape the censures which people are now passing on you. The repentant sinner who turns in his way is always welcomed by good men, but it is on open and frank confession that he is forgiven. The same generosity would be extended to you here, but you insist upon stirring up ill-will in this House by claiming that you have adopted a policy and that it is your policy. I undertake to say that every dollar of money voted for subsidies in Colchester will inure to my support, because the electors will say : This is the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party which the Liberals dared not change when they came into power. If the Minister of Finance will give me two or three more subsidies I will get every vote in Colchester, Liberal or Conservative, because the Conservatives will claim for me, and the Liberals will admit it, that by advocating the policy of subsidies I am pursuing the old policy of the Conservative party, which the Liberals have been compelled by public opinion to adopt after attacking it for 18 years. I regard their conduct in doing that as the only satisfactory feature in their whole course. I congratulate them on being strong enough to admit that they were wrong. Some one should move in this House, for the sake of the history of this present generation, to strike out from the 'Hansard' of this country the speeches of gentlemen opposite for the 18 years from 1878 to 1896, because if these speeches are permitted to remain intact they will form the basis for the historian to write the history of this generation, and I am bound to say if he happens in his search for information to light upon the speech of the Minister of Customs, he will decide that in this day and generation we were incompetent imbeciles, because the speeches he made during these 18 years, instead of aiding the progress of Canada, instead of inspiring the young people of this country and creating a feeling favourable to the growth of Canada, were intended to cripple the people of this country, especially in the matter of railways. The Conservative party made Canada; they found four little scattered provinces; they united them; then they built the Intercolonial, which was the first link between the provinces; then they acquired British Columbia and the west, and pursued their great policy by building the Canadian Pacific Railway. But these were only preliminary steps, and the Conservative party, when they had consolidated Canada into one country went forward and said : We shall have a policy of railway development. They followed that policy continuously in the face of the most determined and unreasonable opposition that was ever offered to a political party in any country, and you gentlemen were the men responsible for that opposition. I in my humble way down in the country, was supporting railway development, supporting these subsidies when Sir Charles Tupper and Sir John A. Macdonald were advocating them, and the Conservative party also supported them. All I can say is that as you gentlemen have adopted our policy I am bound to go on and support that policy. My hon. friend who sits beside me (Hon. Mr. Haggart), when he was Minister of Railways again and again introduced railway subsidies, but he was met and fought step by step as if he were an enemy of the country instead of being one of its great developers and one of its

great builders. When we pursued a different course in this parliament, I think it is ungenerous for gentlemen to get up and pursue the course that they have done. I for one will say that I support railway subsidies all over the country. Look at the map! I said a short time ago that we had not commenced the development of Canada. I said that we had a long fringe of development from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Look at that map! A little fringe of railways from the Atlantic to the Pacific. But the whole country is as absolutely undeveloped as when the Indians possessed it. There is the evidence that my knowledge was accurate; it is as utterly undeveloped as when the Indians roamed over it, except for a little fringe from ocean to ocean. It is our duty to go forward, developing year by year a vast system of railways, and that is in pursuance of the Conservative policy. I congratulate you, gentlemen, on pursuing that policy. Why do you not be more honest and frank and say: We adopted the Conservative policy of granting railway subsidies; our policy in opposing railway subsidies was all wrong. If you do, there will be no contention on our side. Why don't you tell the truth. You do not tell the truth, and therefore you provoke opposition. I say this because I am anxious to get on with the business of the country. I congratulate the Prime Minister upon having one very frank member of his cabinet; that is the Minister of Trade and Commerce. As soon as the iron bounties were called the Minister of Trade and Commerce gets up and goes out. I think he acted fairly in that; I am inclined now to believe that the Minister of Trade and Commerce believed in his contentions at the time he made them. I say that the Postmaster General and the Minister of Customs did not believe a word they said; they were evidently acting a part during these 18 years; they knew they were deceiving the people; they absolutely knew that for 18 years, but the Minister of Trade and Commerce, I am now commencing to believe, honestly believed the nonsense he talked, honestly believed that bounties were an improper policy to pursue in this country. Therefore, whenever the Minister of Finance undertakes to move his resolutions, the old gentleman hobbles out, greatly to his credit. I congratulate the Prime Minister on having one honest, trusty, faithful counsellor on whom he can rely. Even though the doctrines he preached are economically false, he believes them and will stick to them. If the Postmaster General and the Minister of Customs had gone out when these railway resolutions were introduced they would have done themselves a great compliment. They would have shown to us that they disapproved of this railway policy and believed in the policy they had preached for eighteen years. But by sitting here they openly flaunt their indecency, because, after having opposed railway subsidies in every shape and form for eighteen years, they now have the courage not only to support them, but to revile the gentlemen who pursued an honest course. We have the ignoble sight of the notorious sinner reviling the honest patriarch, the representative of truth and right in this country.

Mr. PUTTEE. Before this discussion is concluded, I wish to enter my protest against this whole bonusing system. I do not agree with the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley), who thinks the country can be built up by bolstering up private interests of one kind and another. A number of gentlemen who spoke to-day have stated that they would gladly support the bonusing system in those parts of the country which are not settled, but would object to it in the more settled parts of the Dominion; but I cannot find that principle included in the resolutions now before us. They seem to cover the whole country; they seem to make practically no difference between one province and another. In fact, the well-settled districts seem to be more favoured than the unsettled districts; and when we come down to bonusing railways of one mile in length, it seems to me that we carry the system to an absolute absurdity. There are here about eighty propositions, which I imagine include nearly all the propositions for railway construction in the country at the present time. It would appear to me to be very reasonable to suppose that this system, developed as it has been, actually retards the construction of railways where they are necessary. Where it is decided by a railway company that a line should be constructed as a business proposition, it is not constructed until such time as political influence can be brought to bear to obtain a subsidy; and therefore the construction of necessary lines is prevented. Now, I do not wish to discuss this matter at any length. I have protested against other bonusing Bills and I protest against this. I think the system is wrong. I look for a better system. It is useless for us to support in bulk or in detail a system that we would rather see abolished, and the country as a whole is opposed to this system. When a proposition is put before us in this way, affecting, as it does, almost every section of the country, it is not to be supposed that you can get a general sentiment expressed against it; but if the principle of bonusing railways could be put before the people of Canada, irrespective of any particular Bill, I do not think any of us could have any doubt what the verdict would be. I therefore oppose this bonusing Bill, not only in bulk, but in detail.

Mr. BLAIN. Where is this road to commence and where is it to finish?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is an extension of the road referred to in the first item. A portion of the subsidy is revoted, and this is for an extension as described.

Mr. BLAIN. That does not answer the question. According to the resolution, if this subsidy is granted, the promoters of the railway will have the right to commence it at Ingersoll and take it to the city of Stratford, a distance of 35 miles. That is one proposition. But if they do not choose to do that, they have the right to commence it at Woodstock and take it to Berlin, which may be a distance of 35 miles; or they would have the right to commence at either Ingersoll or Woodstock and stop at any point between Berlin and Stratford. I object to this method of granting subsidies, without specifying the starting point or the ending point. It gives the promoters a chance to hold up the different municipalities for bonuses. Can the minister not specify where this company will have the right to commence the road and where they will have the right to finish it?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say, for the information of the committee, that this company have a charter to build from Port Burwell, on Lake Erie, to Collingwood, on the Georgian bay. They represent that this would be a short and good road for bringing coal from Port Burwell to the various centres throughout the province of Ontario where there are large manufacturing industries, and for bringing grain from Collingwood to Port Burwell. A portion of the road has been subsidized in the past, and is now running from Port Burwell to Ingersoll. That portion of the subsidy which has not been earned, for about nine miles from Ingersoll to Woodstock, is revoted. The company say that they have not decided which is the best line to take to the Grand Trunk, whether by Stratford or by Berlin, continuing north to Collingwood. The subsidy has been petitioned for by almost all the growing towns throughout that part of Ontario, and the government thought that as that portion of the road from the lake to Ingersoll had been built and was in operation, it might be well to give the company this slight encouragement. While it will serve local needs to some extent, it is expected to be of more value as a through line.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is this the road with which the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is associated?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think he is now very considerably associated with the road.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Well, we had better pass that.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the Minister of Railways and Canals be good enough to tell the committee whether the petitions ask for a road from Ingersoll to Stratford or from Woodstock to Berlin? If this resolution be carried, this railway will have the right to construct the road from Woodstock to Berlin, or from Ingersoll to Stratford. It is only fair that the company should state from what point it intends to start, and where it intends to go, rather than have this choice, because this option will enable it to work the municipalities for subsidies by threatening to go in whatever direction it will obtain the largest subsidies. Did the citizens of Stratford petition the government to subsidize a road from Ingersoll to Stratford, and did the citizens of Berlin petition the government to subsidize a road from Woodstock to Berlin?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My recollection is that the petitions were in favour of the scheme in a general way. The municipalities to which my hon. friend refers are all very well supplied with railways, and they will get the advantage of this line, no matter in which section of the county it may run. The object is not so much to have a local road as to have coal distributed cheaply to the various manufacturing centres, for it is a matter of very material importance to the manufacturers throughout that section of the country to have their coal delivered as cheaply as possible. Then there is a great deal of the produce of the country originating on the Grand Trunk Railway and the Great Western which will be taken by this line, and in that way there will be competing rates from this lake port. The people will find a market they can serve and even have water during a part of the year from Port Burwell to Montreal. These are representations which were made by the company to the municipalities supporting it. As either of these two options will be through the same counties and municipalities, I do not think there will be much danger of any competition with regard to municipal bonuses. That is a matter any way about which we in this House need not have any particular care. If the municipalities are so anxious to have this road and think it will be so great a benefit that they are willing to vote assistance, that is their own business. But my hon. friend knows that in Ontario the people must be strongly in favour of a public enterprise of this description before they will grant it any bonus. It must be almost the unanimous wish of the electors of any village, town, township or county before any enterprise of this description will get municipal aid.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This is a road which has been in existence for some time from Port Burwell to Ingersoll.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is just completed this year to Ingersoll.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes, this is intended to be a through road from Port Burwell to Collingwood. You give the option to this road, but it ought to have its plan and it ought to have decided on its route. These parties must know what route they intend to take, and their object must be, in having this option, to go to the different municipalities and say: 'If you do not give us sufficient bonus and per-

haps right of way or other conditions, we will take it to the other place.' You are giving this company the opportunity of holding up these municipalities for the purpose of getting bonuses. Here is an old road which was built from Port Burwell a number of years ago, now completed to the town of Ingersoll. The company propose to go to Collingwood. Surely they know the route. Why do they not come here and ask for a bonus from one particular point to another and not be allowed the opportunity of holding up the different towns and municipalities along the line by saying: 'The government have given us the option of going anyway we like between these two different points, and we will go in that direction which will give us the largest bonuses.'

Mr. BROCK. I would like very much if possible to have a change made and the original plan adopted. That is grant a bonus in a comprehensive way when you are about it for a railway from Lake Erie to Collingwood. I want to square myself with the Postmaster General and show him that I am not so narrow minded as to oppose all kinds of bonuses. But if we are going to give a bonus, it should be for some comprehensive scheme and not a little patch work such as this. This will be a bonus hunting road. We know who is behind this road, and in that respect it is unlike most of those other schemes that come before us. I believe that the promoters deserve well of the government and that it would be well to give a bonus of so much a mile right straight through from Ingersoll to Collingwood. In my opinion the country would support such a vote. I agree with the Minister of Public Works that the building of this road will have the effect of laying coal down in the central part of Ontario much cheaper than at present. It will bring coal directly across Lake Erie to Port Burwell and from Port Burwell it would be quite reasonable that we should build this road to a port on the Georgian bay. It has a charter to Collingwood. Then why not at once instead of aiding it in a half hearted way, give it a subsidy from Ingersoll to Collingwood. I would be very sorry that it should go past my hon. friend's home and town, but even if the road should run directly through Ingersoll to Collingwood and not touch at some of the other towns, they are well supplied with railway facilities by the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Canada Southern. Let this road run through to Collingwood. If a scheme of that kind were to be adopted, this parliament would be justified in granting a bonus all the way and I would ask that that change be made now if possible.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is this road going to Collingwood, or is it not proposed to change it, and instead of going to Collingwood to make the terminus at some other point? I understand that, if they go from Woodstock the chances are they will run on to Collingwood, but if they run from Berlin they will go on to the shores of Lake Huron.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand—and I go simply by their own representations—that their terminus is Collingwood. My hon. friend (Mr. Brock) will see that, while I live in Woodstock and my interests are there to a great extent, I am not selfish in this matter. Their present subsidy takes them to Woodstock, but they represented to the government that it might be in the public interest as well as in the interest of the company that they should go north by Stratford, as being a somewhat shorter and, perhaps, a better route. I quite agree with that, because, if it is a good enterprise, the shorter the line they can make and the better the grades from Lake Erie to Georgian bay, the better it would be in the interests of the whole country. Therefore, I did not object nor do I now, to their proposal to change their course. If they run ten miles from the town I live in and where my interests lie, I am sure the hon. gentleman will exonerate me from any personal interest or feeling. If I had told them that they had already intimated that it was their intention to go through Woodstock, that they had been subsidized to that point, and I would not agree to a change, I might then be accused of selfishness. But I frankly told them that, if it were in the general interest and in the interest of the company to go the other way I was satisfied. I can see the force of what the hon. gentleman says that it would be a good thing if encouragement were offered to the whole scheme from water to water. But the hon. gentleman must remember that this is a very large country, and there are a great many districts that have no railway facilities. And I must say that I, for one, have always supported with a better heart the granting of assistance to a road that was opening up a new section of the country than to one running through a territory already fairly provided with railway facilities. But I am satisfied that, no matter which of these routes the company take, if they can go on delivering coal at the prices at which they are now delivering it, it would be of as great advantage to the manufacturers of Woodstock as though the road ran directly through the town. If I remember well, they got a subsidy from Port Burwell to Tilsonburg, where they connected with the Michigan Central and with a branch of the Grand Trunk. Then they came back to secure powers to connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway. The great roads are interested in lending their assistance and endorsing this proposition, because, as represented to me, they are interested in getting coal for their own use at this point. They are a long distance from the coal fields, and can bring it better in this way

than by a route upon which we spent considerable money—bringing coal by boat to Port Dover and connecting with a branch of the Grand Trunk. But the navigation was not found very satisfactory. If the ideas of the present company are successful, the road will be one of great advantage to the whole of that district of Ontario. If it is merely a local road I should not be here advocating a subsidy for it.

Mr. SPROULE. There is no denying the importance of the road, if it is completed, and I agree with the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) that, if the whole road were subsidized, it would be better, as we should have it completed at an earlier date. But if we cannot get a subsidy for the whole, it is at least well to get a subsidy for a portion of it.

Mr. BROCK. Why not for the whole? There is an overflowing treasury.

Mr. SPROULE. I admit we should be better pleased to have all subsidized, but, if the government see proper to subsidize only a part, that will still be useful. But I want to endorse what the hon. member of Peel (Mr. Blain) said, that the proposition now, so far as I can see, will lead to the holding up of the municipalities. I do not say that I object to the change of route. If you build to Woodstock, you build along side of two other railways; but, if you go to Stratford, you will go through a section that has no railway just now. It is true, you are not very far from a railway in either case, but the route to Stratford will do more to afford facilities to a new section than will Woodstock. But it is a wrong principle to give a railway company power to hold up the municipalities. We all know what railway corporations are—they have neither souls nor bowels of compassion. They take every dollar they can get, and play one municipality off against the other for all they are worth. They should not be allowed an opportunity to do so. This company should not be allowed an opportunity to do so. This company should choose as direct a route as possible to Collingwood and receive a subsidy for that road.

Mr. BROCK. If it would be in order I would like to move an amendment:

That all the words after 'Ingersoll' be struck out and the following be substituted: 'to Collingwood, crossing the Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk Railway in the most convenient places and in the most direct way.'

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I take it that that amendment is in order, because it does not propose to increase the amount of the subsidy as I understand it. There is no person here that I know of representing the company. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) I had expected to see in the House. I had the information as to this road from him. The solicitor of the company was here at one time during the session. I fear that the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Brock) would defeat the object the company have in view. Personally, I would have no particular objection to the amount, but I fear the company could not secure the payment of the subsidy under this wording. I think that every hon. gentleman who has had experience in these matters knows of the difficulties that companies have under the wording of the resolutions, even after they have earned their money, in getting payment through the Auditor General. I doubt very much whether that is definite enough. I would have no particular objection to a change, speaking for myself, but I cannot speak for the company. I know they have built the road now as far as Ingersoll. I know the manager of the road, and it has always been represented to me that they had good financial backing. That is proved by the fact that they have completed a somewhat expensive road and equipped it from the lake as far north as Ingersoll. I did not make any particular inquiry with regard to it. I think the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is financially interested in it. They represented to me that if they built as far as the Grand Trunk they would then be able to supply the Grand Trunk system with a lot of coal. I would be afraid, in changing this without consultation with the solicitor, that we might defeat the object we have in view.

Mr. BROCK. My suggestion was to give them a free hand, but with the distinct understanding that they were to make for Collingwood, and not build to Collingwood, because that is going to be a very different road from the road that is now laid out. A through road of that kind with the prospect of a subsidy is much easier to finance than these little patches of eight or nine miles at a time. If the government could see its way to grant a bonus to this road from Ingersoll through to Collingwood, it would be a great benefit to that country. If it passed by Guelph, or Galt, or Berlin, where there are large factories, it could carry large quantities of coal to these towns. But that should be done with the understanding that the promoters should build it to Collingwood.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think the resolution as drawn could carry out that object.

Mr. BLAIN. I understood the acting Minister of Railways to say that the aim of the promoters is to construct it from Ingersoll to Collingwood, with a view of serving that manufacturing section of Ontario with cheaper coal. Now one proposition is to take the line from Ingersoll to Stratford. I want to ask the hon. gentleman if, when it gets to Stratford, it will be as near to Collingwood as when it gets to Ingersoll.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend means Berlin or Stratford.

Mr. BLAIN. Is Ingersoll closer to Collingwood than Stratford is ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not prepared to say, but looking at the map, there is very little difference. By bearing east in the first place they are going in the direction of Collingwood. If they went due north instead of going to Stratford, they would have to bear east to some other point to reach Collingwood. It would not make any difference in the total mileage.

Mr. BLAIN. Ingersoll is nearer to Collingwood than Stratford. If the aim of the promoters of this road is to run a line from Ingersoll to Collingwood, then they are going out of their way when they go to Stratford. A line from Ingersoll to Collingwood in anything like a direct line would not touch Stratford at all. I want to ask the acting Minister of Railways another question with regard to coal. We all know that a line of railway was subsidized by this government from Port Dover through the central part of Ontario with a view of bringing soft coal from the United States across in boats, connecting at Port Dover with a line of railway running through the province of Ontario to reach these manufacturing points. If I am correctly informed, that venture has proved a dead failure. They have not been able to bring coal across the lake and make connections at Port Dover and serve the central part of Ontario in that way. Now if that be the case, how is it possible to bring coal across Lake Erie to Port Burwell and serve the central part of Ontario with this road, when they cannot do it with the other ? This road has been constructed for many years from Port Burwell up to Ingersoll, and for a much longer time from Port Burwell to Tilsonburg. Tilsonburg is connected with railways running through all that section of Ontario. What amount of coal has been brought over across Lake Erie to Port Burwell and along this line of railway to Tilsonburg, and then distributed to manufacturers in that part of Ontario ? If my information is correct, I think very little.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is somewhat mistaken. The road was only completed this season to Ingersoll. My hon. friend must know that the improvements to the harbour are not completed yet. To do this business properly this company had to have a harbour on this side of the lake, they had to put on large boats to establish the coal trade. He asks me to say whether they have made a success of the coal trade. I am only able to give the reasons that were given to me. First, the water is not deep enough, notwithstandinig that over $100,000 have been spent on that port; secondly, the coal mines are controlled by the American railways. The coal this road will bring would come from another district altogether. They would not ship their coal in that way, but they send it round by Buffalo. For some time they did carry coal that way for the use of the railroad companies. They are supplying coal at Port Burwell from a different district on the other side from that which it was originally intended to connect with the Grand Trunk at Port Dover.

Mr. HENDERSON. The wording of this resolution is not such as to meet my approval, even were I in favour of subsidizing a road through this country. This is one of the roads that I would not consider meritorious. It runs through a rich agricultural country from Lake Erie to Georgian bay, and passes through large manufacturing towns. If any railway can be constructed and made self-sustaining without government aid, it is surely this road. The country through which this road passes would be able to afford abundance of traffic and enable its promoters to pay dividends. However, we have already, in a resolution that we have adopted, granted a subsidy to this road from Ingersoll to Woodstock. That we have disposed of. That is not before us now. Now, we are asked to grant a further subsidy :

> For a line of railway from Woodstock northerly to a point on the Grand Trunk Railway at Berlin.

That is one proposition. The other proposition is to go back to Ingersoll and grant a subsidy :

> From Ingersoll to Stratford, or to any point on the Grand Trunk Railway between these places.

Or between Stratford and Berlin. It seems to me that a roving commission like this is not altogether what I may call fair-play. This company will be able to go to the city of Stratford, and say : We have a subsidy granted from Ingersoll to Stratford. If you elect a representative in North Perth to support the government the road will be conducted along that route, because we understand from the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock), in his categorical examination of my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock), that the purport of these bonuses is largely to secure political support. If the city of Stratford does not concede what the promoter, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) desires, or what the government desires, and if they do not grant a municipal bonus the company are in a position to go elsewhere. They may say : We will go to Woodstock and see what they are prepared to do. If Woodstock gives a good municipal bonus in support of this road they will run the road from Ingersoll to Woodstock and thence to Berlin, providing that Berlin will grant a bonus and representatives in favour of the government are elected in North and South Waterloo. The roving commission that this subsidy gives to this company is such as is utterly unfair to the various counties through which the road passes, because it

simply places power in the hands of the company which no railway company should be given. We have gone as far as Woodstock with the subsidy. The road is built to Ingersoll. Let the road continue from Ingersoll to Woodstock. I think that is the proper route. Then from Woodstock let it go north to Berlin, passing possibly through Galt, and on north from Berlin through a section of the country that is not now supplied with railway facilities, towards Collingwood. If you subsidize this road allowing it to be constructed from Ingersoll to Stratford, and thence from Stratford northward, you are simply paralleling another road which runs to the Georgian bay. You can get on a railway train at Stratford and go direct to Wiarton or Owen Sound. Why should we subsidize a road paralleling that existing road? Surely the government are not so profuse of money that they can afford to subsidize one railway to parallel another through a well settled country such as the counties of Perth, Huron, Bruce and Grey. I do not think it is called for. I think the other is the proper route.

Mr. SPROULE. If you go the other way, you are paralleling the two roads to Woodstock direct.

Mr. HENDERSON. I admit that, but it would only be for a distance of about nine miles. These two roads are practically through roads. Any one living near these two roads may see the trains go past upon them at a very high rate of speed. They make stops at large places. These two roads are not local roads, and as far as the distance between Woodstock and Berlin is concerned, they are practically through roads. The conditions are the same as those in the Niagara peninsula. When you go across the Niagara peninsula you are bound to parallel other roads, because the peninsula is so narrow. Still if you want to reach the United States you have to parallel roads, but in this case you would only be obliged to parallel existing roads for a distance of about nine miles. The moment you strike Woodstock you have an opportunity of going north towards Berlin. I dare say you will pass through such towns as Berlin, Hespeler, Galt and Waterloo, and thence on to Collingwood, so that the road will go through a country which abounds in manufacturing towns which would require the coal that the railway could supply them with. I think this bonus ought to be limited to one route, and that no roving commission should be granted. I do not think it is fair that the different municipalities should be placed in opposition to one another, or that one should be held up against the other, so that whichever bids the highest in the shape of a municipal bonus will get the road, or that the constituency which elects a representative of a certain stripe of politics will get the road. I think that the government should lay down a certain line. Let this committee amend this resolution in the way which I suggest. It would be an absurd thing to parallel a road which already runs to the Georgian bay rather than going to Woodstock, where we have already given a bonus, because we have already granted a subsidy from Ingersoll to Woodstock. Let us continue the road from Woodstock north and go through the important towns to which I have referred on the way to the Georgian bay.

Mr. SPROULE. It would appear that my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) does not understand the geography of the country very well, because he says that if you go from Stratford north to the Georgian bay you would be paralleling another road. You are not paralleling another road. There is no road being paralleled by going from Stratford, but if you go to Woodstock and then back to Galt, you would make a snake fence of it and render the project impracticable. The proposition would be neither feasible nor useful. I understand that my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Brock) desires, with the permission of the committee, to withdraw the resolution that he proposed.

Mr. BROCK. I withdraw the resolution.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very much in sympathy with my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) in the general sentiments that he expresses, and I shall make representations to the company by telegram acquainting them with the views which have been expressed, so that we may amend the resolution before the third reading. I can assure the committee that there is no localism about this matter. It was on the representations of the company, who had obtained a charter from Ingersoll to Woodstock, that the route was described in the way in which it appears here. As the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) points out, the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) is rather mistaken as to the conditions which at present exist. There are two first-class roads between Woodstock and Ingersoll. Besides that, there is a first-class electric road, the cars upon which go up and down every half hour, so that there is no object from the local standpoint in adopting the route which is here proposed. I think the idea of the company was that they should be in a position to adopt whichever their survey showed to be the better route. I had no idea whatever that there was any desire on the part of the company to hold up the municipalities, because these municipalities are so well supplied with railways that they could not, as a matter of fact, be held up. It never occurred to me that there was any such idea in the mind of anybody. These counties are so well supplied with railway facilities that it would be impossible to get anything like a unanimous vote in the community on the question. The resolution was only drawn in this way because the company asked it with the view of selecting the

best and shortest route as disclosed by the survey.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That portion of the road between Ingersoll and Tilsonburg would not be immediately paralleling any line, excepting for a few miles.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. You mean from Ingersoll to Stratford.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Yes, from Ingersoll to Stratford.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a splendid country there.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There is a good country there, and if it ran directly from Stratford to Collingwood it would not parallel any road. But I do not think that a road to Woodstock should be bonused as there are already three roads there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This has been voted for some years.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Then to go from Woodstock to either Galt or Guelph, as has been said, would be to make a snake fence of it. I can certainly see very serious objection to the way this bonus is given; it is encouraging each town to vote a bonus to the railway. I think the minister should either hold this over, or word it so as to remove the objectionable features.

Mr. SPROULE. I beg to move that all the words after the word 'from' in the second line be struck out and the following be substituted therefor :—

'Ingersoll towards Collingwood in the most direct and practicable route not exceeding 35 miles.'

I think that gives a starting point with the other objective point at Collingwood.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We might let this stand until we hear from the company any objections they may have to that wording; personally I have no objection to it.

To the Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Railway Company for a line of railway from the present terminus of its railway, near Bancroft, easterly to a point at or near Renfrew, not exceeding seventy-five miles.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. With reference to this resolution with respect to the Irondale and Bancroft road I would say that this aid has been pressed upon this government by a number of municipalities, including the city of Toronto, the town of Lindsay, the Board of Trade of the city of Ottawa, the Board of Trade of Lindsay, and the Board of Trade of Renfrew. Various other municipalities have pressed this upon the government, but as some sort of objection to it seeems to be manifested I would suggest that it stand over till to-morrow. I may inform my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) that my object in doing this with reference to this and the James bay resolution, which is farther down on the Order Paper, is that perhaps my hon. friend would like to take advantage of the presence here to-morrow of a deputation from the Toronto city council. Perhaps he desires to consult them with regard to these two subsidies. I can assure him that they have been pressed upon us very strongly by the city of Toronto. If the hon. gentleman desires it I would suggest that they stand over until that deputation arrives.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Anything the city of Toronto could have to say about this would be well said, and I am sure that the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) will not object to it because it is carrying out his policy of opening up a new district and when completed it will give to the city of Toronto another through line to the city of Ottawa. This road was pressed forward for a number of years by Mr. Pusey, who came in here giving his time and energy to this project and he fought an up hill fight such as few men in Canada have fought and succeeded in building the road a considerable distance. Mr. Howland is now managing the road to the best of his ability. It opens up a country which is somewhat rugged but one which I am sure will be in a few years rich in mining. The famous corundum mines were opened up owing to the fact of this railway bringing settlers to the region. I would like to see this vote passed.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The objection to this proposed vote would be that it is diverting the line from the route originally intended. Mr. Pusey did not intend to go to Renfrew but to make connection with the road from Brockville to Westport. It was his intention to work down in that direction and as evidence of that he commenced to build a bridge from Brockville across the St. Lawrence. You will see there one or two of the piers partly built and there should be some serious reason why the road is being diverted from its original line towards Renfrew.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The original intention was to build the road to Ottawa. It starts from Kinmount and runs through Irondale and Bancroft, so that this is returning to the original intention. Some years later when the Brockville and Westport railway got into difficulties, Mr. Pusey abandoned the original route and intended to divert the road to connect with the Brockville and Westport, intending to cross the St. Lawrence at Brockville and to have a through route to the west. I know his intentions because I had the privilege of being consulted by him in every move he made. That scheme has been dropped for a number of years past and the intention has been to make a connection with Ottawa, in other words to go back to the original intention of the projector of the railway.

Mr. WRIGHT. This road has been built a distance of forty-five or fifty miles and

has received and earned government aid. It has now been bonused by the Ontario government for a distance of seventy-five miles at $3,000 a mile, and we expect to get assistance from this government and then the road will be completed because financial arrangements have been made with the Knickerbocker Company of New York to complete it. With reference to the possibilities of this road you must understand that with the Madawaska river near where the York branch unites there is situated one of the finest corundum mines in the world. They are spending this year nearly a quarter of a million dollars and this mine will practically control the corundum market of the world. For the information of the House I would like to lay upon the Table a picture of this corundum mine, also a cut of the buildings, which are now being erected and which along with the machinery will cost as I said a quarter of a million dollars. I would also like to submit a sample of the corundum crystal which perhaps none of you have ever seen and also some of the manufactured article. It is an abrasive mineral and the samples which I show you embrace the finest and also the coarsest grades, from No. 12 to No. 200. We expect that they will do an immense business in corundum which is wanted in every iron manufacturing establishment in the world. The company are now shipping their produce all over Canada, carloads are being sent to the great manufactories in the United States and the corundum is also being shipped in great quantities to Great Britain and other countries of Europe. The great difficulty hitherto has been that the road was so far from any railway that the cost of shipping these goods has been almost prohibitive. But you must bear in mind that this corundum mine is not the only mine in this country that this railway will open up.

If you go about twenty-five miles further down the Madawaska, you come to the finest molybdenite mine in the world. This mineral is so extensive that one of the farmers has actually fenced his whole farm with it. It is used in the manufacture of the very highest grade of steel. This mine, which is already started, will be put in such a shape that this material can be shipped, and it will be of inestimable value to this country. In the same vicinity there have been opened up magnificent iron mines of the highest grade of ore for the manufacture of steel. So you have these two elements lying side by side. The difficulty at present is that the ore has to be drawn thirty or forty miles, and it is almost impossible to do it. If this road is built, it will be possible to ship that ore. Twelve miles still further down the river, in the township of Brougham, you come to the Ontario Graphite Company's mine, one of the finest mines in the Dominion of Canada. This company has already spent about $75,000 in opening up this mine. Only last week they shipped a carload of manufactured goods to Berlin in Germany. Those who visited the Pan-American Exposition must have seen the magnificent exhibit of this company there. Theirs is the only mine of its kind now being operated anywhere in the Dominion of Canada. The material is of the highest grade. The Ontario government has purchased the exhibit which was at the Pan-American for the purpose of sending it to the St. Louis Exposition, next year. In view of the prospects of this railway in opening up all these magnificent mines, I cannot understand why anybody should oppose this grant.

Mr. BROCK. In reply to the remarks of the Postmaster General in regard to this Bancroft Railway, I would like the House to understand that I am not an opponent of granting assistance to every railway, but I am oposed to granting public money to undesirable railways. Not only do I support a grant to this particular railway, but I have put a large amount of money into it myself. That money has been sunk for several years, and I shall not get a cent of it back again. Therefore I am not selfish in supporting or opposing any particular railway. With regard to the veiled threat which the hon. gentleman has thrown across to me, that I may meet some citizens of Toronto who are coming here, and may delight his heart by getting up a wrangle with them, he need not be alarmed. They know my opinions. I may not be a municipal officer coming down here to urge the interests of any railway company ; I represent the city of Toronto, and I am positively opposed to the granting of subsidies to railways through well settled parts of the country, particularly when those railways are going to parallel others. I have supported one from a harbour on Lake Erie, where we are spending a large amount of money, for the purpose of having coal brought into this country more cheaply than it is now. But the Postmaster General need not fancy for one moment that I object to meet people with whom I have lived all my life, even though it should be in a committee on a matter of this kind. I am anxious to promote the welfare of this country, and I believe that in opposinig the granting of bonuses in the omnibus way in which they are being put through this House, I am acting in the best interests of this country.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think that the delegation from the city of Toronto are coming here to-morrow in the interests of any railway company, as the hon. gentleman seems to suggest. The only reason that I know of why they are coming is contained in a telegram which I received from the head of the city, stating that they were coming down to urge the government and parliament to acquiesce in an amendment made by the Senate to the Railway Commission Bill.

Mr. BROCK. Why should you invite me to meet them on that account ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not ask the hon. gentleman to take any course. But when in the early part of this discussion he expressed himself so strongly against railway bonuses generally, I told him that he would not oppose certain bonuses in this list, and now I am sustained in that view. I understand that he acquiesces in the bonus to the Bancroft Railway. I told him that I thought he would consider that a good bonus.

Mr. BROCK. I want to use common sense.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am glad to hear it ; and since the hon. gentleman expresses himself in favour of this bonus, I have no desire to postpone the consideration of it. We put it in the list because this was pressed upon us as a meritorious enterprise. The road will open up a country rich not only in minerals, but in agriculture, and will ultimately connect the west with the Ottawa district. The bonus has been pressed on the government by the city of Toronto, the city of Ottawa, the town of Lindsay, the town of Renfrew, and all the municipalities through which the line will pass. Several deputations from these municipalities have waited on the government, and have represented that the railway will open up and develop valuable resources in the district to be served. So that it would seem to be a very useful road, and I am glad to know that our action in aiding it has the unanimous approval apparently of hon. gentlemen of this committee.

To the Nepigon Railway Company, for a line of railway from Lake Superior to Lake Nepigon, and from a point on the north shore of Lake Nepigon northerly, not exceeding eighty miles.

Mr. SPROULE. Where is that railway expected to go ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is proposed to be built from Lake Superior to Lake Nepigon, about forty miles Then, I understand that Lake Nepigon is about 100 miles long ; and I believe the idea is to connect the lake with a through line.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Will the minister explain where the Grand Trunk Pacific is to come in ? Only a short time ago we saw some gentlemen down here doing some engineering, and the next day we saw an item to the effect that the Grand Trunk Pacific was going to run a branch to Nepigon bay. This railway is to go there too. Is it the intention to have two railways from Nepigon north ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This would hardly serve that purpose. There is a large territory there which has no railway at all.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It never will have.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is mistaken. There is a splendid country there, with plenty of resources. I am not able to tell you the location of the Grand Trunk Pacific, but I hope that some day or other there will be one or two roads running through there, and this may connect with it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is there a charter for this road across Lake Nepigon ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the scheme is to build from Lake Superior to Lake Nepigon, and then from Lake Nepigon about 40 miles north.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is not the charter for a continuous railway?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Why not build around the lake. To build a road up to Lake Nepigon and then take a canoe or steamer across the lake, and then build a railway on, would be nonsense. A road that will go around the lake will have to keep a slight distance to the west, and there you would get a very good valley.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The road will be forty miles to Lake Nepigon, and I think it is eighty miles from the south to the north of Lake Nepigon. Then the road will be forty miles north from Lake Nepigon, or eighty miles of railway or thereabouts plus the navigable waters of the lake, which will furnish communications between the outside world and the Grand Trunk Pacific in the course of construction, and provide means of getting in supplies and material. Perhaps later on the owners may connect the two pieces.

Mr. CLANCY. Is this to be a colonization road ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. For the present it will certainly be, pure and simple, because after building from Lake Superior to Lake Nepigon, they propose to use the lake, which is between 90 and 100 miles long. It is represented that there are large pulpwood limits there, and it is intended to establish there pulp and fishing industries. The parties are putting their own money into it, and are prepared to build next season if they receive assistance.

Mr. CLANCY. I understand that the object is to construct a road from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway to Lake Nepigon, but I understand that that road has also a subsidy from the Ontario government for the first ten miles. Then they are supposed to navigate Lake Nepigon for the purpose of bringing up pulpwood and other material down, and it is to be a colonization road as well.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Those are the representations made to me.

Mr. BROCK. It can only be a summer road. In the winter time the lake is not navigable.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The road will be used in the winter time for taking in supplies and you can drive across the lake.

To the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company for a line of railway from Little Current, on its present line, to Sudbury and thence towards the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, not exceeding thirty miles, in lieu of the subsidy of twenty-one miles granted by chapter 7 of 1899, item 38 of section 2.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a revote of 21 miles and nine miles new. It is to run into the nickel mines and will connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. CLANCY. Is that ultimately supposed to go to James' bay ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, the Manitoulin and North Shore line runs south of the Canadian Pacific Railway across the Manitoulin islands. Its charter carries it back to Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this part of the Clergue system of railway. bonused already by the Ontario government and for which we voted a bonus before ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. This is part of the railway that was to go down to Manitoulin across to Tobermory and further down by Wiarton and from Wiarton to Meaford. I said some years ago that I never believed it was seriously intended to build the Manitoulin part of it. However, Mr. Clergue was ingenious enough to get nearly all southwestern Ontario to join with him in an application for a subsidy to build this railway, and the bonuses he got he used in order to build back into the woods to his own pulp lands and mines. I would be much better pleased if this had been spent for the purpose of building the Manitoulin part down to Tobermory and from there by way of Wiarton to Meaford. That would have given us a short road across that section to the Soo, to the Canadian Pacific Railway, but I imagine this must be dropped. Who is behind this now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is somewhat mistaken as to the roads. Mr. Clergue and those associated with him had two charters—one the Manitoulin and North Shore and the other the Algoma Central. They were granted subsidies by parliament for both roads, but there are some twenty-one miles on which the subsidies are still good for another year, granted to the Manitoulin and North Shore Company. The subsidy Mr. Clergue used on the Algoma Central, which he built up to the mines and north towards the Canadian Pacific Railway. That was a different organization, although under the control of Mr. Clergue and his associates.

Mr. SPROULE. But this road was to go to Little Current and from there to extend on to the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. However, there are two separate oragnizations. Mr. Clergue has built more of the Algoma Central—a hundred and odd miles—and of this only twelve or thirteen miles starting from Sudbury and running out into the mining country ; and this nine miles extension is in a different direction and was not subsidized before. We will admit that the enterprises with which Mr. Clergue was associated are not at the moment successful. Still, many of us would regard them as great undertakings, and we all must admit that he has succeeded in spending a great deal of money in that district. No doubt those enterprises are in difficulties by all reports, but I have still confidence that many of these industries will be established and become successful. And he represents that he has still the expectation——

Mr. SPROULE. Who represents ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Clergue. He is, so far as I know the representative of these railway propositions. He says he has financial arrangements pending to put these roads through, if he is given the support. He has done wonderful things in the past, and it seems to me we might take the risk of this small renewal. We want to see the road built, there is no doubt about that. A great deal of money has been spent in that district, and, for my part, I have still confidence that many of the industries will be carried on there. And I hope that Mr. Clergue will reap some reward for the work he has done and the enterprise he has shown. The first investors in some of these industries may lose. We shall be sorry if that is the case, but I believe that the country will be developed and many of these enterprises will be successful in the end.

Mr. SPROULE. I believe that too. But I must say that I think Mr. Clergue is considerable of a fakir in railway promoting. That is my opinion from the experience we have had of him so far. He is an able man no doubt. He has started many industries which, if continued, will be of a most valuable character, and I am sure every one will be glad to see him rewarded for his enterprise. But I think his greatest cause of failure is that, as soon as he starts one enterprise, instead of prosecuting it to successful end, he branches out into something else in which he sees millions, follows it a certain distance, starts something else and so on. With re-

gard to his railway schemes, let me give the committee an idea of them. He got western Ontario to support his scheme for a bonus. He was going to build from Mea-ford up to Tobermory, reach Manitoulin, cross to Little Current, thence to the north shore and so north. This scheme his friends used two or three times during the elections. In North Grey he had the announcement made in the 'Monitor' calling for the building of the whole road. I had left Ottawa, but a short time before, and, up to that time, he had not his plans filed with the government when the statement was made that he was calling for tenders for the construction of the road. I wrote to Ottawa to ask if he had his plans filed then, and the answer I received was that no maps or plans had been filed. Yet, though he had not laid his plans before the government or received their consent, he called for tenders for the building of the whole road, seeking to convince the people that the road was to be built at once. After the election was over, of course, there was a quietus for a time. There was a protest, the sitting member was unseated and a new election was called. Then, the same game was gone over with. It served the same purpose two or three times, and I do not know how many more times it will be used. I am satisfied there was no serious intention of commencing the road. Yet, Mr. Clergue sent out surveyors, of two different routes. Those people who wanted the road to go by the north route were told to support the government candidate and they would get what they wanted; and those who wanted the south route were told the same thing. We would not have complained so much about all this had he gone on and built the railway. But the aim seems to be the same as from the first. He mapped out a large scheme to secure support from a large number of municipalities, including towns and cities, so as to secure a bonus to enable him to complete that portion of the railway back into his mining and pulpwood areas, and he has used that for the purpose of building back in that direction. I do not say this is objectionable, for even the building of that road would be valuable; but he has led a lot of people into the belief that he seriously intended to build the Manitoulin and North Shore, which I do not think he ever did. Now, we are proposing to give him a little help, for his railway back into the mining district. If he seriously intends to build it and will prosecute it, I do not say that it is objectionable, because it would do good to the locality.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Would not this pass near the Spanish River Pulp Company, and their large works going on at the present time?

Mr. DYMENT. Yes, they have a mile and a half built from the Canadian Pacific Railway to the Spanish River Pulp Company.

Mr. BROCK. I desire to make a suggestion. It is hardly likely that we can pass all these items to-night. When charters are applied for large maps are brought before the Railway Committee, showing where the road is to be built, the location of parallel roads, and so on. Would it be possible for the department, in view of these bonuses, to have these maps laid before the Committee of the Whole? In that way we could have a better idea of the situation than we can have from the small maps. For myself, I am very much at sea without this information, and I think a great many of us are in the same position.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Of course the charters of some of the roads to be subsidized were passed, not this session, but years ago. The maps may not be available. But, any that are available I will endeavour to bring down.

Mr. HENDERSON. Surely there must be something very wrong in the wording of this resolution. It is not intelligible to me. It says:

To the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company for a line of railway from Little Current, on its present line, to Sudbury, and thence towards the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

When you are at Sudbury you are on the main line.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have just had my attention drawn to that. It does seem somewhat unintelligible.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is being asked for by the solicitor of the company, and, I suppose, it is put in as he worded it. It would be as well, perhaps, to have it looked into to learn what the explanation is. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) have any objection to this being passed, with the understanding that it would be explained or amended on the third reading?

Mr. HENDERSON. I object to the passing of it on general principles.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. But now that the hon. gentleman's conscience is eased, and he knows that these votes are going through anyway, I would suggest that it is hardly worth while holding over a small item like this when we can pass it with the understanding that on the third reading it can be passed or explained.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is, give the government a roving commission to change the resolution, and they might make it apply to a railway to run to the moon. I would not like to say I would vote for a subsidy and leave it to the government——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Very well, let the item stand.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What the Minister of Public Works means is that when the Bill comes to its final stage in committee, we can make the correction, That is what my hon. friend proposes, not that the government should make it.

To the Thunder Bay, Nepigon and St. Joe Railway Company for a line of railway from Port Arthur north-easterly, not exceeding fifty miles.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This road will pass through a good farming district. I think Mr. Burke, of Port Arthur, is the leading promoter. We have telegrams from a number of representative persons in that neighbourhood asking for this subsidy. I have an application from the Board of Trade of Port Arthur in support of this subsidy.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). This is the best agricultural land in that whole region. The road runs away up north-east of Port Arthur. The people of that town deserve more credit than the people of any other town in the Dominion of Canada. At a time when the town was under the weather, and property was not paying half the interest on its value, the people stuck to their guns ; and now that they have put themselves into a good position they are anxious to get the northern part of that country opened up. Any assistance given to that locality will be money well spent.

Mr. HENDERSON. What subsidy or bonus has the provincial government given to this road ?

Mr. DYMENT. $2,000 a mile.

Mr. CLANCY. $2,000 in cash subsidy is given for the first 10 miles and a land grant of 5,000 acres per mile for the whole distance of 225 miles. Is this subsidy to be applied on the first 10 miles, for which the cash subsidy is given by the province of Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The information furnished to me does not state the number of miles. It states the government of Ontario have granted a subsidy, and I presume that our subsidy will cover the same mileage as far as it goes.

Mr. CLANCY. The subsidy granted by the province covers the first ten miles and the land grant the whole distance. This subsidy does not seem to be in conformity with one of the objects of the Grand Trunk Pacific, which was to be a colonization road from Quebec to Winnipeg. The hon. gentlemen are now opening up colonization roads running from Lake Superior northward into that country, and when we have voted these subsidies for five or six roads penetrating northward, we will convince the country that we are doing colonization business, and doing it in a more effective way than by the Grand Trunk Pacific. These roads running northward will furnish a better means of colonization than could a road running from Quebec to Winnipeg and which would only have an outlet at either end. I was glad to hear the Minister of Public Works declare that this was for colonization purposes, and for the purpose of taking out the products of that country. Now, in view of this policy of the government in promoting colonization by railroads running from the south northward, do they propose to abandon that feature of the transcontinental scheme, that feature which was to make it a colonization road ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid we cannot agree to abandon any part of that excellent scheme.

Some resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the hon. Minister of Finance tell us what business we will take up to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are some Bills and orders standing on the Paper which we desire to take up which will not likely occupy much time, and then we will proceed with the railway subsidies.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the hon. minister state when we may expect the resolution in regard to the Quebec bridge ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend will find that on the notice paper in the morning. It was sent upstairs some time ago, and it will appear in the Votes and Proceedings in the morning.

Mr. SPROULE. Have the government any further information to convey to the House relating to the Alaskan boundary ? It was announced that they would likely come to a decision this afternoon or to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. While it is Tuesday in London, it is hardly Tuesday here. We have no official information to give to my hon. friend.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12 o'clock midnight.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, October 20, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

ALASKAN BOUNDARY COMMISSION.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would draw the attention of the right hon. the First Minister to a despatch from New York stating that the Canadian commissioners refused to sign the award and that a cable

message was sent from the right hon. gentleman to England approving of their conduct. Has he any information to give the House ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have information that the award is to be signed to-day at noon, and that it will not be unanimous. More than that I have none. It goes without saying nobody will suppose that I would presume to communicate with the commissioners regarding their line of conduct.

Mr. SPROULE. In view of the despatch, I brought the matter to the notice of the right hon. gentleman.

REGISTRAR OF THE SUPREME COURT.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 268) respecting the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada. (The Minister of Justice.)

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). I propose that we reconsider clause 3, in order to meet the difficulty suggested by my hon. friend from Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) with respect to the salary of the registrar. He suggested that the registrar might, under clause 3, continue to receive the $600 now paid to him. for editing the Supreme Court Report. In order to avoid that, I would suggest that section 3 be struck out, and another substituted in its place. I beg to move, therefore :

That section 3 of the said Bill be struck out and the following substituted :—

3. The registrar shall, subject to the direction of the Minister of Justice oversee and direct the officers, clerks and employees appointed to the Supreme Court. He shall give his full time to the public service and shall not receive any pay, fee or allowance in any form of excess of the amount provided in this Act.

4. The provisions with respect to his salary and the receipt of any pay, fee or allowance contained in the preceding sections shall not apply to the present registrar until the conclusion of his engagement as one of the commissioners for the revision of the statutes of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the registrar not getting the $600 now ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. He gets $2,600 as salary, and $600 on Order in Council for reporting the judgments of the court. This $600 is voted in the Appropriation Act. The present Bill will not come into force until such time as the revision of the statutes is completed and his salary will remain as it is, namely $2,600 and $600. He is now in receipt besides of a salary of $1,200 for his work as one of the commissioners for revising the statutes. When that revision is completed, he will get the salary provided by this Bill.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will he continue to perform the same duties when he gets the increase as he is paid $600 now for doing?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, he will perform all the duties.

Amendment agreed to.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the effect of section 2 ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is the same provision as exists with respect to deputy ministers. His salary begins at $3,500, with an increase of $100 every year until it reaches $4,000. But every year he has been in office up to the present time counts. For instance, if he had been five years in office, when this Act comes into force, he will start at a maximum of $4,000. If he has been only four years in office he will start with $3,900, and so on. As he was appointed in 1898, he has served the five years, and he will be entitled at once to the $4,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I thought that under the Bill he was entitled to $3,500 now, his salary to be increased by $100 a year until he had reached a maximum of $4,000. But I find that under the hon. minister's interpretation he commences with $4,000.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Let me try to make the position clear. He is entitled to $3,500 as salary to begin with, and he is entitled to annual increases of $100 a year until he reaches the maximum of $4,000. But, if he has served one, two, three or five years, that service will count for the purpose of increasing his salary. So, if he has served for two years his salary will be $3,700, if three years his salary will be $3,800 and so on. This is the general principle. But it is provided also that the Bill shall not become applicable to the registrar of the Supreme Court until such time as he shall cease to act as one of the commissioners for the revision of the statutes. So, until he has ceased to act in that capacity he will remain as at present, in receipt of a salary of $3,200.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then, this revision of the statute will be finished in about six months or a year.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. A year, I suppose.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then, he goes at once to the maximum of this Bill ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Well, I protest against this multiplying of offices and this making of deputy heads where there is no need for it. And, as to the position of registrar of the Supreme Court, I do not think that the qualification required for such an officer justifies the paying of such a salary as that which is paid in this case.

On section 4,

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What does this officer get paid for revising the statutes ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Twelve hundred dollars.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. So, he is in receipt of $4,000 now ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. A little more than $4,000.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 3) to amend the Dominion Elections Act.

On section 2,

2. The Dominion Elections Act, 1900, is amended by inserting the following immediately after section 9 :—

Compulsory Voting.

9a. Any person who does not vote at an election at which he is qualified to vote shall be disfranchised for a term of six years from the date of such election.

2. No person shall, however, be disfranchised if he has been prevented from voting by illness or by absence from the electoral district, if he did not absent himself therefrom in order that he might avoid voting, or if more than one election was being held at the same time and such person voted in some other electoral district where he was qualified to vote : Provided always that a judge of any court of record, upon being satisfied that any person entitled to vote had any other good and sufficient reason for not voting, may grant such person a certificate of enfranchisement annulling the disenfranchisement, which certificate may be in the form KK.

3. Any person who, while disfranchised under the provisions of this section, votes or attempts to vote in any electoral district, shall be guilty of an indictable offence and shall be liable to a fine of not less than one hundred dollars and costs and not exceeding two hundred dollars and costs, or, in default of payment of such fine and costs, to imprisonment for any term not exceeding six months and not less than three months, with or without hard labour.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). That is a section that it will be almost impossible to have adopted at the present time. I think it is far in advance of public opinion, and I see no reason why we should make the exercise of the franchise compulsory. It is a privilege which may be exercised by an individual according to what he considers right or wrong, and I do not see why we should compel a man to vote.

Mr. FOWLER. The same argument would apply to any offence. A man may have so elastic a conscience that he would want to take money for his vote, but I suppose the hon. minister would not make the man's conscience the guide and final appeal in such a matter, nor would he relieve him from punishment because the man's conscience cleared him of offence against that particular law. As to this section being in advance of public opinion, I do not know that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) has brought forward any argument to show that. It seems to me that it is the most direct and most effective way of arriving at what the whole House professes to be anxious to arrive at—greater purity in elections.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. While it is considered very desirable that every elector should cast his vote at election time, I believe that the principle of compulsory voting is altogether undesirable. At the same time, I must call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that we manage to protect the elector who, because of conscientious scruple, does not wish to cast his vote. In Manitoba, in the preparation of the voters' list, every voter has to apply to register his name on the list, and only those whose names are registered are entitled to vote. We have a large class of people in Manitoba and also a number in the North-west who, because of conscientious scruple, will not vote. These people do not register their names, and, therefore, are not called upon to vote. Notwithstanding we attain the object in Manitoba, by the preparation of our voters' lists, of protecting those who on account of religious scruples do not wish to vote or cannot vote. But if we adopt the principle of compulsory voting we would put those people in a very awkward position, because they cannot vote.

Mr. FOWLER. This does not affect those people. If they do not want to vote they are simply struck off the list. There is no punishment inflicted upon them.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. But the same circumstances do not exist in the other provinces. Those who are entitled to vote, whether they wish to do so or not, are put on the list, and if they are put on the list against their wish they would be compelled to vote.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Justice says that the exercise of voting is a privilege. It is more than that. The man who votes is a trustee, he has to exercise a trust, not only for himself, but for a great many others in the community who have no votes. They ought, therefore, to exercise it one way or the other. It is not a privilege conferred upon a person that he may exercise as he pleases ; it is a duty that he owes to the rest of the community, it is a trust with which he is clothed. He not only exercises it for himself, but he exercises it for others in the community who have no vote. The franchise may be a limited one. There is a certain class of females in the community who have no votes ; he has to exercise that trust for them, and why should he not be forced to exercise it ? If, when he comes to the

poll, he finds there is no difference between the two parties or between the two candidates, if he has no choice between them, he may put in a blank ballot. But surely it is his duty when he is entrusted with the franchise, not only for himself, but for others, to exercise that franchise.

Mr. FRASER. He is acting like a hypocrite if he puts in a blank ballot.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No such a thing. There may be no difference between the two candidates. But there is a better plan than that. The Minister of Finance, in speaking upon this Bill, drew attention to the prevalence of corrupt practices in this country. We want to do away with those corrupt practices. One of the chief modes of exercising corrupt practices is the expenditure of money to get parties to vote, to use that trust with which the community have entrusted them—not the exercise of a privilege, as the Minister of Justice says, but the fulfilment of a duty. We want to bring them to the polls, and in order to do that, what is the best plan ? I have thought over the subject for the last twenty years. I have been opposed to the principle which has been advocated in this House again and again in favour of compulsory voting, but I have come to the conclusion that there are only two methods of doing away with corruption, of doing away with the frauds that are practiced in elections, and which are too prevalent at the present day, and those two modes are compulsory voting and open voting.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Open voting is all right.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am in favour of open voting. I am in favour of compelling a man who has a trust to exercise it one way or the other in favour of one candidate or the other ; and if he has no choice between them, let him go to the polls and declare, by putting in a blank ballot, that neither of the candidates are satisfactory to him.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is a purely academic question to discuss whether the franchise is a right or a privilege. Whether it be a right or a privilege it can be exercised in two ways, by abstention as well as by casting a vote. The system of government which we enjoy, and which we all recognize is the very best that can be devised by man for the government of man, is the party system. It is impossible to carry on the government of the country except by party organizations. What has been our universal experience ? We know it happens sometimes that a man is not satisfied with the conduct of the party which he has usually supported ; still he has no confidence in the other party. His conscience will not allow him to go with his own party, because he is not satisfied with certain acts they have committed ; he wants to mark his disapproval, he has a right to mark his disapproval, of those acts, and the best and most effective method by which he can do so is to refuse to vote. There is not a gentleman in this House who has not seen examples of that kind. A party candidate cannot bring to the polls to support him some members of his own party because they think their party has been guilty of some action of which they disapprove, which was not in line with the general policy of that party. Under such circumstances may not one, or three, or four, or twenty, of the most respectable citizens in a community openly mark their dissent from their own party by abstaining from voting ? They have a right to say, we will not vote for you, neither can we vote for the other side, for we do not believe in them ; therefore, we do not propose to vote at all on this occasion. Now is that not a legitimate manner of exercising the right of franchise? Is that not one of the highest, most moral and most effective methods of asserting his independence under the circumstances ? More than that, it has been found to be effective upon every occasion that it has been exercised. Under such circumstances you cannot say that you will compel a man to give his vote, compel him to commit a hypocritical action, in going to the polls and casting a blank ballot. I believe that under the circumstances a man has a right to say : I will not vote on this occasion, I say so openly and above-board, I will not vote, neither will I vote for the other side, because I do not believe in their policy ; therefore, I will stay at home. I appeal to the conscience of every man opposite, I appeal particularly to the conscience of my hon. friend from King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler), who has taken a warm part in the discussion of this question, I appeal to him whether he thinks it is right to force a man to vote under these circumstances. True it is that if we allow this privilege of abstention we may not reach a certain class of electors who want to be bribed. Well, let me say that so far as my experience goes—I will not speak of cities of which I have not much experience—but so far as the rural part of the community is concerned the number of electors who are accessible to bribes is very small, is infinitesimal. You will always find a certain proportion of the electors who are ready to take bribes, but the great mass of the electors vote according to their conscience, according to their sense of duty, according to their usual party affiliations. Of course, there are exceptions, there are always a certain number who will wait to the last moment to vote. We have the five o'clock man, we have the four and a half o'clock man, who will hold back his vote to the last moment, waiting for the highest bidder. If you were to have compulsory voting, and this class of men had to go to the polls, do you think they would be any the less ready to take a bribe ? They would

take it a little earlier, that is all. They would not wait for the highest bidder, but they would take the first one that offered. For my part, I think the method we have at present is the best and the most manly that we can devise.

Mr. FOWLER. I agree with what the right hon. gentleman has said as to the small number of persons in rural constituencies who can be approached by the briber, but unfortunately there are enough of them in most of the constituencies to make the difference between victory and defeat. They hold the balance of power. There are honest men in both parties, and they are the great mass. The very great mass of the electorate, I believe, are honest voters, who cannot be approached in that way. But unfortunately there are a number in almost every constituency that can be handled, and when they all go one way, or the majority of them go one way, that way is apt to be the way that decides the election. That is the class we want to get at. Now the difficulty with the argument of the Premier is that he does not seem to perceive the principle which I think is the true principle, that the right to vote is a trust. As the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has pointed out, it is not only a trust for himself, but for others who are not voters, for minors and for females who have not the franchise. No trustee can exercise a trust by abstaining from fulfilling its terms; that is entirely contrary to the doctrine of trusts. What right has any man to decide at a mere whim of his own whether he shall exercise his trust or not? We have in this country the system of party government, and the voter has the right to select from either one of these parties, but I cannot agree with the doctrine laid down by the Prime Minister that an abstention from voting is an exercise of the trust vested in the elector.

Mr. EMMERSON. Elections are frequently held on Saturday. There is a large body of Christians in the maritime provinces, and particularly in the county of Albert, which I represented for a number of years in the local house, who, when elections are held on Saturday, absolutely refuse to vote, owing to religious scruples. These are the Adventists, who are to be found in large numbers in Albert and in Carleton and a great many other counties throughout New Brunswick. This is a country of religious liberty, and however much we may disagree with their views they are entitled to recognition, they are entitled to liberty of conscience, and it seems to me that it would be manifestly unfair if we were to impose upon these people penalties for not voting.

Mr. FOWLER. Why could this difficulty not be obviated by not holding elections on Saturday?

Mr. EMMERSON. That would be simply absurd.

Mr. FOWLER. Thursday would do as well.

Mr. EMMERSON. Elections may be held on Saturday; there is no statute preventing elections being held on that day, and in selecting a day these matters are not always borne in mind. It may be more convenient, in fact it frequently is more convenient, in the interests of the lumbermen, especially in New Brunswick, to hold elections on Saturday, because on other days they are in the woods and are unable to get out until Saturday. The fishermen also are away all week, but come home on Saturday in time to vote and are able to spend Sunday at home.

Mr. FOWLER. Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) read section 2, which gives the judge power to excuse a man for his non-voting? The reason advanced by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) would be an excellent reason, and the judge would excuse him.

Mr. EMMERSON. I recognize what is in the law as well as does my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler), but I recognize also that it would be a manifest injustice to impose on each of these men the duty of appearing before the judge, with the expense it would involve and the unfair position in which you place him by compelling him to go to a judge and make excuses for the exercise of his religious scruples. Such a law would be unfair in every respect, and not in accord with the constitutional rights we enjoy in this Dominion.

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville.) (Translation). I fear, Mr. Speaker, that in discussing this question in the manner we are doing now, we are somewhat losing too much sight of the real interests of the country. It should not be forgotten that electors who abstain from voting because there is no law to compel them to do so, are not a desirable class of voters. Considered in that light, the question is an easy one to solve. To my mind, voters who do not think it worth while to go to the polling booth are not, as a rule, enlightened people, well informed as regards the matters upon which they are expected to express an opinion, or else they are not honest people. Now, while the present system may not give the best results as regards the number of votes registered, it ensures, on the other hand, better quality. What we lose in numbers is made up by the better quality. I believe that the general interests of the country would be better served by those painstaking and honest voters who go to the polling booth of their own free will, than they could possibly be by those ignorant or dishonest voters whom it is the purpose to compel to vote under penalty of law. What would be the value of a popular verdict with a majority of voters lacking in education or honesty, a sort of compulsory universal suffrage? By

means of the system in force to-day what we lose in numbers we make up in quality.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It seems to me that this House has forgotten the premises on which we started to frame this election Act. The question of drafting an Act of this kind was submitted to a committee on the advice of the Minister of Finance. In recommending this course to the House the hon. the Minister of Finance stated that unfortunately corrupt practices prevailed extensively throughout the community, and he invited all parties in the House to join together for the purpose of doing away with such practices; that was the premise upon which we started. If the premise is not correct, if, as the right hon. gentleman who leads the House stated, corrupt practices do not extensively prevail, especially in rural districts, what was the object of the statement of the hon. the Finance Minister, or why was the Bill introduced? The very suggestion which we are now considering was made by the hon. Minister of Finance to do away with corrupt practices. He said that perhaps one of the most effective means of doing away with such practices was compulsory voting. We agree with him and we have joined with the government for the purpose of drafting a Bill to the best of our ability and of presenting an acceptable Bill to the House. If these practices prevail in the community, as the hon. Minister of Finance states, and as I believe they do, I am with him in stating that one of the most effective means of preventing these practices is compulsory voting, and I believe, as I stated before, that the committee should have gone a step further and recommended open voting. If a man is bribed, you can then ascertain that fact, because you know what his convictions were up to the moment of his voting. If he votes contrary to what he has been stating and talking in the past you become suspicious. Open voting is an effective means of bringing corruption and bribery home to the individual. It would also avoid the enormous expense to which every one of us is put in bringing to the polls those whom the people of the country entrusted with a trust, and who ought to be there without our having to expend money to bring them there. Most of the corrupt practices that are committed are not in the form of direct bribery of a voter, but in the expenditure of money to convey him to the polls to exercise his trust. And why should he not exercise it? As my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) says, it is a trust which the voter exercises for a number of persons in the community. If it is a trust he ought to exercise it in some manner or give an excuse for not exercising it, just as any other person invested with the trust would have to do. For these reasons, I think the Minister of Justice and the government ought to support the Bill or show some other means of accomplishing the same purpose of doing away with these corrupt practices which the Finance Minister stated extensively prevail in a community, and to prevent which he suggested this conference between the two parties. Surely these practices have not ceased in the community since his statement. And why was there not an agreement in the statements of the Finance Minister and of the right hon. gentleman who leads the government? Why did not the Prime Minister say that the Finance Minister was mistaken, and that it was his experience that corrupt practices did not prevail extensively in Canada? We took it as voicing the opinion, not only of the government, but of the members on that side of the House, that there should be an agreement between both parties that an end should be put to the practices which every one of us knows extensively prevail in the community. If this is not a remedy, it is for the government to suggest one. What remedy do the government propose for these corrupt practices if they do not accept the recommendation of the committee? Let them do something to prevent these corrupt practices, the existence of which is notorious.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If these corrupt practices to which the hon. gentleman has referred really exist in the community, I venture to suggest that this proposal is no remedy at all for that evil. It is not a remedy for an existing evil to substitute another evil in its place, and I would consider it a very great evil indeed to enact any legislation that would have the effect of invading in any respect the conscientious convictions of any element in this community. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) says that the evil exists, in the fact that men are paid to keep away from the polls.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. For bringing them to the polls.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. And he suggests as a remedy for that evil that men should be forced to go to the polls.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In what respect is that a remedy? If a man is paid not to go to the poll, he may be forced to come to the poll under this Bill, and when he goes there he can deposit his blank ballot, or he can spoil the ballot. You might know that he had gone to the poll, and so far had given you consideration for the price you have given; but if he spoiled his ballot or did not mark it, he would not have voted all the same. Whether he stays away and does not vote, or whether he goes to the poll and deposits a blank ballot, he has not voted in either case. In what respect then is this compulsory voting a remedy. I maintain that this proposal is in advance of public opinion in this country. This is not the only country where constitutional freedom exists and where

the people have the right of franchise; but of all other countries, only in Belgium does compulsory voting exist. Why have they not adopted it in England, why have they not adopted it in the United States, why have they not adopted it in any of these countries where a free franchise exists. I contend that this is no remedy for the evil.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What remedy do you suggest ?

Mr. MONET. Good example ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We followed the example of the Minister of Finance.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Educate the public up to understand the franchise and the privilege of the franchise ; allow the education that is going on now to continue for a few years more, and then you will have a remedy. The whole world knows that the corruption that was so rampant years ago is fast disappearing. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) knows that his friends on that side of the House are no more unanimous than we are on this subject; of that we have had evidence this morning. This is not a party question ; it is a question on which men are free to express their opinions, independently altogether of party considerations. I said that we were proceeding on a wrong principle ; we are proceeding on the principle that the franchise is a duty, when it is nothing of the sort. No one of the books that discuss this question look on it in any such light.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Every one of them.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Every one of them is a vague statement, but I have some of them here.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Oh, no.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Let the hon. gentleman bear with me a moment. My hon. friend must not make a broad statement as to 'every one of them,' and then run away from the answer. Woolsey, on 'Political Science' (page 388, vol. 1, pars. 5 to 127), discusses this question, and he says :

> Voting is a privilege, it involves for the most part a duty ; to enforce it by penalty would not comport with the nature of a privilege.

I also refer the hon. gentleman to the 'Forum,' vol. 14, page 176 : 'Venal Voting; Methods and Remedies,' where we find the same principle; and also to Leckny on 'Democracy and Liberty,' vol. 1, page 226, where we find the same principle laid down. In any event, independently altogether of considerations of political ethics, I say that it is an infringement of the principle of personal liberty to enact compulsory voting, and on that ground I oppose it.

Mr. FOWLER. If Mr. Woolsey or any other man says that it does not comport with a duty to enforce it by a penalty, he is talking utter rot and utter nonsense.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. FOWLER. He is talking something that is against the views accepted by the whole world.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) ought not to make rash statements of that sort. Woolsey did not say it was a duty; he said it was a privilege.

Mr. FOWLER. If the minister will read the quotation again, he will find that Woolsey says : It is a privilege which carries with it a duty. These are the words of Dr. Woolsey, as the minister read them, and Woolsey goes further, according to the quotation read and says : that to enforce a duty——

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. He does not say anything of the sort ; he says : to enforce a privilege.

Mr. FOWLER. Then read it again, please.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) ought not to be too severe on Mr. Woolsey. This is what he says :

> To enforce it by penalty would not comport with the nature of a privilege.

And he says :

> That voting is a privilege which involves for the most part a duty.

Mr. FOWLER. That is just exactly what I said.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, I said that it was a privilege which involved a duty, and the absurdity of Woolsey's contention is that it was wrong to enforce a duty because a privilege was involved in it. The very foundation of a franchise is that it is a duty as well as a privilege. All cannot exercise the franchise, but some must, and therefore it is the privilege of those who are selected to exercise it. Therefore, some enjoy the privilege of the franchise, but coupled with that privilege is the highest duty of citizenship, which is to exercise that privilege, and to exercise it properly and conscientiously. Therefore, a man has not the natural right to the franchise, but enjoying that privilege, being selected to exercise the franchise, not only for himself but for all others in the community who have not the right of the franchise, it carries with it the highest duty to the state, viz.: that he shall actually exercise it, not abstain from exercising it according to his own will, but that he shall be absolutely compelled to exercise it. No matter what party he votes for, he is fully and completely bound to discharge that duty which he owes to the state. As the Minister of Justice has said :

this is not a party question. Members on both sides of the House are divided in opinion as to the wisdom of the amendment. The special committee was divided on this particular question; some of us felt that while this proposal did not perhaps fully answer the purpose we were striving for, yet it would go some way in that direction, and others of the committee thought that it would be found unworkable. That seems to be the idea which prevails in this Committee of the Whole—the difference being that the majority here are apparently opposed to it, while the majority in the special committee were in favour of it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. How did you divide?

Mr. FOWLER. I think there was a majority of one; we didn't have any very serious dispute over it. At the same time, while I am of opinion that this will be beneficial in its working, yet I am not so anxious about it that I would detain the House at this very late stage of the session in advocating at length this principle.

Mr. GALLIHER. I would like to point out to my hon. friend that whatever duty may be involved in this privilege is a moral duty and that it is repugnant to all principles of law to enforce by a penalty a moral obligation.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The Minister of Justice has just stated that it appertains to the functions of government to educate the public mind to the value of their privileges in this connection. I cannot conceive of any better or more forcible method of educating the public mind to their great privilege in the use of the franchise than the legislation embodied in this Bill. It cannot be a penalty to deprive any man of a right which he possesses, simply because he refuses to exercise that right. The man who refuses to exercise the right to vote, practically disfranchises himself by his own free act. It has been argued that neither Great Britain nor the United States have adopted legislation of this kind. Are we always, as a young, virile nation, to go in leading strings? Are we never to make a beginning, to lead the world in anything? I look forward to the time when Canada will be one of the leading nations of the world, when it will be leading the thought of the world, in the direction of the greater progress and higher civilization than has ever before been realized; and I look upon this measure as a step in the right direction.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). In order to avoid corrupt practices at an election, all we have to do is to pass a law making it a criminal offence to contribute one cent towards an election fund. If there were no money there would be no bribery. Consequently all you have to do is to make it so that no man shall have a fund to purchase votes or to keep men from voting. Then every man will go and vote as he pleases. We find that governments are under the control of large corporations. These corporations supply a large amount of funds —what for? For the purpose of bribing the electors, so that they may carry their point; and the government acquiesce in this, I tell you, and I tell you emphatically, it is time we put this thing down; and the only way it can be done is by making it a criminal offence to contribute towards an election fund. There would be no difficulty about compulsory voting if men did not get money to go and vote. But while we have only two parties in the state, and men have to vote for one or the other, they hesitate about voting at all, it some times happens that both parties stink in their nostrils, and they are disgusted to have to vote for them. If they had an opportunity to vote for some independent man of their own feelings and sympathies, they would not need to be urged to vote. We had better start right now. Let the Minister of Justice insert a clause in this Bill that any man who contributes a dollar to an election fund shall get six months in jail and a fine of $1,000. With regard to what my hon. friend from South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) says about going back to the old system of open voting I think that is played out. It would not do at all in this country. We must have a ballot, not to protect me or the hon. member for South Lanark, because we do not care who knows how we vote. But there are thousands of men in this country whose bread and butter depend on their employer not knowing how they vote, and we must protect these men. With regard to registration, if you make it compulsory on every man to go to a notary public or a registrar and register his name, his age and his place of residence, just as you compel him to register the birth of his child, the death of his father or a marriage ceremony, there will be nothing arbitrary about it. Then make it penal if he does not vote; at least disfranchise him for the next election which is penalty enough. Then, make it a penal offence for any man to contribute money to an election fund. I could give you some of my experience.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Give it.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). It is not necessary. I tell you it is sadder than anything you can think of at the time of an election to see thousands of dollars brought into a constituency to bribe the electors. Everybody knows it is done, and why don't you try to stop it? You can do it by preventing the fund being created.

Mr. BARKER. As a member of the committee to which this Bill was referred, I have been very much struck by the somewhat remarkable change in the temper with which the measure was received when first introduced by the hon. member for North Nor-

folk (Mr. Charlton) and that with which it is received to-day. At that time a good deal was made by the hon. member for North Norfolk of the evil, of which we all hear so much during election times, of men holding back their votes until the last minute, in the desire to sell them to the highest bidder. I do not recollect that any hon. gentleman on either side of the House at that time disputed the existence of that evil. It seemed to be generally assented to that such an evil existed, that it was a serious one, and that if possible some remedy should be found for it. To-day we find quite a different attitude taken towards it especially by hon. gentlemen opposite. We have one gentleman who feels that this clause of the Bill would do a great injustice, because it happened in one province of this Dominion that an election was held upon a Saturday, and the Adventists refused to vote on that day. Well, the hon. gentleman supports that by saying that it may be convenient in that province to hold elections upon a Saturday. I am under the impression that the elections are held throughout the Dominion on the same day, and I think it would not be convenient for all the rest of the Dominion to hold the election upon a Saturday, and therefore it is a very remote possibility indeed that we shall ever have one election for the Dominion held upon a Saturday, or that the Adventists will suffer on that account. Another hon. gentleman minimizes the number of people who hold back for the purpose of selling their votes. He thinks there are very few, and points out that the great mass of the people are honest and give their votes honestly. I do not dispute that; but I think every gentleman in this House will admit that there are quite sufficient of those who hold back their votes to overbalance the majority in almost every constituency of the Dominion. I do not refer to the cases where very large majorities are obtained. But in the large mass of cases there is a comparatively small majority, and I think it is the general experience that a sufficient number of people hold back until nearly five o'clock to turn that majority in the one direction or the other. Then another great objection which is urged to the clause is that it is an outrage to compel a man to vote against his convictions. For instance, a man might be opposed to both candidates, and it would be wrong to punish him because he did not vote for either. But there is nothing to prevent such a man from depositing a blank ballot. The hon. the Minister of Justice tells us that this is an infringement upon civil liberty. But where is the harm of saying to a man who refuses to turn out and vote or even deposit a blank ballot, that if he does not perform that duty which he owes to the public he shall be left off the list for a certain number of years? Then we had a learned discussion as to whether the right to vote was a mere privilege or a trust or a duty. I doubt whether any one will dispute that it is a duty incumbent on every man, who is protected in his civil rights by society and the laws of the land, to vote for the proper men to represent the people in parliament; and I say if he will not perform that obligation, which he owes to society, the right should be taken from him unless he has some reasonable excuse for not exercising it. While I do not believe it possible to provide a complete remedy, this will provide a remedy to some extent and ought to be given at least a trial.

Mr. BELCOURT. No doubt the evil of bribery and corruption is more or less prevalent in Canada, though possibly it may be less prevalent in the rural parts than in the city constituencies, and we would no doubt all welcome a substantial and effective remedy. I do not believe, however, that the remedy proposed by section A is a remedy at all. In my opinion we ought only to impose penalties when dealing with offences per se, things which are of themselves criminal, immoral, unjust or dishonest, and we should not impose a penalty for the mere omission to perform a duty, however necessary the performance of that duty may be. The legislation now proposed is on a line with that kind of legislation by which you try to make people sober, temperate, religious, patriotic, or honest, by Act of parliament. The hon. member for King's, P.E.I. (Mr. Fowler), when dealing with the objection that there is quite a number of people, if we are to believe the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), who have conscientious scruples against voting, compared the refusal to vote to the taking of a bribe. But there is a very great difference between the two. The taking of a bribe is an offence against honesty and conscience and quite another matter from the non-performance of a duty, especially when there are conscientious scruples against its performance. Parliament has never questioned the right or the propriety of proposing penalties for the taking of a bribe, but I do not think that even the most ardent advocate of compulsory voting ever proposed that a man should be sent to jail for not going to the polls. My idea of the only solution is the one indicated by the hon. the Minister of Justice, and that is education. The only way in which you can awaken the public conscience to the performance of a duty is to enlighten that conscience, and you can only do that by constantly putting before the electors the great importance and the sacred obligations of casting their ballot at election time. But, if you deprive a man for any number of years of his franchise because at any election he has not cast his vote, you might as well make a law providing that any one who has been asked to become a candidate for parliament shall not have the privilege of refusing, under penalty of being debarred during a term of

years from coming forward as a candidate. If a man is to be punished for not casting his vote, he should equally be punished for refusing to become a candidate. Then the remedy which section 9a provides is a very peculiar remedy. You declare that it is an offence not to vote, and in order to punish the man who has committed that offence, you compel him to go on committing it during six years longer. That seems to me very contradictory. It is a very poor way of curing one to compel him to remain in his offence for another six years.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question ? Does the hon. gentleman think the law against crime does not prevent crime ?

Mr. BELCOURT. You have a law against bribery, and my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson)——

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). We want to make that law strong.

Mr. BELCOURT. But I am pointing out that the measure proposed will not have that effect, that it is not a remedy for the evil, the existence of which we all admit. If my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) has a remedy, let us have it.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I have given you my remedy.

Mr. BELCOURT. I repeat that, in my opinion, the solution of this question is education. And I think it devolves upon all of us who are engaged in public affairs constantly to educate the people on the subject. During election time particularly, every member of this House should do what he can to make the people appreciate the franchise and the sacred obligations devolving upon those who enjoy it. If we do our duty in this regard, we shall prevent a great deal of the bribery that now prevails, at any rate we shall do a great deal more than by a provision of this kind which, it seems to me, means absolutely nothing.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Belcourt) says it is a very strange thing to provide that, because a man refuses to vote or abstains from voting you should take away from him the privilege of voting and so continue him in his crime. If we accept the doctrine, which is the doctrine of the schools, that the vote is a privilege and a duty, and that the voter is a trustee not only for himself but for all the people, the Bill is logical and perfectly proper. For, if a trustee neglects to perform his trust what do you do ? Do you continue him in his trust ? No, you remove him. The answer to the hon. gentleman's argument is so patent that I wonder it did not strike him.

Mr. SCHELL. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) allow me to ask him a question ? Is the voter a trustee for any one except himself ?

Mr. BELCOURT.

Mr. FOWLER. Certainly. The body of voters are trustees for all the rest of the community. The voting privilege is not for the voters themselves alone, but for all the non-voters in the community as well. That is the true principle, that is the only principle that is contended for by any person. Any one who has given any study to the subject will not attempt to deny that the voter is a trustee for the non-voters. So, the committee were perfectly logical in providing to have the trustee removed for a portion of the time because of his——

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). Will my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) permit me ? He removes a trustee. But who is to replace the trustee during these six years ? If nobody replaces him the parties are abandoned and their interests are no more represented.

Mr. FOWLER. He is not sole trustee.

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). The mandate of the trustee is revoked. Who, then is to take his place ?

Mr. FOWLER. He is not the sole trustee; there are all the other voters. Why, the principle is recognized every day. If you have three trustees and one of them defaults, will not he be removed from the trust ? And if he is removed does it necessarily follow that another will be put in his place ? Suppose there are three executors; one dies and the other two continue in their places; a second dies and one remains as sole executor.

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). I suppose the voter represents the interests of his family. If he is removed, who is to represent them ?

Mr. FOWLER. My hon. friend (Mr. Demers) loses the point entirely. The voter is the trustee not for his particular family or friends, but he is the joint trustee, with all the other voters in the community, for the community.

Mr. MONET. What about different parties then ?

Mr. FOWLER. The trustee has the right to exercise his trust as seems to him best, of course. My hon. friend betrays an absolute ignorance of the whole subject by his question.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the legal gentlemen in the House discussing this question mainly from a legal standpoint. I thought that, perhaps, I might contribute a little from the layman's standpoint. I think there is no hon. member in this House who would approach any measure designed to remove from the community the slur that is cast upon it, through the existence of bribery in any other spirit than that of regard for the public interest. And it is in that spirit that I approach the discussion of this mea-

sure. The trend of legislation in the province of Ontario, from which I come, has been in the direction of extending the franchise. I well remember when no one could vote for a member of the House of Commons unless he had what is called a stake in the community. Now, we have municipal voters who vote on property only, we have also the manhood franchise, which extends the suffrage practically to everyone over twenty-one years of age who is a British subject. This has been done during a series of years, and during that time there have been great struggles for the extension of the franchise. It has come to this perfection; and now it is sought by this Bill, to restrict the franchise to a certain extent. I am sure that every hon. gentleman here would hail with gladness legislation wisely framed to prevent bribery and ensure a free and fair expression of public opinion. But, as against this proposal of compulsory voting, we have heard of people who have conscientious scruples against voting. These scruples may arise in the course of one election to prevent a man from voting, while, in the next election, the difficulty being removed, he would feel himself free to vote. The Prime Minister gave one case in illustration. I have one in mind that came within my own experience some years ago. I was working in a certain election, and, about an hour before the closing of the poll, it was reported to me that a certain prominent Liberal had not voted. I went to him to ask his reason for remaining away from the polls. He said to me: 'William, I cannot vote in this election.' He had been my school teacher and was an old and very highly respected member of the community, a man concerning whom nobody would for a moment think that any illicit means had been used to keep him from the polls. I asked his reasons for not voting, and he said: 'On one question I cannot agree with the party——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Temperance.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). No, not temperance. 'On one question I cannot agree with the party, and for that reason I cannot see my way to vote in this election.' That man had a conscientious scruple about using his franchise in that particular election. Surely under these circumstances, you would not disfranchise a man for six years. For my part I would not think of it. This is only one instance, and I think every member will recall similar instances in his own experience. I agree with the Minister of Justice that this legislation is rather in advance of public opinion, and the best thing would be to drop it from the Bill. While there may be some things to commend it—and I must say that some of the things that have been repeated here in its support commend themselves to my judgment—still, I think public opinion is not ready for this legislation.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Inasmuch as the Finance Minister took a strong stand on the other side, and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) also, I think the House is entitled to know why both of these gentlemen are absent.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The motion is that this clause do stand as part of the Bill.

Motion negatived.

On section 3,

Mr. EMMERSON. There are no great objections to this section from the standpoint of the province of New Brunswick, but I can understand that there are objections from some of the other provinces. There would be technical objections as well. I think it may be that where there are constituencies consisting of two counties, it would be necessary to explain as to which sheriff or registrar should be selected.

Section not agreed to.

On section 6,

6. Section 21 of the said Act is amended by inserting after the word 'lists' in the third line thereof the words 'and of an abstract of the offences and penalties under this Act.'

2. Section 26 of the said Act is amended by inserting after the word 'proclamation' in the first line thereof the words 'and the abstract of the offences and penalties under this Act.'

3. Paragraph (f) of subsection 1 of section 41 of the said Act is repealed, and the following is substituted therefor:—

'(f.) furnish each deputy returning officer with at least ten copies of printed directions in the form L, for the guidance of voters in voting, and at least ten copies of the abstract of the printed directions and abstract the deputy returning officer shall, before or at the opening of the poll, on the day of polling, cause to be posted up in some conspicuous places outside of the polling stations, and also in each compartment of the polling station.'

4. The following section is inserted immediately after section 26 of the said Act:—

26a. Within the shortest possible time after the reception of the writ, the returning officer shall send by mail to each elector upon the voters' list a copy of the abstract of the offences and penalties under this Act, which abstract shall be carried in the mails post free; and in the province of Prince Edward Island the returning officer shall send a sufficient number of copies of the said abstract to each postmaster within the electoral district and it shall be the duty of each postmaster to deliver a copy to each elector to whom any mail matter is delivered.

2. Any postmaster who wilfully neglects or refuses promptly to deliver to the electors any such abstracts shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding fifty dollars and costs to any person who sues therefor: Provided however that this penalty shall not be imposed more than once for each election at which such neglect takes place.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I move that paragraph 4 of section 6 be struck out. I have consulted the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and the King's Printer, and they

both tell me that it is absolutely impossible to apply that section, that it would be out of the question for the returning officer to send to all the electors on the electoral list a copy of these offences, or an abstract of the same. There are districts in which there are eight, or ten, or twenty thousand electors, and to attempt to do such a thing would take up all the time the returning officer has at his disposal.

Mr. FOWLER. He does not do this work by himself, he has a clerk to do it.

Mr. BARKER. I think subclause (f) should be struck out.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think subclause (f) is a useful clause, and it would be an improvement on the Bill if we were to adopt it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not think there is any need for furnishing each deputy returning officer with ten copies of the printed directions as clause (f) requires him to do. What is the use of sending each deputy returning officer ten copies ? I think the thing is absurd, and we ought to strike out the whole clause. I move in amendment that the whole clause be struck out.

Mr. FOWLER. The idea of sending ten copies was that they might be well circulated throughout the polling district.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think this is exceedingly useful for the purpose of bringing to the notice of the electors when they go to the polls for the purpose of registering their votes, the penalties to which they are subjected, and also the general requirements of the election law. I think it is very desirable.

Mr. KAULBACH. I think the Minister of Justice is perfectly right. There should be some instructions to guide the voters when they go to the polls.

Amendment to the amendment (Mr. Campbell) negatived.

Amendment (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) agreed to.

Mr. HENDERSON. I drew the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that I thought there was something wrong in the wording of this first amendment. I would ask the Minister of Justice if he has ascertained how these words would fit in with the statute as it now exists ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Would the hon. gentleman repeat the objection he made the other day ?

Mr. HENDERSON. I have not before me the Act we are amending, but my recollection is that I found some error in the drafting of this Bill, in fact it was admitted by the Minister of Finance the other day when we had this Bill up. The section we are amending reads :

Hon. Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Immediately after the issue of the writ of election the clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall transmit to the returning officer a sufficient number of copies of the voters' list.

Now after that we are to add :

And an abstract of the offences and penalties under this Act.

The section would then read thus :

A sufficient number of copies of the voters' list and of an abstract of offences and penalties under this Act if there are any.

Now it looked to me as if the words 'if there be any' certainly applied not to the voters' list but to the abstract of offences.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think that is intended to apply to the province of Prince Edward Island, where they do not have voters' lists and of course the clerk of the Crown in Chancery could not furnish the deputy returning officer with the voters' list.

Mr. BARKER. The amendment might come in the fourth line of section 21 after the word 'Act' so that it would read :

Immediately after the issue of the writ of election the clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall transmit to the returning officer a sufficient number of copies of the voters' list, if there are any, one copy of this Act and of the abstract of offences and penalties under this Act and of such instructions, and so on.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I moved in amendment that section 6 be struck out and I would like to know what has become of the motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell) must have been speaking to some motion. The members of the committee will remember that I put Mr. Campbell's motion that the whole of section 6 be struck out and that motion was lost.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I move that the clause as amended be struck out.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman surely does not require me to tell him two or three times that when a motion is made to strike out an amendment and the committee reject it he cannot repeat the same motion.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I understood that the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) moved that part of section 21 of clause 6 be struck out and in amendment to that I move that the whole section as amended be struck out. It is not the same motion as I made before, because the clause has been amended.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. In my opinion it is substantially the same thing. The committee have accepted these words proposed by Mr. Barker. They have rejected your amendment, you are asking that the committee shall reverse the decision they arrived at a few moments ago, which is contrary to the rules of order.

On section 7,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The effect of this amendment is to make a distinction between officials who commit offences and the ordinary voter. The penalty for officials is most severe. It is a very severe penalty and it may make it difficult to get men to accept the office, but if a man does accept, I suppose that no penalty is too severe which will keep him straight.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not think there will be any difficulty in getting good men to take the office. I believe in the principle that officials who commit offences should be more severely punished than others.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is a provision here which carries with it disfranchisement for a period of seven years. I am rather opposed to the idea of disfranchising people unless the offence is very serious ; but it is for the committee to decide.

Mr. CLANCY. I have known men to have voted twice who had absolutely no idea they were committing an offence against the law. To disfranchise a person who commits an offence unwittingly might be too severe a penalty.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). A clause should be added to this in the following words :

The deputy returning officer shall be a resident of the polling division in which an election takes place.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Impossible.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). You can laugh, but if you saw the trouble about it I saw, you would not laugh.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. I agree very strongly with the Minister of Justice as to the disfranchisement penalty under this clause. We ought to be slow to impose the penalty of disfranchisement on an elector. In this section it would cover cases in which the offence would not be commensurate with the penalty. We ought not to disfranchise a citizen unless he commits an act which shows that he is absolutely unfit to exercise the franchise. Many of the offences under this Act are not of that gravity, and I would agree with the suggestion of the Minister of Justice to omit the part of the clause which provides for disfranchisement.

Mr. CLANCY. Would this apply to voters generally as well as to officials ?

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. When you make them liable to an indictable offence, I think you go far enough.

Mr. CLANCY. Not in the case of officers.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. Perhaps not, but I do not think it should apply to the voters generally.

Mr. BARKER. Would the Minister of Justice state what are the offences which would bring about this penalty?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If I read the marginal notes perhaps that would be sufficient to describe them. The first offence is interfering with the voter marking his ballot paper by the candidate, officer, clerk, agent or other person. The second provision is that the ballot paper when given to the voters is not to be shown to any one for the purpose of giving information as to the manner in which he has voted, nor is it to be shown by the deputy returning officer or any person, so that those present may know how the voter has voted.

Mr. COCHRANE. We have had some considerable difficulty over this in my riding, and this is a good time to know what the law is. If I mark my ballot and show the returning officer the initials on the ballot paper, who has the right to deposit that ballot in the box; is it the voter or the deputy returning officer ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The deputy returning officer.

Mr. COCHRANE. Are you sure ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am not, but I will look it up.

Mr. FRASER. It is the universal custom that after the officer sees his initials, he puts the paper in the box.

Mr. COCHRANE. I don't want the custom; I want the law. The ballot belongs to the elector, and the officials should have nothing to do with it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am never sure of anything until I have seen the text, and I find now that I was right. It is the deputy returning officer who should place the ballot in the box. Then, in reference to the question of my hon. friend (Mr. Barker), paragraph 4 provides for the punishment of those who induce the voter to display his ballot paper. Any one who has arranged with the voter that when he comes to hand his ballot paper over to the deputy returning officer, or arranges that an elector shall show how he has marked his paper, is liable to the penalty provided for here. Cases have come to my knowledge in the election courts in which, by the aid of a window in the secret chamber where the ballot is marked, the voter puts his ballot on the glass so that a person outside may see how he has voted.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). When we were asking the minister to amend this Bill, I suggested that each scrutineer or agent of a candidate should be allowed to place his initials or any distinguishing mark on the counterfoil, so that when the ballot was brought back by the voter each officer could see that it was the ballot which had been given to him.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is a stamp put on the back of the ballot.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That does not amount to a hill of beans. It is duplicated in many different ways, as the minister knows. I put that suggestion in writing at the time. I do not know whether it was brought before the committee or not.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think section 5 is absolutely without effect, because there is no number on our ballot paper after the counterfoil has been detached. This has probably been adopted from the Ontario Act.

Mr. BARKER. All these are questions affecting the secrecy of the ballot, and any person who interferes with that ought to receive all the punishment provided for here.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to follow the Minister of Justice in objecting to the penalty of disfranchisement. Provision is made for the punishment of a person who commits the offence, under the ordinary procedure of the court. The punishment which deprives the individual of his vote for seven years does not leave any latitude in regard to the nature of the offence. It is a minimum punishment, and it seems to me that if we consider that the offence is subject to a lighter or a heavier punishment, in the discretion of the court, it is hardly logical to make a minimum punishment of seven years' disfranchisement. For my own part, I object altogether to disfranchising the individual for any except the most grave reasons. If his punishment can be achieved by any other means, I would say certainly do not disfranchise him.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Suppose a voter marks his ballot and, without any intention of doing wrong, takes it without folding it and hands it to the returning officer to put it in the box. Under this clause he would be disfranchised for seven years without intending to do any wrong. That is done hundreds of times. The voter goes and marks his ballot paper and forgets his instructions to fold it up, and hands it to the returning officer to fold it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In a case of that kind actus non facit reum, nisi mens sit rea would apply, and there would be no offence.

Mr. BARKER. If what is done in that way were made legal, there would be no good in the Bill at all; any sort of fraud could be committed. A man who had sold his vote could simply, as has been said, open his ballot so that everybody could see it. If the ballot is to be of any effect at all, it must be secret. If we are to fritter the whole system away by allowing men to show how they voted, we had better at once go back to open voting.

Progress reported.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria).

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

House again in committee to consider certain proposed resolutions respecting the granting of the subsidies therein mentioned to certain railway companies.

To the Timagami Railway Company for a line of railway from a point at or near Sturgeon Falls in a north-westerly direction to a point on the westerly shore of Lake Timagami in the district of Nipissing, not exceeding fifty miles.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What railway company is that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My recollection is that the charter is a provincial one. This has to do with the development of large pulp mills in the Nipissing district.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. gentleman know whether any subsidies were given by the provincial government to this line?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. HENDERSON. How long will this road be when completed? I understand we are only giving a subsidy to the extent of fifty miles.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is from Sturgeon Falls, a station on the Canadian Pacific Railway, to Lake Timagami. It is for the purpose of opening up that district and bringing pulp wood to the large mills erected there by the Imperial Paper Company. These people recently invested a couple of million dollars in large pulp and paper mills and the government thinks this encouragement might be given them.

Mr. CLANCY. Where are the pulp mills situated?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At Sturgeon Falls on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. CLANCY. I suppose that it is intended that road is to extend for some considerable distance to the north of that country.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The application is for fifty miles only.

Mr. CLANCY. To what distance is the road chartered?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am perfectly confident that the capitalists are putting their own money into this enterprise. They have taken over the large works, and these English people are capable of carrying out their undertaking.

Mr. CLANCY. Is this the company which had some difficulty with its agents in Canada?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was some difficulty between the local people and the English company, but that has been settled and a new company organized. A son of the late Lord Russell is one of the principal men in connection with it and other wealthy capitalists in England, and they have applied to the government to subsidize this piece of road.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand that the application for this subsidy was made by the solicitor of the railway company and he makes no reference whatever to these pulp mills. All he says is that this road will be a valuable aid to colonization. It does not appear that they desire particularly to aid the pulp enterprise.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The Sturgeon Falls Pulp and Lumber Company own a very large tract of territory north of Sturgeon Falls and have a very extensive water-power at that place. They negotiated for a sale of their limits and powers to the Lloyds Paper Company of London, England. These negotiations culminated in a sale, but then certain difficulties arose between the two companies which were referrred to arbitration. The result of the arbitration was that the limits and the power were handed back to the Sturgeon Falls Company besides a large payment and the Lloyds went out. After the original owners came again in possession, a new company was organized, the Imperial Paper Company, which took over the limits and built a large pulp mill at Sturgeon Falls. This pulp mill was built by Peter Lyall, of Montreal. The area of territory is very large and the power is said to be one of the best powers in that part of the country. Lake Timagami is a lake on one of the branches of the Sturgeon Fallls river and at the beginning of the pulp limits. The intention is to penetrate into the pulp concession by this road for the purpose of bringing down principally pulp wood and also promoting settlement. In addition to the pulp concession, they have got a large tract of territory in fee simple. I know something about this as I acted myself as arbitrator between the companies, but with respect to this particular application I know very little.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then practically the object of granting this subsidy is to benefit a private company which has bought up the whole of the territory in that section.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Not all of it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not sure that we are doing wisely in aiding a private enterprise of that kind, if the general public are not going to participate in the advantages.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In that locality Mr. Booth and Mr. Lumsden and other lumbermen also own limits.

Mr. McCOOL. I may say that this railway passes through a very good agricultural country. It touches the townships of Springer, Field, Grant, Bastedo, Gibbons, Dana, MacWilliams and Pardo, every one as good land as there is in the province of Ontario. There is settlement for a distance of thirty miles along the proposed route of this railway, many of the settlers having been there a number of years. The company who are asking for this are virtually the Imperial Paper Mills Company. Hon. members will see in the Toronto 'News' a report of the starting of the mill on Thanksgiving Day. The capacity of the works is forty tons of paper a day, and they intend developing further power at Smoky Falls, about fifteen or sixteen miles above Sturgeon Falls, and to double the capacity of their mills inside of a year. I had the curiosity to inquire as to the amount of duties the company have paid in to the treasury on their machinery, and I found they had paid within the last year no less than $7,000. This was on machinery that could not be had in this country. They have as complete a paper mill as there is in America—that is the way they put it. And if hon. members will refer to the Toronto 'News' of yesterday they will see quite an item about it. There is no question about the benefit this railway will be not merely to the company but to that section of this country which is a very desirable section to open up.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There were two parties here during part of the session advocating different lines of road in this section. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCool) tell us the merits of the rival schemes ?

Mr. McCOOL. This is another company altogether. The companies to which the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) refers were two local companies. I have here the names of a few of the parties interested in this company, and from these names it will be seen that the company is a strong one :

	Commercial Rating.
D. Sinclair, Esq., (Messrs. Tillie & Henderson)..	$2,500,000
Edward Lloyd, Esq. (Messrs. Bucknall Bros.)..	1,250,000
G. Lawson Johnston, Esq. (vice-chairman, Bovril, Limited).. ..	7,500,000
Robert Jardine, Esq. (Messrs. Ker, Boulton & Co.)..	2,500,000
R. H. Hedderwick, Esq. (Messrs. Hedderwick & Schultz)..	500,000
J. C. Bayldon, Esq. (Messrs. J. C. Bayldon & Co.)..	1,250,000
D. W. Bell, Esq..	1,500,000
J. G. Paterson, Esq. (Messrs. Paterson, Laing & Bruce)..	1,250,000
Sir Jas. Fairfax & Co..	2,500,000
M. H. Barnet, Esq..	1,250,000
F. Lazenby, Esq. (Messrs. E. Lazenby & Sons)..	2,500,000

So it will be seen that this is not a small company. They have the means behind them to carry out the enterprise, and I am sure the work will be started early next spring.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought the hon. Minister of Justice said that Mr. Lloyd had dropped out of the company.

Mr. McCOOL. I think this must be another Lloyd. This is Mr. Lloyd, of Messrs. Bucknall Bros.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not wish to oppose this subsidy, but merely to say that I do not take much stock in the item one sees in the papers about the time railway subsidies are about to be voted or charters given, as showing the merits of the schemes. One who has watched these things from year to year for any length of time must come to the conclusion that if their insertion in the paper is not paid for, at least the publication is for some specific purpose, and it is not always a guarantee with reference to the company. I noticed the item in the 'News' to which the hon. gentleman refers.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Will the companies who are about to receive these bonuses recoup the government at any time for the money paid to them ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a clause in these resolutions which corresponds with that in existing railway subsidies to the effect that if these companies render services to the government they shall not charge for them, but that these services shall be credited on account of the subsidy. Except as we may in time—and I think it is not likely to realize very rapidly—recover a portion of that subsidy in that way, there is no provision for repayment.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps the hon. minister would say whether anything has been earned in this way, what the amount and whence it came ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot give the source, but I will learn that later if the hon. gentleman desires. My hon. friend (Mr. Robinson, Elgin) will have to remember that this wise provision was put in only recently. In the former days of extravagance this was not done.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Oh, you are mistaken.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have put this provision in recently and must not expect to accomplish great things in a short time. In 1902 there was received in the way of refunds of that character—I think altogether from the Post Office Department—$1,057.14 ; in 1903, $1,346 ; and for the present year up to date, $676.90. These are deductions from the Post Office subsidies.

Mr. HENDERSON. I fear the memory of the acting Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Fielding) is somewhat at fault. I have a recollection that, many years ago, when the railway from Calgary to Edmonton was given a subsidy and, I think also the railway from Regina to Prince Albert, concessions of this very kind were demanded of the companies, and that the companies did recoup the government in the way that was prescribed. This policy for which he claims credit is not a new policy ; but, as in so many other cases, hon. gentlemen opposite have adopted the policy of their predecessors and now parade them as theirs, thinking that, perhaps, the memories of the people of the country are as defective as their own. I am sure that my recollection in this matter is correct, and I think the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) who was Minister of Railways and Canals at the time, will bear me out that this is an old provision adopted many years ago at a time when the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) was not in this House, and with the parliamentary history of which he may not be so familiar as with that of his own time here.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am sure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) is wrong in the impression he would leave on the minds of the House. He is right in saying that in one or two cases some such provision was inserted in railway measures. But one swallow does not make a summer, and a condition inserted in ont contract does not make a whole system of railway subsidies. As applied to railway subsidies generally this principle is new, and whatever merit is in it must be credited to this government. The return is not very large, but small as it is, I am not willing to have hon. members opposite claim the credit which belongs to this side of the House.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I have no complaint to make against either government. It is not politics that I speak of. But what I wish to say is that when the government give privileges to any class of people, railways or any other, they should see to it that they get something in return. The people expect this from the government. My hon. friend from Nipissing (Mr. McCool) stated that, in some of these townships the land is as good as in any part of Ontario. Well, if that is the case, I do not see why a company should want a bonus to build a railway or develop any other enterprise. The people are quite competent to do it. The way I feel is this : The government are quite justified in helping any new enterprise. But whenever that enterprise becomes a success they should get their money back—just the same as when a man starts his boy on a farm and helps him to put up buildings and improve the property, when that boy becomes able to lay up money and make a success, he has a right to pay the old man back some time and keep him out of the poorhouse. That is what I want these

people to do with us. We are giving them money and making them rich at the expense of the taxpayers. I am glad to hear from the acting Minister of Railways that there is a provision to compel these people at some time or other to refund the money, or to do some service for the government.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance, as a result of what is called the new and wise policy under which these subsidies are given, how many millions have been granted that have produced $1,000 a year to the revenues of this country ? Can the hon. gentleman give us that information ? It would be useful information now, because the hon. gentleman has laid great stress on this new, wise and progressive policy that was giving a return to the people. We had one return given to us to-day, it is alarming, but it is alarming because it is so small. Will the hon. gentleman say off-hand ? I would not care to exact too much of him. Speaking for myself, I think it is about time the hon. gentleman stopped parading the results of their new and wise policy.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid that the hon. gentlemen opposite are hard to please. They ask for information, and when the information is furnished then we are accused of parading it. They complain if we try to be obliging. I am not able to give my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) the details of this large sum he asks for. If it is considered important I would be glad to get it at a later stage. I happened to have my attention drawn to this when these resolutions were being prepared, and I gave directions to ascertain what amount was received, and I feel justified in saying that these sums have been received, under the policy which has been adopted in recent legislation, in the form of interest on the subsidies. But I have not attached as much importance to it as the hon. gentleman thinks we do. If he attaches importance to it, I will get a subdivision of this large sum of money at a later stage.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think if there is any subsidy that has been proposed to this House in late years that is defensible, it is this one. While we would all appreciate any policy that would bring more direct revenue to the treasury of the country, we must not forget that in this particular case at any rate the country will derive great direct and indirect benefit from the building of this road.

Mr. CLANCY. No one is opposing it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. But my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Robinson) seems to be under the impression that we are giving away a privilege. I am not so sure that it will not become a privilege to the Dominion. It is a benefit to the Dominion when men with capital are prepared to go in and establish works, as these gentlemen have done at Sturgeon Falls, giving direct employment to at least 500 men, taking the timber from the farmers in the district, while the settlers get their land free, and get a market, and get started on their farms. That district is a good farming country. Every gentleman who has visited that section knows that there is good farming land there. We have the fact that even during the present season this company has paid $75,000 into the treasury as duties upon the machinery they have brought in, and perhaps will pay $100,000 more in duty during the coming season, to say nothing of the other business they will work up and which will contribute indirectly to the treasury. I think that the subsidies given to these companies to open up colonization roads so-called ought to meet the hearty support of this country. The great thing is to see that the subsidies are used profitably, that the work actually goes on and that we get value for it. I do not know of any grant made by this government from which we will reap greater benefit almost at once, or in the near future, from the development of the country, than from this subsidy properly applied, because it will do much to develop the resources of the country as well as to open up land now unoccupied.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it this company who are the beneficiaries of this grant ? Because the question was asked, and the acting Minister of Railways did not give us that information. It would be interesting to know whether this railway is owned and promoted, or whether this charter is owned and promoted, by this company of which so much is said, or whether it is owned by some private individual.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The only gentleman who approached me, I think, was Mr. Russell, son of the late Chief Justice of England, and he said that these parties who were interested in establishing paper and pulp mills had this charter, and would undertake to build the road if they got assistance from the government.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is it a Dominion or a provincial charter ?

Mr. McCOOL. I think it is a Dominion charter. The incorporators are really those men whose names I gave a few minutes ago, calling themselves the Imperial Paper Company. Their intention is to develop further power at Smoky Falls, and to increase their capacity to more than double what it is at present. Their expectation is that next year they will carry on a much larger volume of business than they are doing at the present time. It may be some satisfaction to the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Robinson) to know that they expect to pay into the treasury of duties at least $75,000 on further extensions to their plant which they have in view.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The acting Minister of Railways, comparing the benefit received from the new policy of the government with that received from the old policy, says that the amount of subsidy granted during the last couple of years has yielded something like $1,000 a year. He must be entirely mistaken. There must be something received from the subsidies given to the Edmonton road, from the road down to the boundary near Lethbridge, the Galt road, and from the Hudson Bay Railway, which has been transferred to the Northern Pacific Company. The government have not only the right to have their mails carried, and the company gets credit for it on the amount they owe to the government, but the company are obliged to transport the mounted police and their supplies, and all that kind of thing. The minister must find that the revenue is greatly in excess of the amount he mentions. The only change in reference to that is that when a railway or a portion of a railway thus subsidized carries the mail, the amount to which they are entitled for carrying the mails is credited. Under the old system under which so much a year was granted to the railroads in the west, or they were given a guarantee of the amount, they not only had to carry the mails, but they had to carry all government supplies for the mounted police or military stores, and this was credited on the amount of the guarantee given by the government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think my hon. friend has made a slight mistake. The Calgary and Edmonton road received a subsidy in land as to which I think there was no provision for a return in any shape or form. A contract was made in addition to that subsidy whereby there was an arrangement for $80,000 a year for transportation. The road was subsidized in land and as respects that land subsidy there is no compensation whatever, but the figures which I gave have reference principally to subsequent returns made under the recent legislation. I did not go into the other question at all but had reference to subsidies voted in recent years.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister should be able to get the information from his deputy who ought to remember that we gave so much a year for a number of years, independent of the land grant altogether.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is not a subsidy.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Oh, that is not a subsidy. The only thing that constitutes a subsidy then is land. That was one of the provisions of the guarantee of so much a year for a number of years by the government; we were to get our mails and government supplies carried free.

To the Bay of Quinte Railway Company for further extension of its line of railway, from the northern terminus thereof, commencing from a point at or near Actinolite, thence in a north-westerly direction via the villages of Queensborough and Bannockburn to a point in the township of Marmora or lake in Hastings county, not exceeding 20 miles in all.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a further extension of the Bay of Quinte road. I suppose that every member of this committee is familiar with the experience of that road. It is opening up, I believe, some very fair agricultural districts but chiefly districts which are especially rich in mining and timber resources. This is for an extension in the county of Hastings. I believe the road is doing good work in opening up that district of the country and we have from time to time been granting them, on their application, subsidies for small extensions. This is what is known as the Rathbun system of railways in eastern Ontario.

Mr. HENDERSON. What particular industry will this give access to?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The mining industry at Actinolite and I believe that there are mines of importance of different descriptions in that section of the country. There is also a fair farming country in the district of Tweed and there is some timber as well.

To the Bruce Mines and Algoma Railway Company for a line of railway from the end of its line, as subsidized by chapter 7 of 1901, northerly, not exceeding nineteen miles; and for a line of railway from Bruce Mines to Bruce Mines junction, not exceeding two miles.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This line is projected from the town of Bruce Mines, from Lake Huron, north west, a distance of one hundred miles to the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway near Woman River Station. It will open up a number of mines there and will furnish railway facilities to several copper mines in which about $1,000,000 have been invested by American and English capitalists. This information is furnished to us by the promoters and we have no reason to believe that it is incorrect.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is not two miles of this finished? and has it not been finished for two or three years?

Mr. DYMENT. That two miles was finished this spring.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Was there not a grant from the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway down to Bruce Mines to take the tailings from the mines?

Mr. DYMENT. It was not finished until last spring. There is a piece of road built from there by the old Bruce Mines Copper Company, but it has nothing to do with this at all.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I notice that that section of the Canadian Pacific Railway was ballasted with the debris of the mines and

the tailings of the copper works there. How did they get to them unless there was a railway or branch down ? That has been done for three or four years.

Mr. DYMENT. That has been done for twelve years, but this road was not in existence then. Until about two or three years ago this ballast was hauled out there over the Canadian Pacific Railway siding.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In 1901 we subsidized twenty-one miles, of which nine miles have been already built and subsidy thereon paid to the amount of $28,800.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is this two miles from Bruce Mines that I am asking about.

Mr. DYMENT. That has only been finished this spring.

Mr. SPROULE. What company gets this? Is it the English company tnat has been spoken of ?

Mr. DYMENT. This company is principally composed of Americans, a different company altogether.

Mr. SPROULE. Do they own copper mines in Bruce Mines or some others outside ?

Mr. DYMENT. They have nothing to do with this organization at all.

Mr. SPROULE. Then this is an independent organization, or a new one ?

Mr. DYMENT. It is a new one.

Mr. SPROULE. What interests have they that require a railway there ?

Mr. DYMENT. They have a mine at Rock Lake, about seventeen miles from Bruce Mines, and that portion of it is built. Now they want to extend that further up towards the Copper Queen mine which is about fifteen miles north of the Rock Lake Mine and on towards the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. SPROULE. Just for mining purposes ?

Mr. DYMENT. No, partly for colonization ; it runs through a fine tract of agricultural land and hardwood timber which is not accessible at all without a railway, and they have arranged with one company to build a mill on the line of this road for the working up of the hard wood as soon as about twelve miles more of the railway is completed. They will go to the end of the road where there is a large tract of fine hardwood timber. They have also arranged for a large furniture factory to be put in there.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Has this particular part of the railway from Bruce Mines Junction anything to do with the Canadian Pacific Railway ? Is it a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway ?

Mr. DYMENT. No.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It does not belong to the Canadian Pacific Railway ?

Mr. DYMENT. No.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Well, the Canadian Pacific Railway had a branch from their main line down to Bruce Mines.

Mr. DYMENT. Yes, but it has nothing to do with this at all.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This must parallel it.

Mr. DYMENT. The rails have all been taken off some years ago and the road has been abandoned.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that these two miles referred to in this resolution have already been constructed ?

Mr. DYMENT. Yes, finished this spring.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that the policy of the government is to allow a company to survey and construct a line of railway, and after it has been constructed for two years to come forward and secure a subsidy from this government for that line of railway ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think, there have been cases where railways have been subsidized after the time of their completion. Sometimes there have been understandings in advance that the road would be aided and I think there have been cases where a subsidy has been granted after the completion of a section of road.

Mr. BLAIN. Has there been an application before the government during the last two years for the subsidy which we are now voting ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Why was it left for two years ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Last year there were no subsidies.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On a previous occasion the application was for the whole of this road.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In 1901 we subsidized twenty-one miles of this road.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When this reorganized company took hold of the mines they applied for assistance to build this railway. They were granted nine miles at first, which was afterwards increased to 21, and perhaps part of this is a revote.

Mr. FOWLER. If it is a revote, it should not appear here.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is in addition to the previous grant.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This two miles is the total length of the road.

Mr. DYMENT. Oh, no ; it is an extension of the 19 miles.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand that the province of Ontario has already subsidized this road, and it is important in every case that we should be informed as to what subsidy has been granted by a province. It may be that the province thought that their subsidy was sufficient to promote the construction of this road. We hear a great deal at present about provincial rights, and it may be that the province of Ontario would be jealous of our subsidizing a road which they have already aided. Can the Finance Minister tell me what subsidy was granted by the province ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The application of the company says they have received a provincial subsidy for 17 miles, but it does not state the amount.

Mr. CLANCY. We certainly should know what subsidy has been granted by the provincial government in every case. If the province gave a large subsidy in land and cash, it does not strengthen their claim to come here and ask for a further subsidy. There is a limit to the extent to which we can aid even deserving schemes, and we might be disposed to take into account the subsidy granted by a province when we are giving aid. We should not proceed in utter disregard of the fact as to whether the province has granted a subsidy or not.

Mr. DYMENT. There was no land grant given by the province. It was a subsidy of $3,000 per mile in cash for 17 miles.

Mr. FOWLER. For the same road as we are asked to subsidize here ?

Mr. DYMENT. No, for about 11 miles of it.

Mr. HENDERSON. We are groping in the dark. We are granting a subsidy to a road, 17 miles of which has been built, and built with the aid of a provincial subsidy. Why should we, in addition to the ample provision which has been made by the province of Ontario, grant another subsidy for a road that has been already constructed ? The government should see that we are not throwing away the people's money on enterprises that are already provided for by the provincial legislature. I would feel very much disposed to move that this item be not agreed to. I shall investigate it further, because I now think that it is one of those subsidies which should not receive the sanction of this committee.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am afraid we are a little mixed with regard to this. Some years ago the company made an application for a subsidy and nine miles were subsidized. They built the road and made the property a success. Last year no subsidies were granted, but they went ahead and nearly completed 17 miles, and the total subsidy will be for 30 miles of road through that important section of the country. They have established their works successfully, and are now carrying the products of other mines as well as of their own. This application has been pressed very strongly and very energetically by the citizens of the district. It is not as if the road were built by a company without any application on their part, or without any reason for them to believe that if they went on and spent their own money and developed the country and established their enterprise, they would not receive assistance. I believe that a great development has taken place in that part of the country because of the little assistance we gave in the past, and which we are now supplementing, by aiding in the construction of this 30 miles of road.

Mr. FOWLER. Is this two miles from Bruce Mines to Bruce Mines Junction between the same two points that the Canadian Pacific Railway formerly had a branch ?

Mr. DYMENT. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Are they utilizing the old road ?

Mr. DYMENT. No.

Mr. FOWLER. Was there a subsidy granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway for that ?

Mr. DYMENT. I don't think so. The two miles built by the Canadian Pacific Railway were merely for their own convenience, the same as they would run a line into a gravel pit. The Minister of Public Works is quite right in saying that these people were led to believe that if they went on with the work they could look for favourable consideration. The people insisted that the railway company should build into the town of Bruce Mines, feeling perfectly satisfied that the government would supplement what they had already done, and I think every hon. member will agree that this was much better than that the road should have stopped half way.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. They are building on the old road of the Canadian Pacific Railway ?

Mr. DYMENT. No ; they have taken another route altogether.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. A remark was made a moment ago by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) to which I would like to refer. He appeared to think that it would be an extraordinary thing for this parliament to supplement a subsidy given by a provincial legislature. Ever since I have had any knowledge of the Department of Railways, and prior thereto, from the time subsidies were first given, it has been customary for the Dominion government to give a subsidy to a meritorious undertaking which had been given or been promised aid by the provin-

cial government. The very fact that the provincial government had aided a railway very much improved its chances of receiving Dominion assistance. One of the things which the government have required at the hands of each company has been that it should satisfy them of its ability to construct the line ; for we know that a subsidy of $3,200 a mile does not at all furnish sufficient means for that purpose. For this particular road I should say that it would be quite inadequate. My information with regard to this road is that it is a much more extensive one than the ordinary railways which we aid, that it passes through a rough and irregular country, and that it will require a good deal of heavy work in its construction. The object which the government have had in view in requiring each company to advise them whether any subsidy had already been given or promised by the provincial government, was not to furnish a ground for objection to the Dominion giving aid, but to justify the application, and to assure the government that if they granted aid, the undertaking would probably be carried through. The information which the acting minister has furnished is as full information as we have ever required from a railway company. With reference to these two miles which have been referred to, I may say that what has been stated by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dyment) is quite correct, that the company had good reason to expect if they went on with their undertaking and completed these two miles, the government, when considering the subject of giving subsidies at any future time, would give this subject as favourable consideration as they felt they could, and the few days gained, I think, ought not to be any reason why this assistance should not be given.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am not aware that any person on this side of the House made any objection to a grant being made to any particular railway on account of its having received aid from the provincial government.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. I so understood the hon. member for Halton.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I thought the ex-minister was directing his attention to me ; because I am of the same opinion as he, that unless the combined subsidies would be largely in excess of the requirements for the purpose of building the road, we could have no better evidence of faith in the scheme than the fact that it had received aid from the provincial government. I never heard any objection raised on that ground. Nor have I any objection to a subsidy having an ex post facto effect ; because if the parties have gone on in good faith and built a road which tends to the development of the country, I think they are as much entitled to the money as if the undertaking were in prospect.

Mr. HENDERSON. I fear that I did not make myself plain to the ex-Minister of Railways. What I intended to elicit by asking whether this road had received a provincial subsidy or not was such information as would warrant us in granting the vote asked for. We are asked to vote $3,200 a mile to assist this enterprise ; but that may be increased to $6,400 a mile, depending altogether on the cost of the construction of the road. We might consider that a fair subsidy ; and to my mind it should be quite sufficient for the construction of a road into that country, which is referred to by the promoters as one which will produce an enormous amount of traffic, a comparatively rich section, especially in timber and in mines. If that is the case, and the road has already received a subsidy of $3,000 per mile from the local legislature, the combined subsidies will amount to $9,400 per mile, which seems to me to be a very large subsidy for a road into that section. Under these circumstances, I think we ought to be informed whether or not some provision has already been made for the construction of this road. If so, possibly it would be wise on our part not to grant the full subsidy given to roads aided by the province, but to limit the amount and bring it within reason. I rather approve of the policy laid down last night by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock), who suggested that we should have the fullest information, and that all these matters should be referred to the transportation commission for full and ample reports regarding them. At any rate, we should be put in possession of information as to the probable cost of these roads and the character and value of the country through which they run, so that we could vote intelligently on these matters. While I do not consider the fact of a provincial bonus having been granted an objection to our granting aid in a meritorious case, a knowledge of how much the province has given would enable us to decide on what we should do here. Therefore in every case we should be put in possession of these facts.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Let me point out to my hon. friend that before this road could receive the subsidy of $6,400 per mile, it would have to cost $21,400 per mile. If it were to receive $6,400 from the Dominion and $3,000 from the province, it would then have $9,400 for a road costing upwards of $21,000 per mile.

Mr. HENDERSON. Don't you think that is a pretty good bonus ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A good deal would depend on the conditions. There are portions of the country where you could not get a road built with that. At the same time, I agree with my hon. friend that it is always desirable to know what the province contributes. Having regard to the conditions of the country through which

this railway is to run. I do not think the promoters, even if they get all the subsidies which my hon. friend mentions, will make very much out of it.

Mr. BLAIN. Might I ask the hon. member for Algoma if the subsidy from the Ontario government has already been paid to the company ?

Mr. DYMENT. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman that.

Mr. BLAIN. I noticed, when the hon. member from Algoma made the statement that this road had already been constructed and was completed almost two years ago, the acting Minister of Railways seemed surprised.

Mr. DYMENT. This part, which is only a portion of the whole line, was finished last spring.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I said that we had subsidized twenty-one miles, and have paid a subsidy on nine miles as completed. I did not make any statement with regard to these two particular miles.

Mr. BLAIN. But the hon. gentleman understood why this subsidy was applied for, the two miles had not been completed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I was not clear on that point.

Mr. BLAIN. It is evident that when these people applied for a subsidy, they held back from the government the most important information. The fact is the hon. Minister of Finance asked the committee to vote a subsidy when he had not the information as to whether this road was completed or not. I think it is a wrong policy for any government to allow any set of contractors to go on constructing a portion of road, whether two miles or twenty miles, and then, after it is constructed, seek and obtain a subsidy. When promoters require a subsidy, they should ask for it before beginning the road.

Mr. FOWLER. I am not quite clear about the extent of this road. I understood the acting Minister of Railways to say that the first subsidy in 1901 was for twenty-one miles, and if this is also for twenty-one miles, that would make forty-two miles.

Mr. DYMENT. Only nine miles were subsidized two years ago, which, with these twenty-one miles, makes a total of thirty miles.

To the James Bay Railway Company for a line of railway from Toronto, via the east side of Lake Simcoe, Parry Sound, and Sudbury, towards James Bay, not exceeding 265 miles, in lieu of two subsidies granted by chapter 8 of 1900, of 35 and 20 miles respectively, from Parry Sound towards James Bay.

Mr. BROCK. Might I ask an explanation of this particular subsidy ?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This was the subject of some reference last evening. It will connect the city of Toronto with the northern portion of Ontario. Several deputations waited on the government urging that this line should be subsidized.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is it intended to be a connection of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Toronto to Sudbury ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It will cross the Canadian Pacific Railway at Sudbury, and connect ultimately with the new transcontinental.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Who constitute the James Bay Railway Company ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mackenzie & Mann.

Mr. BROCK. This runs half a mile from the Northern Railway at many points.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The Northern Railway runs west of Lake Simcoe, while this runs east of Lake Simcoe.

Mr. CLANCY. Has this company a Dominion or a provincial charter ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A Dominion charter.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the length of the road ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have forgotten. This charter has been in existence some years, and the first real work was commenced two or three years ago, when they started to build north from Parry Sound on the subsidy now being revoted. The total mileage now being subsidized is 265 miles. I think this is perhaps the most important subsidy we are asked to grant. It will bring the whole western section of northern Ontario into direct communication not only with the Canadian Pacific Railway, but with the Grand Trunk Pacific, and will afford a through route to the west. Moreover, it will develop a splendid country north from Parry Sound. Of course, close to Toronto, there is already railway communication, but this, which is really a transcontinental line, will do more to benefit western Ontario than any other scheme dealt with in these subsidy resolutions.

Mr. GOURLEY. Is this road intended to go on to James Bay ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. GOURLEY. It should be pushed through there then ; that is a great country.

To the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company for one mile of railway from Roberval to the government wharf at Lake St. John.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is there any explanation of this ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I thought the modesty of this item would so commend it that it would be at once approved. The object is to carry the present terminus of the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway to the wharf at Roberval, that is about a mile.

Mr. HENDERSON. At least, a scheme of this kind does not call for 'mountains of information' to convince the House of the propriety of it. But it seems strange to apply for a subsidy to build a road to a government wharf. Anyhow it seems a very small matter to trouble the government with. Of course, the information is very meagre, but I apprehend that it would be cheaper to allow the item to pass than to occupy the time of the House in discussing it.

To the Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company on a line of railway from Lake Timiskaming at the present terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway line, in a northerly direction, not to exceed 50 miles.

Mr. FOWLER. Is that the same company as the one to which the subsidy has been given for 265 miles ?

The PRIME MINISTER. This is a company to build an extension of a railway that now runs from Mattawa northward in the direction of Lake Timiskaming, on the Quebec side. It is proposed to build a road to the village of Ville Marie. As everybody knows, this is an excellent agricultural country, which is rapidly being colonized and developed.

Mr. CLANCY. This is simply an extension from the end of the Canadian Pacific Railway line. What is this ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The incorporators are mostly gentlemen in Ottawa and in the locality of Timiskaming.

Mr. FOWLER. Is this a different company from the James Bay Railway Company ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Absolutely.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Would it not be better to offer this subsidy to a line of railway from Lake Timiskaming, running in a northern direction fifty miles, instead of confining it to this Interprovincial and James Bay Company ? The only possible way to get the extension of the line is to induce the Canadian Pacific Railway to extend their line which now runs from Mattawa up along the shore of the Lake Timiskaming. To put it in the form I suggest, gives the government the opportunity to make arrangements, and not give a special status to parties who are mere intermediaries between the government and the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The PRIME MINISTER. The company applied for the subsidy. We inquired about them, and as the company is one of thorough respectability, I see no reasons why we should not grant the subsidy.

Mr. CLANCY. The respectability of the company is not in question. But the fact is that this piece of route will be absolutely of no use unless the company make some arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The PRIME MINISTER. I dare say.

Mr. CLANCY. Then, as suggested by my hon. friend from South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart), it ought to be left an open question. I care not what the respectability of the company may be, they should not be made the intermediary between the government and the railway company that will actually build the line. The question is simply how the country is to be served, and not what is to be the position of the Canadian Pacific Railway or of the promoters of this scheme. I think the proposition of the hon. member for South Lanark is a very fair one.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not see that it is fair. It did not strike us so at all events. The company made an application, and I am sure that the considerations which now present themselves did not occur to us. We wished to see the road built, and, it seemed apparent that the company would build it.

Mr. CLANCY. But the company will be unable to do anything unless they make arrangements with the other company to complete the road.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then, they will have to make the arrangements.

Mr. CLANCY. But we should make provisions designed to secure the building of this road for the people, and not depend upon any haphazard arrangement. It is not unreasonable, in a case like this, to ask that the subsidy be given to a line of railway rather than to a particular company.

Mr. McCOOL. The Canadian Pacific Railway were approached times without number asking for this extension of their road from Kippewa lake, or the foot of Lake Timiskaming—Timiskaming station, as they call it—northward. That road was built some years ago and the extension has been greatly needed, but the people were unable to get any satisfactory assurance from the Canadian Pacific Railway that the road would be built. Men living in Ville Marie, who have been settled there for the last twenty years, went to the trouble of organizing a company, and these men are the promoters of the Interprovincial and James Bay road. They are all men of substance, and I think it would be most unfair if, after they have gone to all this trouble, they should be cut out. I do not think the Canadian Pacific Railway are opposed to it at all. The Canadian Pacific Railway were in

sympathy with their application in the first place, and said : We are not prepared to go on, but you go on and get a charter and build a road, and we will help you. I do not think the Canadian Pacific Railway would ask that this subsidy should be changed from the company named to another company not named.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). On what side of Lake Timiskaming does this road run ?

Mr. McCOOL. On the Quebec side. It is opening up a large and important section near the head of Lake Timiskaming. I suppose there are 3,000 or 4,000 people in there at the present time.

Mr. CLANCY. We are not questioning the necessity of a road at all, but we want to know who is going to get the benefit of it. The hon. gentleman told us it would be too bad to refuse a grant to these gentlemen who had spent their money. For what purpose ? To make something out of it.

Mr. McCOOL. They want to get a road.

Mr. CLANCY. Is this an enterprise in which these gentlemen have large vested interests themselves, or is it merely an enterprise that they have set on foot for the purpose of making money out of it ? Who are the parties interested ? I am not defending the rights of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, they have no rights that I know of. It is the public rights I am looking after. Here is a case where it is proposed to put a link at the end of a railway belonging to the Canadian Pacific Railway, extending their line and depending upon the Canadian Pacific Railway to give them an outlet. Now, who are the parties who made the application, and who are spending the money ?

Mr. McCOOL. I cannot give you from memory the names of the parties. I know that one of the promoters is a resident of Ville Marie, Mr. A. E. Guay, a very respectable and responsible citizen of that place, a gentleman worth probably $100,000 or $150,000. I think Mr. Ranger is another. I accompanied these gentlemen down here on a deputation asking for a subsidy, though I cannot give their names from memory. I also remember when they got their charter the winter before last, when I attended with them a meeting of the Railway Committee. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the charter he will find the names of the promoters, and they are all men of substance.

Mr. CLANCY. When a proposal is made to make a grant to a line of railway without stating any particular company, I do not see any objection, according to the hon. gentleman's own statement, to the proposition made by the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart).

Mr. McCOOL. I am satisfied there is not one man interested in this enterprise who desires to make a dollar of profit out of it, except as an indirect consequence of this road helping settlers in that section of the country, and benefiting any of the promoters who happen to live there. I cannot understand why the hon. member for Bothwell should object to granting this subsidy to a named company, a company who have gone to the trouble of getting their charter, when there is no opposition to it from anybody. There is no opposition by the Canadian Pacific Railway, at least I do not think there is ; and I cannot see any reason why they should not be granted a subsidy under the name of an incorporated company.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I want to say a word of explanation respecting the Bruce Mines and Algoma Railway. I find that my hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Dyment) was correct, and that the former vote was for nine miles. How the memorandum given to me said 27 miles I cannot explain.

For a line of railway from Waltham station to Ferguson Point in the county of Pontiac not exceeding 20 miles.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is for an extension westward of the Pontiac and Pacific Junction Railway from its present terminus to Ferguson, on the Ottawa river.

Mr. CLANCY. Why is a distinction made in this case ? This is for a line of railway, the other was for a railway company. Who are the promoters of this road ?

Mr. McCOOL. I think the reason for the distinction is that the Canadian Pacific Railway, who now own the Pontiac and Pacific Junction Railway, would not make application for the subsidy, although I think they are anxious to get the extension. The Pontiac and Pacific Junction Railway hold a charter covering that ground. The road has been built to Waltham for the last ten or twelve years or more. I ought to know a good deal about it, because I was born about half way between the two points on this road. I am quite satisfied that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will make the extension. If they do not, then I think they will make no objection to another company building.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Has not the Canadian Pacific Railway Company got a charter ?

Mr. McCOOL. They have got a charter covering this ground.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is it not the intention of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to build a bridge across there ?

Mr. McCOOL. I presume it is.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is with the expectation that the Canadian Pacific Railway will really build it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is there a bonus to this particular road already from this government ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There was a bonus.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It has lapsed.

To the Quebec Central Railway Company for an extension of its line of railway from St. François to St. George, not exceeding nine miles; also for a railway from Scott junction to the Quebec bridge, not exceeding 22 miles.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is an extension of the Quebec Central Railway along the valley of the Chaudière river. At present the Quebec Central Railway starts from Quebec, or to speak more correctly, from Lévis and enters the valley of the Chaudière river.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It enters the valley of the Etchemin river first.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, it does not, it goes down by the Intercolonial Railway to Harlaka Junction and then goes south into the valley of the Chaudière river. This is to extend the present terminus from the valley of the Chaudière nine miles to the valley of the St. George. At Scott Junction there is a duplication of the railway. One section goes along the valley of the Chaudière to St. Francis and the other section crosses the railway and goes to Sherbrooke and the Eastern Townships. This is required in order that there may be a railway built directly to the Quebec bridge, a distance of twenty-two miles.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is no railway there now ?

The PRIME MINISTER. There is a railway going eastward to the Intercolonial Railway near St. Charles. This would cut off all that section, giving a straight line to the Quebec bridge.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This is not built ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, it is to be built.

Mr. MORIN. I would like to inform the government that in building this road they are taking one step towards the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific. It was stated in the House some time ago that one reason why they would not build the Grand Trunk Pacific through the county of Dorchester was that it would give a longer route. Let me tell the House that by building this road from the Quebec bridge to Scott Junction you are building a road twenty miles exactly on the line that I have proposed. I may say, further, that in the case you build the Grand Trunk Pacific here you will by this be killing two birds with the one stone, and in places you will be killing three birds with one stone. You must remember that the road would be built from St. George, in the county of Beauce. St. George lies exactly west of a parish in the county of Dorchester called Ste. Justine. Ste. Justine is the natural gap, or the place for a railway to go through there. It is a very level piece of farming land. If the government build this Grand Trunk Pacific Railway it will start from the Quebec bridge, and if the government should send the man who is sitting there beside the minister, Mr. Schrieber, in whom I and every person else have the utmost confidence, to that district and tell him to locate a railway line, he will undoubtedly locate it through the places I have mentioned. Then, besides that, if you build a railway where I am asking it, you will serve the demands made by my hon. friend from Victoria, N.B. (Hon. Mr. Costigan), who has a charter, as we all know, from River St. Francis to Quebec, and by building this line you run a road exactly where he wants it. Then the Quebec Central Railway Company has a charter from St. George up the valley of the Famine river about eighteen miles to Ste. Justine, from Ste. Justine then to this Lake Pohenagamook you would be running on the same line again, from that lake in the county of Temiscouata there you would serve the Quebec Central, the road asked by my hon. friend from Victoria, N.B., and you would serve the government road. You would need to build only one road where there are three applications for roads, and therefore I say that you would be killing three birds with one stone.

Mr. COCHRANE. You would not be killing Costigan, though.

Mr. MORIN. Then, from Quebec through to St. Isidore, in Dorchester county, this one road would do for all. The Quebec Central in building from Quebec bridge, will have to go through St. Isidore and then go straight south to Scott Junction. If the government builds the road they will have to build in the exact place I am now mentioning. It would be wise for the government before dabbling into all these things to send my friend Mr. Schreiber there and let him look at the country and the location; he will undoubtedly say that I am perfectly right. It makes no difference who says I am wrong; I say I am right and I know it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. CLANCY. No, it is not carried.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Surely no further explanation is required after the speech to which we have just listened.

Mr. CLANCY. The explanation which has just been given demands a further explanation. The hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Morin) has stated that if the government carried out their contemplated scheme of a National Transcontinental Railway, it would traverse practically the same territory and serve the same purpose as the road to which it is now proposed to give a subsidy. If that be true—and the hon. gentleman no doubt speaks with very definite information

—it seems to me that that puts an end to any argument that the railway will serve a country that cannot be otherwise served. If the statement be true it is an alarming one, that when we have passed an Act giving the government power to build a railway over this same territory, to serve the same purpose, that some gentleman makes an application for a subsidy and we grant it, knowing all these facts. Unless there is some explanation following the statement of the hon. member for Dorchester, this committee should make inquiry and have definite information before consenting to this vote.

The PRIME MINISTER. There are two branches of railway now asked to be subsidized under this item. One is an extension of the existing railway along the Chaudière valley from St. Francis to St. George, and my hon. friend from Dorchester (Mr. Morin) will say to my hon. friend behind him (Mr. Clancy) that the Transcontinental Railway can have nothing whatever to do with that railway; one goes west whereas the Transcontinental Railway is going east. That settles that point. In regard to the other section of railway from Scott Junction to the Quebec bridge is a distance of twenty-two miles. That is all there is and how far the new railway will parallel this railway, I cannot at present say. That will depend very much on the route to be taken by the new railway. I think that if the railway which is to be built is to follow the Etchemin river it would to some extent parallel this railway. If it does not follow the Etchemin river, after leaving the Quebec bridge, it must go east and would not come in contact with this railway except for a few miles. There are several railways which must in the future come to the Quebec bridge. Already there are the Grand Trunk Railway, the Intercolonial Railway, and probably another road, the South Shore Railway will come to the Quebec bridge. The Transcontinental Railway must leave the Quebec bridge and go south and east and will parallel this for a few miles only.

Mr. MORIN. If you want to build a road from the Quebec bridge south you have to go to the west of St. Jean Chrysostôme church and then east of the St. Lambert de Lévis church, and then right through the parsonage of the St. Isidore church. You cannot help doing this owing to the nature of the country and then from there my hon. friend says the line will follow the valley of the Etchemin river. You must not follow the Etchemin valley at all.

The PRIME MINISTER. For a transcontinental railway?

Mr. MORIN. No, Sir. What I am saying is right, and if Mr. Schreiber and I go on the road, as I have gone with him before, I believe we will agree as to that point. You start from the Quebec bridge, and you go straight south through the parish of St. Isidore, which is about eighteen miles from the bridge. Then you go two miles beyond that, and then the Grand Trunk Pacific will still follow a straight course south or south-east. Then the road of the Quebec Central, a little beyond St. Isidore, would turn to the right on account of a hill there, and go to Scott junction. You must go through the village in which I live, although the people do not want a road there because it is not necessary. Then you go on through the parishes of Ste. Marguerite, St. Malachie and St. Clair, striking the corners of these four parishes. Then you strike the Etchemin river at St. Malachie, and you follow the river clear through to the outlet of lake Etchemin, whence you go to St. Germain. Then you go four miles beyond, when you strike the waters of the Famine river which flows into the Chaudière river; you then turn to the left a few degrees, and you strike the summit of the Chaudière river and the Etchemin river, and then you go eastward through all the other counties. You will thus serve every county on the south side of the mountains. But if you adopt the line that has been spoken of by my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) from the Quebec bridge to the mouth of the Abenakis river, you would only be a mile or a mile and a half apart. After you leave the Quebec bridge, you would commence to ascend the mountains for about fifty miles, until you get probably a thousand feet high. The ascent is not very great from the Quebec bridge until you get to the Abenakis river, but then you strike a very heavy grade for about eight miles until you get to the Pine river, when you turn to your right. If you adopt the route which I have suggested, you follow the natural course of the valley the whole way. As I have already stated in this House, the only two rivers in the province of Quebec which cross the Alleghany Mountains are the Richelieu river and the Etchemin river and we all know that when you have a stream to cut the mountain for you, you are at a great advantage in railway construction.

Mr. CLANCY. For the first nine miles we grant a subsidy to the Quebec Central Railway Company, and the subsidy for the other two miles is granted to any railway company.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. CLANCY. Well, even suppose it is granted to the Quebec Central Company, what purpose is served by this road, which will not be served by the Trans-continental railway if it is built?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know that the Transcontinental Railway has anything to do with the present vote. This subsidy here will go to the Quebec Central Railway, and will accommodate three or

four parishes which have no rail connection now. It will shorten the entrance of the Quebec Central Railway from the United States into Quebec city.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). From Scott Junction to Quebec, the Quebec Central will have two roads: One to Lévis and one to the Quebec bridge. It is the intention that the National Transcontinental Railway will take over the present line of the Quebec Central up as far as St. Anselme.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know what will be done with the Transcontinental Railway. At the present it is the intention to give a subsidy to the Quebec Central Railway.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). From Scott Junction to the St. Lawrence, the Quebec Central would have two railways.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. Are we going to lay down the principle that we are to give subsidies to a road paralleling the road of the same company for four or five miles. It may shorten the distance, but it is a mere convenience to the railway company. We must have money very plentiful when we do that.

Mr. MORIN. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) is labouring under a mistake. This is not to make the Quebec Central line any shorter, but instead of going to Lévis it enables them to aim for the Quebec bridge. Owing to the construction of the Quebec bridge every road on the south side of the river will want to get to it now. Circumstances alter cases. The Quebec Central cannot handle heavy freight from Lévis for about thirty-five miles. From Harlaka Junction they have a very heavy grade, and ten miles further on they strike another almost impossible grade of a mile and a half. Passenger trains find it very difficult to clinch that grade. That prevents them handling heavy freight, but the route which they now propose will avoid all that, and it does not come to the same point as the old road at all. At Lévis the two roads will be probably nine miles apart, and this new road will enable them to handle heavy freight from the north to the south.

Mr. CLANCY. As I understood my hon. friend (Mr. Morin), all the roads are now aiming to get to the Quebec bridge, and I can quite understand that. But are we going to start out on the principle of subsidizing all the railways to reach that bridge, instead of subsidizing lines to serve the public in a wider sense? I may not have grasped the situation properly, but so far as I am able to judge, we are subsidizing a railway now to reach the Quebec bridge, which is hardly in the proper sense of the word a national undertaking at all: it is a private enterprise. Instead of having in view the serving of the public generally, we are subsidizing railways all tending to that bridge. If my information is correct, this is not justifiable.

The PRIME MINISTER. The answer which my hon. friend asks for has already been given by my hon. friend from Dorchester (Mr. Morin). He has stated reasons which ought to satisfy my hon. friend that while this new railway goes to the Quebec bridge, it will serve a section of country which is at present devoid of railways, and is entitled to the same help that we give to other sections.

Mr. CLANCY. I understood the hon. member for Dorchester to say that the transcontinental railway, if built, will serve the same purpose.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Not at all. It is on a different side of the river.

Mr. TALBOT. Might I give a few words of information on this matter? The Quebec Central Railway, leaving Scott Junction, the terminus of the line which is proposed to be subsidized, runs in a north-easterly direction to Harlaka Junction, which is a station on the Intercolonial Railway, about five miles east of Lévis. The proposed line will run due south from the Quebec bridge to Scott Junction. The Quebec bridge will be the terminus of all these different lines of railway; but the Grand Trunk Pacific line will run in a south-easterly direction, while the proposed line will run due south, along the valley of the Chaudière river. The Etchemin river flows into the St. Lawrence about three miles east of the Chaudière river and takes a south-easterly course, and that is the course which the Grand Trunk Pacific will eventually take in that part of the country. The hon. member for Dorchester knows very well that if the Grand Trunk Pacific were to follow the Chaudière river through the parishes he has named to Scott Junction, it would have to run in a southerly direction. The hon. gentleman said a moment ago that the two railways would follow a similar route. My hon. friend knows very well that if the Grand Trunk Pacific were to follow that direction, it would have to be forced out of its course to take a southerly direction, to follow the valley of the Chaudière river, instead of following the valley of the Etchemin river, and then striking eastward through Bellechasse, Montmagany, and so on. If it followed the course my hon. friend suggests, it would be forced to go to Lake Etchemin and then on to the boundary line and through the state of Maine.

Mr. HENDERSON. Before this is carried, I wish to draw the attention of the committee to the way in which this matter has come before the government. I think it has been brought to the attention of the government in a way that we cannot entirely approve of. The only application made was for a portion of the subsidy, and that comes from the hon. member for Beauce

(Mr. Beland). He applied for a subsidy for the Quebec Central Railway from St. Francois to St. George, a distance of nine miles, and stated that the district to be served by the extension was very large, comprising nine towns, with no water communication and no railway communication whatever, and that a population of 10,000 people would be immediately and directly benefited by the extension. This recommendation applied entirely to the nine miles. We have no reference whatever to the twenty-two miles. I wonder who made the application for the subsidy for that portion. There seems to be something in the dark, something hidden. The impression of hon. members on this side is that this subsidy for the twenty-two miles is for some secret purpose, and the government so far has not disclosed who is to benefit by it. Is it recommended by anybody at all, or is it to assist a road for which a charter has been obtained by some other hon. member of this House who does not desire his name to come before the committee ? I think we are entitled to more information with respect to these twenty-two miles, because the manner in which the application has come before the government and the committee indicates that there is something kept back which ought to be disclosed.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The line of the Quebec Central Railway extends from the city of Sherbrooke up the valley of the Chaudière river, crosses the river, runs through Dorchester and on to Harlaka Junction. If my hon. friend will look at the map, he will see that this road, once it leaves the Chaudière river, runs north and easterly. The intention is to extend the railway from Scott Junction, the point on the Chaudière river where it starts to run in an easterly direction, beginning in Beauce, passing through Dorchester and on into Lévis, and ending at the Quebec bridge. It seems desirable to extend this road for the purpose of its business from Scott Junction to the bridge, because at the present time to reach the bridge it describes the two sides of a triangle, one of the sides being the Intercolonial Railway ; and recently the Minister of Railways had the pleasure of listening to a complaint which the manager of the Quebec Central Railway made of excessive charges on the part of the Intercolonial. It is to avoid the necessity of using the Intercolonial from Harlaka Junction to Lévis that this extension is asked for. I do not know how the application came to be made, but there were certainly several interviews in which the general manager and traffic manager applied for this extension. With respect to the nine miles, that is at the other end of the Quebec Central. At present it runs from Beauce Junction to St. François, from which point the intention is to extend it to St. George. The valley of the Chaudière, which will be served by this extension, is probably one of the most fertile portions of the whole province of Quebec. Last season ten million pounds of butter and cheese were taken out of that valley and four million pounds of maple sugar by this Quebec Central Railway, but owing to the lack of facilities to reach Quebec, these goods had to be sent to Montreal for export. This will all be remedied when this line is extended down to the bridge. It will cross the bridge to the harbour at Quebec and the freight will be deposited alongside the steamers.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman has not told us who applied for this subsidy.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Mr. Grundy, the general manager of the company, and Mr. Walsh, the assistant traffic manager, both in my presence, applied for it, but I could not say whether any formal application was made in writing.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is there a charter for the road from Scott Junction to the bridge ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is it a good farming country ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

For a line of railway from the station of Lac Bouchette on the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway to St. André, not exceeding 13 miles.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is a line from the present line in the valley of the Lake St. John from a station called Lac Bouchette, on the present line in the valley of the Lake St. John extending to a new parish where there is a large pulp establishment and other industries.

Mr. HENDERSON. I was rather amused at the reasons advanced by the gentleman who applied for this subsidy. He says that the government has already subsidized lines of less importance than ours, and hopes that they will give personal attention to the matter. To my mind that is a very poor reason indeed.

For a line of railway from Quebec towards Seven Islands, including branches to Murray Bay and Baie St. Paul, not exceeding 200 miles.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Seven Islands is on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, opposite the western end of the Island of Anticosti. The intention is to build from Quebec to Seven Islands. Whether or not that is possible is a question for the engineers. A great deal of work has been done at Seven Islands by the capitalists interested in this project, and they are under the impression that the line is feasible. While the whole of the north shore of the St. Lawrence looks from the river like a sea of mountains, it appears that behind these mountains there is a level valley through which a road can be built. The intention is to build branches from the main line to Baie St. Paul, and also to Murray

Bay, which is a very important point, especially during the summer season.

Mr. HENDERSON. I should be glad if the hon. Minister of Justice who, no doubt, is familiar with this section of country, would tell us the probable cost of the road ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am speaking absolutely without any accurate information. But the preliminary surveys or, I should say, the explorations that have been made from the Bay of Seven Islands up towards Chicoutimi would indicate that the expenditure would be in the neighbourhood of $30,000 per mile. As to the road from Chicoutimi to Quebec, I cannot say anything, except that the country through which the road will run is in some respects similar to the country through which the Lake St. John Railway runs. And I understand that that road cost $20,000 or $25,000 a mile.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand that this is a very mountainous country, and that is one of the reasons why the company applied for a larger subsidy than is asked for by any other company. Their application is for a minimum subsidy of $6,400 a mile.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is not granted.

Mr. HENDERSON. The reasons given why that subsidy should be greater than to other companies are that it is to pass through a mountainous country and that the country is almost wholly uninhabited. What object can there be in granting a subsidy of $6,400 a mile for a railway into a mountainous country almost uninhabited ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, no.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is what the applicants say.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That may be from Chicoutimi east, but not from Chicoutimi west.

Mr. HENDERSON. The reasons given for granting a subsidy are as follows : Mountainous country, almost wholly uninhabited; open up extensive agricultural, timber and mining areas ; will cost in excess of $25,000 a mile ; and make Bay of Seven Islands a great national port. Now, I am not sure that it is desirable that we should commence, at this hour, to open up any more national ports. Our ports at Montreal, Quebec, St. John and Halifax require a good deal of money to equip them, and I fail to see that there could be any great advantage in encouraging this enterprise, if one of the most important objects is to establish a national port at the Bay of Seven Islands. However, I think we can console ourselves with the thought that there is very little danger of the subsidy ever being called for.

For a branch line from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway at or near St. Philippe d'Argenteuil, thence in a northerly direction, passing through the village of Brownsburg, not exceeding three miles.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This description is not very accurate, so I move that the resolution be amended to read :

For a branch line from a point at or near the intersection of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Great Northern Railway between St. Phillippe d'Argenteuil and Lachute, thence in a northerly direction passing through the village of Brownsburg a distance not exceeding three miles.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is this in order to run to the cartridge factory ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The main industries to be accommodated are the factory at Brownsburg and a very extensive quarry beyond that village.

Mr. HENDERSON. This is another of the class of applications that come before this House in very objectionable form. I do not think that it is in keeping with the dignity of this House that one member of the government should write to another member of the government asking for a subsidy for a railway in which he or his friends may be interested. It would be much better if the application came from some other source. The only application I find for a subsidy for this road is a letter from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) addressed to Hon. Mr. Fielding, acting Minister of Railways. That looks very much like a family compact concern. I wonder who owns the granite quarry that this road is to reach, for which we are to give a subsidy of about $10,000.

Mr. CHRISTIE. I had much pleasure in supporting this application for a subsidy. I was approached on the subject by the president of the Dominion Cartridge Factory, which company, as the committee are aware, has extensive works at Brownsburg. This road will be of great benefit to that industry, as well as to the quarry already mentioned. So far as the quarry is concerned, the supply is unlimited, the only difficulty in the way of developing the quarry being the transportation difficulties the company have been obliged to contend with. The company already employ seventy hands, and I am informed that the amount of their pay-roll is $5,000 a month. In these figures I am speaking from memory, but I think they are accurate. I am also informed that if this road is built the amount of business will probably be quadrupled : in fact, that there is no limit to the amount of business which can be done, if the transportation difficulty is overcome. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson), who asked the question, will do me the honour of a visit at my home, I shall have great pleasure in driving him, not only to the Cartridge Company's works, but to the quarry. I will make his visit as pleasant for him as possible, and when he has seen what is

going on there I think he will agree that this subsidy will result in benefit to the country.

Mr. HENDERSON. I thank the hon. gentleman (Mr. Christie) for his invitation, which I gladly accept. I am informed by some of my friends who have visited him that he is a very hospitable entertainer, and so I shall be glad, as soon as I can make it convenient, to go down and spend a day with him. He has told us that this quarry is a very valuable one, that the supply is almost inexhaustible, that they employ so many men and pay so much money—in fact he has told us almost everything that we had not inquired about. We on this side were interested in knowing who were the owners of this quarry. I am not so much interested in knowing the great value of the property. I have no doubt it is valuable, otherwise they would not ask the government to subsidize a road leading to it.

An hon. MEMBER. How many miles ?

Mr. HENDERSON. Three miles.

Mr. CHRISTIE. The president of the company is Mr. Brunet, not the gentleman of that name who was formerly a member of this House.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). He is a large stone and marble dealer in the city of Montreal.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the cartridge company now any railway communication to this place ?

Mr. CHRISTIE. The nearest point is St. Phillippe. The company have spent large sums of money on this road, but owing to the heavy freight carried over it the road is in constant need of repair. I have several letters from the president of the company and other gentlemen who are anxious to see this branch line constructed.

To the Orford Mountain Railway Company for a line of railway from a point on its main line between Lawrenceville and Eastman to Lake Bonella, five miles; from Kingsbury to Windsor Mills, ten miles; and from Eastman to the town line between township of Bolton, east part, and township of Potton, 12 miles, not exceeding in the whole 27 miles.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is a small road in the eastern townships under a Quebec charter.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Did this company get their charter amended here, and obtain a Dominion charter ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think so.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I think this was a Quebec charter that had very extensive privileges, and the promoters came to this House and endeavoured to get a Bill passed with all these privileges granted by the Quebec charter, and they failed. I would like to know how much of it is built ?

Mr. CHRISTIE.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This road happens to be in my neighbourhood, and I am well acquainted with the circumstances. It is a small road in the eastern townships, constructed by the Orford Mountain Railway Company, composed of local men entirely. It starts at present from the village of Eastman and runs northward to a place called Kingsbury. They are now seeking to build a branch line from a point between Lawrenceville and Eastman on their main line to Lake Bonella, where there are large lumbering operations carried on, and they wish to extend it from Kingsbury to Windsor Mills, on the main line of the Grand Trunk, between Montreal and Portland. They also wish to extend their line southwards from the village of Eastman, about six miles, in the hope of carrying it further at some future time to touch the International boundary line, where they can connect with American lines.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Was not a part of this road abandoned once ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, not under the name of the Orford Mountain Railway. There was a railway company called the Missisquoi and Black River Valley Railway Company, that is now defunct. They built a few miles, but the rails have been taken up and the road has been abandoned. The Orford Mountain Railway desires to construct the portion from Eastman southwards partly on the old embankment of that road. But practically it is a new construction entirely.

To the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company for a line of railway from Gaspé to a point at or near Causapscal on the Intercolonial Railway, and from that point to Edmundston, N.B., not exceeding 260 miles; and for a line of railway from Paspebiac to Gaspé as near the shore as practicable, not exceeding 102 miles. Total, 362 miles.

Mr. LEMIEUX. As the House is aware, this charter was granted at the beginning of this session. The road starts from Paspebiac, in the county of Bonaventure, and will run along the shore as far as Gaspé Basin. Thence the road will go into the interior of the peninsula and reach Causapscal, on the Intercolonial, and from there will go as far as Edmundston, in New Brunswick, where it will tap the American system. On the shores of the Baie des Chaleurs from Paspebiac to Gaspé bay, there are from 20,000 to 25,000 people, who have hitherto been deprived of railway communication. This company has agreed to build that line at the urgent request of the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), and at my own request. They intended at first to build a railway only into the interior of the peninsula, where they have large interests. I may say at once that the Gaspé coast is a very fine agricultural country, and the interior of the peninsula is very rich in natural resources of all kinds. To show the

bona fides of the company, I may say that before they procured this charter—because they were incorporated under a local charter—they made all the preliminary surveys, and during last winter they expended a least $60,000 or $75,000. I will read to the Committee a letter which I have just received from the manager of the road, Mr. Carpenter. Some gentlemen from London, England, are interested in this construction. Mr. Carpenter writes as follows :

Montreal, October 16, 1903.

Dear Sir,—Now that our company has been assured they will receive a cash subsidy from the Dominion government, the directors feel justified in instructing their engineers to push forward the work with all despatch. Our engineer in chief is Mr. Henry O'Sullivan——

Who is well known to some hon. gentlemen in this House.

—who informed me last week that the preliminary or location survey was quite complete, and the draughtsman would have the plans and reports of the same from the Intercolonial to Gaspé Basin ready for us in the course of a week or ten days. In the meantime I have instructed Mr. O'Sullivan to get together the necessary staff of engineers, transit men, labourers, &c., ready to proceed to Gaspé and start the final survey for construction. Owing to the lateness of the season we do not contemplate being able to survey and complete the plan of more than three sections of the road before winter sets in, two in the county of Bonaventure and one from Gaspé, in all thirty miles. If we are not prevented by inclement weather we shall have these plans completed and be in a position to start construction on the above sections early next spring.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How many miles?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Thirty miles at present, because, as the hon. gentleman will notice by looking at the report, the company has had imposed upon it very stringent conditions. For instance, the company is obliged to build concurrently the shore line and the interior line, and if the company does not build ten miles within a year, dating from the 21st of June, on which day the Bill was sanctioned by the Governor General in the Senate, their charter will lapse, not only for the shore line, but for the interior line as well.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We will extend it ; all you have to do is to come and ask for an extension of time and we will grant it to you.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am glad to receive the endorsation of my hon. friend and his promise of an extension. I thank my hon. friend for his support and I will say so to the electors of Gaspé.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I suppose that the old C. N. Armstrong charter is abolished ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The Armstrong charter covering all that ground as far as Gaspé Basin has lapsed. This is a new company and has nothing whatever to do with Mr. Armstrong. In fact it was fought by Mr. Armstrong.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will this road touch all the improvements we have been making in Bonaventure and Gaspé ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. It will improve the improvements.

Mr. SPROULE. Are there any better prospects of this company building that road than there was of the Armstrong company building it ? The hon. gentleman has vigorously fought the old company for years and I would like to know if he is substituting anything better.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think so ; I can assure my hon. friend that the government and the two members most interested, the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) and myself, have taken all the precautions that were possible. In fact, I am positive that within the year we will have at least ten or twenty miles built. The gentlemen are quite in earnest and have the financial ability to carry out the project.

Mr. SPROULE. Who are the gentlemen ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The gentlemen concerned are all well known in London. The directors are Mr. William Griffiths, Mr. Mellowes and Mr. Sydney Lee. Mr. Elvey is the secretary, Sir Douglas Fox and partners are the engineers. The bankers are the Bank of Montreal.

For a branch line from a point near the bridge at River Trois Pistoles on the Intercolonial Railway in a south-easterly direction to Mackenzie and Renouf Falls, River Trois Pistoles, not exceeding 2½ miles.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What is the object of this ? I understand that it is running out to a mill owned by an hon. member of this House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If an hon. member of this House is fortunate enough to own a mill I think we ought to be glad of it. We do not expect the members of this House to be dummies, but energetic business men.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The rule with us is that when you want a siding you build it yourself.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a spur at a point near River Trois Pistoles on the Intercolonial Railway to Mackenzie and Renouf Falls, Rivière Trois Pistoles. A large pulp mill is being built there and there are also large timber limits.

Mr. BLAIN. In what county is that ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In Temiscouata.

Mr. SPROULE. Who is the owner of this large pulp mill that is to be built there ?

The PRIME MINISTER. It is a joint stock company of which Mr. Tobin, member for Richmond and Wolfe is president.

Mr. SPROULE. I regard this as a very improper way to use public money. A year or two ago a subsidy was proposed for the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway, which goes through my county, and a portion of that goes through the township of St. Vincent and town of Meaford. It was proposed to build the Grand Trunk Railway down into the town of Meaford which would be probably two and a half miles and although a subsidy was given from that town to build around to Owen Sound and one end of this road would start practically at the wharf and the other extend towards Owen Sound, and although I did my best to get the government to allow a portion of that subsidy to apply to the building of the road down to the wharf, about one and a half or two miles from the end of the Grand Trunk Railway I was answered that the government was not subsidizing or using public money in that way, that this was only a short spur down to the wharf and that the people of the town should build it or that it should be built between them and the railway company. The people were obliged, notwithstanding the fact that a subsidy was given professedly to build a railway from that point, to raise the money to build it themselves. The government would not allow a dollar of the subsidy to be applied in that way and now we are asked to vote a subsidy to assist in building a spur or siding into a man's mill. Because that man happens to be a member of this House he is treated in this way. If these subsidies were given alike in all cases I would not have the same ground for complaint, but where it is emphatically denied in other cases upon grounds which if applied to this case would exclude this gentleman from such benefits, then I think it is unfair and that we have a right to object to it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not remember the other case to which my hon. friend refers, but, it is a mistake to refer to this as a siding; this is not a siding; it is a line that runs off almost at right angles with the Intercolonial Railway at a place where it is believed there will be a considerable development of business. Whether it is a proper subsidy to grant is a debatable matter, but it is not right to describe this line as a siding.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In our country if a man wants a siding or spur into his mill he has to go to the cost of constructing it and the company charges him interest on the rails, besides which he has to maintain the spur. Here the government is to build a road which is really a part of the Intercolonial Railway and is paying a subsidy.

Mr. SPROULE. It is practically a man building a railway into his mill and getting $7,000 to do it. If you would apply the same principle all over the country I would not have the same objection to it.

The PRIME MINISTER. In what year was the application of which my hon. friend has spoken, made ?

Mr. SPROULE. In 1901.

Mr. COCHRANE. There is a principle involved in this case. Why should we, the ratepayers as a whole, be called upon to build two and a half miles of a spur or siding, whatever you call it, for the benefit of a member of this House ? Why should we vote public money for the benefit of a private individual or company. If a railway is developing a country, I would not oppose a subsidy for it no matter in what province it may be, but the government has practically gone insane in voting subsidies this year for little dabs of railways one mile and two miles long, to serve private individuals. The Prime Minister himself must see that this is absurd. Why don't these people do as we have to do in our section of the country, where these railways are built by the private individuals who want them. When these gentlemen on the other side of the House were in opposition, they objected to the name of a member of parliament appearing as an applicant for a charter, but now they sit complacently by and vote this money when a member of the government makes an application to the Minister of Finance for a subsidy. It looks to me a little fishy, and it is time we called a halt. We have gone so far to-day as to subsidize local roads that are chartered by the provincial government, and now we are subsidizing roads which serve the purposes only of some private corporation. How can the members for Ontario go home and justify themselves in voting subsidies for these little tramp railways down in the provinces, when in our own province private individuals have to build their own roads ? If this were a colonization road I could understand it ; but there is no reason on earth why a man should not build his own siding to his mill.

Mr. TAYLOR. As I understand it, this is a branch of the Intercolonial Railway which runs into some industrial establishments lying along that line. Is it the intention of the government to loan them the rails in addition to giving them this subsidy ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no arrangement whatever between the Intercolonial Railway and this company. This is treated as an ordinary subsidy.

Mr. TAYLOR. To whom ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. To the company.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will this road be operated by that independent company or by the Intercolonial Railway ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There has been no arrangement yet on the subject.

Mr. HENDERSON. The acting Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Fielding) objected to this road being called a siding, but I find that in the application which was made by the company themselves, they designated it both as a siding and a spur line. Here is what they say :

Application to construct a spur line near the Trois Pistoles bridge.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. HENDERSON. And here is the letter written to the engineer of the Intercolonial Railway by the government engineer who was sent to inspect it.

As per instructions received from you, I went to Trois Pistoles to go over ground and make report on what is to be a siding or branch from the Intercolonial Railway to a point up stream, where a company own timber limits and water privileges on the main River Trois Pistoles. I found a preliminary location survey has been made by an engineer, sent there by Mr. Tobin and his company. I walked over ground in company with their engineer. The proposed branch or siding is about two and a half miles in length and begins at a point on the Intercolonial Railway about 700 feet east of Trois Pistoles bridge ; running south, crossing the public highway at about grade point, keeping the side hill, passing two large grist mills.

There is one feature of this subsidy which I dislike very much. The general public are not allowed to participate in the advantages of this railway at all ; they will get no benefit from the construction of this railway ; the private company will receive all the benefit. I object to these subsidies for a line simply to run into a granite quarry, to satisfy the desires of a minister of the Crown or any other persons with whom he may be associated. This company tells the government that they have acquired all the water privileges and all the land within a very considerable distance, so that everybody else except the company is excluded from participating in the benefits of this expenditure. This letter is a lengthy one, and I shall not detain the House by reading more than a portion of it. It says :

The company of which Mr. Tobin is promoter proposes building at once at terminus of branch, a large pulp mill, a shingle mill, and an electric power house. And at McKenzie's Falls, about 1,000 feet below, erecting a large paper mill. The electric power house is for the purpose of lighting all the mills on stream below, two large grist mills, and Messrs. Price Bros. large saw mill, and also to light the town of Trois Pistoles by electricity. The company here have acquired all water privileges up this river for a distance of ten mies and have also control of 100,000 acres of timber limits situated on both sides of Trois Pistoles river and extending back in country considerable distance and have control of all available timber lands for some miles back.

Mr. SPROULE. They have everything in sight.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is the great objection. This company has obtained possession of everything in sight ; no other person can go in there and acquire water privileges or piece of land, without dealing with this company. All the benefits which accrue from this subsidy must of necessity go to the company. It is a close corporation, and all the benefits the public get from it is what may be doled out to the workingman in the shape of wages. It is altogether a wrong principle to subsidize such a road as this. No doubt these 100,000 acres of land, and this long stretch of water-power privilege was obtained before there was a railway there, and at a cheap price because of the difficulty of access ; but when this company became possessed of everything in sight, they go to the government and ask them to spend $10,000 or $15,000 to make this property more valuable. They bought it at a cheap price because there was no railway connection, and now they want the government to give them railway connection, so as to enhance its value. Had the subsidy been granted before this company acquired all the property there would be some fair play in it, because then others would have an opportunity of going in there and acquiring property on the same basis. This is undoubtedly a case which has no merit in it whatever. If these people want a siding two and a half miles long, let them do as we have to do in the province of Ontario. I know very well that in the province of Ontario when we want a siding on the Canadian Pacific Railway, we have to make the embankment, put on the ties, and pay a considerable rental for the iron.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Any rebate allowed ?

Mr. HENDERSON. No rebate at all. We pay the regular freight all the same. I am not finding fault with this. I cannot expect the Canadian Pacific Railway to provide special privileges without being compensated for them. But we do not come to the government and ask them to give us these facilities. In the constituency I have the honour to represent, I know of a spur line which was built from the main line of the Grand Trunk Railway to a paper mill. The hon. member for Nipissing has been pleading here all afternoon in favour of supporting grants to paper and pulp mills. There is a very large and old paper mill in the constituency I have the honour to represent, and I do not think it ever secured aid for the construction of railway facilities for bringing out its output. A few years ago a spur line was built from the Grand Trunk to the mill. I cannot say whether it was done at the expense of the proprietors or at the expense of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I am inclined to think that the proprietor had to assist ; but I am quite sure that the government were not asked to contribute one cent, although that was as meritorious a case as the one we have before us now. The

proprietor of that mill and his predecessors for the last forty or fifty years have employed a great deal of labour ; their output is very considerable ; and if a paper or pulp mill is entitled to consideration, that one is as much entitled to it as those in newer sections of the country. I disapprove altogether of aiding private enterprises of this kind where the general public are excluded from taking any advantage of the investment. I do not think this case has any merit at all.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CLANCY. With regard to the item 53, now before the committee, for a branch line to Mackenzie and Renouf Falls, river Trois Pistoles, not exceeding 2½ miles, the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) asked what arrangement was made with the Intercolonial regarding the rails to be laid on that siding. It is surely not proposed to hand over to a private company—not a railway company at all—all these compensations. As pointed out by my hon. friend, they have grabbed everything in sight. They have secured the water-power and the timber limits and every concession possible before investing a dollar in the way of plant, and they ask the country now to construct a railway for them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no arrangement whatever between the government and this company with respect to the operation of the road. The subsidy is the same as any other subsidy and in no different position.

Mr. CLANCY. It is in a very different position from all others.

Mr. GAUVREAU. Does the hon. gentleman say that the company have not spent anything at Trois Pistoles ?

Mr. CLANCY. There is no plant there.

Mr. GAUVREAU. In my constituency, Temiscouata, $250,000 have been spent. There are three shingle mills in operation.

Mr. CLANCY. How long have the mills been in operation ?

Mr. GAUVREAU. Two months. We expect to have five shingle mills at work, and in one year will export 1,200 cars of lumber by the Intercolonial.

Mr. CLANCY. Is this Mr. Tobin's company ?

Mr. GAUVREAU. It is an American company. The promoters are French Canadians from the States, and Mr. Tobin is the president. Those who have invested the most money are French Americans.

Mr. CLANCY. We are very glad to welcome them back to this country, and to welcome the investment of capital in Canada, but there is no reason why the Canadian tax-payer should build sidings for Mr. Tobin or anybody else. We might as well build the mills for his company. This siding is essentially a part of the plant of the company, in which the public are not interested. This company want the government to build a road for them and at the same time loan them the rails and give them the balance of the outfit. We ought to know on what arrangement they are to get these other advantages apart from the subsidy.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is making much ado about something which he considers entirely novel. I can assure him that he is mistaken. The grant of a subsidy for a small road—call it a siding if you will, but it is not a siding—two or three miles long, is by no means a novelty either under the present or former administrations. This company cannot do everything, and there will be a large population gathered around their industries which will give business to the railway. As to how the Intercolonial will arrange with the company later on, that is a matter for future adjustment.

Mr. CLANCY. There is a wide distinction between this and other grants to railways. This is not a road which the public can use. It is a private road in every sense of the word. If we are to take this subsidy as a precedent, there is not a mill-owner in Canada who is not entitled to have a siding built to his mill by the government.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Why do you not move to strike it out ?

Mr. CLANCY. That is just the kind of suggestion I would expect from the hon. gentleman. He always throws a stone from behind the hedge and never comes out in the open. Did he ever move to strike out an item of that kind when contending against it ? If he did not, why does he ask me to move ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I never whined for a couple of hours over an item.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has whined over matters of much less importance, and the hilarity which his interruption excites, particularly on the part of the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Calvert), who had lame men in his riding employed as census enumerators, who had to be carried around in the villages to do the work, is very amusing. The fact that this is a small matter does not at all improve the quality of it. Members cannot come to this House and make demands for votes of public money for the benefit of concerns in which they are personally interested without violating a well recognized principle of our parliamentary system.

This is the feature of it that it seems to me without a single redeeming side. I do not expect to get better information than we have had, but I suppose that hon. gentlemen opposite will have to deal with the public later on.

Mr. SPROULE. We have been voting railway subsidies pretty freely, and very seldom have we on this side offered any serious objection to what was proposed, if there was anything like a justification for the vote. But in the multiplicity of these proposals, it cannot be wondered at that some do not meet with our approval. If we are to support the expenditure of public money it must be upon the basis of some reasonable belief that the expenditure will benefit the public, not an individual or a corporation alone, but the people. It never was proposed, so far as I know, that a subsidy should be given to a private firm or company to build a siding into their mill. Some years ago I applied to the government for some assistance by way of subsidy to build a line from the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway to an important village in our county. The distance would be about two or two and a half miles. We had the assurance of parties who were well able to carry out the work that if the government would give the usual subsidy of $3,200 a mile they would build the line to the village. It was an important village, a place that had been settled for forty years or so ; it contained a grist mill, a saw mill, a woollen mill and the usual other industries of a thriving village, as well as stores of all kinds. With all these, its trade was a very considerable trade indeed. I applied to the government for the subsidy and submitted the best arguments I could. But I was quietly told that such a subsidy would not be justified by the House, and that the minister would not feel justified in recommending it to the Council, for the reason that this was only a spur line. I was told that if I could show that the line would connect two railway systems, so that cars could be transferred from one to the other, it might be regarded as worthy of a subsidy. But, though the village might be an important one and its trade large and growing, the conditions were not such as to justify the subsidy being granted. In view of that, I do not know how I am to go back to the same people and justify such a proposition as is made here, for this has far less merit in it in many respects. In this instance, practically everything in sight, the water-powers, the timber lands, the mill sites and everything else, is owned by a company, and the public have no substantial interest. We are not even told that this is a thickly settled country or that there are industries there in which the public are interested. But it would seem that this company has secured everything it can from the local government and, being still unsatisfied, it comes to the Dominion for further assistance. For the purpose of carrying on their business they desire sidings to be built into their property, and they come to the government and ask for assistance to the extent of $7,000 or $8,000 for this purpose. It can well be admitted that this will be more profitable to the company, but I do not understand that it is even claimed that it is of any substantial benefit to the public. It seems to me that the government have wholly failed to make out a case in favour of this vote. They have not even told us that this railway is owned by a regularly chartered railway company, or whether this road is to be built by the Intercolonial under the general provision of the Railway Act, which gives a company the right to build branches not more than six miles in length without special charter. The hon. member (Mr. Gauvreau), who seems to be familiar with the locality, speaks of a company—Mr. Tobin's company. I did not understand whether it was a railway company, a general commercial company or a lumber company.

Mr. GAUVREAU. It is a lumber company.

Mr. SPROULE. So, no railway company wants this, but merely an association of capitalists engaged in the lumber business. Let me tell the acting Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Fielding) that if he adopts this principle to-night and we vote this railway subsidy, he can have at once a thousand applications equally meritorious from all parts of the country. And if he grants this, how can he refuse the others ? It seems to me that this is establishing a very bad precedent a precedent that the government of this country will find very troublesome in the future.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) says that we are establishing a bad precedent in this case. Now, I do not know the merits of this case very well, but I contend that the precedent for it was established long years ago.

Mr. SPROULE. When ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. By the late government. And the hon. member for East Grey has, over and over again, supported propositions just the same as this.

Mr. SPROULE. Give an instance.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The Cape Tormentine Railway.

Mr. SPROULE. I emphatically deny that I ever supported a proposition of this kind, knowing it to be such.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPROULE. Let me say one word in explanation. Many of these railway subsidies were voted, the exact locality and merits of which we could not know. I may have supported such a proposition under these circumstances, but not under any other.

Mr. CAMPBELL. But the hon. gentleman supported it just the same ; and if he did not know what he was supporting, he was not fit to occupy——

Mr. SPROULE. Tell me an instance.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If the hon. gentleman will look over the subsidies granted by the late government, he will find many cases of grants in cases such as this.

Mr. BROCK. Mention one.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I may say to the hon. gentleman for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) that I have already mentioned one. It was for Mr. Wood, who now occupies a position in the other House. He was supporting the government, and it was at his instance that the subsidy was granted. It seems strange, therefore, that these men, when similar precedents have been established, and when they have over and over again voted bonuses to similar enterprises, should now rise in their righteous indignation and oppose this justifiable grant. The member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) will support bonuses where he is interested for $100,000 or $200,000, yet he will stick, and haggle and whine about a little tu'penny-ha'penny thing of two miles and a half that is in the public interest.

Mr. BROCK. The hon. gentleman is putting his foot in it now. I am not whining about this at all, and I defy him to mention a case where I supported a bonus that I am interested in myself. He is making a statement that he must know to be not according to the facts.

Mr. CAMPBELL. When hon. members sit in this House and allow subsidies to go through without a protest, without raising their voice against them, we may rightly conclude that they are in favour of them. Therefore, when they advocate certain bonuses, and do not vote against others, they are responsible for their passage. The proper way for a member of this House to do, if he is opposed to a grant and has the courage of his convictions, is to rise in the House and move that the item be struck out. That would be the duty of those hon. gentlemen who oppose this grant as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) does so strongly ; he should rise in his place and move that the item be struck out, then he will be acting according to his convictions.

Mr. EMMERSON. We are asked to name a case. I will give the case of what is known as the Harvey branch, which connects the Albert Railway, now known as the Salisbury and Harvey, with a private wharf which was owned by the late Hon. J. J. S. Turner. He owned this branch, and he owned the wharf, and the parliament of Canada, somewhere in the 80's, under a Conservative administration, not only subsidized that siding down to the wharf, but gave assistance to a bridge.

Mr. CLANCY. What was the length of the branch ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Between two and three miles, about the same length as the branch in question. But he was a Tory, he was a member of a Tory government.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member has not made good his statement that it was a similar case, because in that instance the grant was given to a railway company, whereas this is being given to a commercial company.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is not being given to any company.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman explained it as being given to the Tobin Company, which he admits is not a railway company. Who applied for it ? Is it not the Tobin Company ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The Harvey branch was owned by one man, the gentleman I referred to, and it was no more of a public railway than this is to be.

Mr. SPROULE. There are many railways owned by only one man, and we have already voted subsidies to connect railways with a wharf——

Mr. EMMERSON. Not a private wharf.

Mr. SPROULE. We have wharfs by the dozen that are private wharfs, but the public use them all the time to ship their produce. Though this railway may have been owned by one man, it was for the public convenience to connect a water route and land route. Therefore it is not a similar case.

Mr. EMMERSON. That branch was built for the purpose of permitting the gentleman who owned this wharf to ship his lumber down to that wharf over this branch or siding.

Mr. SPROULE. Did not the public use it as well as himself, both for incoming and outgoing freight ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I presume the public will use this in the same way.

Mr. SPROULE. Well it is not very likely. Now, the member for West York (Mr. Campbell), with his usual inaccuracy and braggadocio, says, I am going to give a case, and he cites the case of Senator Wood. Well, did Senator Wood get a subsidy either as a private individual or as a corporation ? I deny it, and the hon. gentleman cannot confirm his statement. It was given to a railway company for the convenience of the public, and not to a private individual or a private corporation.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I want to say that the Cape Tormentine Railway has nothing to do with the item which we are discussing. That railway received a charter becasue it goes for 18 or 20 miles through a

very populous district, and serves a great number of people, while the instance under discussion is a private corporation which controls the whole river, which controls the whole area of timber limits, and the whole situation. It is simply a private individual. The Cape Tormentine Railway was also built to connect the winter service of Prince Edward Island with Cape Tormentine.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The case I refer to is several years old. The railway, as I remember, was a siding that went into Mr. Wood's sawmill, and was about a mile and a half long.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I do not know anything about Mr. Wood's sawmill. The hon. gentleman referred to the Cape Tormentine Railway, and I think there is no fair comparison with this item. While I am on this subject, and as I see the leader of the government in his seat, I would like to refer to the need of branch lines in Prince Edward Island. While we are giving subsidies to hundreds of branch lines throughout this Dominion, we have been unsuccessfully asking in Prince Edward Island for branch lines through populous districts, to serve the farming community, to serve cheese factories, and butter factories, and manufacturing industries throughout the Island. I have instanced a number of cases, and I have presented petition after petition in this House, with no result. During the three years I have been here I have presented petitions for a branch line from North Wiltshire to the southern coast, through a populous district, a line about twenty miles long, a line that will serve a great number of persons. I have also brought to the attention of the acting Minister of Railways and Canals another branch that was needed down to Elmira, and a branch from O'Leary to the western part of the Island. These branches are all much needed by a great number of people. I would like the leader of the government to take these matters in hand. The main line is a government line, and if we are going to get any railway accommodation at all we must get it through branch lines built by the government. While on the subject of short branch lines, I would also mention that I have brought to the attention of the acting Minister of Railways this year, as the board of trade of the maritime provinces have also done, the need of a spur running from the main line at Charlottetown down to the wharf front, which would serve not one private individual, but the whole commercial community of Charlottetown. And during the season of navigation, when the goods are brought into Charlottetown to private wharfs, every bit of that merchandise has to be carted across the town to the station at Charlottetown at a greatly increased cost and at great inconvenience to the shippers. We have been asking for a spur that would not be two and a half miles long and possibly would not be over one mile in length, and yet we have been put off from year to year with the explanation that 'we will look into the case.' I wish that the acting minister would look into it with some seriousness.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no relevancy at all in the observations of my hon. friend.

Mr. LEFURGEY. There is a great deal of relevancy in them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are dealing with railway subsidies, we are not dealing with the construction of railways by the government. There has been no application from anybody in Prince Edward Island to my knowledge for the privileges which are proposed to be conferred on railway companies or other parties by these votes, and any discussion of the construction of branches by the Intercolonial Railway has no relevancy to this. These gentlemen would be very pleased indeed if we would build then a branch line of railway; but the government do not propose to build them a branch line, simply to offer them the usual facilities in the way of subsidies and for the rest they must pay the money themselves. If any one in Prince Edward Island wants the same privileges on the same conditions I fancy that the government would be ready to grant it, but, there is no such proposal from Prince Edward Island and there is no relevancy in the point raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey). If the hon. gentleman wants to advocate the building of a branch line in Prince Edward Island it would be a very proper subject at the proper time. If he wants to convey the impression that this government has not been dealing liberally with the province of Prince Edword Island, I am satisfied that there is too much common sense among the people of that island, in view of the appropriations contained in the estimates for that province, to permit the people to treat his remarks seriously.

Mr. LEFURGEY. We are dealing with the public money of this country, and it makes no difference whether it is being expended for subsidies or for the building of lines. We do not ask for subsidies in Prince Edward Island; we do not build branch lines in Prince Edward Island because the whole system is owned by the government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. So is the Intercolonial Railway in this case.

Mr. LEFURGEY. We want the government to build a line there, as they own the whole system and for that reason the subject is perfectly relevant; it is the expenditure of public money to suit the convenience of the people in the locality and to assist them in carrying on the enterprise in which they are engaged. This spur line in Charlottetown would not only be a convenience to the shippers of produce, &c., in Charlottetown, but would benefit the Prince Edward Island Railway.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is trying to convey the impression that by these subsidy resolutions some privilege is being granted to other provinces that is not granted to Prince Edward Island.

Mr. LEFURGEY. They certainly are.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They certainly are not, because no one in Prince Edward Island has sought the privileges that are granted by this.

Mr. LEFURGEY. They cannot.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They can; there is nothing to prevent them.

Mr. LEFURGEY. It is impracticable.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is no more impracticable for them than for people living along the line of the Intercolonial Railway. If the hon. gentleman says that subsidies are refused to his province, he is wrong; but if he is not seking railway subsidies how can he complain if he does not get them.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. Minister of Finance seems to be worked up on the question of irrelevancy. He did not seem to be so much concerned about irrelevancy when the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell) got up and referred to something done many years ago by another government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. By a subsidy I understood.

Mr. BARKER. We might infer from the words of the hon. member for West York that if a minister twenty years ago had picked a man's pocket that would justify the right hon. gentleman who now leads the government in committing a burglary. That seems to be his argument. The Minister of Finance says this is not a matter affecting the Intercolonial Railway; it is a matter of public concern, a subsidy to be granted by this Dominion. I think the facts are just the reverse of what the Minister of Finance states. This is particularly a matter affecting the Intercolonial Railway, and I think it is absolutely ridiculous for an hon. gentleman to stand up in this House and say that a two and a half mile side track on the Intercolonial Railway is a matter affecting the Dominion, for which a Dominion subsidy ought to be granted. If this is a siding or a spur track that is useful to the Intercolonial Railway why has not the Minister of Railways and Canals dealt with it? If that hon. gentleman, as acting Minister of Railways and Canals, thinks that this two and a half mile track is a necessity for the Intercolonial Railway, surely he could have dealt with that subject as a railway manager deals with every application of the kind. The very fact that it has not been brought up in that way, that the Minister of Railways and Canals has not so dealt with this two and a half spur track to a timber limit, owned by a private individual, is the strongest possible evidence that we can have that this is not a matter that ought to be paid for by the Dominion at large. The hon. gentleman could, if he had chosen, have dealt with this as he has dealt with many other cases where the Intercolonial Railway is interested in a side-track for a spur track or anything of that kind. If he thought the business with this private commercial enterprise justified the Intercolonial Railway in connecting its line with that enterprise by a side track; he could have dealt with it by agreement. The people interested in that enterprise would have entered into a contract with the government and would have undertaken to pay to the government the cost of that siding. Probably there has been some side influence in this case which leads the government not to deal with it, as the Grand Trunk Railway or Canadian Pacific Railway or any other large railway company would deal with such a case; the hon. gentleman has not dealt with it as a departmental matter but has turned it over to the Dominion, and he gravely asks parliament to grant a subsidy for two and a half miles of railway as if a connection with this private timber limit were in the interests of the whole of the Dominion.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that the immortal feature of this transaction should command the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals. The law governing the independence of parliament provides that no member of parliament can receive money from the country and the only way in which he can evade the consequences of the law is by being connected with a company. The principle we have laid down is that we will assist railways, but in this case we are departing from the salutary principle and now we are going to help commercial companies to build railways into their own premises. I want to submit this feature: How can Mr. Tobin, who is a member of this House, be an independent member of parliament and vote against any government measure during this session when he is a suppliant at the door of the government for this subsidy? How can he be expected to do so? It is not in human nature to expect it. It is unreasonable, and while Mr. Tobin may not deliberately violate the independence of parliament Act he is actually violating the spirit of it if not the letter. No member of parliament can be as independent as he should be when he is here seeking a subsidy of money from which he himself will be the principle beneficiary and the largest share of which will go into his own pocket. It seems to me that the government should refrain from doing that kind of thing and that this is a very bad precedent and an improper thing to do.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) worries his soul over

the morals of the members in this respect. How does he justify one of his colleagues who sits usually immediately behind him and who is a director of the Canadian Pacific Railway, although we are voting subsidies to the Canadian Pacific Railway? My hon. friend does not worry over that member's morals in the slightest degree.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he has ever known the hon. gentleman to whom he refers to sit in this House and vote upon the question of a bonus to the railway to which he refers?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not discuss that question. Mr. Tobin, the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe is not sitting in this House, voting on this question, yet his name has been used freely, more freely than I have used the name of the hon. the junior member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler). It seems to make a great difference whose ox is gored. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is very much worried because some of these votes are not expressly to railway companies. It would be a dreadful thing if we should vote money to any company that is not a railway company. This is not a vote to any company, it is a vote for a line of railway. It is in the same position as any other line of railway where no company is mentioned. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) was not always so squeamish about these things as he is now. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) says that if some one picked some one else's pocket years ago, that would not justify another person in committing a burglary now. No, but if a person who committed a burglary years ago, suddenly becomes virtuous, and howls when another person commits a burglary, there is something very suspicious about it.

Mr. SPROULE. We are not looking for virtue from that side.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman expects all the virtue to be on this side of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. We are complaining that there is no virtue on that side of the House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are just ordinary plain people over here, and we do not profess to have that high degree of morality, which enables us to single out the member for Richmond and Wolfe, to lecture him on morals, without looking at the vacant seat behind the hon. member for East Grey. But if there is any degree in morals, we suspect strongly that the member for Richmond and Wolfe is not the bigger sinner in these transactions. I find that in 1888, a vote was made of rails and fastenings; which are money; which stood in the public accounts as an asset for $4,335; these were voted, not to assist a railway company, but to assist a cotton company in the city of Halifax. That is commonly known in my city as the cotton factory siding, and this line was built for the special advantage of the Halifax Cotton Company. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) told us the other night that he was here for a quarter of a century, and we were all glad to congratulate him——

Mr. SPROULE. Might I ask the hon. minister if that was not an arrangement made with the Intercolonial Railway?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Intercolonial Railway is the government of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. It is a different thing altogether.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It does not make it any better or any worse, whether it was an arrangement made with the Intercolonial Railway or not, and I have a pretty strong suspicion—but I do not like to mention names without having an opportunity to verify the record—I have a pretty strong suspicion that some of the members of parliament who sat here when that subsidy was voted, were members of the Halifax Cotton Company. But right alongside that last vote, I find that another appropriation is made of rails and fastenings, which are money, which stood in the public acounts as an asset representing $11,964.56. Was that voted in blank to someone else with the possibility of getting it taken up by an incorporated railway company? No, it was voted to a company which was not a railway company, but which was known as the Steel Company of Canada. This grant was given for a branch, or a siding to their factory.

Mr. CLANCY. What were the general conditions in connection with that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The only general condition is, that they would put down a certain quantity of rails themselves.

Mr. TAYLOR. And all for the benefit of the Intercolonial Railway.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This proposed vote will be for the benefit of the Intercolonial Railway; this is a branch of the Intercolonial Railway. What is the difference?

Mr. BARKER. Will the hon. minister allow me to ask him a question? Will the hon. gentleman say that the rails he refers to there are not to-day the property of the Intercolonial Railway?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot tell, but I can tell that these resolutions granted the rails to the Halifax Cotton Company, and to the Steel Company of Canada. Here is what it says:

> To the Halifax Cotton Company of Nova Scotia, a grant as subsidy—the road to be first laid with new steel rails weighing not less than 56 pounds per lineal yard, and after an Order in Council has been passed authorizing their transfer to the company—of 233 tons of used iron rails and fastenings, loaned to the company——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Hold on: they first loaned them, and that was not bad enough as a matter of morals, but they went further and then gave them afterwards.

—two hundred and thirty-three tons of used iron rails and fastenings loaned to the company, which rails and fastenings stand in the public accounts as an asset for $4,335.

This is a grant to the Halifax Cotton Company.

Mr. BARKER. It is a loan.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No; it says they have already been loaned, but this is a grant.

Mr. BARKER. Could the Steel Company or the Cotton Company dispose of these rails as being their property?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is a grant given to them here. If there is a grant of anything given to the hon. gentleman by vote of this parliament, he can do as he likes with it. We have it plainly stated:

To the Halifax Cotton Company of Nova Scotia a grant as subsidy, &c.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well, that what he has read is the ordinary transaction whereby a railway company issues its old second-hand rails as a loan to an enterprise that it wants to assist, by allowing a siding. They lend their rails, but the rails belong to the company lending them, and the siding cannot be used for any other purpose than for connection with the railway that lends the rails. Does the hon. gentleman suppose, that in addition to that resolution which he has read, there is not a contract with the Intercolonial Railway, that the Intercolonial Railway does not control that siding as any railway company controls the sidings that are made to connect with its main line? The hon. gentleman knows that is probably the case. But what is the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) doing by this resolution which we are considering? He is giving a subsidy in hard cash to a private individual who is building two and a half miles of track, and that individual, whoever he may be, will receive that money in his own pocket.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman does no credit to his professional ingenuity when he makes such a weak argument as that. This is a grant to the Halifax Cotton Company and the Canada Steel Company. It is not anything but a grant. We have to take it just as we find it; as my hon. friend has just to take what he finds in the present resolution. We are proposing to grant certain aid to this road down at Trois Pistoles. In these resolutions I have quoted, the government of the day brought to parliament a proposal to grant aid, and whether they granted it in rails or cash it made no difference, because the rails represented cash, and it is stated here that they stood in the assets of Canada as so much cash, and they must be brought down to the basis of hard pan in cash value.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman knows that the Railway Department of that day had no power whatever to lend these rails, without coming to parliament and getting authority. They came here and they got authority to lend these rails for the purpose of that siding. If the hon. gentleman will undertake to state that that was an absolute gift of these rails, I have nothing further to say. But the hon. minister has admitted that he cannot say that. The langauge he has read from the resolution does not show more than that parliament had authorized the granting a loan of rails to that company.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend is mistaken. The resolution distinctly states that these rails are granted to the company. These rails had already been loaned to the company, and it did not need an Act of parliament to loan them.

Mr. BARKER. Certainly it did.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Then they had loaned them before, and whether they had loaned them by an Act of parliament or not I do not know.

Mr. BARKER. They loaned them without authority, and they had to come to parliament to get the authority.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) is standing here to abuse the late government, by saying that it did these things without authority.

Mr. BARKER. Certainly.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I protest against this attempt of the hon. gentleman to escape responsibility by attacking the late government. I do not believe the late government would do such thing. I do not believe they would lend the property of the Crown without authority. I am bound to believe that the minister of that day, who, I think, was the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) was a man who observed the law and in his absence to-night I want to defend him against this calumny.

Mr. COCHRANE. He does'nt want your defence.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The resolution distinctly states that it is to be a grant of 233 tons of used iron rails and fastenings loaned to the company. They already had them. They were in their possession; they were loaned to them ,and this resolution gives them a free gift, and it gives that gift to them at the net cash price in which it stood in the assets of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to draw attention to the comparison that the acting minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding) has made between this case and the case of the member for Toronto (Mr. Osler), who is a director of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Let me point out that the Canadian Pacific Railway is a railway which is over 4,000 miles long.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. How does that affect the question of morals ?

Mr. SPROULE. It affects the question of morals a great deal. This is a railway of 4,000 miles, which has its ramifications all over Canada, supplying the needs of the people, and handling the commerce of the country whether it be the product of the farm or the product of the manufacturer. That company which is engaged in building a highway of commerce for the people of every part of Canada, deserves assistance from this government. There is an hon. member of this House who happens to be a member of that corporation, and because a subsidy is given to that great international railway enterprise, the Minister of Finance thinks that member is as guilty as the member who receives a subsidy for no railway corporation whatever, and a subsidy which is not given for the benefit of the public, but for the private benefit of that member. It does not ask a dollar of it for the accommodation of the public. The public have no interest there, because this corporation owns the land, the timber, the water-power and everything else in the locality.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is what the Canadian Pacific Railway does when it gets a chance.

Mr. SPROULE. It is begging the question to cite that as a parallel case. It is a very unfair comparison to say that the hon. member for West Toronto is doing an equally immoral act to sit in this House when a subsidy is being voted the Canadian Pacific Railway, as the member who represents this company, and who goes to the government and asks for this bonus. It goes largely, you might almost say solely, into his own pocket, whereas the Canadian Pacific Railway is building railroads all over the country.

Mr. BARKER. What year was it in which that loan of rails was made ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot say in what year the loan was made, but the year from which I quoted was 1888.

Mr. BARKER. I desire to call the attention of the House to the rather peculiar circumstance that the acting Minister of Railways and Canals justifies this grant for two and a half miles of railway by a precedent of fifteen years ago. The hon. gentleman has been looking up the records. He has felt that this subsidy is something very unusual; he has been conscious that he had to justify it, and he has looked back fifteen years to find a case which would justify what he is doing ; and what has he found? He has come here with a report of 1888, and he has taken very good care not to look into the agreement entered into then to ascertain whether it was a loan or not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Act fixes that.

Mr. LOGAN. In reference to this loan of rails to the Steel Company of Canada, having some knowledge of the matter, I wish to state that these rails were taken by the steel company, put on their own land, treated as their own property, the company went into liquidation, its assets were sold, and among the assets sold were these same rails.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They were not loaned ; they were granted, and the company had a right to sell them.

Mr. CLANCY. The acting Minister of Railways gave my hon. friend from Prince a distinct challenge, and I understood him to say that if application were made from Prince Edward Island under similar conditions, it would be granted. I want to ask the hon. gentleman now if he has dealt with every case of a siding along the Intercolonial Railway in the same manner in which this is being dealt with. If the hon. gentleman is following out a rule that has obtained for many years, whether it is a good rule or a bad one, he will have some excuse for the course he is taking.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Let me first note the remark of the hon. gentleman that I said that if an application were made from Prince Edward Island, the same privilege would be granted. I did not say that. I said it would be time enough to consider an application from Prince Edward Island when the application came. So far we have not had any.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman is not so generous as I thought he was.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not want to be generous ; I want to be reasonable. I want to point out that I have no right to promise in the name of the government that these things will be done. When applications come forward each one will be dealt with on its merits, and one province will be treated as well as another. The hon. gentleman wants to know if we are dealing with all these cases alike. Yes, where subsidies have been granted for small branch roads, they are granted in the same way ; and my hon. friend sat in this House yesterday and voted—and I am glad he did—for the following item :

For a line of railway from Debert station on the Intercolonial Railway to Coal Mine, not exceeding 4½ miles.

A difference of a mile or two makes no difference, and if I had time to go through the books I could find a number of cases

in which small branch lines have received subsidies. I think I have answered the hon. gentleman's question.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has not answered it at all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not in the way the hon. gentleman wanted.

Mr. CLANCY. The way I want is a direct answer to a direct question. The hon. gentleman has so far evaded it. I shall repeat the question again. There are constant applications for sidings or branch lines ; you may call them either. Has it been the policy in the past and is it still the policy of the government of the day to treat all these applications alike ? If the hon. gentleman is prepared to admit that that is not the case, he is out of court.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not been dealing with the question of sidings. I am confining myself to branches, and I am pointing out that in granting a subsidy to aid a road two and a half miles in length, we are not doing anything that is new.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, if after the railway is finished, this company which owns this timber and this land, exercises the privilege of selling the railroad as well as the land, will it become their property ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This appropriation does not go to any particular company. It stands exactly in the same position as any other railway subsidy, and arrangements would have to be made to have a contract as far as possible under the same terms and conditions as in the case of other subsidies. We have not made any arrangement which enables me to answer my hon. friend's question, except to state the general policy in relation to all roads of a like character.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). Will this branch belong to the country or to this company, and will the subsidy raise the value of their property provided they want to sell it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It will stand in exactly the same position as all these other appropriations to companies. These roads will belong to the respective companies subject to the terms and conditions of the Railway Act.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). I am asking the minister a very plain question, and I would like a plain answer. If this timber company sell the property shortly after the road is completed, will they sell the bonus which this country is giving them ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It will stand in exactly the same position as any other railway company. It will be in the same condition as respects this bonus as the Canadian Pacific Railway will be with respect to the $3,300,000 which we gave it for the Crow's Nest Railway. The principle is the same, the amount is nothing.

Mr. SPROULE. I am afraid that the next thing will be an application for money to buy out this branch of the Intercolonial. We will pay the subsidy and then buy the road back.

To the Matane and Gaspé Railway Company for a line of railway from a point at or near St. Octave on the Intercolonial Railway to Matane, not exceeding 30 miles.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is for a railway from the Intercolonial at Metis down to the St. Lawrence at Matane. The distance is thirty miles. There is no communication at all for these people after navigation is closed.

Mr. SPROULE. Was there a company chartered for this ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, it has had a charter for several years.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to find out how many lines of railway are subsidized by these resolutions in each of the provinces, and what is the aggregate of the money voted for each of the provinces respectively in these railway subsidies ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not made any statement from a provincial point of view.

Mr. SPROULE. Could not the hon. gentleman get that ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Is it necessary ? Why should we be provincial ?

Mr. SPROULE. It is not for the hon. gentleman to say whether it is necessary or not, if I desire the information. I am asking what is reasonable. There may be nothing wrong, and I am not saying there is ; but if it were only to satisfy ordinary curiosity, the question is a reasonable one to ask.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid that if I make out a statement by provinces, my own province will not look well, and I will be accused of having been unfair to it.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to get the information in some way or other and in other lines as well. We are entitled to it, so as to be able to make comparisons. It will not take much work for the hon. minister to get it if he desires to be agreeable.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I like to be agreeable.

Mr. SPROULE. Then the hon. gentleman will agree to give it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I had rather my hon. friend would make it himself. I might make a mistake and I want him to be responsible.

Mr. SPROULE. That is a little lower than we would expect from the hon. gentleman, to treat a member of the House in that way. I do not think it is proper treatment. The question is a reasonable one and he can get the information in a short time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to consider it and not ask me to make a promise ?

Mr. SPROULE. I want to know if I can get it. If I do not get it I will have to analyse these subsidies.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Do not stop, go on, we have not heard from the hon. gentleman this session.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the hon. gentleman awakened ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We are in the eighth month of the session. The hon. gentleman has spoken several times every day these eight months. Do not deprive us of the pleasure of hearing him again in the dying moments. Let him continue to make himself a standing nuisance until the end of the session.

Mr. SPROULE. That statement is absolutely untrue. I tell the Postmaster General that to his face. He should be the last man to make such a statement. I am asking for what I regard as proper information and I desire to know whether I shall get it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think it is a very proper question, but I am not refusing the request. I cannot prevent his getting the information because he can make out the statement himself. Therefore my answer does not prevent his getting it.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not treating hon. members with even ordinary courtesy. If the hon. gentleman had been asked something very unreasonable, I might be met with such a reply ; but I am not, and I respectfully submit that the 'put-off' style of the hon. minister is not what we might expect from him. He has granted many more requests much more difficult to comply with. I want to know whether he is prepared to give this information, which he might easily get ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We can both easily get it. My hon. friend and I and anybody else can get it in half an hour, but what I do not like is the hon. gentleman insisting on looking at these things from a provincial point of view. I know that he can take larger views. I do not refuse to give him the information, and he can get it even if I did refuse.

Mr. SPROULE. Only a few years ago we had a very lengthy discussion in which the right hon. the First Minister took part. The right hon. gentleman then showed conclusively to my judgment, that in the distribution of money for public works he had made what I regarded as a very fair distribution among the provinces—much fairer than the Conservative party did when they were in power. In my own campaign I admitted that I believed it was a fair distribution. It was quite proper for the hon. gentleman to do that, and I do not see why it should be improper for me to go into the same inquiry. I am not contending that there is anything wrong, but I desire to ascertain how far the distribution of these subsidies complies with the principle laid down by the right hon. gentleman some years ago, which I thought perfectly defensible in every particular. Surely if I can point to so high an authority for dealing with the question in the manner I suggest, I am not making an unreasonable request.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In view of the very handsome manner in which my hon. friend has acknowledged that this government has made a very fair and equitable distribution of the public funds as regards the different provinces, I will give him the information he requires.

To the Chateauguay and Northern Railway Company for a line of railway from a point on its main line at or near L'Epiphanie, passing by way of the parish of St. Jacques d'Achigan to the village of Rawdon, not exceeding 16 miles.

The PRIME MINISTER. At this moment there is a railway being built from Montreal to Joliette to join Montreal to the Great Northern at Joliette by way of the Bout de l'Ile bridge, which is intended to provide for a branch from l'Epiphanie up to the village of Rawdon in the county of Montcalm, which section of country is not provided at all with railways.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there a company prepared to build this ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The company is described in the resolution—the Chateauguay and Northern.

Mr. SPROULE. Is any of the road built now ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The road is now under construction. This is a new branch.

For a line of railway from the line of the Montreal and Atlantic Railway Company at St. Guillaume to the River Yamaska to join with the South Shore Railway, a distance not exceeding 12 miles.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is a railway to connect two railways. There is a railway passing St. Guillaume, the name of which I have forgotten at the moment and another road, the South Shore Railway, and a bridge on the Yamaska to connect the two and serve this section of country. The distance is 12 miles.

Mr. SPROULE. The company has a portion of the road built ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, this is an independent road. The South Shore skirts

the St. Lawrence, but St. Guillaume is inland.

For a line of railway from La Tuque on the St. Maurice river to a point on the Lake St. John Railway near the River Jeannotte, not exceeding 35 miles.

The PRIME MINISTER. The Lake St. John Railway, as I explained on a previous vote, runs from Quebec to Lake St. John. This proposed railway is a branch westward, from a point on the Lake St. John road to the St. Maurice river, opening up a new section of country. It will be a good colonization road.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there a charter for the road ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I am informed that there is.

Mr. SPROULE. A provincial charter ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I understand so, but I have no personal knowledge.

To the Montreal Northern Railway Company for a line of railway from a point at or near Ste. Agathe des Monts station towards the township of Howard, in the county of Argenteuil, passing near Lake St. Joseph.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This is a colonization road entirely.

Mr. SPROULE. Starting from Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, but from Ste. Agathe des Monts, 63 miles from Montreal. It opens up a country that has neither railway nor water communication. Half the road is already built, having begun early in the spring. The charter is a local one.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). Has the local government given assistance to this road ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not a cent as yet.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). If the local government gives the charter, and a subsidy is needed, the local government should begin the subsidizing. If a further subsidy is needed this government may be appealed to. But it is not a good condition of things to have the charter granted by the local government and then the company come here for assistance. If this is a local line, it should not get a Dominion subsidy. It certainly should not receive a subsidy unless the province gives one.

To the Beersville Coal and Railway Company for a line of railway from Adamsville on the Intercolonial Railway to a point at or near Brown's Landing or Beersville, not exceeding seven miles.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This line is intended to open up a new coal district. There have been some operations in coal mining in New Brunswick in recent years, and it is represented that there is a deposit of coal near Adamsville, in the county of Kent. This is to assist the line to develop the mining.

Mr. FOWLER. This is one subsidy that is justified by the circumstances.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOWLER. I am glad to see that that brings a smile to the faces of hon. gentlemen opposite. The fact is that this railway will enable the Intercolonial to obtain coal much more cheaply than at present. They must now haul coal from Nova Scotia, but, with this road built, they will be able to get coal of a superior quality and much more conveniently. Of course, it would be much better if the Intercolonial would build this road themselves. That would be my choice by all means. I believe that the Intercolonial should own all these branches. They should own the Central Railway, the Albert Railway, the Kent Northern and all these different branches. These roads could be operated much more cheaply than at present, for one staff would do for all, and they could be operated much more beneficially to the people of the district. As to this proposed road, I believe it will be a saving to the Intercolonial to build it.

To the York and Carleton Railway Company for a line of railway from its present terminus westerly, not exceeding five miles.

Mr. GIBSON. This line runs from a point in the county of York to the St. John river. It runs in a westerly direction. The total proposed line is about 40 miles in length. The company have six miles built and running, and this will assist them to extend it five miles.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this owned by a railway company ?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, the York and Carleton Railway Company.

Mr. SPROULE. This is the one the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) himself owns ?

Mr. GIBSON. No, I have no interest in it at all.

Mr. SPROULE. This is the one that is generally called——

Mr. GIBSON. The hon. gentleman is thinking of the Canada Eastern. This is another company altogether.

Mr. FOWLER. Does this run from a point on the Canada Eastern ?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes, Cross Creek.

Mr. FOWLER. And runs to what point ?

Mr. GIBSON. Perth.

To the Midland Railway Company, Limited, for a line of railway from Truro northerly towards Brule, not exceeding 34 miles.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a line of railway, the promoters of which anticipate, I think, making Brule

the point of another crossing to Prince Edward Island. Many years ago Brule was a point for crossing to Prince Edward Island. However, of late years other points have been used. The promoters, I think, will attempt to re-establish a line from Brule to Prince Edward Island.

For a line of railway from St. Peters to Louisburg, not exceeding 50 miles.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a road on the south side of Cape Breton island. Hon. gentlemen who were in the House many years ago may recollect that there was what was called a battle of the routes as to which side of the island the railway should run. The government line was constructed by the central route. At the southern portion of Cape Breton island, quite a large territory, was for some years without any railway communication. Some years ago a company composed chiefly of Americans obtained a charter for a road down that coast. They have built from the Strait of Canso as far as St. Peters. The line has recently been put into operation. This will give them a right to extend the line from St. Peters down on the south side of Cape Breton island to Louisburg.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice that in their application they request a subsidy for bridges. Do the government propose to do anything in respect of bridges ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The company's application covered considerably more than we are giving them, and I am afraid that can be said of a good number of applications—we have not given all they have asked. As they have now built as far as St. Peters, we have given them this grant down to Louisburg.

Mr. CLANCY. Is not a portion of this to be used for the construction of bridges ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, this is for an ordinary railway appropriation.

To the Kootenay Central Railway Company for a line of railway from Golden to the international boundary line, via Windermere and Fort Steele, and crossing the Crow's Nest Railway at or near Elko, not exceeding 106 miles.

Mr. GALLIHER. In connection with this subsidy, I may say that the company have a charter for a line from the international boundary to Golden, which was this year extended to Fort George, on the Fraser river. That line starting at the international boundary line, crossing the Crow's nest line at Elko, passing through what is known as the Wigwam river country, a rich district of the south-east Kootenay, goes up to Fort Steele, passes along the valley of the Kootenay river through a rich mineral district where we have mines in an initial stage only waiting for transportation. It also passes through a ranching country, and a country where there are some very fair timber limits. Then it continues on from Windermere and goes down the valley of the Columbia river to Golden, passing also through a country where we have the rich Paradise mine, and the Ptarmigan mine, both producing and shipping mines ; also through a country settled by ranchers, from the town of Golden to the town of Windermere. That will open up a district which is now entirely without railway communication, and will connect it with the Canadian Pacific Railway. In fact it will be within easy reach of the Great Northern Railway on the south, which runs now from Jennings, Montana, up to Morrisey mines, in British Columbia, also connecting with the Crow's nest line at Elko, and with the Canadian Pacific Railway line at Golden. I speak of these two mines as being in the producing stage. There are a number of valuable properties there only waiting for transportation facilities.

Mr. FOWLER. Is there any lumber there?

Mr. GALLIHER. There is lumber all along the valleys of both the Columbia and the Kootenay rivers. The Columbia Lumber Company have lumber interests all through both valleys.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any portion of this built ?

Mr. GALLIHER. None as yet. We got our Dominion charter this year. Surveys have been made over a portion of the road. The parties connected with this railway have strong financial backing in London. Mr. Pollen is one of the chief men in the transaction, the others are mostly local people, Fort Steele people. An application was made to the provincial government of British Columbia during the last sesion. The session lasted a very short time, and a number of railway subsidies that had been applied for were cut off, they did not come up. But I am told that they have reasonable assurance of aid from the provincial government.

To the Kettle River Valley Railway Company for a line of railway from Grand Forks to a point fifty miles up the north fork and west fork of the north fork of Kettle river, not exceeding 50 miles.

Mr. GALLIHER. This is also in my district. It is what is called the Hot Air Line. We are asking for a subsidy to continue that line further into the country. We hope to be able to make use of it in exploiting the mountains of mineral up in the North Fork district. This company, in the first place, have already built a road from Republic, in the state of Washington, crossing the boundary at Cascade, and continuing on to Grand Forks, in British territory. It is about sixty miles to Grand Forks. A portion of that is in Canadian territory. They have received no aid so far, but they are now asking for aid to continue that line from Grand Forks up the North Fork of the Kettle river, to the confluence

of what is known as the West Fork of the North Fork, and then to continue up that West Fork, in all a distance of fifty miles from Grand Forks. That also taps a rich mineral country, rich in gold, copper and silver. Further, it taps a fine coaking coal district, a necessary item in southern British Columbia for smelting purposes. They are asking for this bonus to aid in the construction of this proposed line of road for fifty miles. It is an expensive line to build.

For a line of railway from Wellington to Union Bay, not exceeding 55 miles.

Mr. MORRISON. That line is in the northern part of Vancouver Island. It is an extension of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway and connects the important coal fields of Comox and the mines at Alberni on the west coast of Vancouver Island with the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway system and Victoria and Vancouver.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That line is at Wellington now.

Mr. MORRISON. Yes, the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway extends from Victoria and Nanaimo to Wellington and this is an extension north.

Mr. GOURLEY. I want to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact that just the same number of miles of road would give to the county of Colchester great satisfaction. I do not wish to oppose this item excepting in order to solicit the sympathy of the gentlemen who are pressing this item for the county of Colchester. I received a letter a few days ago from a leading Liberal in my county. The Liberals there have such confidence in me that if they want any solace they write me. The Minister of Finance will know the name of this gentleman and will communicate it to him in confidence, but as his letter is a private one I cannot mention the name publicly. This gentleman says :

I am sorry to say we are going to lose some more of our good citizens. I. B. Morrison, Mr. Finley Corbett, Silas Corbett and son leave shortly for the west, probably California. Never in the history of West Colchester has there been any such exodus and disgust that exists along the shore as has taken place in the last two years. If this thing goes on for five years more the west end of the county will contain nothing but a few old men.

Now, I do not like to read what follows, coming from a Liberal, because it is sad.

If a change of government will accomplish anything the sooner it comes the better.

That is the opinion of a very fine Liberal who is forced to say that I have no doubt, owing to the bitter fact that he has seen his neighbours leaving the country. This man lives on Cobequid bay, an arm of the Bay of Fundy which separates Cumberland from my own constituency. Formerly the coach line ran along there and all of the roads went down this bay and this was then the centre of population. People depended on the water for their transportation. When the Intercolonial Railway was built it was swung about fifteen or twenty miles to the east of these people and they soon found themselves side tracked. All the business formerly done along the shore of the bay is now done along the line of the Intercolonial Railway and the result is now as this gentleman tells me, that these people are emigrating and that in four or five years there will be nothing but old men in as fine a section of country as there is in Canada.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. How far are they from a railway ?

Mr. GOURLEY. We want a road from Truro to Parrsboro. Near Truro the Intercolonial Railway will not be more than two miles away, but as you get down eight or twelve miles from Truro it is perhaps ten miles away, and down near the shore the average distance would be fifteen or twenty miles. The shore country in the old days was most fertile. At a railway meeting there last year, one farmer, a very fine gentleman, assured the meeting that twenty two years ago he had inherited an estate from his father which was valued by the executors at $6,000. It is a large estate containing marsh, and it was on the through road and he said that now he could not get $2,000 for it because there was no railway near; all the trade had gone back twenty miles to the line of the Intercolonial Railway so that the property along the line of that railway which was formerly considered of no value is now worth more than his fine marsh farm. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) must be interested in this matter because when the railway gets to Parrsboro it will enter his county and ultimately be extended along the shore so as to make a continuous connection with the Intercolonial Railway. It is only fifty-five miles and is through a very level country, in fact the Intercolonial Railway was originally surveyed over this route going south of the Cobequid mountains. The interest of the iron mine at Londonderry and the Springhill mines at that time required the railway to be taken across the Cobequid mountains and as the people on the shore at that time had the water communication it was thought better to take the Intercolonial Railway over its present line ; but these people have found that the value of their property has dwindled away. I may say of the gentlemen who are referred to here that Mr. Morrison was a leading Liberal, Mr. Corbett, I think, is a Conservative. These men are middle aged, forty or fifty, and they are taking their families away from what were formerly beautiful farms. This extraordinary state of affairs exists simply because we are backward in building railways. Young people will not stay now ten or fifteen miles from a railway. They want the mails and want the brightness of the trains and they want to have travellers going through. A

railway brings brightness and lightness to a community. Owing to the absence of railways this is now almost a deserted country although it was formerly one of the finest countries in the world.

Mr. McCREARY. Why does not your local legislature subsidize a railway ?

Mr. GOURLEY. The local legislature will, but I want this Dominion government to set the example and then we will force the local to follow suit. I know that the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) will agree with me that this proposal is most meritorious in every particular and one which will aid a number of lumber industries. The road will go straight past the furniture factory of which I spoke the other night as needing a light on the wharf and the whole country would then be restored to prosperity. Then if we had another short line from Brookfield to Stewiacke, thirty or forty miles, it would open up a great country. The minister will recollect that Stewiacke is in a fine country but it is to-day thirty or forty miles from a railway and the young people are leaving it. The county of Colchester, during the census decade 1890-1900, lost over 4,000 population although it is one of the best counties in Nova Scotia. If the people will not stay in a country like that owing to the want of railways they will not stay anywhere where there are not railways. Therefore I have taken the position in this parliament that the time has come when we must have railways. The railway is the modern highway and is to-day as necessary to the community as the old high road was thirty or forty years ago. We must come to that view and adapt ourselves to the situation. I would ask the hon. minister to give some consideration to this Stewiacke railway. I am in the awkward position of not supporting the hon. gentleman politically and therefore I am not as much in touch with him as I should otherwise be, and I do not know that I have any other way of approaching him or if he would care to have me approach him in any other way, but I would like him to consider my application and to insert something like reasonable subsidies. We should be liberal in these matters. Some people think that $3,200 a mile is a great temptation to build a railway. Unless the railway has an immediate commercial outlook, $3,200 is a trifling inducement and I would urge upon the minister to consider that the railways to which I have referred would serve our part of the country and would make the population there happy and contented, would induce them to stay at home and would lead to an increase in the population and the subsidy ought to be at least doubled. That is what this country wants.

I thank the minister for granting the subsidy for the Midland line. And I hope it will succeed in getting that railway started. But these two railways to which I have referred are equally important, and I think I may say for my colleagues surrounding me, that they would have no objection if the Minister of Finance would agree to insert two subsidies for them in these resolutions. I have calculated that we will probably have $10,000,000 more next year than we had this year, giving us a total revenue of $75,000,000 or $76,000,000, and consequently we need not be penurious in these matters. These railways would be of the utmost importance to this large section of the country. They are both in the Stewiacke section and the Londonderry section, in which the stalward Liberals of the county reside. I would therefore ask the Finance Minister to include in these subsidies a double subsidy for thirty-four miles and another double subsidy for fifty-five miles, which subsidies would result in great advantage to the Dominion of Canada, because they would result in making that part of Nova Scotia happy, and contented, and cause it to enter on a career of prosperity.

Mr. LOGAN. I endorse what the hon. gentleman has said as to the need of a railway between Truro and Parrsboro, running from Truro through Economy and Five Islands to Parrsboro. This important part of the country is very badly in need of a railway. It is not only a long distance from any existing railway, but it is separated from that railway by a chain of mountains.

Mr. GOURLEY. Yes; I forgot to mention that.

Mr. LOGAN. I do not know any part of Canada that is in more need of railway facilities than that which the hon. gentleman has just mentioned. I endorse what he has said, and I urge upon the government the importance of providing better railway accommodation for the people of this section of the country.

Mr. McCREARY. It is a reflection upon the agricultural capabilities of Nova Scotia, to say that men will leave that province because they have not a railway within ten or twelve miles of them. How did we settle the province of Manitoba and the prairies, when the people had to carry their wheat seventy and eighty miles to a railway station ? It is not until within the last four or five years, when the province of Manitoba itself bonused roads, that the majority of settlers have been able to get a railway within ten or twelve miles of them. Yet here is the province of Nova Scotia, settled for a hundred years before Manitoba was known, and it comes to the Dominion and asks for subsidies when the inhabitants already have railways not more than ten or twelve miles away. I was told by one of the ministers this session, that the reason why there were such large grants to the maritime provinces for wharfs and breakwaters, was because the means of locomo-

tion in the maritime provinces was by water. Now I see that they come here and ask us for large grants for railways as well. In the province of Manitoba, which is to-day yielding more revenue to the Dominion of Canada than any other province in confederation per head of population——

Mr. GALLIHER. No.

Mr. McCREARY. I am making the statement, and I know what I am saying. Take our bank returns, post office returns, inland revenue returns, customs returns, and they are ahead of any other province per capita.

Mr. GALLIHER. Except British Columbia.

Mr. McCREARY. We exceed British Columbia by $100,000, according to population.

Mr. GALLIHER. No you don't.

Mr. McCREARY. I will leave it to the Minister of Customs, the Minister of Inland Revenue or the Postmaster General. Our post office revenue to-day is nearly as much as for the entire province of British Columbia.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. McCREARY. I know what I am saying, and notwithstanding that, all that is voted for the province of Manitoba here is practically thirty-six miles of railway. I will ask the minister next year to seriously consider relieving the province of Manitoba from the large obligations which they have undertaken to build railways. If they do it for other provinces, there is no reason why they should not do it for Manitoba.

Mr. TALBOT. How many miles of railway did you say were subsidized in Manitoba this year ?

Mr. McCREARY. Thirty-six.

Mr. TALBOT. Look at the list and you will find 139 miles.

Mr. McCREARY. You are talking about the Territories. There are only 36 miles for Manitoba, and that is a re-vote.

Mr. LOGAN. You can scarcely throw a stone in the province of Manitoba without hitting a railway.

Mr. McCREARY. We built them ourselves.

Mr. LOGAN. I will guarantee that my hon. friend from Colchester and myself will be perfectly satisfied if we get one-quarter the railways in Nova Scotia that you have in Manitoba.

Mr. GALLIHER. I desire to correct my hon. friend (Mr. McCreary) and to state that the province of British Columbia contributes more money to the Dominion treasury per capita than does any other province in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. McCREARY.

For a line of railway from Midway to Vernon, not exceeding 150 miles.

Mr. GALLIHER. This railway runs from Midway in the Boundary country ; or rather the charter is from Midway to the town of Vernon. It starts from Midway, goes up the west fork of the Kettle river, thence east of the Okanagan lake to the Okanagan falls, five miles from Vernon, where it will join with what is now known as the Shuswap and Okanagan road, running from that point to join the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Sicamous Junction. That will connect the great farming, ranching, and fruit growing district of the Okanagan around Vernon, Armstrong, Kelowna, Enderby, Peachland and White Valley, with the mineral districts of the south, thus affording these districts access to their natural market. The government could not possibly give a subsidy which will produce better results, than this very subsidy under consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any company ready to undertake this work ?

Mr. GALLIHER. Oh, yes ; the Midway and Vernon Railway Company have applied for this.

Mr. SPROULE. They have not built yet ?

Mr. GALLIHER. No. I may state that there is a provincial subsidy for this line amounting to $4,500 per mile, payable in provincial bonds.

To the St. Mary's River Railway Company for a line of railway from Spring Coulee, crossing St. Mary's river to Cardston, sixteen miles, and from a point on this line to or near the intake of the Irrigation canal, about sixteen miles, in all not exceeding 32 miles. Total, 48.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is what is known as the Galt road.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Did they get a charter this year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, they have built a considerable portion of the road. This country is being settled up a great deal and splendid results have followed the irrigation works established by the company. I am satisfied that this road is worthy of every assistance we can give it.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not quite understand about mileage here. In the margin it says forty-eight miles, but in the resolution it says : In all not exceeding thirty-two miles.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think there is an error there. We will make it thirty-two miles.

Resolution, as amended, agreed to.

For a line of railway from Dawson city to Stewart river, passing at or near Grand Forks, not exceeding 84 miles.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a proposal to build a road as described in the

item. Application is made on behalf of the Klondike Mines Railway Company, by its solicitor at Ottawa. I understand that it is a very substantial company. This road, if constructed, will be the most northern road on the continent of America. I think we are all anxious to develop the Yukon country, and if we can give the people internal railway communication, even though we have not yet a connection with the Yukon, I think it will be very desirable.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the object of the road ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is a general railway to provide communication between different sections there.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In view of the fact that Canada has no entrance to the Yukon and no port to the Yukon on the Pacific ocean, are the government taking into their serious consideration the advisability of building a railway to the Yukon through Canadian territory ? I wanted the Prime Minister a year ago to pledge himself that he would build a road from Kitimat Arm.

The PRIME MINISTER. We will have to do that now since the award.

To the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for a branch line from a point on the main line between Moosomin and Elkhorn, north-westerly to a point in the neighbourhood of the Pheasant Hills, not exceeding 136 miles.

Mr. SCOTT. I am going to ask the minister if he will let this item stand. I fear there are some questions which I shall have to ask concerning the proposal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman will have a chance later on when the Bill is in committee.

Mr. SCOTT. I would like to ask the minister who is the applicant for this ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. SCOTT. Like my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) last night, I am to a considerable degree surprised to hear that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has been an applicant for a subsidy, in view of the fact that we have been told by a prominent director of that company in recent years that it opposes the principle of parliament granting railway subsidies. Was the company the only applicant ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. For this particular road, yes.

Mr. SCOTT. I am not satisfied that this item should be adopted. Yesterday evening the hon. Postmaster General gave a piece of very god advice to the House. He said that if any hon. member objected to the policy of subsidies in general or to any particular subsidy in particular, he should move against it, and I fear that it will be necessary for me to make such a motion in regard to this particular proposition, which I am bound to say does not meet with my approval. I am not opposed in general to the policy of granting subsidies ; but there are certain conditions which I think are necessary to make the granting of subsidies justifiable. I am willing in all cases to vote for proper and reasonable assistance for railways in districts where people require railway accommodation and cannot obtain it in any other way. My information concerning this particular proposition may not be full or precisely accurate ; but my impression is that the greater part of the line for which this subsidy is proposed to be voted is already constructed. This is for a branch line of the Canadian Pacific Railway commencing at a point called Kirkella between Elkhorn and Moosomin, just on the boundary line between Manitoba and Assiniboia, which runs northwesterly from the main line of the Pacific. The construction of the road was commenced eighteen or nineteen months ago, and my impression is that practically the whole of the 136 miles mentioned here have been graded and nearly 100 miles have been ironed. My recollection also is that we have been told in the Railway Committee on more than one occasion by representatives of the company that this particular line was being constructed without any aid and that they did not propose to ask for aid.

Mr. CLANCY. Was the charter for that road applied for during the present session ?

Mr. SCOTT. No.

Mr. CLANCY. Then it surely did not come up during the present session.

Mr. SCOTT. This particular road has been mentioned in connection with other charters applied for by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and by other companies, and my recollection is that the representatives of the company stated on more than one occasion that this road was being built without any aid. It does seem to me a strange proposition to grant a subsidy to procure the construction of a road for the benefit of the people when in fact the road is already constructed. It does not seem to be necessary to aid it ; and, with my present information, I am bound to say that this proposition does not appeal to me as being a proper one.

Mr. CLANCY. Has not the hon. gentleman voted for several schemes of the same kind ?

Mr. SCOTT. Not to my knowledge.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When I am supporting a subsidy, speaking for myself, I do not take into consideration so much the company which is to be benefited as the interest of the public in the section of country which is to be served by the railway. I do not think we should

lay too much stress on statements made by individuals in the course of their arguments in the Railway Committee or even in this House ; because they have no authority to speak for the company or for the public in that particular district. No member of this House, I suppose, is particularly anxious to grant a subsidy to any railway company, even the Canadian Pacific Railway; but some years ago there was a great demand by the settlers in this district for further railway accommodation. As the House well knows, no subsidies were granted a year ago, and when the people of this district were asking for further railway facilities, they were probably told that they would receive the same consideration from parliament and the same recommendation from the government as other sections of the country where the government felt that further railway facilities should be provided. They proceeded with the construction of this road, believing that they would receive the same treatment as any other responsible company, the road is opening up a good district of country, and I do not think my hon. friend should press his objection.

Mr. INGRAM. I take it that this railway is to run through the constituency of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Scott). When he reads 'Hansard,' the hon. gentleman will find that the remarks he has made with regard to it were very guarded. If he will subtract what he thinks and his impressions and recollections, there will be very little left. Before he attempts to furnish us with information, he should be more definite and state the actual facts. I do not think it is any argument that because a director of any company is opposed to subsidies, we should not give his company a subsidy to which it is entitled. One of the directors may be opposed to subsidies and the others may be in favour of it, and the public also, and we must not consider simply the one dissenting director. The hon. gentleman to whom the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) referred, is not present. He may have no personal knowledge of this subsidy or anything in connection with it, and it is hardly fair to make his presumed dissent a reason for opposing the grant, if it be a deserving one.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I to understand that the railway is already built ?

Mr. SCOTT. It is a matter of common knowledge that its construction was begun in the early part of last year. My information is that the line for this distance is all graded, and that the greater portion of it is already ironed. In fact the people in the districts along this route were assured a year ago that the line would, by the end of this fall, be constructed to a much greater distance than these 136 miles. Hon. members must recollect that this particular line was the subject of very considerable discussion in years gone by. Two years ago it occupied a considerable portion of the time of this House. Three years ago a contract or agreement was entered into by the company to build year by year a certain portion—twenty-one miles, if not more. It appears to me that the fact that such an agreement was entered into without any stipulation that aid should be granted in the way of a subsidy, ought to weigh very considerably with this committee. The idea that aid is to be granted for the construction of this road will be a matter of very great surprise to everybody in the district. Three or four years ago, when the people had been waiting for years and appealing for years to the government and the Canadian Pacific Railway to take some steps which would secure the building of this line, the proposition to grant it a subsidy would then have been understood, but the appeals of the people did not have much weight with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the government until now. After more encouragement in the way of business, I suppose, had been offered to the company, they decided over a year ago to begin the construction of this railway, and this particular mileage has been, to all intents and purposes, completed. To the people along the route, it will be a matter of very great surprise to learn that parliament, at this late day, determines to grant aid to a proposition which is practically completed. If the proposition were to grant aid to 136 miles of road from Pheasant Hills westward, and thus give railway facilities to communities which are still without the means of transportation, it would be one we could understand, but no reason has been advanced yet which leads me to consider that the proposition before us is in any sense justifiable.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is quite true that this railway was commenced last year and is nearly completed. It would have been subsidized last year, but no subsidies were then granted, and the company went on in the expectation of getting a subsidy as soon as subsidies would be granted.

Mr. CLANCY. Had the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Scott), when we heard the resolution to subsidize a road going through the St. John district, given attention to what was going on, he would have seen that the committee regarded the fact that the road was under construction as rather a favourable indication that the project would be carried out, and were all the more disposed to grant the subsidy. I know nothing about the merits of the road in question, but the best security which the country can have that the promoters are in earnest, when asking for a subsidy, is the fact that they committee regarded the fact that the road will open up a new district to colonization, and is deserving of a subsidy, the fact that

it is partially or wholly constructed does not detract from its claim.

Mr. BLAIN. I might remind the hon. gentleman from Assiniboia that we have granted a subsidy to a short line of railway which was completed last spring.

Mr. SPROULE. From my personal knowledge of the people living out along this line, this road is very much needed. We have been trying to get a road built through that district for the last twenty years. Twice a portion of that road has been built, but somehow or other the company burst up, and the enterprise failed. There are many farmers, with whom I am well acquainted, who went out there some sixteen or twenty years ago, and who, up to last fall, have been without any railway convenience, and I do think, from my knowledge of the country, that this railway will certainly be of great advantage to the people and is deserving of aid.

Mr. SCOTT. In view of the chorus of disapproval which came from the opposite side last evening in general against the policy of granting subsidies to railway companies, it is rather surprising that when an hon. gentleman gets up and submits practical objections against some particular item, he is greeted from the other side with a chorus of commendation of the whole policy of granting subsidies and especially of the particular item under consideration. I feel impelled to accept the advice given by the Postmaster General last evening. This proposition is not one which I can conscientiously support, and I beg to move that this item be struck out.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The only thing I see to criticise in this subsidy is that the road runs from a point between Moosomin and Elkhorn. Why not say Kirkella ? The railway is necessary, and I do not object to the bonus. In fact, I think it is a very proper and necessary road to assist. But I do not like this coming down and deceiving the committee. The road starts from Kirkella.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that is what it means.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Then why not say so ? The road is already built. We all know that.

Mr. FOWLER. I enter my protest against this vote. I agree with what has been said by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott). This road, I understand, is built through an important part of the western country. I believe that it will pay its running expenses and interest upon the investment. It has already been built without subsidy or promise of a subsidy. And yet this House, in its generosity, proposes to grant a subsidy for 136 miles through a country so rich and of such promise that the company has begun the work and practically completed it before even asking for a subsidy. We do not it seems confine ourselves to granting subsidies to encourage the building of roads, but we grant subsidies for roads already built. I am sorry the motion of the hon. member for West Assiniboia did not carry, for it seems plain to me that this subsidy should not be granted.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Here is an opportunity for the government to control rates under an actual agreement, not the visionary control of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, or the still more visionary control of this less effective and far more corruptible body, the proposed commission, but a genuine control under agreement. I do not agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) who sits beside me. I believe this bonus should be given, but I believe also that some control of rates should go with it. I happened to have an instance of what can be done brought before me the other day. A young man came from the North-west who was proposing to open a route to connect with the Pasqua branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway in Dakota. A part of the route would be covered by steamer transportation on a long lake that crosses the boundary. It was estimated that it would cost only three cents a bushel to bring the grain from the district to be served by this route to the Pasqua branch. At present they have to haul the grain twenty miles to the Canadian Pacific Railway. By the new route they figured they would save from four cents to seven cents a bushel. The matter was brought before the Minister of Customs, and it was decided that it would not be possible to allow the arrangement. But it was pointed out that if the farmers in that district gave the seven cents per bushel that they would save on three season's crop, they could build a road to connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, this road that we are bonusing runs through a farming section, and I take it to be the government's business to see to it that the farmers of that country get the benefit of this $3,200 a mile that we vote ; and the way to secure that benefit for them is to properly regulate the rates. If that is not done, what is the use of voting this money ? If the farmers pay as high rates as ever, we might as well withhold our assistance. Every road that receives a subsidy should have its rates controlled, not, as I say, by this visionary organization, the railway commission, or by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, but by a hard and fast agreement under the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. I see that section 6 of these resolutions provides that 'the Governor in Council shall have absolute control at all times over the rates and tolls to be levied and taken by any of the companies, or by any of the railways, hereby subsidized.'

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The Governor in Council doesn't amount to a hill of beans, so far as the controlling of these rates is concerned.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am afraid the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) is not loyal to the Crown.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Not if the Crown is supposed to mean the Prime Minister and the fellows behind him, who are pulling on all sides. The Mackenzie & Mann road, the Canadian Northern, affords an illustration of what I want. They have an agreement with the Manitoba government that the rates shall be controlled thus and so. The people are behind the agreement, and no matter how much the government might like to please the railway company by allowing the rates to remain high, the voice of the people controls and the law has to be observed.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is the law also, and the voice of the people is behind it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The right hon. Prime Minister knows well that the moment you mention 'Governor in Council' the people bow. They demand nothing; they are afraid.

The PRIME MINISTER. The people, including Colonel Hughes?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am only one of the people, and I am not in the Northwest.

Mr. SCOTT. As the House is apparently unanimous in favour of this grant, it may be superfluous for me to say anything further. But I feel that notwithstanding that my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Hughes) did not give me any support, I ought to support his contention in this case. This session a very considerable amount of aid was granted to another company, the Canadian Northern, to extend their present line to Prince Albert and Edmonton, and a hard and fast contract was demanded of that company, was forced upon them, providing that they should haul North-west wheat on a ten-cent basis from Winnipeg to the lakes. It seems to me it is not fair to make fowl of one company and flesh of another. If it is fair to compel the Canadian Northern to give a contract for maximum rates, then aid granted to this other company should carry with it a similar condition. In this case we should make a contract with the company with regard to the rates to be charged to the people in the district.

For a line of railway from a point at or near Medicine Hat on the Canadian Pacific Railway to the coal fields in or near townships 12 and 13, range 6, west of fourth principal meridian, not exceeding eight miles.

Mr. FOWLER. Let us have an explanation of this.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. SCOTT. This is an item which I think is entirely justifiable. The aid is being granted to a road from the town of Medicine Hat, in a southwesterly direction, to the coal fields about eight miles distant from the town. A land grant was voted for this road some years ago, but that has been cancelled.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) should know more about it than I do. But I thought this road ran northerly, that it was part of the old road intended to run to Buffalo lake and up to the coal lands. But the exact direction is immaterial. The road will open up large coal mines near Medicine Hat, the opening of which is very necessary for the people of that community.

Mr. FOWLER. Might I ask in what direction the road is to run? Does it run north or south?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The material point is that it runs to the coal fields.

Mr. INGRAM. This is opening up a new policy entirely. Is it the policy of the government to grant bonuses for the purpose of extending railways to coal fields?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not wise to adopt general policies in these things. This case may be taken on its merits. But the extension of railways to coal fields would not be a bad idea if it were made a general principle.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The coal mines are in townships 12 and 13, range 6, north of Medicine Hat, down the river.

Mr. SCOTT. My hon. friend is mistaken about this. I am perfectly certain that the road runs in a southwesterly direction.

Mr. INGRAM. The minister says it might be a good policy for the government to adopt. I would like to draw attention to the fact that the press of Canada has been calling upon the government of the Dominion, as well as upon the territorial and provincial governments, to assist in building lines that will enable the people to procure fuel, which is not plentiful in that western country. I agree with the hon. gentleman when he says that it is an important thing to assist railways to these coal mines, because it is a well known fact that large portions of that new territory are so thinly populated that it would not pay a railway company to build a line to these coal fields without public assistance. I trust the government will take that matter into consideration, because it is in the interests of the people who are being sent in there. They have little or no wood, with which the people in the older provinces are well supplied. I believe the coal in the territories is well adapted for domestic use, but the mines are situated at a great distance from the railways.

To the Lake Superior, Long Lake and Albany Railway Company for a line of railway from Peninsula harbour in a northerly direction, not exceeding 10 miles.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is opening up a new district from Peninsula harbour, on Lake Superior, in a northerly direction. The provincial government, at its last session, granted a subsidy of $3,000 a mile for 10 miles. The road is chartered to run to Albany river north.

Mr. FOWLER. Who makes the application ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The application is signed by John W. Cheesewood, of Toronto. This gentleman signs himself on behalf of the syndicate.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He is the solicitor for the company.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the Minister of Public Works know who is the moving spirit ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. I am not sure whether the solicitor was introduced to me when these representations were made. A memorandum was given to me of the Act of incorporation, and of the grant by the provincial government. I know Mr. Cheesewood to meet him. I did not ask him who the directors of the company were. It is quite a large undertaking, and the provincial government thought it of sufficient importance in that new country to grant $3,000 a mile for 10 miles, and we duplicate the grant. I may say with regard to the great majority, if not all, the subsidies that are granted in Ontario, that we have been guided a great deal by the representations made by the municipalities and the provincial authorities. I do not believe there is a single subsidy granted that is not made to supplement a grant made by municipalities or by the provincial government. The people in the various localities who are more directly in touch with the local authorities, have succeeded in convincing them of the necessity and importance of these works, and we have thought well to be guided by that fact in supplementing local aid with Dominion subsidies. We have, therefore, good assurance that the railways will be proceeded with. I have no knowledge personally of the incorporators of this company, nor have any records been submitted to me.

Mr. CLANCY. I think the government may be congratulated upon having shown a disposition to colonize northern Ontario. This is the fifth or sixth line that has been granted a subsidy all leading from the Canadian Pacific Railway north into that country. They will all act as feeders for the Canadian Pacific Railway, and will all offer facilities for the colonization of that country, and for taking out the pulp wood and other timber products. We have the satisfaction of knowing at least that full provision has been made both for colonization and other railways in that country. I shall repeat what I said last night, that we have no longer any fear of that country not being abundantly supplied with railways for settlement and general trade, and there will now be no hurry for the line between Quebec and Winnipeg for the purposes of colonization. This is a very satisfactory feature, even at the close of the session, and it is a very great pity that this had not been considered before hon. gentlemen entered upon that unfortunate enterprise of constructing the road, where they are constructing it, from Quebec to Winnipeg.

To the Cumberland Railway and Coal Company for a line of railway from Parrsboro' station to Riverside wharf, not exceeding one mile.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to furnish a link between the water and rail communication at this point. The boat from Wolville on the other side of the bay lands at the government wharf. The Spring Hill and Parrsboro road ends at the private wharf of the company about a mile away, so that passengers have to walk that distance and it is thought advisable to avoid that interruption.

Mr. FOWLER. This will accommodate the coal company.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, this will accommodate the travelling public ; the coal company would be quite content to have our people walk down a mile from the railway to the wharf.

Mr. FOWLER. I suppose this will include the whole cost ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Oh, no, $3,000 will not build a mile of railway any where in Canada.

Mr. GOURLEY. This is a first class railway and I think from what I know of it that it is essential from the public standpoint.

Mr. LOGAN. This mile of railway is not a part of the National Transcontinental Railway but it is very important to Parrsboro which is a town of three thousand inhabitants. At present the railway from Springhill to Parrsboro does not run nearer than a mile to the public wharf, and all goods have to be trucked from that wharf a mile to the station at Parrsboro. The purpose of this is to have the road carried to the wharf so that goods will no longer have to be trucked.

Mr. COCHRANE. Here is a case of a wharf being built by the public and then to avoid the expense of hauling the goods for one mile the country is expected to build a railway for these people for that distance. I think, as I said before, that the government has gone mad on subsidizing railways. This is not in any sense a colonization road

and it is most absurd. If the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce were here his heart would go faint and sick to see a vote of this kind.

Mr. SPROULE. I would draw attention to the fact that this is a parallel case to the one I mentioned before, the case of Meaford, where the people of the town had to raise $25,000 of their own money to build a railway two miles to their wharf.

Mr. GOURLEY. The coal company run a railway down to Parrsboro and that is all they want; they do not care for anything else. There is a mile between the terminus of that road and the shore of Minas Basin. The steamer goes there with passengers and the passengers have to walk one mile.

Mr. FOWLER. Does this company not ship coal by this wharf ?

Mr. GOURLEY. Not by the public wharf; they have a private wharf. I think it is demeaning to the province that strangers and tourists should have to walk a mile. The company have no object in building this railway, it is purely in the interest of the public.

Mr. SPROULE. It makes the case exactly parallel with the case I mentioned in Meaford, in which the government refused to grant any aid.

To the Indian River Railway Company for a line of railway from a point at or near the north end of Lake Megantic, thence southerly along said lake to a point on the international boundary, not exceeding 19 miles.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The description of this in the vote gives about as much information as any one can give about it, describing the points between which it will run.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This road is intended to connect the Quebec Central Railway at the end of its Tring branch on Lake Megantic with the boundary line, at Rangeley with a railway that goes up from Rumford. This little extension to the State of Maine will enable the farmers in that district to communicate with the lumber camps in the State of Maine. It practically affords a straight line for the Quebec Central Railway into the United States.

Mr. FOWLER. This is an independent company is it not ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, it connects the Quebec Central with this company at Rangeley.

Towards the construction and completion of a railway bridge and approaches over the Nicolet river at Nicolet, in lieu of a grant under chapter 8 of 63-64 Victoria, item 39 of section 2, $15,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. This is a revote of a subsidy which was granted in 1900, for the South Shore Railway bridge on the Nicolet river.

Mr. COCHRANE.

Mr. FOWLER. What has this bridge cost ?

The PRIME MINISTER. In the neighbourhood of $100,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I suggested the other day that it would be a great advantage if these railway bridges were so constructed that they could be used for passenger and vehicular traffic. In all the bridges over the Mississippi river, they are so constructed that they can be used by the general public as well as by railways.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That cannot be done in this case, because the piers have already been constructed, and it has not been provided for.

Mr. SPROULE. Heretofore the principle has been laid down, that the government would grant about 15 per cent of the cost of these bridges. On what principle are we proceeding here ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The principle is that we generally give 15 per cent except when bridges are very expensive, and in such a case the subsidy is calculated on the cost of the bridge, and is an arbitrary one.

Towards the construction of the steel superstructure of a railway bridge on the St. Francis river, in the county of Yamaska, in lieu of a grant under chapter 8 of 63-64 Victoria, item 38 of section 2, but subject to the same conditions as expressed therein, payable to Canadian Bridge Company of Walkerville, as their claim may appear for work already done on said bridge, $50,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. This subsidy was voted three years ago, and a contract was entered into between the South Shore Railway Company, and the Canadian Bridge Company of Walkerville, for the steel superstructure. The superstructure is there today, but there are no approaches to the bridge. The bridge will be of no use to anybody unless it is completed. We ask parliament simply to revote the item, so that the bridge company can receive its money.

Mr. SPROULE. We have not given them any money at all ?

The PRIME MINISTER. They have received no money yet.

Mr. SPROULE. In this resolution you speak of the superstructure only, and in the other resolution you speak of the bridge as a whole. What is the distinction ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The Walkerville Bridge Company will receive $48,000 and the other $2,000 will be to pay some claims against the bridge.

Mr. SPROULE. Then you are voting this to the bridge company, and not to the railway company ?

The PRIME MINISTER. We are voting it to pay the bridge company, because they are really the parties entitled to it.

Mr. SPROULE. How much has this bridge cost ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know what the masonry cost ; but the bridge must have cost considerably more than $100,000.

Mr. SPROULE. If it cost $100,000 we are giving 50 per cent.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am sure that it cost more than $100,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am safe in saying that it will cost over $200,000. It is a two-story bridge, providing for vehicles and passengers, as well as the railway, and it can be used by the municipalities on both sides of the river.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it free to the public ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Does this pay all the charges which the bridge company has against the bridge ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, except as is provided in the next resolution.

Mr. SPROULE. Did the provincial government give any assistance to this bridge ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, the provincial government has given so much a year for ten or fifteen years.

Mr. SPROULE. It is only proper that the provincial government should aid such a bridge, especially as it affords facilities for the travelling public.

Mr. CLANCY. I understand that this money will not be earned until all the work is done.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is not the intention to pay until the approaches have been completed.

Mr. CLANCY. It is very proper that the Walkerville Bridge Company should be paid for the superstructure, but have we any assurance that the balance of the work will be done ?

The PRIME MINISTER. That is exactly what we provide for in the next resolution.

To the Canadian Bridge Company of Walkerville. To strengthen and complete the foundation and approaches to the bridge over the St. Francis river subsidized to the South Shore Railway Company by section 3, chapter 7, Victoria 62-63, a sum of $35,000, which amount shall remain the first charge on the road, and to be recouped to the treasury out of subsidies earned or to be earned, $35,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. As I have just stated that the Walkerville Bridge Company have put up the superstructure, but the bridge is in the river without any approaches. The railway company is insolvent, and we thought we should take some precaution to have the bridge completed, so that the public could have the benefit of it. We agreed with the Walkerville company to give them a subsidy of $25,000. First of all we provide that they shall strengthen the piers. Our engineers have reported that the piers would have to be strengthened, so as to provide against the ice. We then provided that for this amount of $25,000 they should complete the approaches. When they have built the approaches and strengthened the piers, then they will be paid the $25,000, and the $48,000 which is due for the superstructure.

Mr. CLANCY. Who is in possession of this road ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The railway company is still in possession of the road, but they are insolvent.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The railway has not reached there.

The PRIME MINISTER. It has.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They have ten miles graded on the other side.

The PRIME MINISTER. We have provided this sum of money not as an extra subsidy but as a charge on the road to be recouped by the government.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not quite understand how this is to be returned by way of earned subsidy.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have just explained that the railway is completed to the bridge. There are between four and six miles of the railway for which the subsidy has been earned, but not paid, so that we have nearly $20,000 which we can apply to recoup ourselves for the further subsidy which we are giving for the completion of the bridge.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that this bridge would cost over $100,000. We are giving $85,000 to build a bridge which is to cost a little over $100,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. We do not give $85,000. We give $50,000, and we advance $35,000, which is to be recouped.

To the Chateauguay and Northern Railway Company. In addition to the subsidy for the Bout de L'Ile bridge granted by chapter 8, section 33, Victoria 63-64, $50,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. This bridge was also subsidized two years ago. It is now in process of construction, and is partly built, but it turns out to be far more expensive than was supposed. It was estimated to cost between $500,000 and $600,000. The report we have is that it will cost probably $700,000. The condition of the country has

been found to be such as to make it much more expensive, and the plans had to be changed.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What bridge is this ?

The PRIME MINISTER. It is at the eastern extremity of the Island of Montreal, connecting it with the main land on the north side, crossing the two branches of the Ottawa river.

Mr. CLANCY. What was the subsidy two years ago ?

The PRIME MINISTER. One hundred and eighty thousand dollars.

To the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company for a line of railway from Woodstock northerly to a point on the Grand Trunk Railway at Berlin, or from Ingersoll to Stratford, or to any point on the Grand Trunk Railway between these places, not exceeding 25 miles, being in addition to, and continuation of the nine miles mentioned in item one of this section.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This item was allowed to stand at the request of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). I telegraphed to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and he says that the wording here was adopted after full consideration by the directors of the company, and he does not like to authorize a change. I have consulted the hon. member for East Grey, and I believe it will meet the views of the committee to allow it to pass if the hon. gentleman will withdraw his amendment.

Amendment of Mr. Sproule withdrawn, and item agreed to.

On resolution 4,

The subsidies hereby authorized towards the construction of any railway or bridge shall be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, and may, unless otherwise expressly provided in this Act, at the option of the Governor in Council, on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, be paid as follows :—

(a.) upon the completion of the work subsidized ; or

(b.) by instalments, on the completion of each ten-mile section of the railway, in the proportion which the cost of such completed section bears to that of the whole work undertaken ; or

(c.) upon the progress estimates on the certificate of the chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals, that, in his opinion, having regard to the whole work undertaken and the aid granted, the progress made justifies the payment of a sum not less than sixty thousand dollars ; or

(d.) with respect to (b) and (c), part one way, part the other.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I move that this resolution be amended by substituting in subsection C. $30,000 for $60,000. The object is to make the subsection correspond with the Act adopted this session. $60,000 would apply in the case of large enterprises, but in the case of a shorter road it would be a very large sum. There are times when you cannot certify that the road is completed, but the general progress made gives such assurance of completion that it would be quite legitimate to make payment on a progress estimate.

Mr. SPROULE. With regard to the resolution we have just passed, resolution No. 3, relating to bridges, the hon. minister is aware no doubt that a dispute arose between the Auditor General and some company with regard to the cost of a bridge. Has the government made any additional provision for ascertaining accurately what the cost of any bridge is, because when we are paying a percentage the cost may be made out greater than it really is. That is what happened in the case I referred to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We could not put any legislation on the statute-book which would broaden the powers of the government in this respect. That is a matter for inquiry by the engineers.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you adopted any additional safeguards in these resolutions than are to be found in the others ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The resolutions are the same, but in the light of experience the department will adopt additional safeguards where the necessity arises. There is no legislation required to broaden the powers of the department.

Mr. SPROULE. It was suggested that there was a defect in the regulations or in the carrying out of them. When the attention of the government is drawn to it, I should think they would be more careful in the future.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The powers of the government seem to be sufficiently broad. The only thing that might be suggested is that parliament might impose a specific mode of inquiry on the officers of the department before they could act on the provisions of section 3. That may or may not be necessary, and I do not offer any opinion with regard to it. I do not know whether or not there is in these resolutions any provision to ensure the operation of the railway after it is constructed. I do not know that it is very easy to insert such a provision but its necessity was brought to the attention of the government this session by the fact that two railways which had received aid from this government and the provincial government, had not been in operation for several months, and one of them is not in operation yet. Under section 4 of these resolutions, a railway company may procure its subsidy in very small amounts from time to time, and there does not seem to be any stipulation which will ensure the final completion of the road. I do not know whether the form of contract and the safeguards therein provided give any assurance that a road, after receiving subsidies over a certain mileage, will be really completed. It is desirable that the

country should have some assurance that any road which receives the assistance of the government should be operated after completion. The ex-Minister of Railways said at the time it was a matter for serious consideration but he did not know of any measure which could be adopted that would aid us in that regard. Has the subject received the consideration of the government, because it seems closely connected with the provisions of section 4 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The matter has received some consideration. Although the statute does not deal with the matter particularly, the practice of the department has been to insert a clause in all the contracts, requiring the company to operate the road. Still while that clause is there, we have not always found it possible to discover the means of enforcing it. I have referred the form of contract to the Justice Department to see whether we cannot strengthen the clause in any way, and I am awaiting its opinion.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems that there is a very lax method of paying out the subsidies on bridges. They may be paid out on progress estimates, certified to by the chief engineer. This section provides that payment may be made of a sum not less than $30,000, but it does not say that this payment shall bear any proportion to the cost of the work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The engineer will see to that.

Mr. SPROULE. I think he will be more likely to attend to it if he has something to guide him.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The section says 'having regard to the whole work undertaken and the aid granted.' That means a proportionate sum.

Mr. SPROULE. If they had $30,000 worth of work done in the judgment of the engineer, he would be justified in certifying to the progress estimates to that extent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is not done. The practice is exactly what my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) wishes. It must be a reasonable proportion of the whole work.

Mr. SPROULE. No proposition is stated here.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, the engineer must be satisfied that it is a reasonable proportion of the whole work.

On section 5,

The subsidies hereinbefore authorized to be granted to companies named shall, if granted by the Governor in Council, be granted to such companies respectively ; the other subsidies may be granted to such companies as establish to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council their ability to construct and complete the said railways respectively ; all the lines for the construction of which subsidies are granted, unless they are already commenced, shall be commenced within two years from the first day of August, 1903, and completed within a reasonable time, not to exceed four years from the said first day of August, to be fixed by the Governor in Council, and shall also be constructed according to descriptions, conditions and specifications approved by the Governor in Council on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and specified in each case in a contract between the company and the said minister, which contract the minister, with the approval of the Governor in Council, is hereby empowered to make. The location also of such subsidized lines shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How is that carried out in practice ? Is any notice given to persons or communities interested ? Complaint has been made to me during the present session of unfair location of railway lines which are receiving aid from the government, and it is said that this is done without any notice whatever to the municipal body or to the people of a community where there is no municipal organization.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Complaint is likely to arise in matters of this kind where there are conflicting interests. But I have not had my attention called to any grievance as to lack of notice. My own observation is that wherever a road is being surveyed a very lively interest is taken in the location of the line, and if all parties are not satisfied, complaint is likely to be made. There is no special rule as to notifying any of the parties concerned, but, as I say, I do not think there is any grievance arising out of that lack of notice.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I refer to cases of this kind : Suppose a town situated practically upon the proposed line of railway, and the railway located in such a way that instead of running to the town, it runs at a distance of two or three miles, the result being that the property of persons in the town is much less valuable than it would otherwise be. In such a case the tendency is gradually to transfer the town to a point near the line of railway, and the people owning property in the town, rightly or wrongly, feel aggrieved. It may be that, in such cases, there is good reason for locating the line of railway as it is located ; I am not discussing that, but I am discussing the allegation which is said to be literally true. that lines are located in that way without notice to the municipal governments or the people of the town. Whatever may be said as to the merits of any particular case, the people of the town should be notified before the location is fixed by the government. I do not know whether the facts are as represented to me ; I am asking for information.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the line were first located so as to run to a town and before construction the proposal were made to change it, that is a thing, it seems

to me, that would interfere with vested rights on which the people should be heard. But where you are dealing with the first location the case would hardly be the same. But I think that, so far as notice is concerned, the first appearance of a surveyor in the region attracts attention and arouses interest, and if the location fails to meet the wishes of the community generally, we find that representations are very promptly and freely made through various channels. But I have never had any complaint made of lack of information.

On section 6,

The granting of such subsidies, and the receipt thereof by the respective companies, shall be subject to the condition that the Governor in Council may at all times provide and secure to other companies such running powers, traffic arrangements and other rights, as will afford to all railways connecting with those so subsidized, reasonable and proper facilities in exercising such running powers, fair and reasonable traffic arrangements with connecting companies, and equal mileage rates between all such connecting railways; and the Governor in Council shall have absolute control, at all times, over the rates and tolls to be levied and taken by any of the companies, or upon any of the railways hereby subsidized.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I observe that the Governor in Council is given control over rates. Is that intended to be in contradistinction to the powers to be exercised by the new Railway Commission? It strikes me that there is something a little inconsistent in this; at all events, we should have some definition as to when the rates are to be fixed by the Railway Commission and when by the Governor in Council.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have followed the phraseology of the old Act in this respect, and I am inclined to think that before this Bill is finally passed we shall have to adapt it to the provisions of the Railway Commission Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I notice that the expression 'Governor in Council' is used throughout these resolutions. In some cases, no doubt, it is the proper expression, but in other cases it may be necessary to make an amendment.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It may be that, in following the wording of the old Act, we have not made the changes made necessary by the new. Before the Bill is finally disposed of, I shall see to it that that shall be looked into.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Another point relates to the terms of the proposed covenant to be inserted in the contract, which is to be in addition to, or in substitution of, the powers conferred upon the Railway Commission. It seems to me that such matters are pretty well covered by the terms of the Railway Act passed during the present session. I do not say that it would be wrong to insert them in this Bill as well, but we should see to it that the language with regard to running powers, traffic arrangements, &c., is made absolutely to conform with the provisions of the Railway Act. And very probably it will be found that the Railway Act, having been altered in some respect, and this Bill having been founded on the former Act, the language is not exactly in conformity with the new law.

The PRIME MINISTER. I agree that the terms should correspond exactly with those of the Railway Act unless we find something to add. In this case, it may be agreed that, while we can take the exact provisions of the Railway Act, there is advantage sometimes in making them a matter of contract. They would be, in a sense, a matter of contract under the conditions of the statute. But sometimes it is an advantage to have them under the hand and seal of the company, as then the company is not in a position to contest them. At any rate, the language should conform to that of the Railway Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, a company may have successors, but I never knew it could have assigns, as we find in this section. Is there not a provision in an Act passed during the present session with regard to some matters dealt with in this section?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a matter really between the government and the company, that they will agree to make allowance to us in any business we have with them in matters of transportation. I do not think that is covered by the Railway Act, but it is worth looking into.

On section 8,

As respects all railways for which subsidies are granted by this Act, the company at any time owning or operating any of the railways shall, when required, produce and exhibit to the Minister of Railways and Canals, or any person appointed by him, all books, accounts and vouchers, showing the cost of constructing the railway, the cost of operating it, and the earnings thereof.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think this section is covered by the Railway Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would there be any objection to an amendment or an additional clause by which the Auditor General could also have a perusal of the books of the company during construction?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think any practical difficulty could arise there.

Mr. SPROULE. There was the case of the bridge, where the Auditor General said the bridge did not cost the amount that was claimed, and he saved the country a considerable sum of money.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no difficulty in the Auditor General getting

all the information he desires. He employed experts in the particular case referred to, and there is no difficulty under the statutes in the Auditor General getting all the information he wishes.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. He can get such information as he thinks necessary. I think, after all the Auditor General is a law unto himself.

Mr. SPROULE. I think, if I remember right, the government were not giving him that assistance that he ought to have to ascertain the cost of the bridge, and he took the law into his own hands.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was a difference between the Department of Railways and the Auditor General, but I think I am correct in stating that in that case there was no difficulty in the Auditor General getting all the information that he wanted.

Mr. SPROULE. Was it not a fact that that department was quite willing to pay a bonus on the bridge at the exorbitant price that the company claimed it cost, and but for the fact that the Auditor General refused to pay and went into an inquiry himself, that bonus would have been paid and the consolidated revenue would have been that much worse off.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was a difference of opinion between the Auditor General and the department, but I do not recall all the facts.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is not a power that a public officer would abuse, at least we could not presume that he would abuse it. While it can do no harm, there might possibly be a case where it could do good to give him that power, which would be of benefit to the country. I think we gave some power to the Auditor General in the Act relating to the transcontinental railway, which was somewhat analogous to the power I am asking for now.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no doubt that if the Auditor General were to say that he wished to get access to the books of a company for the purpose of examining into a claim, the Minister of Railways, I think, would be bound to give him authority to do so; I have no doubt he would. There has not been any difficulty of that kind that I know of. This provides that the Minister of Railways or any other person appointed by him may examine all the books. If the Auditor General were to say that in consequence of information he had he wished a person appointed to examine the books, I am sure that any Minister of Railways would authorize that person to represent him for that purpose. I do not think it needs any amendment.

Mr. CLANCY. I think I had incidentally brought to my notice during the present session, that the Auditor General did suggest something like that and that the minister, without mentioning who it was, took a very different view, and if it depended upon authorizing an examination of the books under such circumstances no examination would be made. It would be well to make it clear that it was the duty of the Auditor General to make such a demand, and the duty of the minister to accede to the demand.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am afraid I could not agree with my hon. friend as to the theory of the matter. I think responsibility in all these things is on the minister and not on the Auditor General. Theoretically I differ with my hon. friend; but there is no practical difference, because no difficulty on that score has occurred. I do not think the Auditor General complains that he could not get information. I think we all know he is pretty thorough in these things. So far as I am aware, he has always got all the information he desires.

Mr. CLANCY. I have had occasion to hold different views from the hon. gentleman as to what constitutes ministerial responsibility. Ministerial responsibility cannot go so far as to be of any advantage or security to the public in repairing harm after harm is done, or loss has occurred. I think I have stated before that ministerial responsibility does not always make restitution. The better way is to provide by statute against loss to the country through an officer whose duty it is to look after these things. To say that the minister is responsible is not enough. We might just as well say, and it would be carrying the argument to its legitimate conclusion, that each department over which a minister presides should take the responsibility therefor, and that there was no need of an auditor. A minister has a right to say, I am responsible for that, and I do not think an officer should interfere. I think, on the other hand, a safe and healthy course to take is to secure a scrutiny by an officer whose business it is to do that work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Chairman, before you report these resolutions I want to remind the committee that in connection with one of the items for a subsidy in British Columbia an error occurred and that we have a separate resolution to add to the item. We have dealt with the matter and discussed it, but we must correct the error. In order to do that we will have to formally report these other resolutions; I shall then ask the committee to sit again. This is in connection with the item for the Kootenay Central road.

Resolutions reported, read the first and second time and agreed to.

KOOTENAY CENTRAL RAILWAY—SUBSIDY.

On motion of the Minister of Finance House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

That it is expedient to provide as follows :—

That the Governor in Council may, in addition to the mileage of railway proposed to be subsidized by item 66 of the resolutions respecting railway subsidies now before this House, grant a further subsidy to the Kootenay Central Railway Company, for the line of railway in the said item mentioned, not exceeding eighty miles, making the whole length not exceeding 186 miles, instead of 106 miles. (Correction of clerical error).

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to correct the error to which attention has been called. As we have fully discussed the matter I move that this resolution be formally agreed to.

Resolution agreed to, reported, read the first and second time, and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 270) an Act to authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT—SENATE AMENDMENTS.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER informed the House that he had received a message from the Senate respecting amendments made by them to Bill (No. 21) an Act to consolidate and amend the laws respecting railways as follows :—

Tuesday, October 20, 1903.

Resolved, that a message be sent to the House of Commons by one of the Masters in Chancery, to inform that House, that the Senate doth accept the amendments made by the House of Commons to the Senate amendment No. 51 to Bill No. 21, intituled : 'An Act to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways,' and that the Senate doth not insist upon their amendments Nos. 6, 33, 45, 46 and 60 to the said Bill ; but doth insist upon their amendments Nos. 2, 3 and 4, for the reason that the clauses 5, 6 and 7 of the said Bill were an interference with provincial and municipal rights which the Senate amendments minimized, while giving at the same time jurisdiction to the board on all subject matters essential to the satisfactory working of the purposes set forth in the original sections 5, 6 and 7 of the said Bill.

The Senate doth also insist on its amendment No. 11, for the reason that in all tribunals there should be an appeal on points of law. It is equally in the interests of the individual and the company, especially when the appeal can only be granted by leave of the board or of two judges of the Appellate Court.

The Senate doth insist upon its amendment No. 31, for the reason that the clause in its original form involves an interference with municipal rights.

The Senate doth also insist upon its amendment No. 40, for the reason that cases may arise where the agreement was fair and just to the employee. The Senate suggests as an alternative to the words proposed to be inserted by the following amendment :—

'Unless such agreement is conformable to the law of the province in which it is made and is authorized by the board.'

The Senate doth also insist upon its amendment No. 70, for the reasons set forth in the objections to Nos. 2, 3 and 4.

Attest.

SAM'L E. ST. O. CHAPLEAU,
Clerk of the Senate.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that :

A select committee composed of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Hon. Mr. Fielding, Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick and Hon. Mr. Blair, be appointed to draw up reasons to be offered at a conference with the Senate for disagreeing to certain amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 21) entitled an Act to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways.

Mr. SPROULE. I presume the desire of the government is to confine that committee to the members of the Privy Council in order that it may have the greater authority. I observe that all of the members of the committee are members of the Privy Council except the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). He is a member of the Privy Council.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would suggest the name of the hon. senior member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker).

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There can be no objection to this.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not objecting.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is quite unintentional that the hon. member (Mr. Barker) was omitted.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is my mistake. I drew the resolution up hurriedly.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the leader of the opposition would be willing to act, we would be pleased to have his assistance.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would be glad if I could give any assistance. It may be that this being a government measure, it is the precedent that members of the government should represent members of the House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not a controversial matter, and I will be glad if the House will allow me to move to add the names of the leader of the opposition and the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker).

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

QUEBEC BRIDGE—PAPERS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I beg to lay on the Table of the House certain papers with respect to the Quebec bridge. They are printed and will be distributed immediately.

ADJOURNMENT—ALASKAN BOUNDARY COMMISSION.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I wish to inquire whether the government has any official information as to the award that it is rumoured has been made respecting the Alaskan boundary? If so, I would like to know what are the terms of the award; whether there has been dissent by any of the commissioners, and by which of them, and whether any statement has been made public by any of the British commissioners in regard to the reasons on account of which they have dissented from the award of the majority of the members constituting that tribunal. I wish also to ask whether the correspondence and documents touching this question will be brought down immediately? In order to refresh the memory of my right hon. friend, I may recall his words in the debate of March 5th, 1902, on the motion made by my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) that certain documents relating to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty should be brought down to the House. My right hon. friend then said:

> I would recall to my hon. friend the well known fact, that the only references that were made by the Canadian government at any time with regard to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, were simply with the object of having the Alaskan boundary considered together with the Nicaraguan question. We made representations to that effect and though one branch of this subject has been disposed of, the other has not yet been disposed of, though it is still in a fair way towards settlement, and the negotiations are yet pending. My hon. friend will see that it would be impossible to bring down anything concerning the correspondence with regard to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty except such as concerns the Alaskan boundary question, and we could not bring down these papers unless we were to give at once to the public the negotiations which are still going on with regard to the Alaskan boundary. I now come to another branch of the argument made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk). The hon. gentleman has stated that whether negotiations as to the Alaskan boundary are pending or not, we should bring down the representations which had been made by one government to the other. The hon. gentleman will understand that it would be impossible to bring down that correspondence unless we were to bring down at the same time the protocols exchanged, and the propositions and counter propositions which have been made up to this very moment upon the subject. The hon. gentleman referred to the fact that the Joint High Commission which sat at Quebec and Washington has adjourned sine die, and he says that we should not withhold the correspondence until this commission resumed again. I will at once, relieve the apprehension of my hon. friend by telling him, as he knows—because the papers have been placed on the Table of the House two years ago—that the Alaskan boundary question has been removed from the commission, and referred by the commission itself to the British government and the United States government, the two interested parties. Since that time, that is to say, since the month of February, 1899, negotiations have been going on between the two governments. Protocols have been exchanged, propositions have been made, counter propositions have been submitted, other propositions have been made again, and the matter has been under consideration and is still under consideration.

I understand this language of the right hon. gentleman to refer to the questions relating to the Alaskan boundary. My right hon. friend continued:

> So that the very argument which my hon. friend has made cannot apply to this matter, for a very obvious reason; that we could not bring down the papers without submitting the very terms of the propositions and counter propositions that have been made. I cannot divulge these secrets to-day; but it is easy to suppose what has been going on. It is easy to suppose that certain propositions have been made by one government to the other; that these propositions have been referred to the Canadian government; that the government have made its comments upon these propositions; that it has either assented to them or dissented from them.

My right hon. friend was using that language for the purpose of conveying to the House, in a certain way, the fact that negotiations had been going on, that protocols and counter protocols had been exchanged, and that there had been a great deal of correspondence on the subject which he thought could not properly be brought before the House during the pendency of these negotiations. These negotiations have terminated, and if the award has now been made, there seems to be no reason why this correspondence should not be furnished at once to the House, especially as we are, I hope, in the closing days of the session. My right hon. friend in response to an inquiry from me during the present session said, on March 25th last:

> I am sorry to say that at this moment the government is not yet in a position to bring down the correspondence which has taken place upon this particular subject. It is all ready, and I am in hopes that at an early date it may be placed on the Table of the House. All I can say at present is, that if the correspondence is not already on the Table of the House it is not because of any fault of any authority on this side of the Atlantic. We hope, however, that very shortly, the whole of the correspondence which has taken place upon the making of the treaty itself, and the selection of the commissioners will be placed before parliament. We hope further, that all the correspondence which has taken place between the two governments since the adjournment of the High Commission, in 1899, will also be placed upon the Table of the House at an early date.

As nearly seven months have expired, perhaps the right hon. gentleman is now in a

position to place this matter upon the Table. It is important that at this juncture the House should be made acquainted with the communication to which my right hon. friend has referred in the extracts which I have read. As the right hon. gentleman has stated that the correspondence is all ready, I presume there will be no objection to place it before the House to-morrow ?

The PRIME MINISTER. With regard to the several questions which my hon. friend has asked, I have to say that the only information I have at the present moment as to the award, is a telegram from Mr. Sifton which I will communicate to the House to-morrow. This telegram informs me that the award has been rendered, and gives me succinctly the terms of the award.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). With regard to the dissent and the statement of the Canadian commissioners ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no information on that except that our commissioners have dissented. With regard to the correspondence which led to the treaty, there is no objection on the part of this government to laying that before the House. I am not sure that I shall be in a position to do so to-morrow, but I hope to do so before the end of the session.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Several months have expired since my right hon. friend hoped to be able to lay that on the Table of the House at once. I hope he will be able to lay it on the Table so that we may have an opportunity of reading it and possibly discussing it before the end of the session. Will my right hon. friend also state what business is to be placed before us to-morrow ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I hope to clear the paper of everything. We will commence by moving to go into Committee of Supply, when I understand my hon. friend from Pictou intends to move a motion.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12 o'clock midnight.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, October 21, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

QUEBEC BRIDGE AGREEMENT.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolutions :

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

Resolved, that it is expedient to approve, ratify, and confirm the agreement made on the 19th of October, 1903, between the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company, represented by the Hon. Simon Napoleon Parent, the president thereof, and His Majesty the King, represented by the Honourable William Stevens Fielding, acting Minister of Railways and Canals, a copy of which agreement is hereto annexed :—

Agreement made this Nineteenth Day of October, in the Year of Our Lord one Thousand Nine Hundred and Three.

Between

The Quebec Bridge and Railway Company, a corporation duly incorporated and organized under the laws of the Dominion of Canada, having its chief place of business in the said city of Quebec, and herein acting and represented by the Honourable Simon Napoleon Parent, president, duly and specially authorized for the purposes hereof under a resolution passed at a meeting of the board of directors of the said company on the first day of October, 1903, a copy of which said resolution remains annexed to the original of these presents, and is signed by the parties hereto, in order to identify the same (hereinafter called the company) of the one part ;

And His Majesty King Edward the Seventh, acting in respect of the Dominion of Canada, herein represented and acting by the Honourable William Stevens Fielding, His Majesty's acting Minister of Railways and Canals of Canada (hereinafter called the government) of the other part.

Whereas the company has by several Acts of the parliament of Canada been duly authorized and empowered to lay out, construct, maintain, work, manage and use a railway bridge, with the necessary approaches, over the St. Lawrence river at or near the city of Quebec, and also to lay out, construct and operate the following lines of railway :—

(a.) Commencing at or near the northern terminus of the bridge of the company at a point in the parish of St. Foye, in the county of Quebec, thence easterly following the general line of the St. Lawrence river to the city of Quebec ;

(b.) Commencing at a point at or near the southern terminus of the said bridge, in the county of Lévis, to a point at or near the intersection of the Grand Trunk Railway with the Intercolonial Railway at Chaudière curve, in the county of Lévis, or to some point on the Grand Trunk Railway, or on the Intercolonial Railway, near such point of intersection ;

And whereas it is the intention of the company to provide by the construction of the said bridge and works for the conveyance of traffic across the River St. Lawrence at or near the city of Quebec, and to provide terminal and other facilities for the interchange of traffic between the railways which are or may be hereafter constructed near the said bridge upon the north and south sides of the said river, and which may be desirous of making use of such facilities;

And whereas the company has been duly organized and has issued two hundred thousand dollars ($200,000) of its authorized capital stock of one million dollars ($1,000,000), upon which the shareholders have paid the sum of $65,585.70;

And whereas the government of the province of Quebec has granted a subsidy to aid in the construction of the said works to the amount of two hundred and fifty thousand dollars ($250,000) and has paid the whole amount thereof ;

And whereas the municipality of the city of Quebec has granted a subsidy to aid in the construction of the said bridge to the amount of three hundred thousand dollars ($300,000) and has paid the whole amount thereof;

And whereas the government has granted a subsidy towards the construction of the said bridge to an amount not exceeding one million dollars ($1,000,000) and has paid to the company on account of the said subsidy the sum of three hundred and seventy-four thousand three hundred and fifty-three dollars ($374,353);

And whereas the substructure and approaches of the said bridges have been completed, and a portion of the superstructure has been constructed;

And whereas the company has so far expended upon said works the sum of $914,862, and is indebted in respect of the same work in the sum of $779,550, including at par value bonds to the extent of $472,000, upon which was realized the sum of $283,270;

And whereas the amount necessary to complete the said bridge and the said lines of railway and to provide the necessary terminal and other facilities, as well as to pay off the aforesaid amount of the present indebtedness of the company, is estimated at the sum of $6,866,882;

And whereas the company is unable to proceed with the said work without further assistance from the government and it has applied to the government for such assistance, which the government has agreed to grant in the manner and form and upon the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth and declared;

Now, this agreement witnesseth that in pursuance of the said agreement and for the considerations herein appearing,

The said company and the government mutually covenant, promise and agree to and with each other in manner following, that is to say:—

1. In these presents the expression 'undertaking' shall mean and include the said bridge and approaches, the said lines of railway, and the terminal and other facilities to be constructed as aforesaid.

The expression 'the company' shall mean and include as well as the said company, their successors and assigns, and the expression 'the government' shall mean and include as well as His Majesty King Edward the Seventh, His heirs and successors.

2. The company releases and forgoes any claim which it may have upon the government for any balance now remaining unpaid of the said subsidy of $1,000,000 so granted by the government as aforesaid, and also any other rights or claims against the government other than such as are hereinafter set forth and expressly declared.

3. The company will forthwith arrange with the present subscribers of the capital stock of the company that such subscribers shall surrender such stock to the company, and in lieu thereof accept paid-up stock for the amount paid by them on their shares, the company relieving them from further liability upon the stock so surrendered.

4. The company will procure subscriptions for additional stock to the amount of $200,000, such new stock to be issued at a price not below par and to be immediately paid up in full, the proceeds to be applied in the first place in the payment of the discount at which the bonds of the company were issued as aforesaid, to wit, the sum of $188,721.

5. When and so soon as the company shall have completed all the arrangements mentioned in the two preceding clauses, and the proceeds of the said issue of $200,000 stock shall have been paid in full to the company, the company shall be at liberty to issue such bonds, debentures or other securities as hereinafter provided to an amount not exceeding $6,678,200.

6. The said bonds, debentures or other securities shall be issued by the company upon the credit of the company and upon the security of its undertaking and property, and upon the franchises, tolls, rents and revenues thereof, and shall form the first charge upon the same, and shall be secured by a mortgage thereon, as hereinafter provided. They shall be issued payable in fifty years from the date thereof, and shall bear interest at the rate of three per centum per annum, payable half-yearly, and shall be issued as hereinafter provided. The proceeds of such securities shall be applied in payment of the balance of the existing obligations and indebtedness of the company, including any bonds or mortgages issued in respect thereof and not herein otherwise provided for; in the construction and completion of the undertaking, and for the acquisition of the right of way, and other lands, which the company is authorized to acquire or expropriate for the purposes of the undertaking, and in the payment of land damages in connection therewith.

7. The government shall guarantee the payment of the principal and interest of the bonds, debentures or other securities of the company to an amount not exceeding $6,678,200. The said bonds, debentures or other securities shall be issued as to provide for monthly payments, as far as practicable, to the company, and they shall be issued, or the proceeds thereof paid to the company, as the construction of the undertaking is proceeded with to the satisfaction of the government, and in such sums as the chief engineer of the government railways or such other officer as the government may appoint may certify are justified.

8. The kind of securities to be so guaranteed and the form and denomination thereof, as well as the time and manner of their issue and the form and manner of guarantee, shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council.

9. The mortgage to secure such securities shall be made to a trustee or trustees approved by the Governor in Council, and the form and terms of the mortgage shall be subject to the like approval.

10. All moneys paid by the government under the said guarantee shall be held to be paid in discharge of the liability of the government, but not in discharge of the liability of the company under the securities guaranteed or under the mortgage securing them, and the moneys so paid shall be held to be still secured by the said securities and mortgage, and the government shall be subrogated in all the rights of the holders of the securities, the interest upon or the principal of which has been paid by the government, and the government shall, in respect of all moneys so paid, be in all respects in the position of security holders in respect of whose securities default has been made in payment to the extent of the moneys paid by the government.

11. The company shall not create or issue any further stock, shares, bonds or interests in the company or its undertaking other than and except as provided for by and in these presents.

12. The plans and specifications for all the works of the undertaking shall be submitted to and approved by the Governor in Council before any work is constructed thereunder.

13. The continuation of the work of constructing the said undertaking shall be proceeded with so soon as the plans thereof are submitted to and approved by the Governor in Council, and the said undertaking shall be completed not later than the first day of December, 1906.

14. Upon the execution of this agreement, the Governor in Council shall have the right to appoint three directors of the company, the number of directors to be elected by the shareholders of the company being limited to eight, and the directors so appointed and elected shall constitute the board of directors of the company. The directors appointed by the Governor in Council need not be possessed of the qualifications required in the case of elected directors. They shall be entitled as such directors to the same fees or allowances from the company as are paid or allowed to the other directors.

15. The Governor in Council shall fix the tolls and further shall make regulations with regard to the use of the undertaking so as to secure the right to the use and enjoyment thereof to all railway companies which may desire to connect therewith, upon fair and equal terms, without preference to one railway over another.

16. From and after the first day of December, 1906, or the date of the completion of the undertaking, whichever shall first happen, the company shall, out of the net income of the undertaking, that is to say, after payment out of the income of the expense of operation and other charges for maintenance and repairs and for renewals of the said undertaking, or any part or parts thereof, and of the interest upon the bonded indebtedness, annually pay to the government for the purpose of forming a sinking fund for the redemption of the bonded indebtedness of the company a sum equal to one-half of one per cent of the total amount of such bonded indebtedness.

17. If in any year or years the net income of the undertaking is insufficient to pay the amount required for the said sinking fund, the net income of any subsequent year or years shall be applied in the first place in reduction or payment of such deficiency, together with interest at the rate of three per centum per annum.

18. The company agrees that the government may exercise, and the government hereby reserves the right to take over the whole of the undertaking, assets, property and franchises of the company, at any time, on paying the shareholders the amount of their stock at the par value thereof, not exceeding the amount of $265,585.70, with simple interest at five per centum per annum upon such amount as from the date or dates of the payment or payments upon the original or any substituted stock, such interest, however, to be charged with and reduced by the amount of the dividends (if any) which shall have accrued and been paid to the said shareholders respectively, so that no more interest than five per centum per annum, after deducting all dividends, shall in any case be paid to the said shareholders. The government, in addition to interest ascertained in manner aforesaid, shall pay to the shareholders a premium of ten per centum upon the par value of the fully paid shares. Such right to take over the undertaking may be exercised at any time by the government upon giving one month's notice to the company, which shall thereupon, and upon payment by the government to the shareholders aforesaid, grant, surrender and release to the government all their right, title and interest in and to the said undertaking and to the franchises and all other assets and property of the company of whatsoever nature or kind, subject to the payment of such obligations of the Company as may have been contracted with the consent and approval of the government, if any, for construction, operation and maintenance, and to the said bonded indebtedness, which the government shall thereupon assume and pay, according to the terms of the said bonds or other securities and of the mortgage securing the same.

19. In the event of the government exercising the said right to take over the undertaking, assets, property and franchises of the company as aforesaid, the provisions contained in the following clauses, numbers 20 to 24, shall take effect and come into operation from and after the date of such acquisition.

20. For the purpose of the sinking fund for the redemption of the bonded indebtedness, a like sum as is in and by clause 16 hereof provided to be paid for such purposes by the company to the government shall be annually set aside by the government out of the net income of the undertaking, that is to say, after payment out of the income of the expenses of operation and other charges for maintenance, repairs and for renewals or improvements upon and additions to the said undertaking and any part or parts thereof, and of the interest upon the bonded indebtedness and of interest calculated at the rate of three per cent per annum on all moneys paid by the government, in accordance with the provisions of clause 18, for the acquisition of the undertaking, and of interest at the same rate on any other liability or expenditure incurred or made by the government in connection with the undertaking.

21. The government will, subject to the provision next hereinafter contained, annually pay to the government of the province of Quebec and to the corporation of the city of Quebec, respectively, a proportion of the balance of the net income after providing for the said charges, interest and expenses and the amount to be set aside for the sinking fund as aforesaid, such proportion being based upon the amount paid or contributed as a subsidy by each of the three parties, namely: the Dominion government, $374,353; the government of the province of Quebec, $250,000, and the city of Quebec, $300,000; not exceeding, however, as regards the government of the province of Quebec and the city of Quebec, respectively, the sum of $7,500 and $9,000, being the amount of interest calculated at the rate of three per centum per annum on the said sum of $250,000 and $300,000.

22. If in any year or years subsequent to the acquisition of the undertaking by the government the income of the undertaking shall be insufficient to meet the charges and expenses and the provision for the sinking fund, more particularly set forth in clause 20 hereof, the net income of any subsequent year or years, after providing for the said charges, interest and expenses and the amount to be set aside for the sinking fund, shall be applied in reduction or payment of the amount of such deficiency before any such division of the net income and payment of part thereof to the government of the province of Quebec and the city of Quebec, res-

pectively, as provided for by the last preceding clause, is made.

23. If at any time, and with or without notice, the government shall pay or cause to be paid to the government of the province of Quebec and the city of Quebec, or either of them, the amount of their respective subsidies of $250,000, and $300,000, all payments, whether in respect of capital or income, to be made under the foregoing provisions to the said government of the province of Quebec or the city of Quebec, respectively, shall as and from that time absolutely cease and determine.

24. Notwithstanding anything contained in the five next preceding clauses, the undertaking, assets, property and franchises of the company shall at all times be and remain the absolute property of the government, and the sole right of control and management shall be and continue absolutely vested in the government.

25. This agreement shall not come into force or effect unless and until it has been approved, ratified and confirmed by the parliament of Canada.

In testimony whereof, the said parties have hereunto set their hands and seals the day and year first herein written.

(Sgd.) W. S. FIELDING.
(Sgd.) S. N. PARENT.

Signed, sealed and delivered in the presence of O. E. Taschereau.

Motion agreed to.

ALASKAN BOUNDARY COMMISSION.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I was going to give to the House a telegram I received yesterday from Mr. Sifton in respect to the award of the Alaska Boundary Convention. I may say that subsequently during the day His Excellency received from the Colonial Office a similar telegram. It reads as follows :

London, October 20, 1903.

Laurier,
Ottawa.

Award signed to day by chief justice and Commissioners Root, Lodge and Turner, being under treaty binding majority. Line commences at Cape Muzon, goes directly to southern entrance of channel between Wales and Sitklan Islands, proceeding northward between said islands, to Portland channel; thence along the middle of Portland channel to its head; from there line formed by going from peak to peak of mountains, distance from tidal water varying from ten to thirty miles, speaking generally. When opposite Thomas Bay, line stops undefined from there to point about fifteen miles north of head of Taku inlet; thence follows peaks of mountains about north-westward to White Pass, follows summits of White and Chilcoot Passes, thence by peaks of mountains to Mount Fairweather, passes close to police post situated near Klehini river. On this course, the line will be from eight to twenty miles north of the provisional boundary line; from Fairweather a short distance northward and then on a fairly direct course to the rear of Yakutat Bay, thence from peak to peak by somewhat circuitous route to Mount St. Elias. Marked map follows to-morrow.

(Sgd.) SIFTON.

This telegram would not give so much information as to the character of the boundary which is thus settled by the award of the boundary. But I have here two maps which may perhaps interest the House, and which give the boundary, one showing accurately the section of Portland Channel and the other the general outline of the boundary decided. These maps I lay on the Table of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I presume that there are some documents in connection with the Alaskan boundary which can be brought down at once, and there are some others with respect to which there may be some difficulty of that nature. I would suggest to my right hon. friend that those about which there is no difficulty should be brought down at once, and that the others should be brought down as soon as possible. I imagine there can be no difficulty in bringing down this forenoon, perhaps, a certain number of the documents.

USE OF MAIL BAGS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, there is another matter I would like to bring to your attention, and that is a question which has been raised during the last two or three days as to the use by members of certain rooms and corridors of this House. I would like to say that I think it is desirable, even at this late stage of the session, to have a statement made as to the uses to which the different rooms of this House are applied. It is a question which has some interest to myself on account of the extremely inadequate accommodation which is afforded for the work I am compelled to do from time to time. I have been under the impression that we could use the corridors, but judging from events that have taken place recently there appears to be some rule which prohibits using even the corridors opposite the small apartments in which we are allowed to carry on our work. I think it is extremely desirable that we should know exactly to what uses the rooms are put, and what authority you propose to exercise over members of the House in respect to documents brought into this House ; because as late as this morning I understand that certain parcels brought to this House for the purpose of being piled up in room No. 6, to the great inconvenience of members there, and for the reason that there was no other place to put them, have been ordered away by your authority from the precincts of the House. Under these conditions I think it is extremely desirable that we should know a little of the use to which the different rooms in the House are put, and of the rights which we have as members of this parliament to use those rooms. I have seen during the past session and during the present session a room downstairs opposite the telephone room, which does not seem to be occupied by any person, except that members on the other side of the House have used it during the past session for the distribution of literature, I

know that because I have seen them doing it myself. I know something about the use which has been made of other apartments in this House for that purpose. While that has been going on, bags containing a certain amount of speeches and other documents which were required to be sent out by members on this side of the House for the purpose of affording desirable information to the public have been piled up in the corridors, not in corridors opposite rooms used by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, but in the corridors opposite rooms more particularly used by gentlemen on this side of the House, opposite my own room, opposite the room of my hon. friend from Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Taylor), the whip of the Liberal-Conservative party, opposite room No. 6. Now, no objection has been taken to this for many weeks, and I was not aware that any hon. gentleman in this House had been inconvenienced by that; and if it had been suggested in the House that any gentleman on the other side of the House objected to it or was inconvenienced by it, I am sure I would have been very glad to pile a portion of those bags up in my own room, small as it is, littered up as it is, for the purpose of removing that inconvenience. I am sure that would have been done by my hon. friend from Leeds and Grenville, who is also cooped up in a very small room, absolutely insufficient for his purpose. I am sure that every hon. gentleman on this side of the House would have been willing that the small apartment which we occupy known as No. 6 should also have been piled up by these bags rather than that any hon. gentleman on the other side, and particularly the Postmaster General, should have been inconvenienced in any way by these bags being placed in the corridors.

That is one thing, but it is another thing for the Speaker of this House or for any minister of the Crown to undertake to order away from the precincts of this House bags which are sent here to the address of a member of this House; and I for my part wish to say that I cannot, until I am better advised, recognize your authority Sir, or the authority of any man sitting in that Chair—because my remarks are not at all personal to yourself—the authority of any man occupying your chair, to take a course of that kind with regard to documents sent to a member of this House in the House of Commons. I recognize fully your right to see that good order is kept in the corridors, and I have already said that if you or any other gentleman in this House objects to the corridors being used for that purpose, these bags can be piled in my own room, or in a small number of apartments that are allotted to members on this side of the House. But I want to know at the same time something about the uses to which other rooms in this House are applied at present, and which so far as I am concerned do not seem to be occupied for any useful purpose, and might be occupied for that very purpose. It is not dignified for any Minister of the Crown to undertake to place difficulties in the way of sending out literature from this side of the House to people in this country; it is not a very dignified part for even a private member to undertake to play, and I am glad to say that no private member of this House, so far as I am aware, or at least very few, have raised any question about this; and it has been reserved for a minister of the Crown, who, it is said, aspires to the leadership of the great Liberal party of this country, to raise a question about so petty a matter as that. I do not know where that hon. gentleman is at present. I do not see him in his seat. We have a great many apartments in the Commons which are reserved for the use of members of the House of Commons, and if there is to be difficulty about matters of this kind, I think it will be desirable for us to ascertain whether these apartments are at the present time used for the wisest purpose. There are sleeping apartments provided for certain officials of the House of parliament, and if we are so crowded that it is impossible to give members on this side of the House an opportunity to arrange literature for distribution throughout the country, literature which is sent out by both political parties, then I think it may be desirable to inquire whether we could not better carry on the affairs of the country by using these apartments, which are practically dwellings at the present time, for some other purpose than that to which they are now put.

I have not been inclined to complain about my own inadequate accommodation. I have been content to do as I have done over and over again, go out into the corridor to hold conferences with gentlemen, by reason of the fact that my office was so small and was so littered up. I have had to sit in my office and have my secretary neglect his work because, when I desired to have private conferences, he had to go out and cool his heels in the corridors perhaps for an hour or even an hour and a half at a time, to the great neglect of his work which was going on. I have not said anything about this, I have been content to endure it; but if we are to have a tempest in a teapot created by the Postmaster General because certain bags have been piled up in these corridors opposite my own room and opposite the room of the Liberal-Conservative whip, I think it is high time that we should have from you Sir, and I would like to have it to-day, a statement of the use to which every room in this House is applied at the present time, and a consideration as to whether it is not possible to give to gentlemen in this House who have important duties to transact, a little more accommodation than they have at present.

We have had bags stored in these corridors all ready for mailing since the 25th of September, and the post office service of this country has been unable to take charge of them or to deal with them. I want to point out that the blocking up of the corridors, if they have been blocked up, is largely due to the fact that the post office service has not been able to take care of these bags which have been prepared for the mails. I assume that the post office has not been able to do so. My hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) suggests that it is not on account of inability but on account of unwillingness. I do not doubt that, but I make no suggestion of that kind. This is now the 21st of October and there are bags which have been ready for mailing since the 25th of September as I am informed by those who have charge of those bags. There has not been any very enormous quantity. I will venture to say that the speeches of my right hon. friend the leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) in regard to the transcontinental question have been sent out to the people in greater quantities than the documents which are to be sent out from the bags piled up in the corridors of this House. It is very well known that a very large number of the speeches to which I have referred have been sent out.

Another question to which I would like to have an answer from the government is this: Is the government prepared to say that rooms or places in departmental buildings or in buildings hired and paid for by this country have not been made use of during the present session or during past sessions for the purpose of distributing literature for the government campaign. The right hon. gentleman may be prepared or he may not be prepared to make a statement in regard to that. All I have to say is that if he will grant an inquiry into the subject I venture to think that I will be able to bring to his attention certain facts in regard to it that he may not be aware of at the present time and I think if there is any question of abuse of privileges an inquiry such as I have suggested would lead the right hon. gentleman to the conclusion that there are very much greater irregularities in connectioin with these matters than any irregularity which might be occasioned by the piling of certain bags in the corridors of this House. I thought it right to bring this matter to your attention, Mr. Speaker, because, without any desire to be disrespectful or to pass beyond the bounds of the most absolute courtesy towards yourself, it seems to me that it is beyond your jurisdiction and beyond your power, occupying even the high position which you do occupy, to direct that parcels addressed by hon. gentlemen in this House of Commons shall be removed from the premises or the grounds of parliament and shall not be delivered to the persons for whom they are intended. I have stated to you what I have heard in regard to that and what has been my information. I do not know whether this information be correct or not, but I thought it right to bring it to your attention. I trust I have been misinformed in regard to it. But, in saying what I have in regard to this matter, I of course recognize your right as Speaker of the House to preserve order in the House and in the corridors thereof. I would like to know also how it is that the documents to which I have referred are delayed so long in the corridors. They have been there for weeks ready for mailing and if they have not been mailed, I would like to know what disposition is at present made of the rooms which are at present available for the use of members of the House of Commons and to inquire whether there is not some room which might be available in view of the fact that in the lower part of this building there are rooms which are not used for any purpose in connection with the business of this House. Therefore, as I presume that my remarks have exceeded the measure which would be permitted to me in speaking merely on the Orders of the Day, I will conclude my remarks by moving that the House do now adjourn.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has brought up a motion which, I think, is very small in itself and he has spoken on it in a most unfortunate manner and in a manner which I think is unworthy of himself. The members of this House have to submit to some inconveniences. It is a pity but I do not see that this condition can be remedied. It is unfortunate that every member has not room enough in which to transact his business. It is to be regretted that the leader of the opposition has very small quarters. I can sympathize with my hon. friend in this respect. I occupied those quarters before he did but I never complained that they were too small. These rooms were occupied at one time by a man who is at least the equal of my hon. friend or of any of us—Mr. Blake, and Mr. Blake never made the smallest complaint about them. I know the quarters are very small and I know that they are inconvenient because I occupied them for a very long time. But, I occupy quarters today that are not very much larger in space. However, I think there are some things that could receive the attention of the House rather than such matters as these. Have an investigation. It is a small proposition on the part of my hon. friend to call upon the government to have an investigation as to how some of the rooms downstairs are occupied.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I beg my hon. friend's pardon. I did not ask for any investigation in regard to that matter. I said that great irregularities might be proved in respect to the departmental buildings upon an investigation being held.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will accept the correction. It is not much larger than the statement I have made. I think our time is too precious at this stage of the session to think of having an inquiry of that kind. If, at the opening of next session it is thought advisable to have a proper distribution of the rooms of the House I am sure my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) and his honour the Speaker who have charge of that matter will be only too glad to look into the matter and give as much room as possible to every member of this House. But all this trouble has arisen because of a condition of things which was brought to the attention of the House a few days ago. True it is for many years past, so long as parliament has been a parliament, members have distributed the literature of their own party and so long as parliament will be a parliament they will continue to do so, but this procedure which has been normal for some years has taken on proportions which involve an abuse if not a violation of the law. The whole trouble has come from the fact that a certain publisher in the city of Montreal to whom the privileges of the post office are extended and who gets certain bags for the distribution of his papers, instead of using the bags for the distribution of his papers, has used them to distribute the literature of the Conservative party. Since my hon. friend has brought this matter to the attention of the House let us see what the facts are. In order that the members of the opposition might distribute their literature not at their own cost but at the cost of the country they get this publisher in Montreal to send the literature which had been prepared by the Conservative party probably in this House and printed in the city of Montreal, in the office of a certain newspaper, to the party whip, here, not to the parties for which it was intended them to be distributed by the party whip to parties outside. So, His Majesty's mails, instead of being abused once, have been abused twice. This literature was prepared, I suppose, in Ottawa, printed in Montreal, sent back to the House of Commons in Ottawa and from the House of Commons scattered all over the country. This is an abuse of the privileges of this House; it is an abuse of the postal service. The publisher of that paper was within his right when he used the bags to circulate his own newspaper, but when he used those bags to distribute the literature of the Conservative party, thereby incommoding everybody in this House, and other newspapers throughout Canada, it was an improper use of the mail bags. I understand that in order to have free circulation through the corridors, instructions have had to be given to dispose of these bags so that members may not tumble over them. If that is all that has been done, I am at a loss to know in what way, Sir, you have infringed on the rules of the House. I am at a loss to know what there was to justify my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) in using the serio-comic language in which he brought this matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). I am surprised that the right hon. gentleman should have chosen to use such strong language in expressing his opinion of the address of our leader, which to my mind was characterized by the greatest of moderation. The leader of the opposition used not one offensive word, when he got up in the House to assert his rights, and the rights of his followers. The right hon. gentleman has chosen to treat the matter as of extreme insignificance, and as being unworthy to be made the subject of a motion to adjourn. The Prime Minister apparently thinks that it is the business of the opposition to accept with complacency, if not with gratitude, any kind of treatment that may be meted out to them by the officers of the House, and by departmental officers, acting, I presume, under instructions. To my mind it was a very small piece of business on the part of some members of the cabinet which the right hon. gentleman leads. The right hon. gentleman has stated that some very eminent men—of whom he is not the least by any means—have used the narrow quarters in which the leader of the opposition now has to transact his business. But the leader of the opposition did not object to being confined to these narrow quarters, although he was compelled to draw attention to the inconvenience to which he is subjected, when he found that very rigid and strict regulation was placed upon certain portions of this building by the gentleman who directs the management of this House. The leader of the opposition has borne the inconvenience he suffers without complaint. Now, Sir, let me point out, that we do not enjoy the franking privilege as a privilege at all, nor do we receive it as a favour from the government or from any member supporting the government. It is our right to frank letters, and we are going to insist upon exercising that right to the full. That right has been curtailed by the action of the hon. gentleman who fills the position of Postmaster General, and who to my mind, fills it very inefficiently. Here is a gentleman who, with all the resources of his department, and with unlimited facilities for purchasing material and employing assistants, is unable to pass through the Ottawa post office more that forty or fifty bags of mail in the course of a day. We on this side of the House have had no difficulty in procuring three or four boys, who, without previous training, have been able to handle a hundred of these bags in a day, and yet the Postmaster General, the Minister of Labour, is so inefficient, that his whole department is unable to handle forty or fifty bags of this

mail matter in the same time. Would we not be an extraordinary opposition if we were to submit quietly to such treatment? Even if the corridors have to be occupied to a certain extent, they have not at all been crowded to such an extent, as to prevent even so big a man as the Postmaster General from making his way along without any inconvenience. It has grown to be an outrage, that these bags of mail matter have had to remain there for over a month, without being despatched through the mails of this country. If the Postmaster General cannot manage the business of his department any better than he has done in this case, I would submit to the Prime Minister that he should look around for another Postmaster General, and I have no doubt that he will find one who can handle without the slightest trouble, all the mail matter that is despatched by members of the House of Commons. I presume that one single newspaper in Montreal, the 'Star,' for instance, has handled within the past week two or three thousand bags of mail, similar to those that are now lying in the corridors. One single and private institution is able to do that in the course of its ordinary business, and yet, the Postmaster General, at headquarters in Ottawa, where the work is done under his very eyes, is not able to get this mail despatched with promtitude. It is most disgraceful to the Postmaster General, that I am in a position to be able to get up here, and charge him to his face with being so inefficient, that this mail matter which has been stamped and prepared and addressed by the members of the opposition, has had to lie here for weeks without being transmitted. It is an extraordinary thing that the Postmaster General has not been able to transmit these mails from Ottawa, and has not been able to procure a sufficient supply of mail bags to accommodate the newspaper press of the city of Montreal. It is an absurd situation, which no man in the possession of his senses would have created for himself. I say that the Postmaster General is a very indiscreet man, so far as his reputation is concerned, when he seeks to immortalize himself by telling the country, that his department is unable to handle this very moderate amount of mail matter. If the Postmaster General devoted himself to the work of facilitating the transmission of these mails, not one of these bags would be lying in the corridors to-day.

A man of very moderate abilities could handle the 1,700 or 1,800 bags that have come here in the course of a month—for that is the full amount, say 60 a day—and there are now 700 of these bags not delivered. We had an opinion that the purpose of the mails was to receive from the public and to deliver to its destination matter that was regularly and properly placed in the hands of the post office. Apparently that is not the purpose of the mails; in some cases, the purpose is to delay and prevent the delivery of matter placed in the hands of the post office. The post office is a government monopoly, they have the exclusive right to transmit matter that comes regularly into the mails; we have no other person to whom to go if we want to distribute this matter, and therefore we have a right, as citizens of this country, as well as members of parliament, to demand that any matter that we put into the hands of the Postmaster General or any officer of his department should be dealt with promptly and satisfactorily to us—not to him, but to us. We perfectly understand his opinion on this subject; we know his rights and ours; we know his duties and are going to insist that he shall perform these duties. When he or any other man undertakes to deprive members of this House of their rights, then he must expect them to insist upon having their rights and nothing less. The whole matter is unworthy. I was not altogether surprised, from the course of the hon. gentleman who is now Postmaster General when in opposition, to find him acting in such a petty, silly, ridiculous spirit as he is doing, but I was much surprised to-day, I was never more surprised in my life, than to find that the Prime Minister of Canada was disposed to sustain that indiscreet and foolish Postmaster General in the undertaking upon which he has entered. If the Postmaster General chooses to make it patent to all Canada and to a great part of the world outside of Canada, that he is unable to handle 1,800 bags filled with 300 or 400 pieces each of mail matter of the easiest kind, resembling newspapers in character—if he is disposed to send out information that he is not able to organize his department so as to handle that amount of mail matter in thirty days, he has a perfect right to do it, and I congratulate him upon the result. I think he will go down to posterity not only as the man who devised the postage stamps and the motto of the vaster empire than has been, but will be looked upon as the vastest failure that has been as Postmaster General. That is the situation he has created for himself, that is the pillory on which he will be put and will be kept as long as he occupies a seat in this House. He has taken all this trouble out of a small desire to annoy and obstruct the proper conduct of the opposition in using their franking privilege. If the hon. gentleman wants to do that sort of thing he will get enough of it, and he may fry in it and he will fry. I want to know why it is that because the Postmaster General is either unable or unwilling to allow his officers in Ottawa to receive matter from us at a very moderate rate, to the extent of some 30,000 pieces a day, and chooses to create a glut in this building by refusing to take the matter, officials of this House should come to members of the opposition and instruct them that they are not to be

allowed to use the corridors to store this mail matter. It is not the fault of the opposition that that matter is in the corridors. It is the fault of the Postmaster General. We have a post office in this House of Commons, established and maintained for the use of members, and it must be of such character and extent that it will discharge the business tendered to it by the members of this House. It must be large enough to receive every particle of mail which we may tender. If it cannot do this it is the business of the Postmaster General to find other accommodation; if he cannot find it anywhere else, he is responsible for the fact that this mail matter is lying in the corridors, and he it is who should be censured by the Speaker or the officers of the Speaker for having it there, not we. We are not at all anxious to have it about the corridors; we are anxious to get it out and have used every means in our power to get it out, but we have been unable to do so because the department of the hon. Postmaster General is either unable or unwilling to take it. It is a situation which is simply intolerable, and I think it is as well that the right hon. gentleman should understand that the members of the opposition are not going to be lectured in the manner in which he talked this morning. The right hon. gentleman may have his own opinion about the gravity of this subject, and he may choose to regard it as a very small matter, but we want him to understand that an invasion of the privilege of any British subject is a thing that will not be permitted. The invasion of the rights of the House of Commons, of the men who are sent here to discharge the business of the country, or the obstruction of these gentlemen in the discharge of anything that is their right and duty is something which we are not disposed to stand, and we will not be willing to allow this House to adjourn until this matter is satisfactorily settled. We want to have a distinct and clear understanding as to what our rights are; we want to get every jot and tittle of our rights, and we do not want it as a favour from any man. We simply say that we have a right to the franking privilege and we want to be permitted to use it. If the Postmaster General cannot manage the mail service of this country so as to be able to handle this matter, we will want the right hon. the Premier to get another Postmaster General, because it is his business as Premier to have the work of that department carried out in a satisfactory manner, and he is responsible if the gentleman occupying that position under him is not able to discharge the duties of that department. I might call the attention of my right hon. friend to this further fact: This is not a question merely for to-day or for this opposition; it is a question for all time in Canada and for all oppositions that may sit in this House for all time. If we have these rights we must exercise them. If when the right hon. gentleman was in opposition he had been refused this privilege I have too much respect for him to believe that he would not have protested. We have our rights and we do not want to be hindered in these rights; we are now asserting these rights as much for the men who will follow us as for ourselves, because we realize that the object of the Postmaster General is to cause us petty annoyance, and that his efforts must fail in causing us anything more than a mere temporary inconvenience. But it is a question of privilege and of right, and we are speaking for the men who may sit here at any time as an opposition. We have our rights and are determined to assert them, not only for ourselves but for the men who in time to come may exercise these rights.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). I regret not having been in the chamber at the commencement of this discussion, and perhaps owing to my absence I may not deal with some points, if any have been made, which I did not hear. However, I have had the honour of listening to the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), who has in this instance departed from his usual course of addressing the House with a certain measure of moderation and dignity. I on this occasion regret to find that he has departed from that role, and has, as all gentlemen do who are trying to uphold a bad case, indulged in rather violent and abusive language. Without dwelling upon the personal attack which he makes upon me or discussing the question of whether or not the general administration of the Post Office Department is satisfactory to the public, leaving that question to be determined by the public itself, I will give to the House the bare facts of the case without endeavouring to evade or to cloud the issue. This is not a question of the franking privilege at all, although that subject may fairly come up for consideration in view of the events that have taken place. Let me tell you frankly and exactly how the matter came to my attention and how the situation has grown to what it is. On Saturday last I received a communication from a leading publisher of the city of Montreal—not the Montreal 'Star,' but another leading journal in that city—complaining that his house had not been furnished, according to the usual custom, with bags for carrying their papers to the post office. I might say that the department, in order to accommodate newspaper publishers, inaugurated the practice of allowing them to receive from the post office, from time to time, sufficient mail sacks in which to bag their papers for transmission to the post office.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is that custom not for the purposes of accommodating, not the newspapers, but the post office author-

ities, by saving them the expense of sorting these mails ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Probably there are mutual advantages. It is doubtless for mutual convenience, and may have the advantage suggested by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes), but it also has the corresponding advantage of enabling the publishers to send their mails to the post office at the latest moment, and it is a great boon to newspaper publishers to have as much time as possible to get out their issue before the outgoing trains. If, however, as the hon. member for North Victoria suggests, this is no advantage to the newspapers, I do not understand what grievance the 'Star' newspaper may have, if it does not enjoy that privilege to-day. But to return to the history of the situation. On Saturday last I received the communication to which I have alluded. I had no idea then that any difficulty of this kind would occur. My attention had been called to the accumulation of bags of this kind in the corridors, and in private conversation I expressed my opinion.

Mr. CLARKE. Pretty vigorously.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, but it was a private conversation with a leading gentleman on the other side, and the matter then absolutely escaped my attention until I received the communication to which I have alluded. In desirinig that this work should proceed rapidly, and that no ground for complaint should exist, either here or at Montreal, through the department failing to issue bags to the publishers in sufficient quantities, I at once inquired into the cause of the congestion. I learned that the Montreal 'Star' had procured from the post office at Montreal an unusually large number of mail sacks, and had used them, not for the purpose for which they were issued, namely, the carryinig of the newspapers to the station, but to pack up this literature to be transmitted from the post office at Montreal to the Whip of the opposition at Ottawa, and we found bags full of mail matter accumulating at different places throughout the city. I at once caused an inquiry to be made at the post office in the House of Commons to ascertain why they had not been sending away this literature and getting these bags liberated. The answer I received was that the postmaster at Ottawa had refused to receive any more at the city post office. The course adopted for the transmission of the mails from the House is to send them to the city post office, where they are shipped by cars to the various stations and taken away for distribution throughout the country by the various postal cars that leave this city. When, therefore, I learnt that the city postmaster had refused to receive any more because he had no room, I deemed it my duty personally to inspect the post office, and see what justification there was for that explanation. I there was given ocular proof of the correctness of the statement. I was pointed to masses of accumulated bags, which blocked up the inside space. And as a considerable amount of general mail matter passes through the post office in and out, and the postmaster deemed it his duty to see that the general mail service was not unduly interfered with, he refused to receive any more mail bags. The postmaster, or one of his officers took me to the basement, which covers all the ground floor, and he there showed me hundreds of bags full of campaign literature which had been dumped on them, and to remove which they had not sufficient postal cars.

Mr. CLARKE. Who dumped the bags in ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They were sent by the House of Commons postmaster to the city postmaster.

Mr. BELL. Is not that a perfectly regular proceeding ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Certainly, that is the proper thing to do.

Mr. BELL. Why then characterize it as dumping ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Because the expression aptly describes what was done. I am trying to give the facts. The postmaster or rather his deputy then took me to the entrance of the building, where there is a very considerable lobby space, and he here pointed out to me the accumulation of bags and said : 'In our efforts to accommodate we have received all the bags we can find storage for inside the building,' and he pointed to me—may I use the word 'monuments.'

Some hon. MEMBERS. Mountains.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He pointed to a mountain of bags, and said that there was not space for another bag. When he told me that the mail clerks on the cars had complained that they could not handle any more matter, and that the quantity forced on them was calculated to interfere with the general mail service of the country, I prosecuted the inquiry further.

Mr. GOURLEY. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Certainly.

Mr. GOURLEY. I want to ask if he reprimanded this underling, this understrapper who undertook to interfere with the privilege of parliament ? He ought to have dismissed him at once, instead of listening to his impudence.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know to what officer the hon. gentleman re-

fers. The city postmaster informed me that they were sending out by train all that the trains could take. I made inquiry of another officer in order to learn the fact from him also.

Mr. CLARKE. Who was that officer ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The controller of the railway mail service. I asked him why they did not remove more of this matter by the trains, and he gave me this explanation : ' Most of this mail matter,' he said, ' was for Ontario.' There was some small proportion of it for the west, but the great and overwhelming bulk of it was for the province of Ontario. There are only four passenger trains a day carrying mails leaving Ottawa for the west. He told me that, considering the limited capacity of the postal cars—for every one knows that only a portion of a car, as a rule, is devoted to postal purposes, there being a compartment for express, and, perhaps one for baggage also—they were carrying all that they could possibly carry.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. In four cars ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Did you believe him ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did and I do believe him.

Mr. BRODER. Will the hon. minister allow me to ask him how it is that this matter can come here so quickly if it cannot get away ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I understand that it came by post, by express, by baggage and in every way it could get here. But, when mail matter is being exported from the city, it cannot be sent away under conditions which allow of it being sent in carloads; it must be sent under such conditions that the bags may be opened the moment the train starts on its journey, and the separate pieces of mail matter which the bags contain sorted for their destination. Mr. Armstrong, the controller of the railway mail service, informed me that there is a very considerable volume of mail matter from the city, from the public generally, that must leave by every outgoing train, and an additional average of ten bags per postal car is all that can be accommodated. My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) represented that it was only the question of the despatch of forty bags a day. It is not such a question, but a question of despatching a very large number of bags per day. But the whole of the mail service, from Ottawa westward cannot be assigned exclusively to any particular class of work. But if there must be a choice, I should think that we should be bound to give precedence to the general correspondence of the people dealing with trade and other matters, rather than allow it to be shut out by any other class of mail matter. For example, there are large quantities of goods sent by mail, as well as a great many newspapers and other pieces of printed matter. If the situation is such that there is not accommodation for everything in the mails, I think priority should be given to correspondence. But, whether that view is acquiesced in or not, Mr. Armstrong—and there is no better authority ; he is not one of my appointees ; I promoted him to his high office, but he is an old and experienced officer appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite and there is no more faithful official in the public service of Canada—Mr. Armstrong informed me that considering the demands upon the service of postal cars leaving Ottawa, they are not able to handle an average of more than ten bags per train in addition to the other demands upon the accommodation upon the cars.

Mr. CLANCY. A pretty bad service.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The cars now in use are as large as are available. I did not build them or organize them ; they are the cars of the country, and the cars that have been used for the performance of this service year after year. If hon. gentlemen opposite say that we should supplement the service by subsidizing additional train service to carry away the mails and so prevent congestion by this class of literature, that is another question.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question, if I may. I have been informed that one of the large newspapers in the city of Montreal was sending away 3,000 bags a week. The Postmaster General will observe that, according to the statement of my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) that is twice as many bags as the whole number that have caused this congestion. Is it the case that one newspaper in Montreal send out over 3,000 bags a week.

Mr. CLARKE. Which go through the mails——

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Certainly, which go through the mails—and, if so, how is it possible that there should be so great congestion in this office because the department is called upon to handle sixty or seventy bags a week ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not familiar with all the details of the working of the post office. But I was explaining that, where mail matter has to go in a postal car, and the assorting of the pieces in the bags must go on while the car is on its journey, that is very different matter from a newspaper being able to ship away by post, by freight, by baggage, by express, by steamer, and in every way, thousands of bags a week. There are many ways for these thousands of bags which leave Montreal weekly to go. I am now speaking of

the service that has to be performed by means of the postal cars on the four regular trains leaving here daily for the west. The situation is as I stated, so far as I know and so far as I believe it to be—that it is not possible, with the railway facilities now furnished this country, to take from this city, during the session, more than forty bags per day over and above the average output of the session. There is always a very considerable amount of franking going on during the session, and this adds to the volume of the mail matter leaving Ottawa in the regular and ordinary course.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend the Postmaster General mentioned forty bags in one case and ten bags in another. I suppose these figures apply to different conditions, but I do not know that I understood exactly.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I was speaking of what Mr. Armstrong, the controller of the railway mail service told me. He said they could not find accommodation in the car for the receipt of these bags and the handling of the matter they contained—there must be men in the car and they must have floor space to work in—for more than an average of ten additional bags to each car, which, with a car to each train and four trains a day, would make an everage of forty bags. I have urged Mr. Armstrong—I may tell my hon. friends in good faith—to do all that is possible. I address myself particularly to my hon. friend from Pictou. He is a gentleman to whose good opinion I attach some weight. I am sorry that he should have expressed himself as he has done. I am sure he spoke in ignorance of the facts, but he has, unintentionally, done me an injustice.

I am not asking him to recall or recant what he may have said in a moment of weakness. I concede to him and all hon. gentlemen the privilege of making the best they can out of a bad cause. But I am now dealing with this matter departmentally, and I say that Mr. Armstrong reported to me that if the regular train service only were available it would take nearly sixty days to carry off all the mail matter that is now here, this additional mail matter that we have to despatch. Therefore, if, as my hon. friend says, we are not to prorogue until this stuff is carried away, we might as well adjourn over the Christmas vacation. Now, the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) charged me with acting in a high-handed manner in withholding from the Montreal 'Star' the privilege of receiving bags. Let me say that it was not a question of choice. When I gave the order not to give out to that paper any more bags until they had returned to us some 1,830 they had, I did so because of the department being unable to supply the other publishers with the quantity of bags they required, simply because the Montreal 'Star' had obtained so large a number. The Montreal 'Star' having obtained possession, for this illegitimate purpose, of such a large number of bags, over 1,830, in a short time, not only exhausted the supply that would have been available for that paper, but a considerable number that would have been available for other publishers. My deputy endeavoured in every possible way to meet the difficulty, telegraphing to Winnipeg and to other places to gather in these bags, if there were any that were available, in order that we might meet the shortage in Montreal.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What supply of bags have you in the city of Montreal ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The supply of bags that go to newspapers is different from the supply of other bags. There are all sorts of bags, there are bags of different sizes and grades ; there are small bags for letters, there are waterproof bags for certain purposes, there are bags for the English mail, and there are these large sacks which are used for the newspapers.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How many was your deputy successful in finding ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We got 200 from Winnipeg. The public there have been inconvenienced beyond measure by the hundreds of bags that have been lying to the order of the whip of the opposition, by reason of the space being used for the storage of this Tory literature.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Was there not a very serious congestion at Winnipeg for some months before this Liberal-Conservative literature was being distributed ? Is it not true that members of this House from that region have complained that mail matter was being delayed there for want of accommodation long before this literature was distributed ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It happens that owing to the great prosperity which is now blessing this country, the business of Winnipeg is to-day in a most flourishing condition, and the post office, which was erected by our predecessors, a post office of very diminutive proportions, which showed their conception of the future of this country, and which they thought was adequate to meet all the requirements of that district for many years to come, that post office, I say, owing to the beneficent influence of the present administration upon business, now proves wholly insufficient to meet the requirements of the business people of the west. That is a condition regrettable in itself, but not to be deplored in view of the cause. My officers have endeavoured in all possible ways to supplement the post office accommodation of that city and to get additional floor space for handling the mails. But so prosperous is that city that it is hardly possible to rent a

single building for that purpose. If, therefore, the mail service in Winnipeg is taxed to its utmost capacity, it is only what may be said of the business people of Winnipeg generally, who find themselves scarcely able to carry on the great volume of business which comes to them. The market is so satisfactory that even the manufacturers and trades people of Winnipeg are not able to do the business which presents itself to them, owing to the lack of capacity in their premises. But coming back again to the subject we were discussing, I was explaining why I found it necessary to withhold from the Montreal 'Star' that issue of bags which it would have been otherwise the pleasure and the duty of the department to make to them. We did not issue to them all the bags that were asked for on Monday, simply because we did not have them available, simply because the Montreal 'Star' had got into its possession more than its fair share, some 1,800 bags odd, and was inconveniencing the rest of the service.

Mr. BRODER. Is it not a fact that the great majority of these bags were here in the custody of the Ottawa post office, and not in use by the Montreal 'Star'?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are sent here to the order of the chief whip of the opposition, and they are used for holding this accumulated tonnage of literature, some of it, I am sorry to say, of a very incendiary and seditious character. I hope I shall have the moral and physical support of the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) in endeavouring to preserve the peace of this country in the event of its being disturbed by the dissemination of this inflammatory literature. However, I hope it will not be necessary, even after this appeal to arms which has been made, to call upon my hon. friend to render to this country the same gallant and valuable services which he has rendered on another occasion to the empire. Again I will endeavour to return to the Montreal 'Star.' The department did not feel it fair or right to the other publishers to continue to issue to the Montreal 'Star' the property of the department to be used for a purpose unauthorized and unwarranted, and the issue to the 'Star' was discontinued until it returned to the government the bags which it had obtained, and gave a guarantee or assurance—a word would be sufficient—that they would not hereafter be put to the uses to which they were then being put.

Mr. SPROULE. How could the 'Star' return them when they were in the possession of the Post Office Department here?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I understand there are some down in the express offices and stored around town. Are those in the possession of the government? When I last took stock of the bags in our possession——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK.

Mr. CLARKE. We don't take much stock in it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. At any rate, on Saturday a hundred odd additional sacks reached this city. I believe they came by post. Then I believe we got on Sunday 400 odd bags that arrived by train. At that time, as I was told by the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Macpherson), he counted 735 sacks full of this literature scattered through the corridors of this building; at this particular time the whole basement of the post office building was also occupied with bags of this literature, several hundred in number, and the lobby of the city post office was also crowded to the ceiling with one or two hundred more. I do not remember how this totalled up, but I think it came up to the vicinity of 2,000 bags.

Mr. CLARKE. One thousand eight hundred and thirty, the hon. gentleman said.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is not very far from 2,000.

Mr. CLARKE. That is the statement the hon. gentleman made.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I said in the vicinity of 2,000. Call it 1,830 for short. I take the view that the diversion of these bags has been caused by the Montreal 'Star,' and that they are responsible for the return of these bags. Yesterday, when representatives of the 'Star' appealed to me on the subject I told them that I would be pleased to start the issue of them at once if they would make it possible to me to do so by returning those bags.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). May I ask the hon. gentleman upon whose information it is that he states that 400 bags came up on Sunday?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Upon the information of my deputy.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I can inform the hon. gentleman that the statement is absolutely inaccurate. The 400 pieces to which he refers were not conveyed in bags at all. They were bundles tied up and it was Saturday they came and not Sunday.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The assistant city postmaster pointed out to me a pile of mail bags containing this material which he said reached him on Saturday evening.

An hon. MEMBER. How many were there?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not count them but hon. gentlemen may go down and count them for themselves. There would be over 100 bags in that lot.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not talking about bags at all. I am talking about the 400 pieces that were not in bags at all.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When did they come?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). On Saturday.

Mr. TAYLOR. They did not come by the mail at all. They came by express.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then we are dealing with those that did not come by mail. I am dealing with the fact that the post office in Montreal isued at least 1,830 bags to the Montreal 'Star' and that they were used for this purpose.

Mr. TAYLOR. No.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I know they were. I have it on the authority of the head of the postal stores branch.

Mr. CLARKE. In what period of time ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Since this movement began.

Mr. TAYLOR. Six weeks ago.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I want to show how I have treated that company and I think that the House will admit that I have treated them fairly. I informed the representatives of the 'Star' yesterday that as fast as they could get any of these bags liberated and if they told me that they would not misuse them the courtesy would be restored to them. I said that I would speak to Mr. Speaker and see if he could assist them in that movement. Mr. Speaker was good enough to receive them and I understand that he assisted them to carry out the arrangement. Last night the manager of the 'Star' told me that about 100 bags had been emptied and would be returned to the department this morning. I then told him that I would give him an order and I did write a telegram last night and delivered it to the representative of the 'Star' giving instructions to the post office authorities in Montreal at once to give to the 'Star' 100 sacks if they had them available and if it did not inconvenience other publishers.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, if it did not inconvenience other publishers because inconvenience has been occasioned by the Montreal 'Star' and other publishers have no right to be inconvenienced. I notified the representatives of the 'Star' this morning that as fast as we got any of the sacks back we would continue to enlarge the issue until we get back to the normal state of affairs when we would have no more trouble with the matter. I think they will not complain that the department has treated them unfairly. On the contrary I have reason to think that they do not attach any special blame to the Post Office Department. I think they know where the real responsibility rests.

Mr. CLARKE. Where is that ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They know where it rests.

Mr. COCHRANE. It rests with the hon. Postmaster General.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, it does not rest with the Postmaster General and it does not attach to any of his officers. The congestion continues to-day and it cannot be relieved at once unless parliament is prepared to subsidize special trains for the particular purpose of carrying this mail matter at an enormous expense to the country. If it did it would be enlarging the service to an extent never before contemplated. The assistant city postmaster who has been for many years in that office and who has practically charge of it tells me that in his long experience he has never witnessed such a state of affairs as that which has taken place to-day. Yesterday I received a letter from a leading manufacturer in a town not far from this city who told me that it was his practice in the course of his business at certain times in the year to hand into the post office large quantities of circulars advertising his business to be transmitted through the mails and that when on Friday last he visited the post office in connection with this issue he was informed by the postmaster in that large town that there had come into the post office under the frank of a member of this House such an immense quantity of this literature and other literature, mentioning the character of it, being in the form of hand sheets issued by the Manufacturers Association, I think he said, that it would take him two or three days to clear off this avalanche of postal matter which had been thrown in upon him and that until it was cleared out he could not receive the mail matter that this business man was offering to him. This is but one illustration of the extent to which this has gone and therefore perhaps it is not unreasonable to come to the conclusion that no Post Office Department could very reasonably be expected to be called upon unexpectedly to perform such an extraordinary, and I may say, useless and expensive service as that which the Post Office Department is now being asked to perform.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (Leeds and Grenville). Mr. Speaker, I regret that when my hon. friend the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) rose in his place this morning for the purpose of drawing the attention of the government to some grievances that not only he himself, but——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) will allow me, there is one point that the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) referred to that I intended to speak upon. He discussed the franking privilege. The franking privilege does not come into this discussion at all. Every one has rights under the statute. There is no attempt or desire to curtail any one's rights in that regard. This is simply a question

of administration, and while the hon. gentleman may argue it from the standpoint of the franking privilege that is not the issue here. The franking privilege remains as long as the statute remains as it is and any hon. gentleman is perfectly within his right in availing himself of the benefits of the statute. The department does not in the faintest degree desire to do anything to interfere with anybody's rights in that regard. It may be a question whether you are exercising that right within such reasonable limits as to make it possible to practically enjoy it.

Mr. COCHRANE. Who is to be the judge in that matter ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. You.

Mr. COCHRANE. I have as good a right to be the judge as the hon. Postmaster General. I want to tell hon. gentlemen who are so ready to use their mouths without any sense——

Mr. TAYLOR. I was remarking when interrupted by the hon. Postmaster General and Minister of Labour that I regretted very much, that, when my hon. friend the leader of the opposition rose in his place for the purpose of drawing the attention of the government to a grievance that he, himself, was subjected to and not only himself but many of his supporters, the right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) should have answered him in the way he did. It is to be regretted that the Prime Minister, instead of promising to remove these grievances, should have attacked the Montreal 'Star,' declaring that it had abused its privilege by sending mail matter to the whip of the opposition. But the right hon. gentleman did not say that the Montreal 'Herald,' which is largely subsidized by his government, has done the same thing. The 'Herald' printed hundreds of thousands of copies of the Prime Minister's speech on the transcontinental railway, and sent them up here in mail bags——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. I say yes, and I know it. The supplements of the Montreal 'Herald' were franked all over the country by the supporters of the government, just in the same way as this was done by us. Why were we not told about this ?

Mr. CLARKE. He was not frank enough to say that.

Mr. TAYLOR. No.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. TAYLOR. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to see that I am protected in my rights. The Prime Minister did not refer to the matter brought to his attention by the leader of the opposition, which was, that you, Mr. Speaker, acting, I presume, on instructions from the Postmaster General——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TAYLOR—had refused to receive into this House——

Mr. SPEAKER. The statement which the hon. gentleman has made is incorrect.

Mr. TAYLOR. I take it back, but I have the right to say that you did this, and I have the right to suppose that you did it, acting on his instructions, because it is a post office matter.

Mr. SPEAKER. That statement is incorrect.

Mr. TAYLOR. I know that the Sergeant at Arms told me last night——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have taken it back. I ask the Speaker to keep the gang sitting across the House quiet. Hon. gentlemen will get prorogation in a very few days if they keep on like that. The Sergeant at Arms told me last night that he had instructions from the Speaker, not to allow the stuff that came to me by express to enter the House. I paid the express charges of $32.04 upon it, and when it came to the door it was not let in, and it was driven back to the express office.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Shame.

Mr. TAYLOR. By whose authority was that done ? I went to the express company this morning, and I told them to send it back again, and I would carry it into the House myself, if Mr. Sergeant at Arms or Mr. Chief Messenger should order it away again.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TAYLOR. It came up here and he refused to let it come into the House, and it was dumped on the ground, and I said : 'If you don't call out an army of messengers and carry it into the House, you will hear more about it.' Somebody gave the order then, and the messengers were put to work, and it was carried into the House. That is the kind of treatment we are subjected to. As every one knows, I leave for home on Saturday, but last Saturday I remained until the seven o'clock train on account of the absence of the leader of the opposition. As soon as I left the House the Postmaster General saw fit to make an attack upon me, and if he is correctly reported in the newspaper——

Mr. CLARKE. When your back was turned.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, when my back was turned. But I generally give a Roland for an Oliver, and I am going to draw the attention of the House to the undignified conduct of the Postmaster General——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TAYLOR. I withdraw 'undignified.'

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). You don't have to ; that's all right.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is referring to a previous debate.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am referring to what the Postmaster General said in my absence, if the newspaper report is correct.

Mr. SPEAKER. The report in the newspaper is stated to be a report of what took place in the House. The hon. gentleman cannot refer to a past debate.

Mr. TAYLOR. I can read what I see in the newspaper as a statement made by the Postmaster General reflecting on me. Here is what——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot refer to any previous debate.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). He is not referring to a previous debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. If this were allowed, then we would have every day a repetition of what was said the previous day.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman is referring to a previous debate for the purpose of explaining an attack that has been made upon him.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has a right to make a personal explanation, but I understand that he wants to make an argument.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). He is rising to make a personal explanation.

Mr. TAYLOR. If I am attacked by a member in this House, I have a right to answer it. Here is what the Postmaster General is reported to have said :

I have alluded——

Mr. SPEAKER. A personal explanation is not an argument to meet an argument which has been made by some other member of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If an hon. member of this House has been charged in his absence with some conduct which is not regarded as proper, he has a right to explain his connection with that matter, and to deny that he acted in such a way as invited criticism.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has a right to make a personal explanation, provided he does not enter into an argument.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Postmaster General said certain things about me which I take exception to. Here is what he said :

This accumulation arises from the particular class of literature to which I have alluded, which has been despatched in postal bags to the whip of the opposition, to be redistributed by him throughout Canada. I want these bags, as the property of the Crown, to be forthwith returned to the Post Office Department. Unless they are delivered there, I shall have to exercise the authority of a minister of the Crown and take possession of them. I beg to say, in all seriousness, that we are to-day without mail bags for the proper convenience of the subscribers to the press of this country. We have sufficient of that class of property, but it is unfortunately at this moment out of the control of the government. Enormous numbers of these bags are under the control of an hon. member of this House, and I ask him here to return those bags forthwith, or I will take steps to take possession of them by force of law. We do not desire in the slightest degree to interfere with the use of the franking privilege. I am giving notice now. If I am asked to specify a time, I will do so. I will give the hon. gentleman to-day to deliver those bags to the proper officers, and if they are not delivered by Monday morning, I will take steps to take possession of them.

* * * * * * * *

If hon. gentlemen who control these bags would be good enough to remove their contents and let us have the bags, then the business of the post office could be carried on. But I am not prepared to go to thousands of dollars of expense to purchase additional bags—even the making of them would involve a considerable time—simply to enable a procedure of this kind to be carried out. It does seem to me that a very grave abuse has been made of the privileges of parliament in this procedure. I doubt if parliament ever intended that tons and tons and carloads and trainloads of printed matter should be printed in different places in this country and sent post free to the city of Ottawa, to a member of parliament, under the provisions of the Act which allows such matter to come free ; and that the same privilege should be so abused in the method which is now being adopted.

* * * * * * * *

When a member of this House finds himself in possession of mail bags which are marked the property of the Crown, the property of the Post Office Department, it is his duty at the earliest moment to return them to the government to whom they belong ; and when they come to him illegitimately, as they did in this case, that duty is a much more pressing one on his part. It was a gross violation of the privilege granted to the publisher of that newspaper to divert these bags from the purpose for which they were entrusted to him ; and it is my intention not to allow that same publisher any more to be entrusted with bags until guarantees are given that they will not be diverted from the use to which they ought properly to be put.

I would like to ask the hon. gentleman how I came into possession of these bags illegitimately and why I am holding them illegitimately. When he knew that I had left for home at 7 o'clock he made a demand upon me to have them returned by Monday morning, knowing that I did not get back here until 5 o'clock Monday afternoon. If he had not known that he would have sent a law officer of the Crown to take possession of them. Why these bags are now in the possession of a law officer of the Crown, one of his deputies, the postmaster of this House.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He is not an officer of the Post Office Department.

Mr. TAYLOR. He is an officer of this House acting under the instruction of the Postmaster General. These bags commenced

arriving here on the 20th of September. Every day as they came in here they were emptied and the contents were franked and they were sent to the post office. The post office took them in, put the stamp of the post office on them and threw them out into the corridor and to-day there are 300 bags lying there, stamped by the post office, blocking up the corridor around the front of the post office, in the lobbies, and extending down towards the telegraph offices. Each one of these has been through the post office and has been stamped by the officers of the department, but owing to instructions to receive only so many bags a day so as to prevent as far as possible the sending of this literature to the country, the city post office can take only forty bags a day while tons and tons of matter are going in from different departments for transmission through the mails. If, as the leader of the opposition asked this morning, a commission is appointed we will be able to prove that from every department mountains of literature, put up by servants and paid for by the people of this country are being sent. In one department last week there were six men sitting around a table putting up this blue-book upon the transcontinental railway and the speech of the right hon. the Prime Minister. They were folding them up and sending them out under a minister's frank, paid for by the people of this country, and because the postmaster would not allow our bags to be delivered to us from the post office, as it is our right to have them delivered, we have had to pay $32 of express and then we have been refused the right of admission for express parcels into the House. Is this not a grievance for the opposition? And yet when it is brought to the attention of the Prime Minister he laughs at it as if to say: You, the leader of the opposition, and the gentlemen supporting you have no rights in this House; you cannot have express parcels come here; our officers, the sergeant-at-arms, the chief messenger and the Speaker have forbidden it and it cannot come in. The sergeant-at-arms told me last night that it could not be delivered. I made up my mind that it would be if I had to walk through the sergeant-at-arms, the chief messenger, the Speaker and, back of them all, the Postmaster General. These gentlemen, like the coon in the tree, came down this morning and gave orders to carry it in and it is there and this House is not going to rise until the Postmaster General gets these bags through his post office, so the sooner the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition come to an agreement the sooner this House will prorogue. It will not prorogue a day before the opposition are satisfied that every package of literature that is in these buildings will be sent out, not that it will be held by the Postmaster General, who said a few minutes ago that we would be here until after Christmas if we waited until this was all sent out. We know what he will do; the moment the session is over, as soon as the gun is fired, the franking privilege will cease and the Postmaster General will order a bonfire to burn up this literature. We know that he is afraid, that the Prime Minister is afraid to have this literature go to the country; they are afraid to have the people of this country enlightened on this enormity of the transcontinental railway. We know that. The Postmaster General said that the whole system is blocked on account of the use of these mail bags. If a fire happened and these 1,830 mail bags were burnt would that block the post office system of this country? Altogether in the last six weeks only 1,830 bags of this literature have been sent from the 'Star' office addressed to me here and they have not been in my possession twenty-four hours until they were emptied, their contents franked, and handed to the post office here to take charge of them. I want to ask the Postmaster General now why a couple of hundred bags addressed to me have been held at the Ottawa city post office for the last eight or ten days?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Where is that?

Mr. TAYLOR. In the city post office, because Mr. Speaker gave his instructions to the sergeant-at-arms, and he to the chief messenger not to allow the bags to come into this building.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You say there are a quantity of bags addressed to you in the lobby of the post office at Ottawa.

Mr. TAYLOR. They are held in the post office at Ottawa; the men brought them up here but had to draw them back again by order of the Speaker through the sergeant-at-arms and the chief messenger. They are down there now and I went to the post office and asked the postmaster why they were not delivered.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman asks me a question but he himself gives the answer because he says the Speaker refused to permit these bags to enter the building. I must say that I have never for a moment taken the liberty of suggesting anything to the Speaker, who is responsible for the proper administration of the lobbies of this House, in respect to this matter. I have nothing whatever to do with the actions of either the Speaker or of the sergeant-at-arms or any other officer of this House.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman said a while ago that the city post office is to blame. This stuff came in addressed to me at the House of Commons and why has it not been delivered?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not carry it around.

Mr. TAYLOR. The leader of the opposition brought this to the attention of the Prime Minister this morning and he paid no attention to it. Here are the bags addressed to me lying in the post office a week and not delivered. That is a nice state of affairs. One load was brought up here, but by orders of the officers of this House they were not admitted, and I am satisfied, I have that much confidence in the Speaker, that unless there was some intimation from the Postmaster General he would not of his own accord say: Do not admit literature addressed to Mr. Taylor into the precincts of this House.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend is entirely in error; there has been no interference of any kind on my part or on the part of any one else to prevent the delivery of this mail matter. The only difficulty has arisen because of the state of the lobbies and halls of this House. The Speaker himself, of his own motion decided, that it was better not to allow any further accumulations. I requested the Speaker, if he could, to place a room at the disposal of the hon. gentleman that there might be no such difficulty and he informed me that he had placed at his disposal the Railway Committee room, the largest available room in this building, which it is thought will greatly relieve the congestion.

Mr. CLARKE. But how much floor space is there in it?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Three thousand square feet. That room is at his disposal if he desires to use it. I may say that the mail service between the city post office and the House of Commons post office is not under the control of the Postmaster General or of the Post Office Department, but is under the control of the postmaster of the House of Commons, who is an officer of this House and therefore if there were facilities to receive this matter here the hon. gentleman could have it delivered at once.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Postmaster General makes a very pleasant speech, but what are the facts? He says that he requested the Speaker to get rooms and the Speaker kindly placed at the disposal of the 'Star' men the Railway Committee room upstairs. I immediately went to the messenger department to know if I could have the stuff moved up there, but they could not give me a man to do it. Then we offered to hire six men, but that offer was not accepted nor were we allowed to use the elevator.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. TAYLOR. When the House rose at one o'clock, I was trying, in my humble way, to refute the charge brought against me by the Postmaster General, when he said that I had in my possesssion an enormous quantity of mail bags, and that if I did not deliver them by Monday morning—and the hon. gentleman knew very well that I would not be here until five o'clock on Monday afternoon—that he would take forcible possession of them by law. I want to explain how these bags came to be in my possession. They came addresssed to me. The contents were taken out and franked, and, at the request of the postmaster of the House of Commons, instead of being carried into the post office and dumped on the floor there, they were put back into the mail bags. The postmaster took the bags into the post office, sorted out the contents, stamped them with the post office stamp, filled the bags again, and sent them out into the corridor, where they have been the last two or three days. How am I responsible? If I or any one else attempted to empty the bags and hand them over to the Postmaster General, the postmaster could have us arrested for tampering with His Majesty's mails. The Postmaster General charges me with improperly holding these bags when they were in the charge of the postmaster of this House. I want the hon. the Postmaster General to get up and apologize for having charged an hon. member with having in his possession improperly and refusing to return the bags belonging to His Majesty or the Post Office Department. I have sat in this House 22 sessions. During the 14 years I sat on that side, and the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues sat on this, and I challenge the right hon. gentleman or any member of his government or any of his supporters, to say that any one of them was ever refused delivery of any parcel or bag addressed to him and sent by express or mail. Neither the Prime Minister nor any of his supporters can say that during the 18 years they sat in opposition they were ever refused any franking privilege, and they sent out tons of literature franked all over the country. But they seem to think that they can ride over us roughshod. They even refuse to allow express parcels to be delivered to us. I call upon the Prime Minister to explain by what authority in law any officer of the government has the right to stop an express wagon at the door of parliament and refuse to allow it to deliver goods to a member of this House. The sergeant-at-arms knows that that has been done this session, and the Postmaster General should explain. That hon. gentleman made a statement a few moments ago which he knew was not correct. He said that 100 bags came for me on Saturday and 400 on Sunday. Where are they? Why does he or his officers deny me the right to have these bags here? Why are they not delivered? If the bags are there, I want them. The Postmaster General notified an official of the Canadian Express Company not to bring

a bag into the city of Ottawa by express or he would have the company prosecuted.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is wholly without foundation.

Mr. TAYLOR. The agent of the express company made that statement since noon. He said that he was notified by the Post Office Department not to carry mail bags by express. He explained that they had not carried a bag since they had received notice that they would be prosecuted if they did. Yet the Postmaster General says that 400 of these bags came in on Sunday. As a matter of fact, 400 parcels came by express, but delivery was refused to me through the interference of officers of the House, under instructions of the Postmaster General.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Perhaps the Postmaster General can explain whether 400 bags did come on Sunday ?

Mr. TAYLOR. The Postmaster General says they came, and we must assume that he would not make a misstatement in this House. Then, the hon. gentleman said that there were not only carloads but train loads of this literature. How many trains would it take to carry 1,800 postal bags ? This gentleman aspiring to be a statesman, occupying the position of Postmaster General, Minister of Labour, a man 'vaster than has been,' rises in this House and makes a statement that one of the little page boys here would know to be absurd. Why, there are hardly enough of these bags to make three or four good wagon loads. Yet, he told us of the trains that would be required to move these bags from this House. Eighteen hundred bags—and a man could take one on his shoulder, in fact he could carry one under each arm !

The Postmaster General accused us of abusing the franking privilege. Has he any idea of the conditions under which that privilege is to be exercised ? If so, why did he not call down his colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) who went to Toronto, delivered a speech in Massey Hall, then had it printed and hundreds of thousands of copies sent out under his own frank as Minister of Trade and Commerce. Every man in my constituency got a copy of that document, franked by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. That was not only an improper but an illegal thing. Why did not the Postmaster General prevent that action on the part of his colleague, or why has he not since called upon him to contribute to the revenue the amount of postage that should have been paid upon these hundreds of thousands of documents sent through the mail. Ministers have the right to send out correspondence, departmental reports and so on ; but they have no right to send out copies of stump speeches, and particularly to have the wrapping, addressing and franking of that literature done by the officers of the public service.

Then I want the Postmaster General to explain the delay that takes place in the handling of the postal matter that has been placed in charge of the postmaster of this House. Some of these bags have been in there since the 25th of September. These bags commenced coming here on the 20th of September and they have been coming at the rate of fifty or one hundred bags a day ever since—a total of 1,800 bags. Nearly half of this literature is here yet. Is that the way for the Postmaster General to respect the law giving to members of parliament the franking privilege ? He will send out the literature franked by the supporters of the government of which he is a member. The literature is not left to clog up the corridors of this House, though the amount of it during the session has been as great as that of the opposition's. The literature of hon. gentlemen opposite can be sent out, but, no doubt, the Postmaster General has given the wink to his officers and, since the 25th of September, this literature has been left to lie there, because his officers acting under his instructions, I am sure, do not carry it away to be delivered to the parties to whom it is addressed. I suppose he has told the postmaster that this literature is incendiary, and has given his instructions not to receive more than forty bags a day of Tory literature, but to let the Grits send out what they please. No doubt he believes that as the House is to prorogue in a few days, this Tory literature will not get to the country. That is the intention of this beautiful specimen that we have in charge of postal affairs in this country.

Now, I think it is the duty of the right hon. Prime Minister to make an apology, an humble apology, to the leader of the opposition. If there is a man in this country whom the people admire and respect for his gentlemanly conduct in this House and out of it, that man is the leader of the opposition. The leader of the opposition, in a gentlemanly way—he could not act otherwise than in a gentlemanly way—called the attention of the Prime Minister to the grievances the opposition were labouring under, through the abuse of his power by the Postmaster General in not handling this mail matter, and in some other matters, and how was he treated by the Prime Minister ? Was he treated respectfully ? Far from it. I say that it is the duty of the Prime Minister—and I know that there is enough of the gentleman in him to cause him to do his duty—to go down on his knees and apologize to the leader of the opposition for having been so insulting as he was this morning. If he is a gentleman, he will certainly do that. One of the reasons the Postmaster General gave for having given the instructions about handling this literature was that it was incendiary.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, I did not.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not wonder that he is afraid that it will set the country on fire——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I made no such statement.

Mr. TAYLOR. I suppose he fears that it will arouse such feeling that the militia under my hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) will have to be called out to quiet the people. Well, I have in my hand a copy of this literature, and I intend reading it, so as to put it on 'Hansard,' and I would ask the Postmaster General what part of it is incendiary and seditious ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The article headed 'To Arms.'

Mr. TAYLOR. This literature is in two sheets of newspaper form. One of them opens with the heading 'The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Project : Mr. Borden's Alternative Scheme—Mr. Blair's Sweeping Denunciation of the Cox Project.' Is that an incendiary part of this campaign literature ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Keep cool.

Mr. TAYLOR. A colleague of the hon. gentleman's makes a speech in this House that the people ought to read, and this is printed here side by side with the speech of the leader of the opposition, that the people may have the facts before them. And this, the Postmaster General says, is 'incendiary.' And the sub-heading of these speeches is 'Messrs. Borden and Blair on the Government's Railway Policy.' 'The Conservative leader brings forward a better plan.' Mr. Blair mercilessly scores the Cox can't wait plan.' Is that incendiary ? This document contains a fine illustration in the way of a photo of the leader of the opposition, also one of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair), who made this 'incendiary' speech. Some of my friends purpose reading this whole document, and I have the other document, which I purpose reading, and I hope the Postmaster General will listen and point out what there is in these documents that is incendiary. I can well understand that he does not wish to have a wide circulation of this speech made by his own colleague the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair), whom they fired out of the government because he held views opposed to theirs. But finding he was a power in the land, and that his speech was going throughout the country, they have been down on their knees ever since begging him to keep his mouth shut, because if he didn't they knew the country was going against them. What is the other campaign sheet ? I want the hon. gentleman to explain what there is incendiary about this :

Canada's indictment against the government.

I am sure Canada is practically up in arms against the government for their monstrous scheme. Here we have on this paper a map showing each one of the provinces holding a flag, while the figure representing Canada holds a banner on which is inscribed :

People vs. Government. Broken promises. Wasteful administration. Increasing expenditure. Temporizing with tariff. Legislating for franchise dealers.

On the other side is the leader of the opposition holding a banner on which is inscribed :

Clean politics. Protect Canadian labour, agricultural and industrial. Stop wasteful schemes. Redeem promises.

The indictment continues:

Broken pledges. A policy to benefit foreigners while Canadians are ignored. Committing the country to a $120,000,000 railway, without surveys, without estimates of cost, without proper knowledge of the country to be traversed, and in open defiance of the matured and sound views of the Minister of Railways. Sins of omission. Sins of commission. Increased taxation. Waste and extravagance. A bungled census, costing $648,277 more than the census of 1891.

What is there incendiary about that ? Not a word, unless it is these words uttered by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Would my hon. friend permit me to interrupt him ? Perhaps the Postmaster General is ready to surrender and apologize for his misdeeds.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Do not deprive us of the benefit of hearing it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not intend to ask him to surrender. As an opposition we are entitled to our rights, and I give the Postmaster General notice that we intend to have them. Then the indictment continues on the next side :

Government by hypocrisy. Platform built to get in upon ; immediately afterwards destroyed. Public domains given over to speculators. Attempt to paralyze the sentinel whom Alexander Mackenzie left to guard the treasury. Burdening the Yukon, the Eldorado of Canada, with a water concession of bad repute, and a handicap on the mining industry of the nation.

What is there incendiary about that ? The Postmaster General must be overflowing with indignation when he charges the leader of the opposition and his supporters with sending out incendiary literature to the people of this country. On the next page I find : $120,000,000 railway.' That is the estimate placed upon it by his own colleague the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. Surely there is nothing incendiary about that.

To be built for a group of capitalists friendly to the government.

That is why the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals said that Cox could'nt wait,

that there was a ring which could not wait.

Without surveys, without estimates, without information. A reckless scheme that drove the Minister of Railways from the cabinet. Will kill the Intercolonial and sidetrack the canals. 'Cox can't wait,' so the people must pay.

After keeping parliament sitting all summer without disclosing its policy on the transcontinental railway question, the government suddenly announced a scheme at the tail end of the session.

It was an entire surprise to all concerned, and no one knows yet why many of its most absurd features were adopted.

It proposes that the government shall build a railway through an unknown wilderness from Winnipeg to Quebec, and then through the unpeopled forests of New Brunswick to Moncton. The government know so little of the route that they will not attempt even to estimate the cost of the line. Hon. Mr. Blair, whom this scheme drove to resign the railway portfolio, and who ought to know more about it than any other man, says that it commits the government to an expenditure of $120,000,000.

Will the Postmaster General get up and explain now what there is incendiary in the remarks I have read thus far? I propose reading the document through, paragraph by paragraph and line by line, to show what there is incendiary about it. Surely the Postmaster General will withdraw that remark and not force me to read the whole document.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no desire to curtail the right of my hon. friend to read anything he pleases. But if he desires me to allude to that portion of that paper which I regard as incendiary I will do so, at the same time I would not like to prevent him from reading the intermediate part. The portion to which I alluded is that article headed 'To arms.' Will he kindly read that article?

Mr. TAYLOR. That article is an appeal to the people of this country to take their ballots in their hands and turn the hon. gentlemen out. Is there anything incendiary about that? The Postmaster General virtually said to-day: This is an incendiary document and ought not to be read by the people of this country, therefore I have a right, I, Sir William Mulock, Postmaster General, Minister of Labour, the vastest man in this country, the man who licks the postage stamps for the people of this country, who puts the mucilage on them—I say this is incendiary literature and I won't allow it to go through the post office, and whatever is left after parliament rises we will make a bonfire of it on parliament hill. That is what the minister has said in the argument he made. That is the treatment he is dealing out to the opposition, and he thinks they are weak and miserable enough to stand it. But he will find out before he gets through that every package of literature that is in these corridors, franked or unfranked, is going to go through the post office, and by his mails, because it is our right.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will the hon. gentleman permit me another remark? I have said, and I repeat it again, that this is not a question of the franking privilege. I have not the slightest desire to interfere, nor could I interfere, with any franking privilege possessed by members of this House.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Now he is surrendering.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, I am not surrendering. I told the hon. gentleman this morning that this was a matter affecting the department only, that special facilities had to be provided, that the ordinary facilities do not provide for the handling of such a mass of stuff as is now thrown in upon us. I hope the hon. gentleman will not again charge me with seeking to interfere with the franking right of any member.

Mr. TAYLOR. I absolve the minister from that, because he knows as well as any one what the law is, and he knows he cannot interfere with the franking privilege. But he knows that as soon as the House is closed that right ceases, and if he can only get along by dribbling out 40 bags a day while the end of the session is in sight and the literature is there, then after prorogation he will not receive any more of it, because the law says that the franking privilege only lasts while the House is in session, or so many days after. That is the scheme of the Postmaster General, and I challenge him to get up and deny it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Certainly, I deny it. The hon. gentleman is romancing. Whatever is posted is in the hands of the post office, and is entitled to go.

Mr. CLARKE. Then why did you not take it out of there, and obey the Speaker's order?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Because there is no place to put it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Let the hon. gentleman sit down. I do not want my speech interfered with.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Whatever is posted has a right to pass through the mails.

Mr. TAYLOR. But if the hon. gentleman instructs the Sergeant-at-Arms not to allow any mail matter to come in, how can it pass through the mails? I paid $22 express charges upon it, and the Sergeant-at-Arms would not allow it to come inside the House. How could I frank it? The hon. gentleman has given instructions to the city post office to impound a number of bags addressed to me at the House of Commons, with the re-

sult that mail matter which is sent to the city post office to be delivered to me at the House of Commons is not delivered.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When mail matter arrives at the city post office for delivery at the House of Commons the duty of the post office is completed, and it is prepared to hand over that matter to any officer from the House of Commons who is authorized to receive it. The House of Commons has always taken charge of the delivery of the mails between the House and the city post office. If mail matter is directed to an hon. gentleman it is only waiting his order or the officers of this House authorized to receive it. It is not withheld by the post office. On the contrary, we are most anxious to get rid of it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then why has not the rule been carried out ? Here is stuff which has been addressed to me at the House of Commons. It has arrived at the city post office. The gentleman who has the contract for carrying the mail between this House and the city post office brought a load up here, and he was notified by the hon. Postmaster General's officers——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not at all.

Mr. TAYLOR. I know what I am speaking about—he was notified to take it back, and he took it back.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. By whom ?

Mr. TAYLOR. By the chief messenger and the Sergeant-at-Arms.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have nothing to do with that.

Mr. TAYLOR. Would it have been done if you had not interfered ? Did you, Mr. Speaker, of your own authority, say to the express companies of this city : You cannot deliver any mail matter which is addressed to Mr. Taylor at the House of Commons, or any parcel addressed to Mr. Taylor to be delivered to him in his room in the House of Commons ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I have been asked to make a statement by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) as to the use of the corridors and of the room of the House of Commons. I do it willingly, because I am glad to have the occasion to remove the bad impression under which the hon. member laboured during his remarks towards the Speaker of this House, and with regard to some orders which I deemed it my duty to give. A few days ago my attention was called by some officers of the House to the fact that some of the corridors of the House of Commons were getting filled with mail bags, and without any permission from anybody authorized to give it. We then tried to find a room where those bags could be put, because we considered that the fact of those bags being in the corridors was not a nice sight for the numerous strangers who happened to visit our parliament buildings. We could not, however, find at first any available room. I then gave instructions to ship away those bags as soon as possible, and not to receive any more to be put in the corridors. I was, in doing that, following a precedent of some years ago, when the same question came up. The Speaker at that time ordered that the bags be removed from the sight of the strangers visiting the House. I consider that the corridors of the House of Commons are not available for warehouse or storage purposes. I may be wrong in that respect, but that is the view I entertain upon the question, and until the House decides to the contrary, I think that I am taking a reasonable view of the matter. It has never been my intention to prevent the members of the House who happen to have rooms at their disposal from using them the way they like, and I may say that I have never given any instructions which would deprive any of those members of their entire liberty in that respect. If some statements to the contrary have been made during the discussion, I may say that those statements have been made under an erroneous impression or erroneous information.

Yesterday the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and a representative of the 'Star' came to me and asked me whether they could have a room to empty those bags and release them for the use of that paper. We went over the whole ground and found that the only available room was the new Railway Committee room, which I was very glad to put at their disposal. They all seemed to be pretty well satisfied with that arrangement. At all events, the hon. member for South Leeds, who was then present, did not utter a word of dissent. On the contrary, I think he thanked me for what I was doing. I suggested at that interview that perhaps the bags could be put in No. 6, and that it would be more convenient for the members of the opposition. The hon. member for South Leeds went to inquire whether this could be done, and when he returned he said 'no.' Then it was agreed that the Railway Committee room would be at their disposal to empty those bags and remove the congestion in the corridors. Now, I have been charged with having given orders to prevent the express companies from carrying parcels into room No. 6. I may say that I have never given any instructions of the sort, and the Sergeant-at-Arms reports to me that the orders he has given referred, not to any rooms, but to the corridors, and the parcels addressed to the rooms, so far as he is aware, have not been interfered with. I have every reason to believe that his statement is correct.

A reference has been made also by the hon. leader of the opposition to the fact that

there was a room available down stairs, which was used by some members for mailing parcels and literature. I think he is misinformed in that respect. Last year, or two years ago, I think that room was occupied by five or six members of this House, and they might have sent parcels or literature from there. Since that room has become a dining room, I am not aware that it has been used for any other purpose. The hon. leader of the opposition also states that he has a small room, but he will be good enough to render me the justice of saying that last year I offered him a larger room, and that he told me he could not very easily take it. I may repeat that I never did prevent any of the members who have rooms from doing what they like with these rooms, but what I did was simply to prevent the corridors being used for storage or warehouse purposes, and in doing that I intended to do only what I considered my duty.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker has read a statement and has also spoken on behalf of the Sergeant-at-Arms. I say most emphatically that I went to the Sergeant-at-Arms last night and asked him why this stuff was turned away, and he said by instructions. I said: This matter is coming up in the morning, and I am going to take it to my room if I have to carry it myself. He said: You cannot do it. Mr. Speaker did offer to the representatives of the 'Star' and myself the Railway Committee room, but I immediately asked how we were going to get the bags up there and could we get the messengers. No, we would have to hire our own men to carry it up there.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Why not?

Mr. TAYLOR. Because the messengers are used by the members of the government and their supporters to carry their literature and to do their messages while we can hardly get one to do an errand for us. The stuff is impounded at the post office and it is impounded at the express office, although it is addressed to myself. That is the position we are placed in. Mr. Speaker makes the statement that the corridors are blocked. They are not being blocked by myself or by any other member of the opposition. These bags have been filled in the post office, carried out and stacked in the corridors for weeks. Why does not Mr. Speaker order the postmaster to remove them? Yet this is all charged against the opposition whip, who is held responsible for blocking the corridors. It is either the hon. Postmaster General or the postmaster of this House who is at fault in not having this stuff removed, because it has lain there for the past two or three weeks. We have emptied the bags that came in every day, franked them and put them back into the post office. Why should we be charged with causing the blockade? The Sergeant-at-Arms will not deny that it was by his orders that our stuff, which came by mail and by express, was turned away. He told me when I brought it up here this morning that I would not be allowed to take it in, but I came prepared to take it in even if I had to carry it in myself. I defy the Sergeant-at-Arms or anybody else to deprive me of my right as a member of this House of taking my express parcels into my room. Here is the position we are in: The hon. Postmaster General knows very well that if we did not get this stuff franked and into the post office before the gun fired, or within two or three days afterwards, because I understand there are two or three days of grace, it would not go out to the people of this country. He said it was incendiary, because the electors were called to arms, to vote against this government, and he knows that the people are up in arms against the government. I want to embellish the pages of 'Hansard' with this, so as to contradict the Postmaster General, who made a statement that he must know was not correct.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will take that back, Mr. Speaker. If he didn't know it was not correct, he ought to have known it. There is a lot of this stuff piled up on the green outside of the House, and if there comes a shower of rain it may be spoiled.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want you, Mr. Speaker, to instruct your officers to have that brought in and delivered to me in room No. 6. I want you to order your officers to take in the express matter which they refused to take. I want an order to the chief messenger that the stuff out on the green be brought in. Am I to understand that you do not answer, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER. If some stuff was brought for room No. 6 and has not been delivered to room No. 6, it is on account of some misunderstanding between the Sergeant-at-Arm and the hon. member. The Sergeant-at-Arms has just informed me that he has never refused to receive stuff coming to any room.

Mr. TAYLOR. There was a load of this literature came to me by express and the chief messenger refused to receive it.

Mr. SPEAKER. There must have been a misunderstanding.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Sergeant-at-Arms told me last night that he could not send down for the express matter which was refused the other night.

Mr. SPEAKER. As I have said, there must be a misunderstanding, and I trust the hon. gentleman will not pursue that matter further.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then somebody has backed down. I take the ground that neither

the Speaker nor the Postmaster General, nor the Sergeant-at-Arms, nor the chief messenger will deprive me of my lawful rights of having my literature delivered to me. The Postmaster General now says that there are 500 bags addressed to me impounded down in the post office. Will the Postmaster General issue an order to have that sent to me at this House immediately ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There appear to be a great many misunderstandings. I did not say anything about 500 bags being impounded. It is not a fact that any mail matter addressed to the hon. member is impounded at the post office, and not available to him. I have been informed that there are a large number of sacks sent from the 'Star' office, Montreal, by post to the hon. gentleman, and as we have no storage accommodation for them in the post office proper, they are in the lobby of the post office. We are most anxious that the hon. gentleman should send for them and take them away. What I did state was that one of my officers informed me that there were 400 bags or packages of mail matter sent here on Sunday.

Mr. TAYLOR. They were not in the post office ; they were in the express office.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know even that. I was informed that they came to Ottawa, but I do not know whether it is correct or not.

Mr. COCHRANE. It is none of your business anyway.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It would be if the bags of the post office were used. If my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) would take away one or two hundred bags that are lying there now, he would accommodate the post office very much, because they are in the way.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have made inquiry, and I find that 400 parcels, not 400 bags, have come by express, because the right to send them by mail under the franking privilege was denied. I am informed that after they came to Ottawa, an officer of the hon. gentleman's department called upon the express company, and threatened to prosecute because they did not come by mail.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am sure that is an entire mistake.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is my information.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to give me the name of the officer ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know the name of the officer, but I will give it to the Postmaster General before the day is over. I am informed that first we were denied the right of sending them by mail, and then, having sent them at our own cost, by express, the express company, our agent, was threatened with prosecution because he was violating the law in relation to the carriage of mail.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Postmaster General says that there are at the post office one or two hundred bags of mail matter addressed to me at the House of Commons.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I didn't say that.

Mr. TAYLOR. He told me that there were a number of bags addressed to me in the lobby of the post office, and he wished I would go down and take them. And he wished I would go and get them.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. So I do.

Mr. CLARKE. There is free delivery in this city; why do you not deliver them ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Under the franking privilege any parcel sent to me by post should be delivered to me at the post office in the House of Commons; that is the law.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Where is that law ?

Mr. TAYLOR. And yet the Postmaster General calls on me to go to the city post office, to hire a cart and draw these bags up. Is that the way the hon. gentleman intends to treat the opposition ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Post Office Department delivers no mail matter for any member of this House, on this side or on that side. The House itself has always had its own arrangement for conveying this mail matter from the city post office to the House of Commons post office, and vice versa, and it is a matter for the committee of this House to deal with.

Mr. CLARKE. Who pays for its conveyance between the two post offices ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The House of Commons.

Mr. TAYLOR. The people of this country pay for it. The Postmaster General went to the post office and inspected this mail matter and knows that it is addressed to me at the House of Commons, yet it is not sent up here. Who is neglecting his duty ? Why has not that been sent here ? It was sent to the House, but was refused admittance, and was sent back to the post office. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is to become of this stuff which is at the city post office ? I desire an answer.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have no further statement to make. I do not desire to take any part in the discussion, and I do not think it is becoming for the Speaker to take part in a discussion.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want information ; is the gentleman who carries the mail from the

city post office to the House of Commons post office under your jurisdiction ? Is the chief messenger of this House under your jurisdiction ? The gentleman who carries the mail from the city post office to this post office brought a load of that to the House ; your chief messenger ordered him to take it back, and would not receive it, and I wish to know who is at fault. I ask the Postmaster General who is at fault, and why I had not possession of the 100 bags which the Postmaster General says he saw at the post office ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know that my hon. friend will accept my opinion on the subject, but I am quite willing to give it. The whole trouble has arisen from the action of the hon. gentleman in deluging this House with more mail matter than there is accommodation for. The post office accommodation in this building is limited. The building is supplied with a post office room, but that is inadequate to hold the quantity of mail matter that the hon. gentleman desires to have put into it. Whoever approved of the plan of this building in years gone by are to blame, because they did not anticipate this extraordinary condition. However, the bringing of the mails up here is a matter entirely under the control of the House of Commons of Canada. The hon. gentleman is right in saying that the stuff is waiting at the city post office, and I certainly wish with all my heart that the hon. gentleman would make arrangements to remove it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will have to make an appeal to the Prime Minister. I have been in this House 21 years, 14 years supporting a government when he sat on this side of the House, and I would ask him if he ever saw the opposition treated by the Conservative party as the opposition is now being treated by the government ? This matter has been refused admittance to the House ; a load came this morning and is now out on the green. Is that the treatment that the Premier intends meting out to the members of the opposition ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not attach the same importance to this matter as my hon. friend does; perhaps because of the difference in the point of view. I sympathize, however, when he tells us that a lot of this stuff is on the green, and it would be worse if this stuff should be exposed to rain. Perhaps, however, it would extinguish the fire in it if it is incendiary. If my hon. friend had consulted me earlier, I have not much control over these matters, but I think the resources of the country are adequate to deal with the difficulty, to have the stuff removed from the green, and I think I could undertake to say more, to have it carried over and placed on the trains and disposed of.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Prime Minister is good at making evasive answers. He says the resources of the country are adequate to receive and despatch the mail. If he, as Prime Minister, had an officer at the head of the Post Office Department who would give instructions, it could be done, but the Postmaster General knows that the postmaster in this House has had bags in his possession for three weeks and has not sent them to the city post office; he has authorized the city post office to receive only 40 bags a day, and then he makes the statement that we are to go on at that rate, and that we will be kept here until after Christmas if all of these bags are to be sent out——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. So we will.

The PRIME MINISTER. Will you allow me to have a moment's conference with my hon. friend the Postmaster General, and I think I can soften him ?

Mr. TAYLOR. While the conference is going on, I shall present to the House——

The PRIME MINISTER. That is not fair; my hon. friend is like the Boer, when we are in conference he prepares for war. Let me confer with the Postmaster General, and then perhaps we can solve this difficulty.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to say that, so far as using the corridors for warehouse purposes is concerned, I regard you, Mr. Speaker, as having absolute jurisdiction, but not as having jurisdiction to order away from the precincts of the House matters sent by mail or express to any member. From the statement which Mr. Speaker read to the House, we may arrive at the conclusion that he is of the same opinion and that any occurrence of the kind was due probably to some misunderstanding. As far as using the room down stairs is concerned, I may say that I did not know it was used as a dining room, but as I have not been accustomed to go into the lower precincts so much perhaps as other hon. members, I cannot speak with authority on that point. With respect to my own accommodation, I did not rise for the purpose of making any complaint, although I regard it as somewhat inadequate for the purposes of my work, but I owe apology to you Mr. Speaker, for having forgotten that last year you did offer me somewhat larger quarters, which I did not think I could use, because they were not conveniently situated. I did make an effort to have another room somewhat nearer mine but that did not seem practicable. In what I said this morning, I did not speak, Mr. Speaker, in any personal sense, but on a question of importance as to whether or not any man occupying the Chair of Mr. Speaker has the right to

issue the orders which I understood, when I spoke yesterday, had been issued by you, Sir, in this regard. I do not wish to comment on the somewhat sneering terms in which the right hon. the Prime Minister referred to my remarks. He suggested that I desired to put myself on a higher plane than eminent men who have occupied my present position. I trust that my past course in this House is sufficient to justify me from that. If the right hon. gentleman did not enjoy more accommodation in this House than is now given me, the demands of one in my position are perhaps larger than they were years ago—larger because the business of the country is growing and more work has to be done. My right hon. friend speaks of some matters as trifling, for example, whether or not a mass of campaign literature has been addressed and circulated from departments of the government by servants employed and paid by the country. I am not inclined to regard that as so small a matter, and years ago the right hon. gentleman would have been inclined to speak in a different tone regarding it. But that was in the days when he was advocating greater efficiency and purity in the administration of public affairs. I wish to address myself to the practical difficulties of the situation. The Postmaster General says 1,830 bags have been used for this purpose.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. At least.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think that is an outside estimate, if I am correctly informed. But let me point out to the hon. gentleman that 1,830 bags are only a little more than one-half the number which one newspaper in Montreal uses every week. This work began as far back as the 25th of September. Twenty-six days have elapsed since then. If he had put these bags out at the small number of forty per day, he would have disposed of 1,040.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman will allow me I did not say that 1,830 bags was the maximum. I said we had given at least 1,830 bags to the 'Star' people which were used for this purpose. That many we have track of, and my hon. friend will remember that his chief whip said that this stuff began on the 20th of September.

Mr. CLARKE. He did not say 'stuff.'

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He said that this stuff began to leave Montreal on the 20th of September and had come at the rate of from fifty to one hundred bags per day—not forty. That would make nearly 3,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have been informed as to the number of documents sent here from time to time, and according to that information 1,830 bags would cover absolutely everything that has come from Montreal from first to last. I have not counted them but have made some inquiry, and I believe that that is an outside estimate. I know that about 500,000 copies of these documents have been sent out and there are about 300 in each bag. That would be under the estimate which the Postmaster General made this afternoon of 1,830 bags. But if you can distribute 3,000 bags in the course of one week from one newspaper office how is it that from the 25th of September up to the present you have made so little progress in disposing of these bags ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If my hon. friend will allow me, I will give the reason. The bags that are sent by the 'Star' newspaper containing its own papers are made up and directed to the post office of each town where the matter is to be delivered. No sorting takes place. Those thousands of bags are not handled on the cars but go as freight or baggage. They do not go in the postal cars at all.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). But they go in the post office.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They do not.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). They do when they reach their destination.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is another matter. We are talking about sending them out.

Mr. BELL. Are they not in the possession and under the charge of the Post Office Department the moment they are put on the train ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Certainly, but we are speaking of the work of handling the mail on the cars, and my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition desires to know the exact facts. A newspaper like the 'Star' delivers every day to the railways a large number of bags containing newspapers. Each of these bags is directed to a particular town, and there is no sortation on the cars of the contents. They are not handled in the postal cars at all. They are put into the baggage car so that there is no more difficulty in handling a bag containing 200 or 500 newspapers than in handling a trunk. But each bag of the mail matter to which we are now referring contains many separate pieces. These have to be sorted on the train. The bags of postal matter are put upon the car. When the train starts the clerks have to pour out the contents of the bags upon the table, examine the direction upon each separate piece and put it in the bag for its destination. A considerable space is required in the postal car for the convenience of the officers engaged in that sortation. Therefore, the matter cannot be handled wholesale, as in the case of newspapers going from the office of publication, but must be handled retail, each separate article being subject to separate treatment.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am obliged to the Postmaster General for that explanation. But I understood that, so far as large cities are concerned, the bags have already been so made up.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. But still the bags have to be opened in the postal car and their contents examined, because in very few instances do the bags contain only matter for a particular post office.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think that any difficulty as to that might have been obviated when the bags were filled. If the authorities in the Post Office Department or the post office authorities of the House of Commons had intimated to those engaged in this work that it would be more convenient if the mail matter for a particular place were put in a bag by itself, that would have been done, and that, very likely, would facilitate the work very much. The explanation of the Postmaster General seems to make it abundantly plain that there is no work at all for the Ottawa post office in all this; the work is on the mail car. So far as the Ottawa post office is concerned, it is simply a question of storage, and surely the resources of the government should have enabled them to overcome any difficulty as to storage room. Let me point out this fact to the Postmaster General—that if in Ottawa a paper were to commence publication having a circulation of 15,000 or 20,000, it would give His Majesty's mails more matter to handle than that caused by the distribution of this literature. Yet, I am sure, the Postmaster General would hardly likely stand up in this House and say that the whole mail service in Ottawa would be paralyzed by the mere fact of a newspaper of that magnitude beginning publication here. And let me say also that I am informed—I do not know with what truth, and perhaps we had better have a statement about it if any minister of the Crown is in a position to make known the facts—that the equivalent of twenty-five bags of mail matter has been sent out by my hon. friends on the other side as campaign literature every day for the last six or eight weeks. If that has been going on, let us attribute the congestion to that to which it is really due. Let the Postmaster General not send forward the twenty-five or thirty bags of literature on his side, and keep back ours, and then say that the congestion is due to the literature sent out from this side.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. On that point, I would like to correct my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax). I have no control over the postmaster of the House of Commons. And, so far as I know, no person has sought in any way to direct or interfere with his actions. You, Mr. Speaker, who have jurisdiction on behalf of the House in these matters, I am sure, have not interfered with the postmaster in the proper discharge of his duties. The postmaster has discharged his duties as he thought best and if he is showing partiality, as an officer of the House he is amenable to the discipline of the House. But I am sure there is no foundation for the suggestion that literature from one side has received preference or priority over the other. There has been the utmost fairness, and no partiality has been shown.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was not accusing any officer of partiality or unfairness. But I am credibly informed by those who profess to know what they speak about that mail matter equivalent to twenty-five bags a day has been sent out by my hon. friends opposite for the last six or eight weeks.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. And by my hon. friends on that side.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The result of that is a certain congestion.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Caused by both sides.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is exactly what I am coming to. But, up to the present time, we have been told that it has been caused by the literature sent out by this side. And we have heard of the scandalous abuse of the franking privilege, and so on. Let us understand that both sides are engaged in the work of propagating their political views by sending out their campaign literature during the session of parliament under franks. But, when that occasions congestion, let us not have ministers standing up in the House and accusing members on this side of causing that congestion, and let us not have a stoppage, and the piling up of that literature in these corridors, the stoppage applying only to the literature from this side. That is all we ask. We simply desire that our rights in that regard shall be the same as those of others, that there shall not be all this comment and excitement because we are doing what is quite within our right to do, and what hon. gentlemen on the other side are doing in exactly the same way, and, as I believe on a very much larger scale.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Oh, no. The hon. gentleman does not believe that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, I will take my hon. friend's word that it is not greater. There is another remark as to how this mail matter accumulates. It came in by mail up to the time we were driven to send it by express, which we did until the express company were threatened, as I am informed, with prosecution for carrying matter that should be sent by mail—it has come here in some way without great apparent difficulty ; but it is only when we try to send it away from here that the congestion is caused. The

explanation of my hon. friend as to the necessity of sorting on the train accounts for it in part. But, even with that explanation, I do not see that there should be the congestion which is said to have resulted merely through our effort to send out what seems to me a very moderate amount of campaign literature. I do not think it is desirable to have this condition of affairs continue. It seems to me that means could be found to prevent this congestion. I am sure that my hon. friend the Postmaster General and the Prime Minister, if they should have this conference spoken of a little while ago, will devise some means by which a result will be arrived at satisfactory to all the members of the House. And I shall be glad if when my right hon. friend (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has arrived at a conclusion with regard to it, he will give a statement as to what we may expect on this question which has already occupied a considerable length of time.

Mr. SEYMOUR E. GOURLEY (Colchester). The unfortunate thing about this debate is, that the employees of this House will be encouraged to treat members of parliament with disrespect. I think members of parliament, on both sides, should stand together, to preserve the respect due to this House. By so doing we maintain the honour of the people of Canada. I am persuaded, that the conduct of the Postmaster General will give the employees of the House the impression, that they can treat members of the opposition with less respect than they show to members supporting the government. It would be unworthy and dishonourable for members of this House to occupy that position, not because they are members of the government side of the opposition, but because they represent the constituencies of this country. So far as service is due by members of parliament, I do not make the slightest distinction between those who support the government and those who support the opposition.

Now, I want to say first that I think the Prime Minister should apologize to our leader. I am not inclined to make unkind remarks. In taking part in the debates of this House I have always endeavoured to exercise courtesy. If a man is not strong enough to say what he wants to say in measured language, then he is not a very strong man. Now, I think the Prime Minister should apologize to the leader of the opposition for saying, as he did this morning, that the language used by the leader of the opposition was unworthy of himself. I think the language of the leader of the opposition was mild and measured in the extreme. If we have any complaint to make on this side against the leader of the opposition it is that he always fights with gloves when he fights the hon. gentlemen opposite, that he is too courteous to the gentlemen who sit opposite. After that has been the leading feature of his conduct towards the government, it strikes me that the Prime Minister was not well advised when he made that remark. I think the language is peculiarly unworthy of the Prime Minister himself. It is cutting language, and I would not have blamed the leader of the opposition if he had resented it with much more fire and spirit than he did. But with his usual courtesy he permitted the Prime Minister to go almost scott free. I do not propose to do that, and I wish the Prime Minister to apologize to the leader of the opposition for departing from the traditional good manners that should characterize a Prime Minister of Canada.

Now, the Prime Minister said that he had occupied that room when in opposition and he never complained. He ought to have complained. If he, the leader of the opposition, was shut up in that little room, he ought to have had more respect for his position and he should have complained. I am going to complain, and I will never stop complaining until every member of this House is treated with proper respect. When I am at home—and I think it is the same with reference to every other gentleman—I have a house, I have an office, where, if a gentleman wishes to consult me privately, he can do so. I have typewriters, an office fitted up with the usual appliances to enable me to attend to the business of my clients. When I come here I come representing 25,000 people of the county of Colchester, whose business I have to attend to, and how am I treated here ? I have no room, I have not the slightest opportunity to do the business that is imposed upon me. But I do not wish to be a loafer, I wish to work and perform the duties that are cast upon me. But when I come here, I am encouraged to be a loafer and an idler. I am put into a large room which is more like a club-room, where there are eight, or ten, or twenty gentlemen smoking and talking together. How can I do the business of 25,000 people in such quarters as that ? Yet that is the accommodation that is furnished to me, and I am going to tell the people of Colchester that this government and this parliament are to blame for it, that this government treats myself and treats them with the utmost disrespect in neglecting to furnish me with a private apartment in which I can do the business of my county. Up in this part of country it appears that only the ministers are supposed to have any business to do. I am charged with responsibilities as well as they are, and I want some place assigned to me in which I can do the business of my constituents. As it is, I had to go into the library and crave from the librarian the courtesy of an alcove in which to do the business of a member of parliament. But it is far from being a place to do business in, because you are interrupted. A gentle-

man who is accustomed to work wants privacy. But we are deprived of all that and it is only the ministers who have apartments.

When we appoint a judge of the Supreme Court of Canada we assign him two or three rooms in which to do his business. It is not nearly as important that he should have two or three rooms as it is for a member of parliament. A judge of the Supreme Court does not deal with the interests of more than 200 or 300 suitors in a year. I have charged upon me the interests of 25,000 suitors in this parliament. Why should we give a judge a couple of rooms in which to do his business, and not assign one room to a member of parliament, who has vastly more important duties? I charge upon the members of this parliament, who have represented this country for the last thirty years, in having been derelict to their duty in allowing themselves to be treated with absolute disrespect. The members of this House should supply themselves first of all with accommodation. If we appoint a clerk he is at once given a room of his own. See what contumely is heaped upon the members of this House in treating them with less respect than a clerk. We appoint a man to a position and give him a salary of $1,200 or $1,500 a year. Do we ask him to sit out on the green to do his business? Do we ask him to sit on one of these bags? No, we do not, we assign him a room. Why, the very instant we employ the meanest clerk in the House of Commons we assign him a room. They have intelligence enough, but it is impossible for any one to do work without a room, therefore, we assign the meanest employee a room of his own. I blame the members of parliament for permitting this indignity to be heaped upon them—the members of parliament on both sides of the House, and not only of this parliament, but of all preceding parliaments.

I desire to say further that I think the Postmaster General has been led into this difficulty through listening to over zealous partisans. For my part I would be a long time in this House, I would be ten years in this House, going up and down these corridors, before I would make a complaint to anybody about these bags. They are piled up there, and if some gentleman in going home late at night feeling tired and sick, passing between those tiers of bags on each side of him, it would be an assistance to him, in case any accident happened, to find a soft bed on which to fall. There should not be very much complaint. Why should any gentleman going through those corridors object to these bags being there unless he were a partisan? I undertake to say that the hon. Postmaster General allowed himself to be used by some ungracious partisan on his side who went to him and represented to him that he should interfere with the opposition in the pursuit of their duty. He pulled his leg, as it were, and instead of telling this partisan that he did not want to interfere with the opposition, the hon. Postmaster General listened to him and became a partisan himself. I do not believe that hon. gentlemen opposite sympathize with the hon. Postmaster General. I believe there is too much courtesy and refinement amongst hon. gentlemen opposite to sympathize with anything like this mean partisanship which has been shown in connection with this matter. I regret this partisanship very much. There are partisans on both sides but the leading men of the party on both sides ought to be strong enough to teach them better manners. The hon. Postmaster General says that a complaint was made by a newspaper in Montreal. Then he is the victim of the mere jealousy of some newspaper in Montreal. Some newspaper is perhaps jealous of the 'Star' and wants to give the 'Star' some trouble in respect to its mail matter. The hon. Postmaster General should have told the newspapers to settle their jealousies between themselves, that the urgent need of more mail bags will pass away in two or three days, and he should not have permitted himself to have been drawn into the matter in the way in which he has been. That hon. gentleman represents the dignity of this House in some measure and in some measure the dignity of the country and he should not have permitted himself to have been dragged into a mere petty quarrel between some newspapers in Montreal. He should have been the first man to have stood up and fought for the dignity of this House. He should have said that the members of this House had privileges. I charge the hon. Postmaster General with not standing up for the dignity of this House. It is the duty of every member of this House to preserve the dignity of those on both sides. A minister ought not to be a partisan when it comes to preserving the respect of the people for this House. I will always stand up for the respect which is due to this House. We should have respect for ourselves. We should conduct our debates with courtesy and decency and we should stand together in the preservation of our rights in order that the country may respect us and respect parliament. I think the hon. Postmaster General forgot himself when this newspaper came to him and made the complaint to which he refers. When this newspaper complained to him that they had not sufficient bags, the hon. Postmaster General should have inquired into the matter and if he found out that members of parliament in the exercise of their franking privilege had used up the supply of bags he should have said to that newspaper: Wait, your business is private. You have a little private newspaper to run. The bags are being used by members of parliament for the dissemination of public information all over the

country, which is more important than the dissemination of any private newspaper. If he had had any self respect he would have said on behalf of this House that the privileges of a member of parliament are superior to the privileges of a newspaper. The hon. Postmaster General said that a manufacturer in some small country town could not get his manufacturing circulars sent through the post office for three days because the post office was occupied by literature sent out by members of parliament. I undertake to say that such a statement is an insult to this parliament. He should have told that manufacturer that it was our duty to send out literature to the country rather than that the post office should be occupied with the literature that he desired to send out. I take the ground that it is our duty to send out literature. The people in my constituency are complaining because there is no literature sent out. They say that the members of parliament are lazy and that we are not performing our duty if we do not send out literature while we are here. The people pay the bills, they have a right to have literature sent to them and it is the first duty of the Post Office Department to send out literature from this House for the purpose of educating the people. If the government have a wise policy they should be the first to want literature sent out, because, if their policy is wise, the literature we send out will only exhibit that policy in a better light. Therefore, if I were supporting a government which I believed to be a strong government I would urge the opposition to send out literature, because, if the policy of the government were a desirable one, the opposition would make out a weak case. The people are just as competent to criticise an argument as we are and in many cases there are many more intelligent men outside of this House than there are inside of it. While there is a fair proportion of intelligence inside of this House there are many men outside of this House who are far in advance in the matter of intelligence than men inside of this House. Hon. gentlemen opposite should not interfere with political organization but they should rather encourage us.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. GOURLEY. One or two hon. gentlemen of ill manners can make a noise. They should encourage us in our organization. They should give us every facility for organization because this country is governed by parties and it is in the highest interests of the country that every bit of knowledge that can assist the electors in arriving at the verdict as to which party shall rule the country should be presented to their minds. Every bit of information should be scattered broadcast. That is the basis of the franking privilege. The franking privilege is the privilege of the people. It is not my privilege, it is not the privilege of any other hon. member, but it is the privilege of the people to get literature from this parliament free, because, if you charged the cost of sending out literature to an individual member, it would be impossible for him to send it out. Therefore, the people have wisely decreed that members of parliament shall have the liberty of sending out literature through the country free. Recollect you put into our hands the most powerful weapon when we can go to the country and say: You dare not allow us to exercise the privilege of sending out literature, because your crimes and misconduct are such that you do not want them to be known. Consequently I for one would say that the hon. Postmaster General should get up, recall every order that he has given and if necessary order 5,000 bags to-night. What is the cost of a few bags compared with this attack upon the privileges of parliament? And if necessary he should have a few extra postal cars. If the hon. Postmaster General were a business man rather than have this matter exploited he would have ordered 5,000 additional bags and hired some postal cars and had this literature removed from day to day. Surely the Post Office Department of Canada is strong enough to remove this literature. What a confession that after six years of administration by the hon. Postmaster General the post office service has become so inefficient, so impotent, so weak, that it is impossible to move a few bags of mail from the corridors of this House. I did not think that the Post Office Department had been so emaciated by the administration of the hon. Postmaster General as to leave it in this unhappy state. I think the hon. Postmaster General should give instructions at once, no matter what it costs, to have these corridors cleared and to have the stuff transmitted through the mails. I think also that the right hon. leader of the government should apologize to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition and that the hon. Postmaster General should apologize to the House for this serious attack upon the privileges of every member of parliament.

The PRIME MINISTER. With the desire that we should endeavour to proceed with the business of the House, I have had a conference with my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock), and he informs me that he has ordered 1,000 bags. They cannot be made in a day, but they will be made on short notice. If my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) will allow me to proceed with the businesss of the House, I can confer with him, and I think we can come to a satisfactory arrangement.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That will be satisfactory.

Motion (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to adjourn the House negatived.

SUPPLY—QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE BY MR. WALTER SCOTT.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. WALTER SCOTT (West Assiniboia). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. In one of these sheets of that campaign literature, which has been the subject of debate all day, I find that I am charged with the serious offence of lowering the tone of debate in this House. There is an article headed: 'Lowering the tone of debate; Liberal backbenchers resort to abusive tactics and barroom politics.' This sheet is gotten up in a form that might lead some people to believe that it was a veritable official document; it has the national coat of arms at its head, and it would almost remind one of the celebrated proclamation once isssued to the Indians instructing them how to cast their ballots.

Mr. EMMERSON. Or the bogus 'Globe.'

Mr. SCOTT. Or the bogus 'Globe,' as my hon. friend says. I and some other members of the House are charged with lowering the tone of debate and degrading this parliament—I presume that the exhibition we have seen to-day from gentlemen opposite is calculated to restore the tone of debate. Those of us who are charged with this offence have, according to this sheet, precipitated a crisis in this country, and the people are called to arms on account of that crisis in national politics. And why is this? It is because one hon. gentleman on this side called an official of a railway company 'a red-headed boy'; because another hon. gentleman applied the term 'a raw young person' to some one outside of the House; because it was said that one hon. gentleman 'displayed his ignorance'; and because the words 'intellectual paralysis' were used in another case. The fact that these epithets were applied has, according to this sheet, brought on a crisis in our national affairs, and in consequence the saving remnant of the people are called to arms. My own offence is that I made reference to certain railway companies, namely, the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan and the Calgary and Edmonton Companies, in connection with which I made an allusion to my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler). I wish to explain my position, in face of this charge which must be considered somewhat serious. I wish to state that when I referred to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) I did not mean to reflect in the slightest degree upon his honesty or personal honour. I have some right to complain that a disposition has been shown on the part of some members of this House, and on the part of a section of the press, as well as in this campaign document, to read into the words I used a meaning which these words were not intended to convey, and which I do not believe they do convey. On the contrary, I would like to have permission to state, with regard to my hon. friend (Mr. Osler), that I believe he holds his public position in this country at a very considerable personal and financial sacrifice, as do many other members of this House. It is an encouraging thing that men of his calibre, men of very extensive business interests, are found willing to sacrifice their personal and financial convenience to hold public positions. I repeat that I did not make, and that I do not intend to make any reflection on the honour or honesty of my hon. friend from West Toronto. My reference to him was made in perfect good faith. Beyond having verified from the reports of the Department of Railways and Canals the figures on which my reference was based I had not, however, immediately before making the reference, looked very closely into these particular matters. I thought they were matters of common knowledge, and while the direct and absolute way in which my statement was challenged by my hon. friend (Mr. Osler) left me no recourse but to retract, it did surprise me exceedingly. Later I took occasion to examine into such of the facts as were available to me. The House has had some notice of this by the series of questions which some days ago I put upon the Order paper. I had, nevertheless, concluded to make no further reference to the matter until the serious charge against me in this campaign sheet was called to my attention. I think the House will agree with me that the very widespread accusation which is made in this sheet—stating that my personal conduct has been such as to degrade parliament—renders it incumbent on me to set myself right. I trust that the facts which I will endeavour very briefly to place before the House will lead my hon. friend from West Toronto to set me in the right with regard to his accusation that I had knowingly and wilfully made a false accusation against him. On looking further into the case, I found these facts: First, notwithstanding that by law railway bondholders' mortgages are required to be deposited in the office of the Secretary of State, no such document with respect to the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan is in that office. I have, therefore, been unable to verify the assertions of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) with respect to that particular railroad. I find, however, that in the statutes of 1890 (chap. 82), confirming the agreement made between the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskachewan Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, subclause (E) of section 1 of this agreement, sets out:

> The company shall not issue any bonds, secured directly or indirectly on its land subsidies or any portion of such land subsidies.

My hon. friend (Mr. Osler) declared, if I understood him aright, that the $3,809,140 bond issue of that company, was only floated by the additional pledge of the total land subsidy. That statement of his, and the clause of the agreement, do not appear to harmonize, and some further explanation from the hon. gentleman would be in order. I may point out that there is another rather suspicious looking clause in the agreement, which is to be found in chapter 82 of the statutes of 1890. Subclause (C) of section 3 of the agreement sets out as follows :

It is understood and declared that the Qu'Appelle Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company may transfer one half of its land subsidy to any person or persons as it may deem proper.

However, as I said, the mortgage is not deposited in the office of the Secretary of State, and I was able to find no particular facts with regard to that road or that company. But by chapter 84 of the statutes of 1890, in an Act to incorporate the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, I find that the name of my hon. friend the junior member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) appears amongst the names of those incorporated as the company to whom we voted 6,400 acres of land per mile for 340 miles of road, and to whom we granted $1,600,000 in cash, in twenty equal annual payments. Now, I find also, in the mortgage deed of the Calgary and Edmonton bondholders, this provision :

It is, however, expressly understood that the land grant from the government shall be excepted from the operation of the said mortgage and shall form no part of the security for the payment of the said bonds or the interest thereon.

Now, I appeal to my hon. friend if the discrepancies between these matters of record and what I understood him to state on a former occasion in this House are not sufficient to at least call for some further explanation from him. He stated, if I understood him accurately, that he was not one of those who obtained the new Calgary and Edmonton charter in 1890, but, on the contrary, I find that his name appears in the Act. I also understood him to state that in order to raise the amount of money—the exact sum was $5,474,513—which was the proceeds of the Calgary and Edmonton bonds, the land grant had to be pledged to form part of the security, or, as he put it, the land grant was sold with the bonds for the above sum. Now, the clause in the mortgage which I have read would seem to indicate that the contrary was the fact.

Let me give my hon. friend a very brief analysis of the figures of this contract. The proceeds of the bonds sale in connection with the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway were $3,809,140, while the cost of the road was $2,539,600. There is a balance there of $1,269,540, which my hon. friend explained was left in the hands of bankers to guarantee six years' interest. By my calculation six years' interest at 6 per cent upon the amount of the bonds would be $1,371,288. The surplus as between the proceeds of the bonds and the actual cost of the road was $1,269,540, so that upon the money raised by the bonds there would appear to be a shortage in this matter of interest for six years of $101,748. Does my hon. friend contend that it took a land grant of 1,619,200 acres to cover this deficiency of, roundly, $100,000, which appears to be the shortage in the six years' interest ?

The results with regard to the Calgary and Edmonton are very similar. The proceeds of the bonds were $5,474,513, while the actual cost of the road appears by the records in the Railway and Canals Department to have been $3,743,562. There is a surplus there of $1,730,951, which, as my hon. friend said, was left in the hands of bankers. At 6 per cent, six years' interest upon the total bond issue would amount to $1,970,820, and to cover that amount there was a surplus between the bond issue and the actual cost of the road of $1,730,951, so there would be a shortage there from the amount necessary to cover the interest of about $240,000 in round numbers. I ask, with regard to this, does my hon. friend contend that a land grant of 1,888,000 had all to be pledged to cover this $240,000 : and if so, what became of the paid-up capital stock, which on the Calgary and Edmonton road, is put at an amount of $1,000,000? I shall send these figures and calculations over to my hon. friend, and he will be able to see whether or not they are accurate.

It certainly appears to me to be almost impossible that it should have been found necessary to pledge the whole land grant to provide for these comparatively small amounts of money. If the land grant were not pledged, as appears to be indicated by the clause of the mortgage which I have read, then the question is, what became of the land grant ? On looking into this phase of the matter, I have found that of the land grant earned by the Calgary and Edmonton Company an area of 1,139,700 acres has already been patented, and to whom ? The railway company, of which my hon. friend, I believe, is a member, has secured patents on 215,816 acres. Nominees of the railway company have secured 57,576 acres. The firm of Osler, Hammond & Nanton have secured patents for 25,140 acres. Mr. James Ross has received patents for 41,130 acres. Assignees of Mr. Ross have received 105 acres. The Calgary and Edmonton Land Company has received the greatest amount, it has received patents for 792,799 acres, and assignees of the land company have been given patents for 12,510 acres. Now, as I pointed out, the land company has obtained the big slice, nearly 800,000 acres, which, in my opinion, is worth $2,500,000 to-day if it is worth a cent. I found fur-

ther that my hon. friend is a member and a director of this Calgary and Edmonton Land Company, which is a different concern from the railway company. He appears to be a member of both the railway and the land company, both of which have participated, as I have shown, in the land grant.

Let me go over this ground again briefly. The Calgary and Edmonton Railway actually cost $3,743,572, which, I may remark, my hon. friend assured the House on a former occasion, was every bit paid in cash. The bond issue was $18,500 per mile for 300 miles; this appears in the mortgage deed. But the actual proceeds of the bonds seem to have been only $5,474,513, being roundly $75,000 less than their apparent par value. Between the proceeds and the cost of the road there is a difference of $1,730,951. This sum my hon. friend said—and I believe him implicitly—was left with the banks as a guarantee of the payment of interest—and I have shown that the annual interest at 6 per cent would amount to only $328,470—so that this surplus would evidently, with the exception of a shortage of only about $240,000, meet the total interest of 6 per cent for the whole period of six years.

Let me remark further that considering the fact that these bonds were put on the market with the virtual assurance to the purchasing public on the other side that the Canadian Pacific Railway would, in a certain number of years, take them up at the price of 110, and considering further that the full interest for six years was guaranteed, less only a matter of $240,000, these bonds must have been satisfactory to the purchasing public. Surely that guarantee ought to have been considered ample. In the last annual report of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I find the fact recorded that the total bond issue of the Calgary and Edmonton Company has been taken up by the Canadian Pacific Railway at par, and that the Canadian Pacific Railway has further paid $500,000 for the paid up capital stock of $1,000,000, which my hon. friend, on a former occasion, told the House was not all paid in cash originally; and at all events, both the bondholders and the railway company seem to have come out of the deal very successfully, wholly apart from the land grant. I have no wish to go further into the merits of this matter or to press it any further, but I would ask my hon. friend to do me the justice of admitting that these facts—which I believe are facts and which I only had in a general way in my mind when making my first allusion—go to show that I did not knowingly and wilfully make any false accusation against him.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). I did not intend to make any reply to this renewed attack upon me, coming at this time of the session. I can hardly understand it. I have explained very fully my connection with this road. I have pointed out where the figures that have been quoted are wrong. I explained that the land was sold with the bonds to a syndicate, which is a very common way of doing these transactions, and that the whole money realized was expended on the construction of the road and in paying the interest. The only point I would make now in reply is regarding my previous statement, which might be misconstrued, from the fact that my name is on the directorate of the present Calgary Railway Company. I made the statement that I was not directly or indirectly connected with the inception of either the Saskatchewan and Long Lake or the Calgary and Edmonton Road. I was not a promoter, in any shape or form, of either of those roads. I came in after the original promoters had failed, and at the request of the late Sir John Macdonald. When I spoke on a previous occasion, I did not know thoroughly the history of the older incorporations; but Mr. Nicol Kingsmill, K.C., whose name is well known to this House, and who had been connected with those two roads long before I had anything to do with them, has given me the following memo concerning their origin and inception:—

October 19th, 1903.

E. B. Osler, Esq., M.P.,
Toronto Club,
Toronto, Ont.

My Dear Osler,—*Re* Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Railway Company.

This company was formed by an amalgamation with the South Saskatchewan Valley Railway Company, a list of the directors of which I now inclose also; a list of the incorporators of the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company.

I was employed by the late Senator MacInnes and Mr. Andrew Onderdonk to endeavour to get the assistance of the government to this railway, after the first 25 miles had been built.

The affairs of the company were in a very low condition financially, and Mr. Onderdonk had been called in by the late Senator MacInnes to endeavour to undertake the construction of the railway. Mr. Onderdonk made an offer to the government, but no arrangement was made, and it was, if I mistake not, some time subsequent to this that you lent your assistance and carried the railway to completion. I was acting for the contractors who constructed the road, but in this you had no interest.

Re Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company:

As regards this company, as you are aware, I was one of the incorporators, and have been upon its board ever since until two or three months ago, when it was passed over to the Canadian Pacific Railway; and I am also aware of all the circumstances which preceded its construction.

The Calgary and Edmonton was preceded by a line called 'The Alberta and Athabasca Railway Company,' incorporated July 20, 1885. The name of this company was changed afterwards to 'The Northwestern Railway Company of Canada,' in 1889. The original incorporators are on the memorandum I inclose, and the directors added by the Act of 1899, you will also find on such memorandum. This company was brought before capitalists in

England, and Praed's Bank were interested in it; one of the Lloyds was sent out to make an examination, and reported so favourably that it was supposed they would be able to finance the transaction; they had a large land subsidy, but no cash subsidy; the land subsidy was 10,000 acres a mile. After attempting to finance the matter, they finally failed; I know this personally, as I went and saw the Praed people in London, and received a letter from them stating that they had been unable to do anything and must withdraw.

After this occurred the government, who were exceedingly anxious that the line to Edmonton should be constructed, as a preventive to further troubles with the Indians, asked Mr. Ross to take up the project, and the Act incorporating this railway company was applied for and obtained at the instigation and request of the government of the Dominion; this I am personally aware of, as I had the conduct of the negotiations with the government at the time, and the making of the contract. It was, if I mistake not, at this juncture, that you first had anything to do with the transaction; and you and Mr. Ross went to England and raised the necessary money. The government were so anxious that this railway should be constructed that they passed the original Order in Council for the subsidy, subject to the sanction of parliament, before such sanction was obtained, and it was upon this order that the financial arrangements in England were commenced.

These facts are shown in the draft petition of right which we were about filing against the government, for the purpose of obtaining a settlement of the land grant, a settlement which was afterwards made. I inclose you a draft of the suggested petition of right, the value to you of which will be that you can absolutely depend upon any statement that is made in this draft being correct, it having been made up for the purpose of having the opinion of counsel. There is a good deal of it which is merely historical, and has relation to the land dispute with the government. Be good enough to send me back this printed draft petition of right in the Exchequer Court, as it is the only copy I have.

Trusting that this will supply the information you needed, believe me,

Yours very faithfully,

(Sgd.) VICAL KINGSMILL.

South Saskatchewan Valley Railway Company, incorporated by 43 Victoria, Chapter 66, assented to May 7, 1880.

Names of persons incorporated :—Andrew Robertson, Donald MacInnis, John Ross, M. H. Cochrane, Duncan McIntyre, J. R. Thibaudeau, James Turner.

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskathewan Railroad and Steamboat Company, incorporated by 46 Victoria, Chapter 72, assented to May 25, 1883.

Names of persons incorporated :—Robert Doull, William B. Scarth, Oliver T. Stone, John A. Mackenzie, J. J. Foy, Edgar Dewdney, Gilbert R. Pugsley.

Alberta and Athabasca Railway Company, incorporated by 48 and 49 Victoria, Chapter 88, assented to July 20, 1885.

Names of persons incorporated :—Henry B. Beard, George F. Jackson, William W. Huntingdon, John S. McEwen, Louis Sands, Arthur T. H. Williams, R. P. Russell, A. B. Nettleton, Samuel P. Snider, C. C. Colby.

Directors added by the Act, assented to April 16, 1889, 52 Victoria, Chapter 65 :—

Mackworth Bulkley Praed, John Maurice Lloyd, John Dale and James Lloyd, all of London, Eng.; Charles T. Drummond, William White, and C. C. Colby.

I do not wish to take up the time of the House at present. The facts are as I have stated. My previous statements to my connection with these companies, and as to the disposition of the land and of the money received, is absolutely correct; and so far from being a company promoter, so far from my having had anything to do with the original conception of that road, that road was forced upon the attention of Mr. Ross and myself afterwards by the late Sir John Macdonald. I shall not weary the House with going into this long petition of rights, but I may say that it contains letters from Sir John Macdonald to Mr. Ross urging him to take the road up and to go forward at once on the Order in Council, and promising that a subsidy would be voted by parliament, and declaring that he would be perfectly justified in submitting his proposition to the capitalists in London. That was done, and the securities were disposed of as I have said, and the money realized from the securities provided for the construction of the railway and for the payment of the interest on the bonds and other debts. Two years ago, when this matter was brought up, I explained very fully my connection with the company. I have only to repeat that every statement I made with respect to that road is absolutely correct.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—PENSIONS.

Mr. ANDREW BRODER (Dundas). Before leaving the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring a matter before the House which should have received the attention of the government before this time, the question of some additional pension to those who served in South Africa and suffered more or less disability. I am sorry to think that men in that position in this country have remained three years without receiving any consideration at the hands of the government. I do not at all advocate that the people of any country should be induced, by what may be offered in the sense of recognition of service, to enlist in the ranks of the army; but I think that the people's gratitude should be expressed towards those who have risked life and limb in defence of the common rights. I have in my own constituency a case which certainly is deserving of more recognition than it has so far been given by the government. I refer to Trooper Mulloy, blind Trooper Mulloy, a boy born and brought up in the county I have the honour to represent. I have known his family for years. They are in every sense respectable, deserving people; and this young man, who is a man of more than ordinary ability, ambitious, active and fairly well educated, went into the South African war and suffered total disability by loosing

the sight of both eyes. He receives, from the British government a pension of 65 cents per day. That is altogether inadequate for the maintenance of an individual in this country. He is now pursuing his course at college, endeavouring to get an education, that he may be able so far as possible, to take care of himself in the world. I am sure I do not appeal to this House in the way of charity on behalf of this young man and others like him ; but I appeal to the sense of justice of those who took the post of danger at the time of the country's trial. When he returned to Liverpool he made what I may call that Spartan speech, that for him the past had no regrets. And that speech has gone around the world wherever the English language is spoken, and it is echoing and re-echoing through this country to-day. That young man is struggling without sight, endeavouring to get an education that he may put himself, even though he has lost his sight, upon an equal footing with other men. And the government have given no attention to these cases—nothing has been done. I bring this forward not to criticise the government, but to try to impress upon them the idea that this is a thing that should be attended to, and that the services of these young men should be recognized. We may talk as we please about this country abroad and in the eyes of the world, but the going of these young men from Canada did more to bring this country into prominence than any other thing that has been done in the last twenty-five years. I refer to Trooper Mulloy, not because I would single him out from among others who are also deserving, but because I am acquainted with all the circumstances of his case, and his case teaches me how deserving all these others are. I am quite aware that these men are not in the same position as the young men, for instance, who went out at the time of the rebellion of 1885, and who received pensions, some of them receiving special treatment at the hands of the government. But, though they are not in the same position towards the Canadian government, I say they are just as deserving. The South African question was a colonial question. It was a question involving the rights of the colonists which were invaded by those who had no right to invade them ; and those who went out to fight for Britain's cause in South Africa were fighting to maintain colonial interests as much as were the men who put down the rebellion in the North-west. I have here a return, brought down for the information of the House of Commons, showing those who received pensions because of disability resulting from services in 1885. I find that some received special treatment ; for instance, Captain Peters received $1,000 a year. That was away above and beyond the ordinary rule.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). And he only lost an arm.

Mr. BRODER. And, as the hon. member says, he only lost an arm, while Trooper Mulloy suffered total disability, and so deserves special treatment at the hands of the government. I am sure the country will bear out the Prime Minister in recognizing the claims of the men who served in South Africa, and I hope he will give this matter his attention at an early day. Three years, I am sure, is quite long enough for these young men to wait, querying whether or not they are to receive recognition from their country. An example has been set up by the people to the south of us. I do not say that we should follow that example. The American people are paying $138,000,000 a year now to men who were in the war of 1861-65. They say to the men who took part in that war : Even though you may have only served in the ranks, your country remembers your service ; and if you are injured or suffer disability even in the ordinary avocations of life, you shall receive a pension. I do not say that I would advocate a similar course in this country. But their example teaches us a lesson. That country is permeated with patriotism so far as American rights are concerned—and we have just had a lesson of that—and their soldiers know that the sympathy and help of their country can be depended upon. I want to say on behalf of these South African boys, that the people of this country, irrespective of party or race, I believe, are ready to support anything reasonable that the government may choose to do in recognition of their bravery.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). I wish to support strongly every word that has been uttered by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Broder). Although he has spoken particularly of one case, he has included all cases. I am ready to support a special recognition of the particular case he mentioned, and I hope there will be a general willingness to support a recognition of all cases of disability suffered by our soldiers in South Africa. I do not know that I can say anything more than he has said, and I do not think I can say it as well as he has said it. But I wish to emphasize everything he has said, and the way he has said it. I can perhaps speak the more feelingly on this matter, because as I have already taken occasion to inform the House, the constituency which I represent sent more men to South Africa than any other in the Dominion of Canada. There are men throughout that constituency who have suffered serious disability because of their patriotism, patriotism of the highest type. I do not wish to imply that the men who served in the North-west in 1885 were anything but soldiers and patriots of the highest character, but if there is any difference it is in favour of the men who went around the world to carry the British flag to victory. Certainly we owe much to those who sacrificed everything for imperial senti-

ment. So far as we were concerned we were in no material danger. But there was danger to the empire which we uphold. These men did not stop to consider the cost to themselves, and we should not stop to consider the cost to ourselves now. When these men went out it was a matter of pride to Canada to pay their wages, and I think it should be ten times more a matter of pride to Canada to see that those soldiers who did her such honour on that occasion and rendered the empire such signal service, should not be dependent on the pittance of pension which is derivable under the British army regulations. That pension list is framed with regard to a certain class of people, to the ordinary soldiers of the British army. But the conditions of the Birtish army and of the class of people who serve in the ranks of the regular army, are different from those which prevail in this country, and amongst the men who served Canada and the empire so well in South Africa, and will be demeaning ourselves if we fail to recognize those fellow-countrymen of ours who did us such great credit; if we fail to recognize their service in some more liberal fashion than we have done so far in leaving them entirely to the support of the British pension list. That would be leaving them without any recognition at all on our part. I believe that without distinction of party, without distinction of race or creed, or anything else, the people of this country will be proud to grant a liberal compensation to every soldier who has suffered physical disability in performing military service in South Africa.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I wish to say a few words merely to indicate my hearty concurrence in every word that has been uttered by the two hon. gentlemen (Mr. Broder) and (Mr. Oliver) who have spoken on this subject. Loyalty and defence of one's country are two of the highest qualities of citizenship, and those who are prepared in the hour of danger to expose and even give up their lives in defence of their country are in my judgment deserving of the highest recognition we can pay them. No reward is too high, no return too great that we can make for their services. It is a well known fact that all civilized countries deal generously with those who perform military service in defence of their flag, and those who have been maimed or have suffered physically while performing military duties have special claims upon our gratitude. The British empire is noted the world over for the care it takes of its defenders. In this country many lives of our valuable citizens have been sacrificed in our defence, many also have been sacrificed in defending the empire where our own country was not directly involved. In both cases I think our soldiers deserve the fullest gratitude of their countrymen. Those who were unfortunate enough to suffer as poor Trooper Mulloy suffered by losing his eyesight, should be especial objects of our commiseration, of our sympathy and our care, and our government should show substantial evidence of our gratitude for what Mr. Molloy has done. It seems to me that it is a crying shame that he should be allowed to go through life without a special compensation, with only the sixty-five cents a day allowed him by the British pension list, and nothing at all from Canada. Has it come to this, that in this enlightened age of the world the only proof we show of our admiration for loyalty, and for those who have endangered their lives and suffered physicial disability in the defence of their country, is the pittance allowed them by the British pension list, and that we in Canada are to do nothing more to mark our gratitude for our own fellow-citizens who have rendered us such signal service? To my mind every man who went out to South Africa, whether he took part in active hostilities or not, if he went out in defence of the empire and in the maintenance of its authority, should be dealt with by us in the most liberal fashion, and we should be prepared to show in some very substantial way our recognition of the very valuable services they have rendered to their country.

Mr. W. A. GALLIHER (Yale and Cariboo). I also desire to add a few words to what has been said by the hon. members who have spoken on this subject. I heartily concur in the remarks they have made. A number of men went out from my own district to the South African war, some of whom have returned and some of whom have lost their lives in that country. Among those who have returned there is now living in the town of Rossland a young man who was a very able and efficient soldier and scout, and who went out both in the first and the second drafts. He has been practically disabled from the exercise of his ordinary calling in life by an accident in consequence of which the muscles of his left arm are withering. I think such a case deserves recognition at the hands of this government. The case mentioned by the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) is an exceptional case, and should be dealt with with exceptional generosity by this government. There are others whose services should also be recognized, although perhaps not as liberally.

I have no doubt that our government are fully alive to this question, and that they will deal liberally with these men who were so unfortunate as to have suffered in consequence of their loyalty, which impelled them to go forth to battle for the empire. There is another matter to which I wish to refer, and I feel a little delicacy in doing so for the reason that I myself was a member of the contingent which went to Egypt and served in the campaign of 1884-5. While most of those who served in the rebellion of 1885 in Canada have received recognition by way of land grants from one or other of

the governments in Canada, no attention has ever been paid to those who took part in the Soudan campaign of 1884-5. If I were the only one concerned, I certainly would never mention it, but there are scattered throughout Canada many men who took part in that campaign, and I may say that they took a part that was creditable to themselves and creditable to Canada. They formed a very efficient corps of the British army engaged in the campaign of the Soudan. I think that while this question of recognizing the services of Canadians in South Africa is being and has been taken up by the government we should not forget those boys who served in an equally dangerous position, as any one knows who has run the cataracts of any waters, while at the same time being exposed to attack from the enemy. Their claim, I think, is one that should also be taken into consideration by the government. This is the first time I have mentioned it, and I think the occasion an opportune one to draw the attention of the government to the claim of these men, who, I think, it will be admitted, are deserving of some recognition.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know that I can add anything to that which has been so well expressed by my hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder) and other gentlemen who have spoken, but I desire to say that, as far as I am concerned, I would heartily support any appropriation by the government for the purpose of doing what I think is no more than justice to these men who have suffered from the service which they have rendered to the country in South Africa. The case of Mr. Mulloy may be taken as an illustration. I have no doubt there are other cases that are equally deserving. I had an opportunity of meeting Mr. Mulloy when he came to Halifax for the purpose of receiving some instruction at a school for the blind in that city. I may say that I induced him to tell me the story of the occasion on which he lost his eyesight, and although it was told with a very great deal of modesty and not putting himself forward in any way, I felt very much impressed by the ability and gallantry which he displayed on that occasion, and I regard him as a man who is eminently deserving of consideration at the hands of the government for the way in which he served his country then. We hailed the departure of these men for South Africa with a great deal of satisfaction. They were acclaimed by crowds cheering them on their departure, and they were met with like receptions upon their return. Taking the case of Mr. Mulloy; he has been deprived of that blessing of sight, a loss which will render his life altogether different in the future from what it would have been. He is a man of great ability, a man who could have looked forward to a distinguished career in this country; he has lost that most precious boon of eyesight in the service of his country, he is now practically incapable of earning his livelihood, he is left in that condition by the country for several years, and not one single dollar has ever been contributed by the country for the purpose of supporting or maintaining him. I do not think this is a condition of affairs which ought to make us proud of this country, and the sooner it is remedied the better. I am aware that the question of pensions might open up a very wide scope if we do not proceed upon some definite principle, but the case of Mr. Mulloy and other men who have incurred disability in South Africa, it seems to me can be dealt with without any danger at all to the public interest. It will impose no great burden upon the country, and any precedent which is fixed by dealing generously with these men will not be a dangerous one. I would very heartily support any measure introduced by the government for the purpose of doing what, as I have said before, is no more than simple justice to these men.

The PRIME MINISTER. The case of Private Mulloy, which has been brought to the attention of the House by my hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder), is one which can not but excite the sympathy of every man who is familiar with it. Private Mulloy not only showed himself to be a good soldier in the field, but he has borne the great misfortune which he sustained in the loss of his eyesight, with a courage and a fortitude which excites the admiration of every one who has been made aware of it. I think that the case of Private Mulloy should not be taken up separately. If we are to deal with this question we ought to deal with it as a whole instead of dealing with the case of one or other of those who have in a greater or less degree suffered in consequence of the discharge of their duty to their country. When the colonies were invited by the British authorities in October, 1899, to take their share in the war in South Africa, the British government undertook to defray certain expenses and undertook at the same time to deal with the matter of pensions. The British government have discharged their undertaking in that behalf, but, according to our notions on this side of the Atlantic, a pension which perhaps might be found adequate in England seems to us strangely inadequate. A pension of 65 cents a day in Canada is not at all what we would expect under similar circumstances. At the same time, I believe it is a fact that the patriotic fund which was raised in 1899-1900, and which, as I understand, reached a pretty high figure, has been made use of for the relief of those who, like Private Mulloy, have suffered in the South African war.

Mr. BRODER. I think he got $1,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know how much he got, but I am under the im-

pression that he received something. I refer to this now, not by way of putting a bar against the application of my hon. friend, but simply as a circumstance taken into consideration at the proper time. I can only say to my hon. friend that on a previous occasion I stated, speaking for the government, that I thought the country would respond to any action which might be taken by us if we were to undertake to deal generously with those who had risked their lives in the war. The matter has been engaging the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden). I am sorry he is not present to-day. In the rush of business of this long session, I am sorry to have to admit that for my part the matter has escaped my attention. I am sure it has not escaped the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence and probably at some day—I cannot say when——

Mr. BRODER. I intimated to the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence that I would bring it up in the House, and he was therefore aware that I intended speaking upon it.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not find fault with that. The Minister of Militia is absent to-day for a very good reason, but if he were present, he could have given the conclusion which he has reached on the subject. I shall make it my duty to call his attention to the matter, and to point out the sympathetic reception it has received from the members of this House.

Mr. S. HUGHES (Victoria). This is the third time this question has been brought before the House during the present session. It, however, was not in reference to this specific case of Private Mulloy, but with general reference to all those who have suffered disability in South Africa. I think the Prime Minister is right in saying that we cannot make Private Mulloy's case exceptional. I have had several interviews with the Minister of Militia and he has expressed himself as prepared to give a favourable consideration to the whole matter. I am pleased to hear the Prime Minister say that he endorses that idea. The approval of the hon. gentleman, of course guarantees its accomplishment. I would point out, that there are many who are partially disabled through the loss of an arm, a leg or one eye, and the money available from the patriotic fund is not at all sufficient to meet the requirements of these cases. I would remind the Prime Minister that, in addition to a moderate pension, these young gentlemen who are partially disabled could be employed in some suitable positions in the public service. In England, a society has been formed to get positions for army reserve men, and for those who have been partially disabled in war, and the employers of England are responding to the objects of the society in a very commendable manner. None of these young Canadians who are partially disabled wish to avoid work, and I suggest now to the Prime Minister that positions might be found for them in the government service. The question of pensions generally, has engaged the attention of various nations. New Zealand has an efficient pension system not only for those who are disabled in the service of the empire, but for those who on account of old age are not able to work longer. The highest statesmen in England have proposed a scheme of old age pensions to be paid from the national resources. I believe that the Prime Minister will be endorsed by every member of this House if before the session closes, he will bring down an appropriation in the estimates to pay a pension to the comparatively few men who have been seriously disabled in the South African war. I am delighted to know that my hon. friend (Mr. Galliher) is one of the old Nile voyageurs, and I congratulate him on bringing the question of a land grant before the House. I trust that the government will give its careful attention to that matter. As an instance of the reasons which some people give for requiring a pension, I may say that an old gentleman came to me and told me that he was out in '37 and '38, and he asked me to advance his claim. As a matter of fact he did'nt fight at all, but he had turned out for two days, and he thought he was entitled to a pension. I asked him which side he fought on, and he said he was on the side of the Loyalists, but I told him that his chances were better for getting some recognition, if he had supported the other side: However that may be, this nation should now turn its attention to compensating in some way, the men who have been disabled in the loyal defence of the empire. Probably there are not more than forty or fifty Canadians who have been permanently disabled in the late war, and I do not believe that one-thousandth part of one per cent of the people of Canada would object to our granting these men pensions.

Mr. MONET. Could the hon. gentleman tell me whether any one of these soldiers who fought in South Africa has received compensation from the insurance fund that we heard so much about in the session of 1900 from Sir Charles Tupper, who then led the opposition ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I suppose at this date it is no harm to mention names, and I may state, that when I made an offer of troops for South Africa, Mr. Hugh Graham of the Montreal 'Star'—who has received so much attention to-day—wired me offering to pay an insurance of $1,000 on the life of each of the thousand men I was anxious to enrol. I understand, however, that this insurance was for loss of life ; I do not think it applied to disability.

Mr. MONET. I understand there was a scale of indemnity attached to it, which was to be granted for partial disablement.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I do not know about that. I was fortunately not compelled to draw upon any such fund, but even if this fund did give an indemnity to men who were disabled, I do not think any one in Canada would object to their receiving in addition some recognition from the state.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I know of two cases quite near my own home, where this insurance referred to by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monet) was paid.

Mr. MONET. Were these men disabled ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They were killed.

Hon. Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER (Pictou). In view of the general expression of opinion from all sides of this House, and the sincere sympathy expressed by the right hon. Prime Minister, it is unnecessary to add anything further to what has been said on the question. I listened, however, with regret, to the statement of the Prime Minister, that there was practically no hope of this question being solved this session, which I understand is rapidly drawing to a close. As the right hon. gentleman says the question is still in the hands of his ministers, and therefore not under the consideration of the government, it seems almost hopeless to expect that it will be brought to an end and that any mature plan will be evolved by the government. Now, I do not interject that for the purpose of attempting to make capital against the government, but I do suggest that in view of this very general feeling in the House something ought to be done; I do suggest that an effort should be made to mature a plan that will work out a solution at once, instead of having the matter thrown over to be dealt with at the next session of parliament.

Mr. EMMERSON. Reference has been made by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) to the desirability of giving employment to the South African veterans in addition to any financial aid which may be given. I think it is but fair to say that the government have acted in that direction. I can bear testimony to the fact that the ex-Minister of Railways has given employment on the Intercolonial Railway in the maritime provinces to a very large number of these men.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE BY MR. SCHELL.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL (Glengarry). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I wish to rise to a question of privilege. When the House was in Committee of Supply, on Thursday last, the 13th, the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid), for the fourth time, I believe, this session, again coupled my name with that of the superintendent of the Williamsburg canal. He had previously stated several times that this gentleman was an appointee of mine, in the course of some remarks not reflecting very favourably on the superintendent of the canal. I have just noticed that as reported on page 14147 of 'Hansard' the hon. gentleman used these words :

> As I mentioned the other night, when he was given this important position, one of the most important positions on the river, a position the occupant of which should know the marine interest thoroughly, he was a school teacher in Glengarry. I do not believe he ever saw a canal before he was placed in this important position—he was the financial agent—I will put it mildly—of the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Schell).

I wish to state, Mr. Speaker,—and I wish to put it mildly—that this statement is absolutely and entirely and unqualifiedly untrue. As I stated before, this Mr. Stewart was at one time, as a young man, a school teacher in Glengarry. Later he was employed in Montreal, Ottawa, and I cannot tell what other places, but during the year 1900 and for I do not know how many years previous to that time, he was not a resident of Glengarry. He was not my financial agent, he was not an appointee of mine, I had no connection with Mr. Stewart. It is too bad, Mr. Speaker, that a member from his privileged position in this House, should go the length that the hon. member for Grenville did, even to attack a government employee. I know Mr. Stewart, and I understand from the department that he is a good and capable officer, and even if he does not suit the member for Grenville, it is not a fair thing that he should be attacked in this manner. I may say that Mr. Stewart is not one of the Glengarry Stewarts ; he was not born in Glengarry, and so far as I know, is not related to the Glengarry Stewarts.

Mr. BRODER. That is a good thing for them.

Mr. SCHELL. We have many Stewarts in Glengarry, and I do not think there is one of them who would descend to such a low moral or political level as to strike an enemy behind his back or to injure him from a privileged ambush as the hon. member for Grenville has undertaken to do on more than three occasions during this session. I am well acquainted with Mr. Stewart ; I may say that he is a friend of mine, but I have had no connection with him. I am not saying this to indicate that it would be any reflection on myself to be connected with him, but simply to state that there never was the slightest ground for any of the statements made by the hon. member for Grenville, and that Mr. Stewart has not been connected with me directly or indirectly, so far as being my political agent, or being appointed by me is concerned.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

FINANCIAL REVIEW.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, probably no one statement ever made in the House of Commons has attracted more attention than the historical one made in the year 1894 by the opposition of that day, that the revenue and expenditure of Canada should be kept at a point about $2,000,000 less than the $38,000,000 which was then the expenditure of the country. These gentlemen did not all agree as to the amount by which the $38,000,000 might be reduced. Some wanted a reduction of $2,000,000; others $3,000,000 or $4,000,000; some $5,000,000; and I think one gentleman would have applied the pruning knife to the extent of $6,000,000. However, if we take $2,000,000 as the more moderate estimate and the more likely to be the correct one and apply that to the expenditure of that day, then, in the opinion of those critics, the ordinary expenditure of Canada ought to be $36,000,000, and its total expenditure, including expenditure on capital account, about $41,000,000. Practically, the promise was made to the people by the gentlemen then representing the Liberal party that if elected they would carry on the affairs of the country for the sum I have just mentioned. No doubt the country did take these gentlemen seriously. No doubt the country understood that, if returned to office, they would reduce the expenditure of the country and the consequent taxation imposed on the people to something like the extent they promised. I need scarcely say that this promised economy has not been carried out. If we will regard the expenditure and income of Canada to-day from that point of view most readily understood, namely, the amount per capita, we will find that since 1896 the revenue, and consequently the taxation, of Canada has increased at a very rapid rate, and that the expenditure of the country has increased in proportion. Instead of the government realizing what the people expected, it has gone in the very opposite direction. Instead of practicing economy it has gone on steadily increasing the burdens of the people and the expenditure of the country. In 1896 the revenue per head was $7.20 and the expenditure $7.26. In 1902, which is the last year for which returns were submitted by the government, the revenue, instead of being $7.20, was $10.64 and the expenditure $9.30, instead of $7.26 per head.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The balance was on the right side.

Mr. BELL. Yes. Last year, taking the figures which we find in the 'Gazette,' the revenue was $11.94 and the expenditure $9.37. Again the balance is on the right side, but there is a very large increase over the figures of 1896. The increase per head since that time is in revenue $4.74 and in expenditure $2.11 per head, so that while this country has had an abundant revenue—and we will have opportunity before I conclude my remarks of tracing the sources of that revenue and showing the manner in which it has been collected and pressed upon the people—the promise of economy has been absolutely set at naught. Instead of maintaining the expenditure at the point fixed by these hon. gentlemen when in opposition, that expenditure has been increased by $2.11 per head. This increase of expenditure has been steady since 1896. The ordinary expenditure of Canada has increased from $37,000,000 in 1896 to $52,000,000 this last year. And the total expenditure has increased from $44,000,000 to $64,000,000. The expenditure has gone up every year since the present government has been in power. Even this last year, in which there was at one time some prospect of economy, the expenditure has increased by $500,000 over that of the preceding year, when it was abnormally large. By these figures we can determine the manner in which the expenditure affects the individual householder. Take the average family at five and a half persons, we find that in 1903 the revenue had risen to $65.67 per family, or $11.94 per head, and the expenditure to $51.54 per family, or $9.37 per head. A very large increase, I need scarcely say, over the figures which were recorded as altogether too excessive by the critics of 1893-4, when the Conservatives were administering our affairs. We would perhaps get a better idea of the steady manner in which the present government has kept increasing the expenditure by taking a series of years and contrasting the seven years from 1890 to 1896—the last seven years of Conservative administration—when the average ordinary expenditure was $37,000,000 and the average total expenditure was $42,000,000, with the subsequent seven years. When we contrast those years with the seven years of Liberal administration of this government, who have been endeavouring very unsuccessfully to carry out their pledges of economy, we find that in those seven years in which this government has been in power, the average ordinary expenditure has increased from $37,000,000 to $44,000,000, and the average total expenditure from $42,000,000 to $54,000,000, making an increase of $7,000,000 in the one case and $12,000,000 in the other. These increases are very large. In the case of ordinary expenditure they amount to about one-fifth of the sum fixed by the Liberal party as that required to carry on the business of the country. These gentlemen went so far as to say that there was absolutely no justification for a larger expenditure. But it is argued by these gentlemen, when they have been challenged from time to time for their failure to make good their promises, that

there is something in the existing conditions which justifies this large expenditure. They say that if the expenditure is great so is the revenue, and that the country can afford an expenditure in 1903-4 which it could not afford seven years ago. They insisted in 1894, not only that the taxation was too high, but that it was oppressive. Well, if we are to judge the affairs of the country by the conditions of its finances, we will find that there is no reasonable ground for that contention. There was no failure, no difficulty whatever in acquiring the revenues required for the use of the country at that time. A very brief survey of the financial condition of Canada in 1894, when these gentlemen were most positive in expressing these strong views, will show that the country provided, without any excessive taxation or any very burdensome impost, all the money required to carry on its business.

For instance, in 1893 the expenditure on account of consolidated fund was $37,000,000 in round numbers, and the total expenditure $41,000,000. In that year the revenue was $38,000,000, or $1,000,000 in excess of the expenditure on account of consolidated fund. In 1894, the expenditure on account of consolidated revenue fund was $37,000,000, and the total expenditure $43,000,000. In that year the revenue was $36,000,000, or about $1,000,000 less than the expenditure on current account. This was a comparatively small deficiency, and one that could easily have been made up by slight additions to the taxation of the country. It was a deficiency moreover which was due to the fact that large deductions had been made, under the capable administration of the Finance Minister of that time, in the taxation imposed upon the country. On the whole, for the two years I have given there was a surplus of $180,000. So, evidently, expenditure and revenue were very nearly balanced in these years. The revenue per head in 1893 was $7.73, and in 1894, $7.29, while the expenditure was, for 1893, $7.46, and for 1894, $7.54. These figures show that under the system of financing at that time in vogue, matters were managed by the government so as to keep revenue and expenditure just about where they should be—that is at almost a perfect balance.

Now, it must further be observed that at that very time we had entered upon a period of depression, a depression which came to its climax in 1895. We were not, as now, in a period of expansion, of buoyant trade, but were approaching the lowest point in one of those depressions which periodically visit all countries. Furthermore, it must be borne in mind in making a comparison of that time and this, that the Finance Minister of that day had withdrawn the duties upon sugar and other articles, and so had relieved the people of taxation to an amount which was estimated, and I think accurately estimated to save to the people in a few years $19,000,000. The great relief afforded to the people of Canada by that immense reduction in taxation accounts very readily for the fact that there were at that time certain small deficits. At present we have an utterly different state of affairs. And, as I have been able to show the fallacy of the argument of the Minister of Customs that the country was in such a position, in the years I have referred to, that they were warranted in reducing taxation and the public debt and curtailing expenditure, so I think I can show that if the government is now in the enjoyment of large revenue, it is because we are not only enjoying all the advantages of a period of prosperity, one of those periods which we, in common with all the rest of the world enjoy from time to time; but because during all this period of expansion, of prosperity, of great volume of business and high prices, the government of the day has not followed a sound financial system, has not relieved the people of taxation that is unnecessary for the purposes of the country, but has maintained throughout this period of expansion taxes which could only be justified under some pressing necessity requiring the government to take from the citizen every dollar that he could spare for the purposes of the government. The present government has not diminished the duties as did the government of which Hon. George E. Foster was the Finance Minister during a period of expansion and great prosperity previous to 1893. On the contrary, coming into power as they did, in 1896, when we were entering upon the period of expansion, of buoyant financial conditions, that we have enjoyed since that time, they proceeded to add to the taxation which had been imposed by Mr. Foster in order to meet the requirements of the country during the hard years of depression. They not only retained the taxes imposed by Mr. Foster, but added to them, and added to them very largely, by imposing taxation upon articles which are of universal use, and, therefore, the articles which most readily respond to the call of the government for increased revenue. Since it came into power, this government, even at a time when the current of business was flowing strong, at a time when we were evidently entering upon a period of good times, increased the duties on sugar, increased the duties on tobacco and increased the duties on spirits, all articles which respond readily to the effort on the part of the government to secure increased revenue. And, not only did they impose those duties, but they have maintained them during their whole period of office, a period when the revenue of the country was sure to be large, trade being buoyant and the business resources of the country greater. During the last year, we find that from sugar, an article on which the people of Canada in the years when these hon. gentleman criticised the government paid a very small duty, this government

has this year derived a revenue of $2,647,274 much greater than the average revenue from this source under the duties previously imposed. From tobacco higher duties have raised $1,642,830 of increased revenue. Thus the government have added to their revenue and their surplus during a period of prosperity, an enormous taxation which could only be justified if the country were in pressing need for an increase of revenue. The present government has refused to reduce these duties, though the necessary consequence of maintaining them is that the taxation of the people per head has been greatly increased. And why have they refused to reduce them ? I suppose it is unnecessary to say to hon. gentlemen who have occupied seats in this House during the last seven years that the government rely for their support in the country largely upon the fact that they are enabled to say to parliament and to the country, from year to year, that they have large revenues and large surpluses. But for this, in my opinion, they would not continue the taxation at the point at which it stands. But, apparently, to the minds of these hon. gentlemen, sound financing is the collection of large revenue, and the best title to the support and admiration of the people is to prove to the people that the government is exacting from them large sums which are not needed to carry on the business of the country during the current year. The large surpluses which the government have had, mean, of course, that large sums in excess of the ordinary expenditure of the country, and of the ordinary requirements of the country, are taken from the citizens by the government.

Now, that is not ordinarily held to be good financing. It has been held to be good financing that the government should pay its way, that the revenue of the country should equal its ordinary expenditure. But in order to maintain matters at a proper level, the capital expenditure of the country is the expedient which has been devised in order to relieve the citizens from an excessive burden of taxation and to prevent the necessity of the government taking from them a larger sum of money than is required to meet the ordinary expenditure of the country. Consequently, to my mind, and I think it ought to be evident to every one, sound financing consists in reducing the expenditure of the country to the lowest point consistent with an efficient administration of the affairs of the country, and at the same time reducing taxation to a point where the revenue will precisely equal ordinary expenditure. Ordinary expenditure should be economically made and kept at the lowest possible point, and the revenue of the country ought to be kept to a point which will precisely meet or slightly exceed that ordinary expenditure. Except living expenses, the ordinary expenses required to meet the administration of the government, to meet the regular everyday requirements of the people, all other works ought to be paid for, not out of the surpluses, which are only produced by excessive taxation, but ought to be paid for by a system of capital expenditure by which the cost of those works will be spread over, not one, two or three years, but over the whole period during which those works will be available, and they will be gradually paid for by the people during the years in which they have the advantage of those expenditures. In this way each year the country pays its ordinary expenses, and in addition, by means of sinking fund, it pays its proportion of the capital outlay for the extraordinary expenditure which the country is required to incur.

Now there is another reason which to my mind makes it clear that a system which enables a government to be in the possession of large surpluses, and to claim credit for them is a most objectionable system. The state, if it is economically and fairly well governed, can always procure money, can borrow money a great deal cheaper than even a rich citizen, and, of course, very much cheaper than a poorer citizen ; and if money is required for capital expenditure, it seems to me it is better financing, and better for the government, and better for the country that the moneys required for extraordinary expenses of the country should be procured by borrowing, and should be repaid by a system of judiciously applied sinking funds, rather than that this expenditure should be made out of surpluses which can only be in the possession of the government in consequence of the taxation of the country for the time, being excessive. There is another objection to surpluses, and one which was urged very strongly and effectively by a gentleman who sat upon this side of the House in the years in which the Conservative party were in power—for during many years when the Conservatives were in power, they did have surpluses to their credit—and that was the fact that the possession of large revenues, the possession of surpluses, the possession of excessive revenues, has a great tendency to lead to extravagance. I do not think we need go very far in considering the estimates, not only of this year, but of the years that are past, to discover that there are reasons to believe that the people of this country have not very far to look in the pages of these estimates to find that the result of large revenues in the hands of this government, has been to largely increase the expenditure, and to induce that extravagance which we had every reason to believe would result in the case of every government that has large surpluses in excess of its needs.

Now, there is another reason still, to my mind, why the taxation should be reduced to the point at which it would meet the ordinary expenditure of the country and no more. There are in the country a certain number of people who have wealth, who

have money to spare, but it is a small class. There is a much larger class to whom money is of great value, who have no money to spare, and on the other hand are for the greatest part of the time in the market borrowing money. Under a system that, without any process of taxation, derives large revenues from that portion of the population which has surplus funds, which has money to spare, we find that in addition to other sums which the present government have borrowed, they have in their hands, and are using, nearly $100,000,000 which were loaned to them practically by the people of this country. They have nearly $40,000,000 of notes in circulation, pieces of paper with the endorsement and guarantee of the government upon them, which are accepted by the people as cash, and for which, of course, the government receives the equivalent of cash. To that extent the whole amount of the circulation of this country, which is nearly $40,000,000, is practically a loan made by the people to the government of the day. Then in the Dominion government savings bank and the postal savings bank of the country there are deposits of some $60,000,000 as well. From that class of people, from the business people who keep the money in circulation, and from the more wealthy people, who use the savings banks as banks of deposit—it is evident that the government to-day is receiving from that class, which has a superfluity and can spare, something like $100,000,000. They receive that at a very low rate of interest, the average interest upon that whole sum is only a fraction under 2 per cent; about 1·87 per cent, I think. Now from these facts it seems clear that the government having $100,000,000 practically in their hands, have already withdrawn from circulation and from the coffers of those who can spare, of those who have money which they do not require, as large a sum of money as can be safely and advantageously contributed to the government by the people. When the government of the day maintains taxation at such a point that it is in a position to point to surpluses such as we have this year, an enormous surplus, then to my mind, the government of the day has taken from the pockets of the people, who require it more than they do, and can use it to better advantage than they can, a large sum of money which would be far better in the pockets of the people than in the coffers of the government. Apart altogether from the fact that a large surplus at the hand of the government over and above what is required for ordinary expenditure, leads to extravagance, apart altogether from that, it is withdrawing from the pockets of the people a sum of $14,000,000 this year, which the country could use to much better advantage than can the government. A great part of the people of this country are borrowers, as a rule they have to pay 6 or 7 per cent for the money which they borrow. The government that requires money in an emergency can borrow money for 3 per cent or less, and to my mind it seems perfectly clear that a system of finance in which any large sum of money is left in the hands of the government in the form of a surplus, is simply a diversion of that money from the pockets of the people, where it would be most productive, to the coffers of the government, where it is not required at all. In fact it is the people who make the surplus. I think I have heard of some cases in which it would almost seem that the members of the government spoke in such a fashion as to lead you to infer that the government created the surplus, that the Finance Minister made the surplus, and deserved all the credit for it. A surplus is made by the people, and to my mind it is made by the people at a loss to their own pockets, a loss to their own interests. They make the surplus and they lose by making it.

Now I have said that these large surpluses mean large expenditures. We know very well that from the date on which this government came into power, the expenditures of the country have grown rapidly. We do not forget the now historic remark of one prominent member of the government, who, when the largely increased expenditure of the government was called to his notice, said: 'Oh, yes, but wait till you see us next year.'

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He is not on this side now. He is on the other side.

Mr. BELL. He is not the Finance Minister on this side. If he is on this side I have not seen him. I am of the opinion that his spirit is evidently on the other side. He is apparently just as much as ever he was the master of the administration in so far as its expenditure is concerned.

Mr. MONET. The hon. ex-Minister of Public Works declared at his last meeting at St. Hugues in the county of Bagot that he had no more confidence in the present government, so that he has passed to the Tories.

Mr. BELL. I presume that no man in Canada is in a better position to judge of the merits of that government and to pronounce what I would fondly hope would be an unbiased opinion in reference to it. One of the instances that go clearly to prove what I have said that the fact is that large sums in the possession of the government tend to extravagance, is to be seen in connection with a very important event in the history of Canada that occurred in 1901. I refer to the late census. The last census taken of this country cost more than twice as much as the previous census under the administration of a government which did not aim at having surpluses, did not boast of having surpluses and did not make it its chief business to have surpluses. The last

census has cost at least $100,000 more than twice as much as the previous census and yet the population of the country enumerated only increased by about ten per cent. There you have an instance of the result of these ideas of a growing and abounding prosperity, there you have an instance of the result of the government approaching a public work with an overflowing pocket, there you can very clearly see the results when those who are doing the business of the country turn to their paymaster with a full knowledge that the government are in possession of an income largely in excess of what is required for the necessities of the country and that they have an overflowing treasury. The census of 1901 has cost $100,000 more than twice as much as the census of 1891.

Mr. TALBOT. It is twice as well done.

Mr. BELL. If it is twice as well done there must be a great many bulletins and volumes to be issued that we have not yet seen to justify this large expenditure. In my opinion it is not half as well done. If it is twice as well done it must be in the province of the hon. member who interrupted me (Mr. Talbot) where there is a great advance in population which will require further investigation. It will be found that throughout all these expenditures the cost of enumeration is doubled not only in one county but in every county. Whether the population has increased or not the cost of the census has doubled. It is evident that if the cost of enumeration is twice as much as the cost of the previous one, then the compilation has cost more than $100,000 more than twice as much as the cost of the compilation in 1891. It has not yet been completed and from what I have been able to learn it is not likely to be completed. The cost of the census gives an admirable instance of what results from the government administering the affairs of the country in such a manner as to have a large surplus. It shows that not only in one county, one office, or one division of the country but that in every county, every office and every division of the country the cost of administering the affairs of the country has increased enormously and that it has more than doubled. In reference to the civil government of this country which has to do with the ordinary every day administration of affairs the same result is to a certain extent true. The estimates of this year show that the cost of civil government has increased about $40,000. Increases are given everywhere and in addition to that we have just passed through this House Bills for the purpose of increasing the remuneration of different officers, and the cost of civil government, which, it has been estimated by a speaker on the government side of the House, will require a further expenditure by the government of $80,000, so that practically we will see an increase of $120,000 in the cost of civil government for this present year. The cost of civil government in 1902—3 was $1,365,244 and next year it will approach $1,500,000. The increase in the cost of civil government is not an exception. It merely indicates what is the rule. In the Immigration Department we have an increase of $150,000 with no corresponding increase of immigrants. There is a large immigration coming into the country from the west but it is not coming in as a result of this large expenditure. The large expenditure made by the government of the country has not brought into the country any immigration of a valuable character. In fact there is a large movement out of the country. Not only has the exodus not been stopped by any acts of the government or by immigration work but the fact of the matter is that the exodus from the eastern part of Canada, as well as the volume of settlers' effects going into the United States, is increasing. I will give a few of the increases in expenditure since the year 1896:

Service.	Increase.	Per Cent of Increase.
Interest on the debt ..	$ 473,005	5
Administration of justice	191,960	25
Civil government	100,741	7
Miscellaneous and contingencies	973,757	566
Public works (capital).	2,921,948	225
Inspection of staples ..	10,933	420
Immigration..	374,643	311
Quarantine..	169,491	178
Ocean and river service.	314,739	174
Public works (revenue).	339,053	213

These are a few instances of what is the rule as may be found by reference to the columns showing the expenditure in the public accounts. The rule is that the expenditure of every department has increased excepting one, and that is the expenditure in reference to the census. The census column shows no increase whatever because the census figures have not been placed under the heading of census. They are mixed up with other items under the heading of Arts, Agriculture and Statistics. This is one of the particular cases in which the most glaring manifestation of extravagance is afforded and yet there is nothing to be seen in the public accounts at all relating to that expenditure. An enormous increase will be noticed in the item of miscellaneous which is a very comprehensive subject and a very convenient heading under which to include many items which it is not desirable should be too specifically treated in the accounts.

It is very natural to inquire as to how these immense increases have come about. We find the government guilty of some of the most amazing expenditures. We find a wharf at Grand Vallee, in the province of Quebec, which cost $50,000, built for a private individual and not for the public service—a present of $50,000 given to one man. Naturally a government with a surplus of

$13,000,000 or $14,000,000 is not going to be too severe on a good supporter, and twenty good supporters at $50,000 each would only cost $1,000,000. We had another amazing expenditure of $50,000 for plugging a hole in the Yukon; for undoing work that never should have been done. In Ontario we have seen a wharf costing $10,000, built where there is no population, and where there is no necessity for a wharf. This government, with an overflowing treasury, cannot be too hard on men who approach them with a pull or with influence. We have evidence on the St. Lawrence canal works to show that, apparently, expenditures are going on of their own accord and beyond the control of the government. We see contracts carried on by the owners of a dredge at their own sweet will, and apparently the government could not stop it. There is lots of money in the treasury, and when contractors have a dredge, why should they not put it to work and present their bills to the government and collect the accounts. Hon. gentlemen who have watched the estimates this year know of many such cases as I have enumerated. Nine years ago these gentlemen on the treasury benches, when they sat in opposition, contended that an annual expenditure of $38,000,000 was $2,000,000 too much, and that an expenditure of $36,000,000 a year was an ample expenditure for the public services of Canada. But nine years afterwards they are in power and their main estimates for the financial year 1902-3 amounted to $59,061,934.90, and their supplementary estimates for the same financial year amounted to $5,390,968.27, or in all, for the year ending the 30th June last, this House voted $64,425,903. These gentlemen opposite advocated an expenditure of $36,000,000 nine years ago, and while they still seem wedded to the figures '3' and '6,' it unfortunately happens that they have reversed the order of these figures, and they have deliberately expended over $63,000,000. In the main estimates for the current year, we voted $57,109,974.35. These main estimates, when they were submitted, indicated an evidence of economy, as they were less than the main estimates of the previous year, but that was only the first chapter of the story, because later on during this session, we were presented with supplementary estimates amounting to $10,590,863.12, and just a few weeks ago we had a batch of further supplementary estimates amounting to $771,365.55. In the supplementary estimates there was an addition of 20 per cent to the expenditure in the main estimates. We, therefore, have estimates for the current year amounting to the enormous sum of $68,472,203.02. This year we voted 9·1 per cent to supply the deficit on the estimates of the previous year, and if next year we are called upon to vote the same proportion of 9·1 per cent to be added to the total estimates we have voted this year, then the total amount of the estimates for this year, 1903-4, will have amounted to $74,703,173.49.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). What will it be in five years ?

Mr. BELL. Five years hence a better, and a wiser, and a more economic government will be in power, and the expenditure will be reduced. Evidently the Minister of Finance has been unable to keep a check upon the treasury as effectively as he could have wished. In his budget speech, delivered last April, he estimated the expenditure for the coming financial year at $61,650,000. He apparently did not do justice to his government or to the appetite of his supporters, because the expenditure for the year has reached almost $64,000,000, an increase of nearly $3,000,000 over the estimate by the Minister of Finance in April last.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Where does my hon. friend get these figures ?

Mr. BELL. From the budget speech.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, but the hon. gentleman is saying that the actual expenditure is $64,000,000.

Mr. BELL. I have added the regular estimates of last year and the supplementaries for the last year which have been passed this session.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no need of taking estimates when the actual figures of the outlay have been given in the House.

Mr. BELL. Would the Minister of Finance be kind enough to give the exact expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is $62,074,000, which includes everything.

Mr. HENDERSON. When were those figures laid before the House ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Some time ago; I do not know the exact date.

Mr. BELL. I was not able to find these figures anywhere. In that case, the Minister of Finance has exceeded, by about $424,000, the estimate made by him in April last.

Mr. MONET. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell) estimated that the expenditure was $68,472,000.

Mr. BELL. No, I said it was $64,000,000. But when we consider the expenditures we are going to make next year, or that we have become liable for, then the situation becomes startling. Although the figures this year are enormously large, they are small in comparison with the possibilities of the expenditure which the government has provided for in the future. For instance, in the last week of this session, we have voted $13,500,000 for railway subsidies, and we are asked to vote nearly $7,000,000 for the

Quebec bridge. $20,500,000 are voted in the last days of the session. Of course, it may be argued that all this money will not be spent in the course of the year, and that we will not be called upon to pay the whole of it, but it is added to our liabilities, and there is the possibility that we may be called upon to pay it. I have prepared a table to show the liabilities of this country as assumed by parliament this session, including the estimates, subsidies, proposed expenditures for railway construction, and guarantees, I find that we have voted :—

Supplementary Estimates, 1903	$ 300,000 00
Estimates, 1903....	5,090,968 27
Estimates, 1903-4....	54,109,974 35
Supplementary Estimates, 1903-4..	10,590,865 12
Supplementary Estimates, 1903-4..	771,365 55
	$70,863,173 29
Railway subsidies....	$13,300,000
Iron bounties....	1,248,359
Lead bounties....	300,000
Grand Trunk Pacific....	120,000,000
Guarantee G. T. Pacific....	31,000,000
Guarantee Canadian Northern bonds.	9,360,000
Guarantee Quebec bridge bonds....	6,900,000
Guarantee Civil Service increases..	80,000
	$253,051,532

We have voted railway subsidies amounting to $13,000,000.

For iron bounties we have a liability accruing, which if equal to what it was last year, will be $1,248,359.

We have for lead bounties a liability of $300,000.

We have for Grand Trunk construction, taking what I consider to be a perfectly conservative estimate, a liability of $120,000,000.

Then we guarantee the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway bonds, $31,000,000, assuming that the prairie section is 1,000 miles in length and the mountain section 600 miles in length.

We have guaranteed the Canadian Northern bonds to the amount of $9,360,000.

We will be asked in the course of the next few hours to guarantee for the Quebec bridge $6,900,000.

We have voted civil service increases which are estimated to cost the country $80,000 and the total sum of money voted, or for which the country is made liable in the course of the present year, reaches the enormous total of $253,051,532.

Then in addition to that there are several unconsidered trifles, there are a further increase to the iron and steel bounties, a bounty on binder twine, &c., all of which when put together may be expected to bring up the total liabilities to $253,100,000.

That seems to be a record which is not likely to be surpassed even by the present government for some time to come, no matter what opportunities they may have to spend money.

Mr. BELCOURT. Does my hon. friend object to the expenditure caused by the increase to the salaries of the civil servants which were recently passed ?

Mr. BELL. I suppose that as an opposition we are here to criticise and examine the expenditure of the government and while we are not indisposed to see the civil service increases made it is perfectly legitimate for us when we are examining the liabilities and obligations of the country to include this expenditure. I have no objection to making reasonable increases in the salaries of the civil servants.

Mr. BELCOURT. You do not object to it now ?

Mr. BELL. I am not objecting to it ; I am giving the results of the benevolence of the government. The government has a tremendous capacity for spending money and they justify that expenditure to the country always with the same story : Everything is prosperous, Canada has never been so prosperous as since we have been in power. 'Post hoc, ergo propter hoc' is not a very sound argument, but apparently it is thought by the government to be good enough for their purpose. But, after all, a very little examination will show that the surpluses of which they are boasting are partly derived by adopting a financial system different from that which existed when they came into power. For instance, under the preceding government and under this one up to a certain point, the iron bounties which we give in lieu of increased protection were paid out of current revenue; they are now paid out of capital account and the consequence is that every dollar paid out in iron bounties is a direct addition to the surplus of the year. Last year this country paid $1,242,218 for iron bounties and if this amount had been paid under the system of financing adopted by the late government the surplus would be less by $1,242,218. I presume that the increased bounties on iron and lead and binder twine and all expenditures of a similar character will be paid—in the case of the iron bounties they will certainly be paid—in the same way. Consequently you cannot fairly compare the surpluses of this government with those of the government that preceded it. The policy of the government is to keep taxation at the highest point at which the people will bear it, and to charge up to capital account every part of the ordinary expenditure of the country they possibly can. They have done that in the case of the iron bounties and in the case of a great deal of the expenditure on railways. It is undoubtedly a fair criticism of the administration that a large expenditure, aggregating nearly $1,000,000, upon the Intercolonial from year to year, which ought to be charged to revenue is charged to capital account. The government keeps up their sur-

plus by maintaining taxation at a very high point and charging to capital account every dollar they can justify themselves in charging to capital account and a great many dollars which they cannot justify to any sound financier. In this way they make the surpluses appear much larger than they really are. The probability is that sound financing would reduce the surplus of the present government by nearly $3,000,000, and if you take off in addition to that the large increase in taxation which has been put on the necessaries of life, sugar, tobacco, and spirits, the surplus would be reduced by $1,500,000 more. Thus their boasted surpluses are not as large as they appear. A favourite argument of this government in defending itself from charges by the opposition in the House or the country is to assert that the members of the opposition have not challenged or divided the House upon the items in the estimates.

Mr. MONET. Hear, hear.

Mr. BELL. My hon. friend says hear, hear; he apparently concurs in that view. I am surprised to hear him say that in the House of Commons; if he was speaking on the stump in some of the more remote hamlets in his constituency it might be effective.

Mr. MONET. It was.

Mr. BELL. In this House where everyone is familiar with the manner in which the government is carried on, it is known that the opposition would keep parliament in session for ever by challenging every item; it is the business of the opposition to criticise and to let the government make the expenditure.

Mr. McCREARY. Why did my hon. friend not object to these very large sums which were voted in Nova Scotia last week for wharfs, railway subsidies, &c. He took all he could get.

Mr. GOURLEY. There were only $300,000.

Mr. BELL. What would be the result if we had to challenge every one of those items.

Mr. McCREARY. Perhaps some of the members on this side would have voted with you.

Mr. BELL. I have seen propositions submitted by gentlemen on this side of the House which were much more likely to induce support from hon. gentlemen opposite, yet, they received absolutely no support.

Mr. McCREARY. There was one subsidy challenged and only one member of the opposition voted with the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) against it.

Mr. BELL. Such criticism is perfectly idle. It is not possible for an opposition to call for a vote on every item. These items are submitted by the government, which has a majority at its back or it would not be in office, and that majority is bound to put every item through.

Mr. MONET. Would not some hon. gentleman opposite have voted with the government, and is not that the reason the vote is not challenged?

Mr. BELL. No, that is not the reason. There are many items in the estimates which could be challenged but it would be perfectly vain to challenge them. At all times it has been the practice of the opposition to criticise the items and allow them to pass. To challenge item by item would simply mean division after division and the result would be the same. No more idle and foolish criticism can be addressed to an opposition than to attack them because they do not challenge all the items. There may be from time to time some items which are challenged. But the usual course for the opposition is to criticise and leave the government to assume the responsibility. In this way I have reviewed all the evils of the government system—its exorbitant taxation and expenditure and its failure to implement the pledges it gave in opposition. So many members of the cabinet to-day were leaders of the late opposition that it is impossible for them to evade the responsibility for the pledges given by the Liberal party at that time. They made the most positive pledge to reduce the taxation and the debt and the expenditure. They have absolutely failed to keep any one of these promises. Instead they have gone to an enormous length in the very opposite direction, to such a length that apparently their great object is to emphasize their own disapproval of the opinions they expressed in the past. These very gentlemen who appeal to the people on the ground that they were economists, who would reduce taxation and expenditure and our national debt, now that they are in office, evidently have changed their opinions and are appealing to the same people to keep them in power because they have out-Heroded Herod in everything in the shape of increased taxation and expenditure and general extravagance. I maintain that it is not the duty of the opposition to challenge every item or even very many items of the expenditure. Such a course would hopelessly delay parliamentary business, with no satisfactory result. But I think it is imperative that we should from time to time, remind these hon. gentlemen of their utterances while in opposition, recall to the attention of the people the statements they made, and point out how far they have departed from those sound principles of government and finance which they laid down when out of office. Everybody must admit that economy is a good thing, that we should keep taxation at the lowest possible point, and that any taxa-

tion which takes a dollar more from the people than is required for the administration of public affairs is diverting money from a profitable to an unprofitable channel. Such a policy encourages extravagance, it increases the burdens of the country, and launches the country on a course of wild expenditure, from which it is exceedingly difficult to turn back. Therefore, I would move :

That all the words after the word 'that' in the proposed motion be left out and the following substituted therefor :—

The total expenditure during each fiscal year from 1891 to 1902, both inclusive, was as follows :—

1891	$40,793,208
1892	42,272,136
1893	40,353,728
1894	43,008,834
1895	42,872,338
1896	41,702,383
1897	42,972,756
1898	45,334,281
1899	51,542,635
1900	52,717,467
1901	57,982,866
1902	63,970,600

That the Finance Minister estimated that the expenditure for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, would be $61,650,000.

That the regular estimates and the supplementary estimates voted for the year ending June 30, 1903, amounted to $64,452,903.17.

That on this estimate of the Finance Minister the annual expenditure on both consolidated fund and capital account has increased between 1897 and 1903 by a sum of $18,677,244 or on basis of estimates voted by a sum of $21,480,147.

That during the period above named the revenues of the country have been unusually large, and yet the public debt has not been kept at the point where it stood in 1897, but at the end of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, showed an increase of $13,331,651.85.

That the sums voted at the present session of parliament amount to $73,863,171.29 of which $68,472,203.02 are for the current year.

That in addition to the sums so voted large increases of the public expenditure have been made which are authorized by statute to be paid out of consolidated fund. Among these are railway subsidies over thirteen million dollars.

That this House desires to place on record the opinion that the expenditure for the year 1903 and the proposed expenditure for the year 1904 are excessive and extravagant, and that it views with alarm the course of the government towards ever-increasing expenditure, its failure to reduce the public debt by maintaining a high rate of taxation, and its adding to capital expenditure and to the obligations of the country enormous sums for which the country cannot receive adequate returns.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Whatever difficulties we may have with respect to economy in other matters, I think we have reached the stage in the business of the session when we can all agree that economy of speech is desirable. Therefore though my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) has covered a very considerable ground—I will not say at much length—and has referred to many questions which would tempt one to occupy time, I shall deem it necessary to condense my remarks as much as possible, and, for that reason, to deal only with what I regard as the chief points. I think my hon. friend labours under a great difficulty, which is common to all hon. gentlemen on that side. These hon. gentlemen seem to be utterly unable to appreciate the changes which have come over this country since the days of 1896 with which they make comparisons. Perhaps it is not unnatural that they should experience that difficulty. When we recall the predictions they made as to the dreadful things that would happen to this country if a Liberal government should come into power, and when we recall what has happened since that day ; when we contrast the reality with the predictions of my hon. friends : when we realize that the public appreciate the great change that has taken place, perhaps we should allow hon. gentlemen the privilege of still shutting their eyes to the great facts which are apparent to the public at large. I would like to say to my hon. friend that the speech he has made and the resolution he has moved would be alarming, if we had not had a number of such speeches and a number of such resolutions in previous years towards the close of the several sessions under Liberal rule. I remember that in the first session in which the Liberal government took charge of affairs, in 1896, the distinguished gentleman who then occupied the position of the leader of the opposition, in a very eloquent and vigorous address declared that it was a moral certainty that the government would come out at the end of the fiscal year with a most disastrous showing, that they would have a deficiency of some $3,000,000. At the end of the year the deficiency proved to be a very modest one—some five hundred odd thousand dollars if my memory serves me well. And every session since that time, we have had one of these alarmist speeches, and one of these alarmist resolutions, in which all the moneys we have voted have been rolled up into one great sum with a view to persuading the people that, under the financial legislation of the session, nothing but disaster could come upon this afflicted country. But somehow or other, when the end of the year has been reached and the accounts have been made up, the people have discovered that the finances of the country have prospered, that these dreadful things have not happened, that the world has moved on in a very nice and comfortable way, and that Canada, instead of being obliged to face deficits, as in the past has enjoyed an era of very comfortable surpluses. And so, I venture to say the citizens of Canada, reminded as they will be of these dreadful speeches and dreadful anticipations of former times, will understand that the speech made and the resolution moved to-night by my hon. friend from Pictou is only another one of these alarms which they are not just-

ified in taking too seriously. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been crying out these alarms year after year and session after session, so they must not be surprised if the people no longer take much stock in them.

I do not attempt to deny the apparent fact that the expenditure of this country has grown very largely since 1896. But it has grown for good and proper purposes. Instead of apologizing for that expenditure, we are proud to refer to it, because that expenditure, we believe, has been one of the instrumentalities which have brought about the growth and the progress of the country since 1896. The growth and progress and prosperity of Canada for the last few years, undoubtedly, have come from the industry, intelligence, energy and thrift of the people. But all these qualities would have been vain if they had not beeen assisted by wise legislation; and we believe that this government and this Liberal party, by their financial legislation as well as by other measures, by the liberality and wisdom of their public expenditure, have been doing much to help the people to produce the splendid results which the records of the country place before them.

We have spent more money. Let me take a few of the principal classes of our expenditures as compared with 1896. We spent last year $846,345 more on militia than was spent in 1896. Is there any hon. gentleman opposite who objects to that expenditure? Do not we know that, far from opposing the militia expenditure, there has been a tendency on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to demand larger expenditures on this service? Do not we know that, again and again suggestions have been made by these hon. gentlemen with regard to the militia of the country which would involve us in very large expenditures? So, I may fairly ask my hon. friends opposite to agree with me that, in that great item where we have spent almost $1,000,000 more than in 1896, there is no room for criticism. We expended in 1903 on public works about $2,750,000 more than was spent in 1896. Sir, these expenditures have covered the whole face of the Dominion, and they have been wise and useful expenditures. It would be foolish for any of us to claim that, in the expenditure of so much money from ocean to ocean, employing a vast army of officials and servants, every man engaged has been absolutely faithful to a cent; it would be foolish to say that in no case had a mistake been made; it would be foolish to say of the men employed in public affairs, any more than of men employed in private affairs, that all are perfect. But, take it all in all, I do not hesitate to say in the light of all the inquiries that have been made, that these expenditures on public works have been wise and useful expenditures, and have been instrumental in helping on the progress and prosperity of the country. We spent on the lighthouse and ocean service of Canada $498,000 in 1903 more than was spent in 1896. Shall we apologize for that expenditure before the people of Canada today? No. Are we not a great maritime country? Have we not our great waterway, the St. Lawrence, which must be improved with buoys, lights and all the various aids to navigation? Have we not our coast line in Quebec and the maritime provinces, as well as in British Columbia, where we must have lighthouses and all the other improvements which protect the mariner? We have been expending money for these services; and, far from regretting it, far from apologizing for it, we say that in face of criticism such as hon. gentlemen have offered tonight that we are prepared to provide the money and do the work, and let the world know that our national highway is a highway of safety for the commerce of nations. We spent $100,000 more on the fishery service in 1903 than we spent in 1896. Shall we apologize for that? Is there a man in this House who does not recognize the importance of the great fishing industry of this country? Is there one who does not recognize the obligation resting upon us to nourish and encourage and protect that industry? We have spent more money, and, no doubt, as the days roll on, the minister in charge of that great department will find it necessary to spend still more; and, if he is able to spend it with the same justification as can be given for the expenditure in the past, we shall not need to apologize before the people of Canada for that use of their money. We spent on the service of immigration in 1903, $526,000 more than was expended in the year 1896. Shall we, in the face of what we have seen in the west, apologize before this House for that increased expenditure? The little that hon. gentlemen opposite spent in 1896 accomplished nothing. Every dollar that has been expended in the immigration service of this country under the present administration has brought a rich harvest for the present and will bring a richer harvest for the future of Canada.

My hon. friend from Pictou says that in that respect there is an exodus from the lower provinces. We have discussed that question before, and I say to my hon. friend that there is, there has been for a great many years, and I imagine there always will be, some movement of population from those provinces. They are an adventurous people who live by the seaside, their tendency is to go abroad, and I do not expect the time will ever arrive when that movement will not be found to some extent. But I do take the responsibility of saying to-day that throughout the lower provinces there is a better condition in that respect than there has been at any other time during the last quarter of a century. I say there are fewer people leaving the maritime provinces, and I say that in most parts of the maritime

provinces the question to-day is not one of an exodus, the question is to find men to labour on the works which are opening up all over these provinces.

We have spent $565,000 more in connection with our sinking fund. That is a mere matter of book-keeping, it adds nothing to the burden of the country, it is an assistance to the redemption of the public debt, and whether it be large or small, it is practically a provision for redemption, and our obligations are not in any sense increased. We have spent more money on the administration of justice—my hon. friend called attention to that. I have not the figures he used, but it is a curious thing for my hon. friend to select that as the subject of complaint, when we have in our mind the fact that only a few days ago, when there was a discussion in this House with regard to the salary of judges, almost without exception every hon. gentleman who rose on the other side asked that the salaries of the judges be increased. What is the use of the hon. gentleman standing up and denouncing an expenditure when he knows that the general feeling of the men around him is rather in favour of increasing that expenditure than of reducing it ?

We spent last year on the item of the customs service, $332,000 more than in 1896. I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen opposite will go throughout the country and will point to the fact that under the administration of my hon. friend the Minister of Customs the expenditure has increased to that extent ; but they will forget to mention the fact that by means of that increased expenditure of $332,000, he is able to show an increase in the revenue of $17,170,000. There was an increase in the expenditure in connection with excise of a little more than $8,000 last year, as compared with 1896 ; but that slightly increased expenditure was incurred in the machinery for collecting a revenue which increased to the extent of $4,087,000. We spent last year on expenditure chargeable to the consolidated fund on account of the post office, $440,000 more than in 1896 ; but on the other side of the account, which hon. gentlemen are careful not to mention, the revenue was increased by $1,443,000. We increased the working expenses of the Intercolonial—practically they were doubled—we increased them about $3,184,000, but every dollar of that increased expenditure in the working of the Intercolonial, apart from the capital account, came back to us in something more than a dollar in the increased revenue which came from the road.

My hon. friend, in presenting his bill of alarm, magnified the figures of the railway subsidies as much as he could, and he made, not for the first time this session, the statement that these subsidies have been brought down at the end of the session when there is not time to consider them. I have taken the trouble to look into the record of the former government on that question, and I find that beginning with the year 1885, there never was a single occasion in the history of the Conservative government when these railway subsidies were brought down as early as they have been in the present session. These subsidies were placed on the notice paper of the House of Commons on October 6. I suppose, if things move prosperously, we may look forward to what the Prime Minister sometimes describes as the blessings of prorogation, at the end of the present week. Assuming that we shall close on Saturday next, though I hope it will be Friday, I want to point out that there will then be eighteen clear days from the time these subsidies were brought down until it is contemplated parliament will prorogue. Compare that with what happened in the days of the Conservative administration. I find that in 1894 they brought their railway subsidies down five days before the session closed ; in 1893, five days before the session closed ; in 1890, four days before the session closed ; in 1887, three days before the session closed ; and in the whole record of all these years, the longest period that they ever allowed for the consideration of the railway subsidies—and that was in one year only—was a period of twelve days. So I am able to say to my hon. friends that they have no cause of complaint with regard to the manner in which these subsidies have been brought before the House. This has been a busy session. It is not the business of the government to load down the Order Paper with a vast amount of business that cannot be digested by the House ; it is the business of the government to keep the House supplied fully with leading and important measures, and there never has been a session of parliament in which that duty has been better performed than it has been by this government during the present session.

My hon. friend deals with these railway subsidies as if they were to be expended all in one year. He does not say that, but the manner in which his speech is framed and his resolutions are framed, will convey the impression, I am afraid, as it has in the past, that the sums mentioned will all be expended in one year. Now my hon. friend knows and will admit that that would be a very erroneous impression.

Mr. BELL. I think I stated that these would not be all expended in one year. Perhaps the hon. gentleman did not notice that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Then the question arises, why they should be included in dealing with the expenditure for one year, for my hon. friend realizes that these subsidies in some cases will never be expended at all. The experience of the past is that some companies which come forward and induce the government to grant these subsidies, come forward in good faith,

find that they cannot finance the undertaking. In some cases it has happened in the past, that the amounts have not been paid at all. That will no doubt happen in some cases in the present instance; but even in cases where these railways are undertaken it will take several years to construct them, and this vast sum of money which my hon friend includes in his bill to frighten the citizens of Canada, will, so far as it becomes payable at all, cover a number of years. In answer to a question put in the House a few days ago, I was able to state that in the term of ten years the subsidies granted to the various lines of railway, approximated—because as respects some of them, you cannot fix the exact amount to $27,000,000; yet the actual figures of expenditures show that during those ten years the payments for subsidies only amounted to $15,000,000. So if we follow the experience of the past and strike a fair average, what we shall probably have to pay, taking one year with another, will be about $1,500,000 each year in railway subsidies. That will not be an excessive sum when we consider the splendid territory it will develop, and the disposition that is manifest now from ocean to ocean to take up new enterprises with more courage and more hope than ever existed in former years.

But, Sir, I observe that my hon. friend, while contenting himself with these general denunciations, does not attempt to indicate any particular item, either in the railway subsidies or in any other portion of our public expenditure, with which he can find fault. I should perhaps make an exception, because he has mentioned one or two items—I do not remember the exact figures, I suppose altogether $15,000 or $20,000 for two public works. But at whatever sum my hon. friend may place them, where does he find himself then? We have appropriations which run up to, I think he said, $200,000,000 or more. My hon. friend has the figure, but, whatever it is, he has not ventured to move to strike out any of those items, but he stands up and denounces them generally. I think he said it is $200,000,000 or more.

Mr. BELL. More than that.

The FINANCE MINISTER. But, whatever it is, he has not ventured to move to strike out any of these items, but he stands up and denounces them all generally. He may say that as respects the transcontinental railway he did record his vote against it, but he did so at the same time that his leader brought forward another scheme that everybody knows was more expensive than the one that we proposed. If my hon. friend goes back to the grand old county of Pictou, talks as he has talked to-night and denounces these railway subsidies, one can imagine an old Scotchman standing up and saying: My friend, did you vote against them? No. Why didn't you? You moved a resolution that this expenditure was extravagant, that the country was alarmed—why did you not record your vote? My hon. friend will probably say: I could not very well do that, because some of these subsidies were going down into my own county. That would be all right, if my hon. friend would only take a broad-minded view of the matter. He knows that these subsidies are voted for his own county for useful and necessary works. In the vast territory which we have in Canada, no one man or set of men can have a knowledge of affairs from ocean to ocean which will enable them to judge of the requirements in the different provinces of Canada. But every section of this Dominion is represented in this House, and each group of members has its own local knowledge of its own province, so that it is possible for hon. gentlemen opposite to obtain a general idea of the wisdom or unwisdom of these expenditures. I feel quite sure, from what I know of the hon. member for Pictou, that if he thought that these expenditures were unwise, alarming, rash and extravagant, as he says in his resolution, he would not be content with vague denunication, but he would move to strike the objectionable items out. True, my hon. friend asks: What is the good of doing that since we will vote vote against it? Yet that does not prevent my hon. friend from moving this resolution that we are probably going to vote against it. We have this vain, indefinite, academic resolution, which means nothing and leads to nothing. Unless my hon. friend is prepared to move a practical resolution, which would strike out a railway appropriation, or the appropriation for some great public work, I am afraid that the House and the country will not attach very much importance to the resolution which he has moved. I am quite sure that the astute, intelligent people of Canada, not only in his province, but in all the other provinces, will say that when hon. gentlemen opposite take that ground they cannot be very serious in their denunciations of this lavish expenditure. But, Sir, if economy is desirable, and if it is not to be obtained from this government, where are the afflicted people of Canada to obtain it? From hon. gentlemen opposite? The wildest dream of the most unreasonable person in this Dominion would never expect a policy of economy from a Conservative government. From time immemorial they have declared for economy, but they have not practiced it and they do not even practice it now. Hon. gentlemen opposite know that I am calling their attention to a simple truth when I say that in nine cases out of ten when they rise to discuss some public expenditure, it is for the purpose of asking that the government do something on a more liberal scale than we have been doing in the past. We ask them, as we have done in the past, to point out anything that is wasteful or extravagant. They cannot do it. Usually the Public Accounts Committee

is the body that investigates these things. I venture to say that never in the history of this Dominion was there such a farce as the meetings of the Public Accounts Committee during the present session. We could not get the hon. gentlemen to attend. They used to come and introduce a motion that somebody be summoned, they would give notice that they intended to move to inquire into something, but when the time came for them to make the motion, they would not be there, or they had not called the witness, or something else would happen, and really the thing became laughable in the end. The Public Accounts Committee adjourned, and there was practically no inquiry into the public accounts of the past year. Why ? Not because hon. gentlemen opposite were not able, not because they were too generous to avoid an inquiry in the expenditures of the government, but simply and solely because they found there was no ground for attacking the expenditures of the government. I have said that if economy is not to be expected on our side there is very little prospect of it from hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not know a case in which hon. gentlemen opposite have advocated economy. We brought down what we thought to be a wise proposal in reference to a great transcontinental railway. Hon. gentlemen opposite were not content to simply negative that, but they had to bring forward a policy of their own, which certainly could not have the merit of being more economical than the one the government proposed. We have a provision on the statute-book authorizing us to spend $750,000 for a fast Atlantic line, and we have been looking for somebody to do the work for this appropriation. Hon. gentlemen opposite stand up and move a resolution scoffing at the idea of our being able to get a fast Atlantic service for $750,000 a year, and telling us that we must get a fast line, cost what it will. Then, in order to make the thing if possible a trifle more ridiculous than that, about three-quarters of the hon. gentlemen opposite have been complaining of this government because we have not sent our good friend Captain Bernier to hunt up the north pole.

Mr. HENDERSON. There is where you made a mistake.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a good consistent old Conservative. He is going to vote for this resolution declaring that the expenditures are alarming, and he is going to ask the government to spend a couple of hundred thousand dollars to send Captain Bernier to the north pole. Let him go through the record of the public service, and he will find that a suggestion of economy never comes from the side of hon. gentlemen opposite. Again and again we have heard complaints made that this government is not dealing with sufficient liberality. The words of the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) are still ringing in our ears. My hon. friend from Pictou denounces as extravagant the railway subsidies which we brought down, and which we thought were fair and moderate. But the hon. member for Colchester made the declaration that they were paltry subsidies, and that if we had any respect for ourselves and for the country we would have brought down larger and more generous subsidies. My hon. friend simply expresses the general view of hon. gentlemen opposite. They move resolutions for economy, but they are vastly more extravagant than any hon. members who sit on this side of the House.

Let us look a little at the expenditures of the past. My hon. friend from Pictou has called attention to a fact, which we all know, that the expenditures during the years prior to 1896 were much lower than they are now. Therefore, he assumes, because the expenditures were lower than they are now that theirs is a policy of economy and that ours is a policy of extravagance. Well, I do not think that is good logic. I think it is quite possible that a small sum might be spent in such a way as to constitute extravagance and that a large sum may be so spent as to constitute wise economy. It depends on whether you have the money to expend. That is a very vital matter. In the years 1894-5-6, when the economical government that my hon. friend is so anxious to praise were in power, although they spent less money than we did, they spent more money than they had to spend, and they added to the public debt. In 1894 they spent 103 per cent of their revenues. I am confining myself to what is called consolidated revenue fund. In 1895 they spent 112 per cent, or 12 per cent more than they had to spend, and in 1896 they spent a little more than 100 per cent—about 101 per cent. My hon. friend thinks that is economy. The fact is that, though we spent a great deal more money, we have the excuse that we had the money to spend. In 1897 we spent 101 per cent. That was the year during which the Liberal government did not have full control over the finances of the country. They came into power after the fiscal year had begun. They had to deal with the estimates prepared by their predecessors, and they did not have that full grasp of the finances of the country which they were able to obtain in later years, so that their expenditure for that year was a little more than their income. But in the following year, when the Liberals began to get their hands on the helm, we find that in the year 1898 this government spent only 95 per cent of its revenue ; in the year 1899 this government spent only 89 per cent of its revenue ; in the year 1900 this government spent only 84 per cent of its revenue ; in the year 1901 this government spent 89 per cent of its revenue ; in the year 1902 this government spent 87 per cent of its

revenue; and in the year 1903, which has just closed, we spent 78 per cent of our revenue, as against the 101 per cent that the Conservative party spent in 1896. And yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell) would have the country believe that, compared with the expenditure in 1896, our expenditure for the year 1903 was extravagant.

There is another way of viewing this matter. Let us take the public debt. After all these resolutions year after year from the opposition, as to the enormous obligations we are assuming and the enormous additions we are making to the public debt; the country would be prepared I suppose for a moderate increase per capita in the public debt. If I had to acknowledge that we had added two or three dollars per head to the debt of the people of Canada, it would not be anything that one need be ashamed of in view of the tremendous improvements which have been carried on during the past few years. But what are the facts? In the year 1896 the net public debt stood at $50.96 per head; in the year 1902 under a Liberal government, the net debt had fallen to $49.97, and in the year 1903, just closed, the public debt had fallen to $47.37 per head. Now, part of this decrease in 1903 is due to the readjustment of the accounts between the provinces and the Dominion, and therefore I do not take credit for it all; but if you make allowance for that you will find that even deducting that, the net public debt of the Dominion stands to-day $47.97 per head as against $50.96 per head in the year 1896. That statement will surprise some of my hon. friends; it will surprise many people in this country who in consequence of such speeches as we have heard to-night, in consequence of such resolutions as the one now before the House, have been led into the impression that there is an enormous increase in the public debt of Canada.

I am glad to be able to say that as respects the year just closed, we have the most gratifying condition of affairs that it has ever fallen to the lot of a Finance Minister to announce. I have given the figures for the past year already, but I may be pardoned for giving them again. The revenue for the year 1903, ending June 30th last, was $66,034,108.32; the expenditure of the ordinary character chargeable to the consolidated fund, was $51,707,172.89 showing a surplus of $14,326,935.43.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I repeat that the expenditure chargeable to consolidated fund, what is called the ordinary expenditure was $51,707,172.89; the charges to capital account, including all things charged to capital, were $10,367,163.01, making the total expenditure for the year $62,074,335.90. Now, in connection with this surplus, my hon. friend (Mr. Bell) had something to say about our charging bounties to capital account, and he told us that in former times these bounties were charged to income. The fact is that in former times they were charged in such a mysterious way, that it was very hard to find them at all. They took the very curious form of a refund of duties. One would think that the common sense view is that a refund of duties is the paying back of money which has been paid, and how in the world the payment of a bounty which had never come into the treasury could properly be classified as a refund of duties, is one of these things which no fellow can understand. In former times, the Customs Department paid out of its receipts these bounties and thus reduced the customs revenue to that extent, which was a very curious method of bookkeeping.

Mr. CLANCY. Was it not after all paid out of consolidated fund, while the hon. gentleman charges it to capital?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes; it reduced the customs duties to that extent. That system continued because attention was not especially drawn to it, until the rearrangement of the Bounty Act, when we saw that we were going to pay very large sums in bounties. The sums that were paid by the late government for iron and steel bounties, in proportion to the gross business of the country, were not in reality large; they did not affect the question of revenue, or expenditure, or surplus in any large degree. When, under the new condition of things, we found that large sums, running into the millions, were going to be paid for these bounties, we came to the conclusion that the old method of dealing with them was a mistake. Every business man in the House will say now, that whether they were charged to income or capital, the method of deducting them from the customs duties and treating them as a refund of duties, was unbusiness-like and improper. But, inasmuch as the bounties were based upon a sliding scale, contemplating their extinction in a short time, it was deemed well to charge them to capital account. In every financial statement I have presented to this House, I have invariably called attention to that point so that there could be no misunderstanding. I want to say, and it is notably so in this case, that whether you charge that to income or to capital, it would not have affected the general result. It would not have affected it perceptibly last year, because the income which was collected last year was sufficient to pay, and did pay all the ordinary expenditure of the country chargeable to consolidated fund, all the expenditures for bounties, all the expenditures for railway subsidies, all the expenditures for railway construction, all the expenditures of every shape and form were paid for last year out of the revenue of the country, and there was a large reduction in the public debt besides.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was a decrease of the public debt on the operations of last year of $6,580,360.88; there was a further decrease in connection with the readjustment of the provincial accounts—and I have purposely separated the two—amounting to $3,305,450.24; making a total decrease in the net public debt of Canada at the close of the year as compared with the previous year, of $9,885,811.12.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am glad to be able to say that the outlook for the business of the current year is in most respects entirely satisfactory. We do not want to rely too much on the future. I quite realize that the time may come when business may not be as brisk as it has been in the past, but for the present, the outlook is by no means discouraging. I am glad to be able to say that for the new fiscal year, from the first of July up to the twentieth of October (yesterday), the revenue for that period, as compared with the revenue of the corresponding period last year, shows a handsome increase of $2,620,000.

Mr. SPROULE. If my hon. friend's financial showing is so very good, why is it that he is unable to borrow money in London to-day at less than 4½ per cent, when we could borrow it a few years ago at 3 per cent ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The government of Great Britain have paid, I am told, 4½ per cent for their money within the last month. My hon. friend is shutting his eyes to facts which the financial world understands, which the government of England understands and has to recognize. I have some difficulty in understanding the attitude of my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) on the question of surpluses. For some years efforts have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite to prove that there were no surpluses, that they were a delusion, and indeed, before the hon. gentleman had concluded his speech, he got back to the old ground and began to argue that this surplus was not, after all, a real surplus. The bulk of his argument was that we have very large surpluses and we should not have them, that it is bad financing, and that we should reduce taxation. Will my hon. friend tell me on what articles he will reduce taxation ? The great policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is to increase taxation. Every motion that they have made on the fiscal policy has been in the direction of higher duties, and if called upon to reduce taxation they would find themselves in a difficult position to discover an article on which they are willing to have the duty reduced. Does the hon. gentleman want the duty on sugar reduced? I will not press the question.

Mr. BELL. I think, under the circumstances, with such a surplus as the government has, it would be quite warrantable to reduce the duty on articles of general consumption.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand that my hon. friend, speaking in the name of the opposition, says that the duty should be reduced on sugar. But the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) says the duty on sugar should be increased for the benefit of the beet sugar industry. Now, if hon. gentlemen opposite are protectionists, if they want to encourage home industry, if they want to help the beet sugar industry, why do they want to cut down the measure of protection which the beet sugar industry already enjoys ? The hon. member for East Grey, in a former debate, said that they did not want to increase the duty, but only to have a bounty, but since that we have had the declaration again and again by hon. gentlemen opposite that a bounty is not the right way to aid an industry, that the true and only way to aid a home industry is by increasing the customs duties. Thus, if my hon. friend from Pictou speaks in the name of the Conservative party when he advocates the reduction of the duty on sugar he will have a difficult account to settle with the constituents of some of my hon. friends who have sugar factories in their constituencies.

Mr. CLANCY. What is your attitude?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My attitude is disclosed in the budget speech and in the tariff as it stands. My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) says we should not keep on these high taxes. Sir, this taxation is not so oppressively high. He falls into the error of assuming that because there is a great revenue there a great burden of taxation. The true way to look at that is that, so great has been the prosperity, so improved has been the purchasing power of the people, that they have been able to consume all the products of our industries and to import many millions' worth from abroad, and in that way the revenue from customs has been greatly increased. But the customs tariff of this country in regard to most of the great staples, in so far as there has been any change at all, has been reduced. That is what hon. gentlemen opposite complain of; they complain that we are reducing the duties, yet my hon. friend says we are increasing the taxation. At one moment we are told that we are cutting down the duties and destroying the industries of the country and the next moment we have my hon. friend declaring that we are keeping the duties at too high a point.

Then he said that we should not charge these great works which we are carrying on now to income; they should be charged to capital; that, he said, is the very purpose of a capital account; raise just enough money to pay ordinary expenditure, and charge the balance to capital account. That would

be sound reasoning if you had a tariff which was a burden to the people; then if you raised money enough for ordinary expenditures and had to pay a great deal on capital account for great public works that course could be well justified. But why should you add to your capital account when it is not necessary? The complaint of hon. gentlemen opposite half the time is that we are adding to the capital account more than we should. Did not my hon. friend (Mr. Bell), even before he concluded his own speech, complain that we are adding and charging too much to our capital account? But, Sir, if you look at these figures you will find that the tariff and the taxation are not a burden. I will make the statement that the people of this country are not to-day complaining of undue taxation. I will state that, except perhaps on a few items the tariff is giving good satisfaction generally. The complaints we receive are not that the taxation is too high, but that the taxation is not high enough, and these complaints come from our friends opposite. Why should we go on charging things to capital account when we can provide for a large portion of them out of revenue under a tariff policy which is not burdensome? We can collect these large sums from year to year, and we have been able to provide for our ordinary expenditure and for a good portion of our capital account out of our income. We do not think we have charged anything to capital account which is not legitimate; but we were not prepared, in view of all that has been said for the last three or four sessions, for the sudden right about face which my hon. friend took to-night, when he spent fifteen minutes in condemning us because we did not charge more to capital account. What is the reason of our being able to charge these things to our income account? We have been able to avoid going into debt to a degree which would otherwise be necessary, and by avoiding going into debt we avoid also the increase of interest charges. My hon. friend made some references to the increased charges for the public debt. I have here a statement showing the outlook for the present year with regard to our interest on the public debt. I had prepared this statement in answer to a question put on the paper by my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau), but I was not in the House to-day when questions were reached, and I shall take advantage of this opportunity to give the answer:

For the year 1902-3 we paid for interest on public debt	$11,068,139 17
And credited the province of Ontario for interest on trust funds pending settlement	167,288 14
Total	$11,235,427 31
When the main estimates for the present year, were prepared some months ago, before the adjustment of the provincial accounts, the probable sum required for interest was placed at	$11,133,407 52
A revised estimate to-day places it at	11,057,700 00
Showing a decrease as compared with last year's payments of	177,727 31
But in computing the actual interest we must take into account the increased sums on which interest will be received.	
We will receive for interest on stock purchased for sinking funds during the year	105,000 00
For interest on new advances to the Montreal Harbour Commission	27,000 00
For interest on Debt accounts of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec now established—	
Ontario	72,319 44
Quebec	58,944 38
	$ 263,263 82
Deducting this increased interest, which we will thus receive, from the amount of interest to be paid, the net result, approximately, will be a reduction of interest amounting to	$ 440,990 31

My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) laboured under the difficulty that he was unable to take into account the great changes that have come over this country since 1896.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman claims a saving from the adjustment of accounts between Ontario and the Dominion, but it is a mere book-keeping matter.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, it is an absolute sum placed to the credit of the Dominion. It is a readjustment of the provincial account, and it is so much money less to be paid by the Dominion. My hon. friend should take into account the great change which has come over this country since 1896. The Canada of that day was vastly different from the Canada of to-day. The population of the Canada of that day was 5,086,061. We have not the exact population of to-day, we have to take it approximately, but a proper approximate statement is 5,528,847. The increase in population is not so great as we would like, but in that respect we are making up for lost time, and the population is likely to increase much more rapidly than formerly. In 1896 we received 16,835 immigrants. In 1903 we received 128,364. In 1896 we had a revenue on consolidated fund of $36,618,590. In 1903 that revenue amounted to $66,034,108. In the year 1896, there were sales of public lands in Manitoba, the North-west Territories and British Columbia, to the amount of $93,303. In 1903, the sale of these lands represented $313,960. The total imports in the year 1896 were $118,011,508. In 1903,

under the great progress and prosperity of the country, at a time when our factories were busy and our people employed as never before in the history of the Dominion, the purchasing power of the people had so increased that they consumed more home produce and increased their imports from $118,011,508 to $241,214,961. The total exports in 1896 were $121,013,852, and in 1893 they amounted to $225,849,724. Our exports of home products, which perhaps is the better test of the prosperity and the activity of our people, amounted in 1896 to $109,915,337, and in 1903 they increased to $214,401,674. Our exports of products of the farm and animals and their products in 1896 amounted to $55,378,407, and in 1903 they were $114,441,863. Then take the article of manufacture, the very industry that hon. gentlemen opposite have tried to make themselves the special patrons of, which they claim the particular credit of nursing and nourishing. In 1896 our exports of manufactured products amounted to $10,222,877 and last year they amounted to $20,624,967. The total trade of this country, which in 1896 was only $239,025,360, increased last year to $467,064,685. But though my hon. friends opposite seem unable to open their eyes to this vast change, the people of this Dominion are not so blind. The great mass of the people see these things, not only by the evidence of statistics, but by the evidence of the hum of industry which prevails almost in all parts of the Dominion, and they know that in this changed condition a very liberal expenditure is necessary. I remember on one occasion when my right hon. friend the Prime Minister was on a tour through the province of Ontario, observing in one of the very beautiful villages which was decorated for the event, a streamer stretched across the main street showing these words: 'Wise expenditure is true economy.' There was philosophy in that. There is a misunderstanding in some quarters as to what this economy means. Parsimony is not economy. It was not economy in 1894-5 and 6 to spend more money than we had, and it is not extravagance to-day for this government to spend a great deal less money than they are collecting. There is a policy that scattereth and yet increaseth, and there is a policy that withholdeth but tendeth to poverty.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). I shall require to take only a few moments, Mr. Speaker, to prove that the hon. gentleman is giving us to-night an exhibition of the complete reversal of all the doctrines he preached in opposition. He tells us now that true economy consists in a large expenditure of money. Was that the doctrine of the Liberal party before 1896? Why, according to that party then, every dollar expended by the Conservative government of that day was wasted. The hon. gentleman opened his speech by telling us that certain predictions were made as to what would happen the country if the Liberal party came into power. Let me ask him if the Liberal party had carried out their policy, would these predictions not have come true? He knows that the only reasons these predictions were not fulfilled was because the government went back on their tariff policy. Not one of the pledges they made did they fulfil, and these hon. gentlemen, now, with their usual modesty, boast that they have not fulfilled them. The hon. gentleman has told us that liberal expenditure is true economy.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Wise economy.

Mr. CLANCY. Well, I will accept the qualification which the hon. gentleman now makes. In 1896, when this government took office our expenditure was $44,334,000 and it now is $62,084,000. What is there to show in the country for that expenditure? What great public work has been constructed? What is there to show for this immense jump from $44,000,000 in 1896 to $62,000,000. I challenge the hon. gentleman to point to anything which stands out prominently as an asset to Canada for that large amount of money. He cannot do it. The money has been dribbled away in a wasteful manner in making works that are practically of no benefit to Canada.

I come now to the crucial point in the hon. gentleman's speech, the only strong point, it seems to me, the only other point requiring an answer. He stated and restated that the Conservatives had spent more than they had received, while the Liberals were justified in doing all they had, because they spent less than they received. Am I right in so interpreting the hon. gentleman's speech?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And I gave the figures for it.

Mr. CLANCY. Yes, and I will give the hon. gentleman the figures now. The year 1898 was the first year when the hon. gentleman claimed a surplus. The receipts for that year were $40,556,510, and the expenditure was $45,334,281, or $4,777,771 more than the receipts.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) knows that he is including the capital expenditure.

Mr. CLANCY. Certainly.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. member for Pictou complained that we were charging too much to capital. In my remarks I made a clear distinction, and where the expenditure was on consolidated fund account, I said so.

Mr. CLANCY. That makes no difference. I am giving the total receipts and total expenditure. Let us not deceive ourselves or the country. The figures I have given show that, in 1898, when the hon. gentleman

claimed a surplus of $1,722,000 in round numbers, he had actually spent $4,777,771 more than he had received. I am taking the accounts as they are kept in England, in the United States—in fact in every civilized country except Canada. Now take the next year, in which the hon. gentleman said, he had spent only 95 per cent of the whole income. As a matter of fact, he had spent about four and three-quarter millions more than he had received. The income was $46,743,000, and the expenditure $51,542,000, or an excess of expenditure over receipts of $4,799,000. In 1900, the income of the Dominion of Canada was $51,031,000, and the expenditure $52,717,000, or an excess of expenditure over receipts of $1,186,000. Now in 1901 the receipts were $52,516,332, and the payments, $57,982,866, or an excess of expenditure of $5,466,000. Again, in 1902, the expenditure was $58,052,000 and the payments were $63,970,000—payments $5,918,000 more than the receipts. Yet the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) rises here and cooly and blandly tells the House and the country that during these years he spent less than he received. Does the hon. gentleman adhere to that statement ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman asks a question I have no hesitation in answering. I gave the figures with regard to the late government and the present government on precisely the same basis.

Mr. CLANCY. For the purpose of what I am now saying, it is not necessary to compare the present government with the former one. I am taking the hon. gentleman on his own statement with regard to the receipts and expenditures of the whole of Canada, and I tell him that in the year when he says he spent 95 per cent of the whole income, he spent four and three-quarter millions more than he received. The hon. gentleman cannot shelter himself behind the fact that he can take any sum he pleases and charge it up to capital account, and so declare a surplus of as many millions as he thinks will suit him. Will the hon. gentleman claim a surplus now for the period from 1897 to 1902 ? I am leaving out the last year, because I wish to deal with that separately. The hon. gentleman has claimed surpluses during that period to the amount of $27,971,000. To be perfectly fair, I am going to take the sinking fund that was applied on the public debt, although that was a statutory expenditure, and one made by former governments as well as by this one. If we take the six years before the present year, we find that the present government has paid about $14,000,000 to the sinking fund, while the former government paid something over $12,000,000. If we deduct the amount paid by this government on sinking fund, $14,459,000, during these years, from the total surpluses of the years, $27,791,000, there is still the sum of $13,331,000 to be accounted for. Now let me ask the hon. gentleman what has become of that surplus ? I think this would be a very proper time for him to account for it. On a former occasion I asked the hon. gentleman the same question, and now I ask him again. What has become of that money ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should ask me to explain a thing that is so easily understood. Each and every one of these surpluses was applied to the capital account, and so, to that amount, additions which otherwise would have been made to the debt were abolished.

Mr. CLANCY. Ah ! Now we have the solution. The hon. gentleman charged it up to capital account—that was a piece of book-keeping. But that did not prevent the increase of the public debt, so the hon. gentleman had no surplus at all. For the first time the hon. gentleman has made perfectly clear the fraud that has been perpetrated on the people in declaring these surpluses. Well, he has a surplus for the year 1903, not of $14,326,000, as he claimed, but of $4,949,770. His receipts for the year were $66,034,000, and his expenditure $62,084,000. These are the figures, yet the hon. gentleman declares that he has a surplus of $14,000,000. Will not the little boys in the schools laugh?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think they will.

Mr. CLANCY. They will laugh—and if they do not laugh they will sneer—at calculation which shows receipts of $66,000,000, expenditures of $62,000,000, and a surplus of receipts over expenditures of $14,326,000. Is it not about time that we put an end to that sort of farce ? Is it not about time that we should tell the tax-payers the whole truth ? Is it not about time we should cease to make appologies like that of the hon. gentleman, telling the people that there are surpluses, when, as a matter of fact, the expenditure exceeds the income ? I challenge the hon. gentleman to say that except the year that has just closed, that during the whole period the Liberal party has been in power, there has been a single year in which the expenditure did not exceed the receipts. Yet the hon. gentleman gives as a sole justification of the large expenditure of this country, that his receipts were larger than the expenditure. I have no hesitation in saying that he is practising deception on the people of this country. It is not a fair statement, and it is not an accurate statement. I challenge the hon. gentleman now to deny that during the period from 1897 to 1902 there was a single year in which the hon. gentleman did not expend a sum in excess of that received, and that during these years the excess did not aggregate $27,791,281. Yet that was the sole excuse the hon. gentleman gives for the increased expenditure. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word about the Public Accounts Committee. The

hon. gentleman said that the Public Accounts Committee had become a farce.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not the Public Accounts, but the committee.

Mr. CLANCY. Well, the Public Accounts Committee of which the hon. gentleman was a distinguished member, became a farce, he says. Well, I am forced to agree that that is to some extent true. I know of more than one occasion on which that hon. gentleman turned it into a farce ; I know of occasions on which the hon. gentleman did not go there to assist the Public Accounts Committee in unravelling and detecting the wrongs that were committed under the government, but he went there to block the way, and by every means in his power to prevent an examination of that character. I remind him of one case when a witess was asked to state the truth with regard to an account, and the Finance Minister was the first to come to his assistance and tell the witness that he need not answer the question. The hon. gentleman knows the case I refer to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Will the hon. gentleman state the case ?

Mr. CLANCY. It was the case of Mr. Rochester, when he was asked what sums of money he paid out other than appeared in his accounts. If he had answered that question there would have been no trouble in putting our finger upon the raid that had been made upon the public treasury. The Minister of Finance was the first to rise in the Public Accounts Committee and to tell that witness that he need not answer the question. Yet the hon. gentleman comes here and says that the Public Accounts Committee is a farce.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Does the hon. gentleman not know that that incident—which he has not described I think correctly—had relation to his friend the ex-Minister of Public Works that he now takes to his bosom, and that it occurred a year ago, not in the recent committees which are referred to ?

Mr. CLANCY. Well, if the hon. gentleman means to insinuate that there was something wrong on the part of the ex-Minister of Public Works——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. I do not.

Mr. CLANCY. Then why does the hon. gentleman refer to it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I refer to it because it happened to be a fact.

Mr. CLANCY. Then it must have some meaning. I am not denying that it was a case in which the department of the ex-Minister of Public Works was concerned. The hon. gentleman is making reference to it now with the evident intent of casting some blame upon the ex-Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. CLANCY. Then his reference has no meaning. Was he honest then when he told the witness not to answer the question ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not casting any reflection on the ex-Minister of Public Works. The hon. gentleman was casting a reflection upon him and I was defending him from what I thought was an aspersion. But all that was a matter of a year ago, and my remarks had reference to the Public Accounts Committee of the present session.

Mr. CLANCY. Well, now, the hon. gentleman wants to make the short memory plea. I am not dealing alone with the Public Accounts Committee of the present year. I think the hon. gentleman might have taken in past years. But let us look at the present year. This has been a busy session, there has been no time to give to the Public Accounts Committee, or very little. But what has been disclosed in that committee that the hon. gentleman calls a farce ? I wish the member for West Middlesex (Mr. Calvert) was in his place. What was disclosed there only a few days ago is a fair sample of the waste of public money that has gone on in this country with regard to the census. Why, Sir, one of the commissioners that was appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite, came down here and was examined before the Public Accounts Committee, and what was he forced to tell ? He was forced to tell in every case where a man had put in an account that he never questioned it, but still he paid it. He was forced to admit that they had hired horses in little villages of 200 or 300 inhabitants to drive the enumerators around for the purpose of taking the census when everybody knows that there was no horse hire, everybody knows that, it was a stuffing of the accounts, everybody knows it was a pillaging of the public treasury, yet the hon. gentleman says the committee was a farce. That is only one case that was brought out where the public treasury was pillaged. I say, Mr. Speaker, that if time had permitted us to go into a large range of the public expenditures of this country, we would have discovered a great many cases of which the one I have just mentioned was only a sample. But there was not time, and the only case that we did examine was of the most frightful character ever disclosed before the Public Accounts Committee of this country.

Now, Sir, it is very amusing to see the hon. gentleman set up a defence of that kind. He says, we have been taunted about the Fast Atlantic Service. we are told by hon. members of the opposition that we should have a Fast Atlantic Service at any cost. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman threw away the only opportunity we ever had in Canada to have a Fast Atlantic Service at a fair and moderate price. The hon. gentleman declared that the price was too high, and

now they have lost the chance, and they are unable to get a service at twice as much as they could have got it for. Yet he taunts the opposition with saying that we are bound to have a service at any cost. This country does require a service, and if the hon. gentlemen threw away the opportunities, and if they have to pay double the cost of a service now, I would like to know with what propriety he can taunt this side with being willing to give twice as much as it could have been obtained for before. How is he going to answer for throwing away the opportunities that were given him, and of which he was an advocate for a number of years past? The hon. gentleman threw away every chance they had of getting a service, so I do not think he takes the right position in blaming the opposition. Now, I want to call the hon. gentleman's attention to one matter on which he laid great stress; and I see the Minister of Customs sitting beside him who once made a similar challege to the Conservative opposition. When we complain of the expenditure the Minister of Finance says: Why don't you rise in your place and move for a reduction. Did the Liberal party do anything of that kind during the 18 years they were in opposition? During that whole period these able and vigilant gentlemen sat in this House. I see before me now one of them who never lost an opportunity of making a point against the government of the day, who is now an able minister and who was not particularly wanting in his duty in courage or in knowledge. During that whole period of 18 years $603,000,000 in round numbers were expended. Let me ask the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Paterson) how much of that was challenged during that whole period. Out of that sum of $603,000,000, but $447,000 was challenged. There were no votes against subsidies—not one. No hon. gentleman ever proposed to vote against a railway subsidy during that period. I think it is about time hon. gentlemen ceased making challenges of that kind. The Hon. Minister of Finance is unwittingly slandering the Hon. Minister of Customs because the hon. Minister of Customs was in the House before 1896 and was actively in opposition. I think I should come to the defence of those hon. gentlemen who were so derelict in their duty, who sat here while this country was being robbed, while $600,000,000 was being expended and who only had the courage to challenge a vote during that whole period in respect of less than half a million dollars. Now, I wish to say a word in regard to the prosperity of the country upon which the hon. minister has laid very great stress. He has told us what has been done for the country. He says that we have expended money for the purpose of facilitating the business of Canada. I purpose to make a comparison in regard to agricultural products which is the main feature of our exports. It will be seen that we stand exactly in the same relative position that we occupied in 1896. I challenge the hon. gentleman to deny the fact. In 1896 Great Britain imported horses, cattle, sheep, bacon, hams, beef, mutton, pork, meats all other, lard, poultry and game, butter, cheese, milk condensed, &c., margarine, eggs, hides raw, sheep pelts, tallow, bristles, wool, wheat, barley, oats, pease, beans, corn, flour wheat, oatmeal, corn meal, grain and meal other, seeds, clover and grass, flax seed, hops, apples, cherries, grapes, pears, plums, other fruits, onions, potatoes, tomatoes, other vegetables, oil seed cake, flax, and fish. The total imports into the United Kingdom of these articles were $827,352,902. This of course includes fish. During that period Canada exported to Great Britain $53,254,758 or 6·43 per cent. Taking the total imports of the same articles of animal produce into the United Kingdom, the value in 1901 was $976,582,901. Of this value the total amount imported from Canada was $66,446,101 or 6·80 per cent or less than ¼ of 1 per cent of an increase during that period. Notwithstanding this vast expenditure of money we stand relatively in the same position as in 1896. But the hon. gentleman opposite to-night stated that the people were so prosperous that they have not only produced a great deal but that they have largely imported. The fact of the matter is, as the hon. gentleman knows, that the people of Canada have imported a large number of articles which they should have produced. They have been consuming foreign goods and there is not much in the boast that we have largely increased our import of goods which should have been produced under a proper policy in this country. I do not propose to pursue this subject any further than to say that we have an enormous expenditure, an alarming expenditure, which, as stated by my hon. friend from Pictou, represents no less a sum than $62,000,000 in round numbers. I challenge the hon. gentleman now in conclusion to put his finger upon one great service which is being performed and to show what benefit Canada has from this increased expenditure. I say that it is impossible for the hon. gentleman or his friends to show that as a result of this enormously increased expenditure, nearly double what it was in 1896, anything has been done for the people that will stand to the credit of the government or that will confer some lasting benefit upon the country. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the expenditure has been dribbled out for the most useless purposes and that Canada has been called upon to pay immense sums for no substantial purpose. Just look at the sum which the taxpayer has to pay at the present time and which he had to pay in 1896. The taxpayer had to pay in 1896 $7.50 per head for each man, woman and child. In 1903 every man, woman and child has to pay $12.30 or $4.73 per head more than was paid in 1896. I repeat again that there is

absolutely nothing to show by way of a return for this immense tax put upon the people of the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say that we did not challenge it. As has been stated by my hon. friend from Pictou the opposition cannot lengthen the session surely beyond what it is now by dividing the House. The best way to indicate dissent is for an hon. member upon his responsibility to stand in his place and condemn that expenditure. Hon. gentlemen opposite are not slow in quoting speeches against us. Hon. gentlemen, when they go to the country, do not require to have votes. They will say that Mr. so and so made this statement and that they are prepared to hold them to it. We have not complained that hon. gentlemen in the past did not give evidence of their opposition to expenditures because they did not divide the House. It was they who raised the question and not we. I have nothing to say beyond this that we will leave it to the people of the country to decide they will have before them a set of promises from hon. gentlemen opposite and a set of performances that would not do much credit to any government even of less pretensions.

Mr. ANDREW BRODER (Dundas). Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to detain the House long but I want to refer to one case to show the reason why the Public Accounts Committee may have been somewhat of a farce. I refer to the case of an individual who is acting as private secretary for Mr. Charleson. What are the facts in connection with the conduct of this man whose name is Gobeil. The Auditor General reports that he refuses to give any vouchers for his expenditure. At page 333—323 of the Auditor General's Report for 1900, we find that this man sent $2,809.93 for sundries, supplies, &c., and that he absolutely refused to produce any vouchers. Why is this private secretary whose salary was raised from $700 a year to $2,400 without any examination, why is he allowed to go about the country and spend his time at Syracuse, N. Y., and elsewhere, and have his expenses paid by the government ? What is he doing there for Mr. Charleson ? In the Auditor General's Report for the year ending 30th June, 1899, the Auditor General complains that this private secretary is allowed to break all the rules governing his case. He goes to Vancouver or wherever he likes, he spends all the money he likes, and he produces no vouchers. And yet the Minister of Finance talks about the Public Accounts Committee being a farce. Of course it is a farce; what is the use of having a fire without wood; what is the use of having an investigation without vouchers ? The government want it to be a farce, and the greater farce it is the better they are pleased. Why is it that the private secretary of a contractor, paid out of the people's money, is allowed to go wherever he likes, and allowed to refuse giving vouchers ? Does he go to Syracuse for the good of his health, or for the good of the health of some hon. gentlemen connected with the department ? It would not be healthy to have him here while the Public Accounts Committee is in session. There is not the slightest doubt that the Minister of Public Works, who is not now in the House, but who ought to be, knows very well for whose health this man goes to Syracuse. This government does not want vouchers to be produced; they have a horror of them.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Bell).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Henderson,
Avery,	Hughes (Victoria),
Ball,	Ingram,
Birkett,	Johnston (Cardwell),
Blain,	Kaulbach,
Borden (Halifax),	Léonard,
Boyd,	MacLaren (Perth),
Broder,	Monk,
Calvin,	Morin,
Carscallen,	Richardson,
Clancy,	Robinson (Elgin),
Clarke,	Sproule,
Cochrane,	Taylor,
Fowler,	Vrooman,
Gourley,	Wilson.—30.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Bazinet,	LeBlanc,
Beith,	Loy,
Béland,	Macdonald,
Belcourt,	Mackie,
Bernier,	Macpherson,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	McCool,
Bourbonnais,	McCreary,
Brown,	McIsaac,
Bureau,	Marcil (Bagot),
Calvert,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Campbell,	Mayrand,
Carbonneau,	Meigs,
Champagne,	Mignault,
Christie,	Monet,
Copp,	Morrison,
Delisle,	Paterson,
Demers (Lévis),	Power,
Demers (St. John),	Préfontaine,
Desjardins,	Puttee,
Douglas,	Reid (Restigouche),
Dugas,	Roche (Halifax),
Emmerson,	Ross (Ontario),
Erb,	Ross (Rimouski),
Fielding,	Rousseau,
Fitzpatrick,	Schell,
Galliher,	Scott,
Gauvreau,	Talbot,
Geoffrion,	Thompson (Haldimand
Gibson,	and Monck),
Harwood,	Tobin,
Kendall,	Tolmie,
Lang,	Tucker,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Turcot,
Laurier (L'Assomption),	Wright.—68.
Lavergne,	

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Hyman,	Gilmour,
Johnston (Lambton),	Simmons,
Charlton,	Tisdale,
Sutherland (Essex),	Northrup,
Harty,	Reid (Grenville),

Stewart,	Bruce,
Wade,	Smith (Wentworth),
Parmelee,	Pope,
Costigan,	Hale,
Heyd,	Tolton,
Grant,	McGowan,
Davis,	Roche (Marquette),
Holmes,	Kendrey,
Murray,	Osler,
Sutherland (Hon. J.),	Haggart,
Ethier,	LaRivière,
Gallery,	Lennox,
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Lavell,
McCarthy,	McIntosh,
Turgeon,	Kidd,
Matheson,	Halliday,
Smith (Vancouver),	Clare,
Ross (Victoria, N.S.),	Brock,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Tupper (Sir C. H.),
Dyment,	McCormick,
McColl,	Ward,
Fraser,	Bell,
Guthrie,	Porter,
Mulock (Sir William),	Barker,
Cowan,	Pringle,
Maclaren (Huntingdon),	Rosamond,
Riley,	Earle,
Stephens,	Seagram,
Gould,	Thomson (Grey),
Fortier,	Roddick,
McGugan,	Hackett,
Girard,	Casgrain,
McEwen,	Sherritt,
Bickerdike,	Bennett,
Fisher,	Maclean,
German,	Lancaster,
MacKinnon,	Wilmot,
Lewis,	Robinson (Northumberland),
Oliver,	Kemp,
Russell,	Ganong,
Madore,	Culbert.

Amendment negatived.

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

Consolidation of Dominion statutes, which may be paid notwithstanding anything contained in the Civil Service Act or in the Act respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery, $16,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Who are the commissioners ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I gave the names of the commissioners a few days ago when this matter was up in another form. The commissioners are : Mr. Newcombe, the Deputy Minister of Justice ; Mr. Power, another employee of the Department of Justice ; Mr. Cameron, Registrar of the Supreme Court; Sir Henry Strong, ex-Chief Justice of the Supreme Court ; Mr. Sirois, of Quebec; Mr. Roscoe, and Mr. St. Louis, secretary of the commission, the names of the others were given on a previous occasion.

Mr. BLAIN. How much is it expected that the revision will cost ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is very hard to say; the last revision took place in 1886, and cost, if I remember rightly, somewhere in the neighbourhood of $48,000. We have, up to the present, expended in connection with this consolidation the sum of $16,000. We expect to keep within the $48,000, notwithstanding the fact that we have to revise the statutes from 1886 down to the present time, 17 years. That vote of $20,000 has been in the estimates for the last four or five years. In 1902-3 we expended $12,722.38; in 1903-4 we expended $3,398.71, so that the total expenditure up to the present time is $16,121.09.

Mr. MONK. How far has the work advanced and what now remains to be done ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am now speaking from memory, and my hon. friend will find that I gave all of these details and that they are on 'Hansard.' My recollection is that there are about 154 statutes to be revised, and of that number 17 have been completely revised and 38 have been prepared and are ready now to be passed upon. They are partially revised, and the whole work is expected to be completed next year.

Mr. MONK. Why should it cost over $40,000 to revise 150 statutes ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I estimate that it will cost $40,000 odd, because the revision of 1886 cost $48,000.

Mr. MONK. We must do better than this.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We will do better than this.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think that is a fair comparison, because you have now as a basis the Revised Statutes of 1886. That was the first revision and it naturally took a long time. I think that more than 150 statutes were revised in 1886.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not remember the exact number; at all events, this is equally important and equally expensive with the work done in 1886, if not more so. There are now seventeen years of statutes to be revised.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In the other case there were 20 years of statutes to be revised, and that was the first revision; a great many of the statutes that are now being revised are mere amendments to particular chapters of the revised statutes. I think the work, while equally important, would be less laborious and would occupy less time than the work of 1886.

Galops rapids—to complete channel, $60,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This matter was discussed on a previous occasion. It is for some improvements in the Galops rapids, where we have spent a vast sum of money. One hon. member in this House expresssed the opinion that this was not a useful work, but the view taken by the department is that it is useful, and it does seem a pity that for the small sum still required we should abandon the work. We have spent $978,000 to improve the

Galops rapids, and we are advised that this will complete the work.

Mr. CALVIN. Is any record kept in the department of the number of vessels using this channel? I am inclined to think it is neglected and not used at all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have no record of vessels using it, but we have a report from the engineer of the department in charge of the St. Lawrence, who thinks it is very important that we should finish up the work by making this expenditure.

Trent canal—construction, $360,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to complete the work of construction on the different sections, comprising sections 2 and 3, and also the steel work for the hydraulic lock on the Peterborough section.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Are there any new contracts this year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, but very considerable operations are still going on.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What is the report of the engineer on the feasibility of connecting Rice lake and Port Hope instead of going down to Trenton?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I shall be glad to furnish the report. It is in substance favourable to the Trenton section rather than Port Hope. I shall see that the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Ward) has access to it.

Trent canal—to build a new entrance pier at Peterborough, $1,600.
To build entrance pier at Burleigh, $1,200.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These are small repairs connected with the old works.

To build entrance pier at Lovesick, $1,200.
To dredge shoals between Peterborough and Heeley's Falls, $2,800.
To dredge sheds at Ketchawana and Buckhorn lake, $2,800.
Rebuilding dam at Peterborough, $4,800.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I would ask the hon. minister if he has any report about opening up the waters north of Balsam lake? I do not know of any part of Canada which would derive equal benefit from an expenditure of $100,000. Such an expenditure would open up 100 miles of waterway, by building four or five locks north of Balsam lake. We have voted cheerfully large sums for building docks, bonusing railways, to mills and all that sort of thing in the maritime provinces and the province of Quebec, but I do not know of any part of the Dominion, in which so large an area would be so materially benefited by the expenditure of this sum, as would the counties of Victoria and Haliburton by the construction of four or five small locks, at the outside seventy-five feet. I would ask the hon. minister to make a note of this, and another session bring in a vote for it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What depth would you get?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In the river there is lots of water. Five feet in the canal would be plenty. All we want is to get boats in and out to move down the cribs of hardwood timber. There would also be a tourist passenger traffic in that district. At the same time, I would ask him to make a note of this fact. The system of opening and closing those locks is not the most modern. The superintendent says they are improving the system, but at present it is very tedious.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Which locks?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). All the locks along the entire system. In the old days the Trent canal was rather pooh-poohed, but I am glad to see that the hon. gentleman from Ontario is a strong advocate of it today. He will find that Lake Skugog, that large lake in his own town, will be immensely benefited when this lock is opened up. I am glad to see that he is a strong supporter of the construction of this work.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to capital—Railways—Intercolonial—to dredge and ballast rock at deep water terminus at Halifax, $25,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is made necessary by the increasing draft of the steamers. There is a good wharf there, and what used to be a good depth of water. But with the increasing size of the Allan steamers it is necessary to dredge to a depth of 30 feet.

National Transcontinental Railway—to provide for surveys and other expenses, $500,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is the first installment of the expenditure on the government's portion of the new railway. This amount is designed to cover only incidental expenses and surveys. Of course, there will be no work in construction until the House meets again. In the meantime it is intended to organize and send out survey parties.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I see by the Montreal 'Star' of this evening that Mr. Hays says he has survey parties all over the road. Is the government paying for these?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No arrangement has been made with respect to that. But if the Grand Trunk have made surveys which can be properly utilized, I think we should be glad to have the work advanced to that extent and to utilize the result. And if we utilize the work of the surveys, no doubt some arrangement will be made to bear our fair share of the expense.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The government have not selected the commissioners or the chief engineer ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. The Deputy Minister and Chief Engineer of Railways and Canals has made an estimate of the probable cost of surveying parties for the railway, showing an estimated expenditure of $450,000. To be safe, and to cover other expenses, we make it $500,000.

Mr. MONK. Has the hon. minister that estimate here ? When does he propose commencing work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Of course, construction cannot be commenced until we have the survey. I suppose that immediately after the enactment of the measure steps will be taken to push the surveys forward. No doubt something can be done this autumn and winter to make provision for numerous surveys. Whatever can be done will be pushed forward with all speed.

Mr. MORIN. Are the surveys below Quebec sent out by the government or by the Grand Trunk Pacific?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They will be sent out on behalf of the government through the instrumentality of the commissioners.

Mr. MORIN. I understood the hon. gentleman to say there were some there already.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Some between Winnipeg and Quebec. I am not aware that any have been sent out by the Grand Trunk east of Quebec.

Mr. MONK. I would like to see the estimate to which the hon. gentleman referred, to see how the work is to be divided. Of course, if this were a small sum I would not ask it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The deputy minister in his estimate has not designated any particular points where the parties will be established. But he has estimated that twenty parties could be usefully employed between Winnipeg and Moncton—fourteen between Winnipeg and Quebec and six between Quebec and Moncton. He has not designated the places where they will commence work.

Mr. MONK. But it must be divided into sections.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the work will be arranged by sections under the chief engineer, just like any other railway work, and a large number of parties will be put in the field to push the work with all speed.

Mr. MONK. When will the work of survey begin ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As soon as we can have the surveyors appointed. There is every disposition to push the work. I should think that immediately after the session parties will be put in the field and the work proceeded with as long as the season will permit.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The Montreal 'Star' says :

> Mr. C. M. Hays, general manager and second vice-president of the Grand Trunk Railway, has made the following statement regarding the company's plans for completing the Grand Trunk Pacific :—
>
> The reconnaisance survey is proceeding vigorously and, in fact, has been, ever since early last spring. We have between fifteen and twenty parties in the field, some of whom have about completed the work of their division ; others will keep on all through the winter. Great care has been taken with a view of obtaining a line with a minimum grade, not exceeding 4 per cent——

I presume that means 4-10ths per cent.

> —or twenty feet to the mile, about the same as the maximum grade between Toronto and Montreal, and with no greater than two or three degree curves.
>
> On some portions of the route where the country is comparatively unknown, for instance, in the Lake Nepigon district, owing to the lack of transportation facilities, supplies are difficult to obtain, and progress is not as great as otherwise would be the case.
>
> Plans for construction at the point at which a beginning will be made are dependent on the completion of surveys. We have now the territory pretty well covered. The first parties we sent out, which were started before the government policy as to the eastern division was developed, were located between Winnipeg and North Bay, the theory being that that was the section of country that was most in need of additional facilities, and while it is undoubtedly true that, for some years to come, a large proportion of the grain crop of the North-west will move out by water during the season of navigation, there is to-day a very considerable quantity moving by rail north of Lake Superior and this quantity will be increased in a constantly growing volume as rail facilities for the economical and expeditious movement of the traffic are provided. The new line with its 4 per cent grade——

Meaning, no doubt, 4-10ths per cent.

> —will have great advantages in this respect.
>
> Our surveying parties are also well distributed across the territory from Winnipeg west and construction on that portion of the line will be pushed as soon as the results of our surveys are known, as also the construction of the branches from a port on Lake Superior (which port is yet to be determined) to a junction with the eastern division and a line from North Bay, north also to intersect the eastern division.
>
> As to plans and intentions in connection with the work on the eastern division, I shall have to refer you to the government, that portion of the undertaking being, as you are aware, under their control.
>
> While it is dependent on conditions generally, the results of surveys, the situation as regards labour, movement of supplies, material, &c., it is not likely that the road will be completed short of five years.

So it would seem that the Grand Trunk Pacific are surveying the line to the north. This is a nice little piece of campaign literature, and I thought I would read it for the benefit of the minister.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. On which side ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Well, turn it either way. What I want to know is whether the government will instruct the chief engineer, when they appoint him, to take over these survey parties ? I understand that they are almost entirely American.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have no arrangement with the Grand Trunk in that respect. I understand their surveys are between North Bay and Winnipeg. Of course, only that part of their line which coincides with the contemplated line of the government can be used. But if bona fide surveys have been made which are found useful for the government's purposes, I think we should take them over and make a fair allowance for them.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). And take over the engineers, too ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not necessarily, but take over the surveys. However, this is speculative, as we have no arrangement.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman intend, when he appoints survey parties, that they shall enter upon the ground already surveyed by the Grand Trunk ? The hon. gentleman has just said that if a portion of these surveys turned out to be valuable the Grand Trunk people would be recouped for their outlay. That does not seem unreasonable, unless the hon. gentleman intends to put a staff over the same territory.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think where competent engineers have covered the ground to the satisfaction of the chief engineer, after his appointment, I would not suppose it necessary to go over the same ground. That would be a matter in which we would take the advice of the chief engineer. After allowing for the work which the Grand Trunk have begun, there is still a large amount of work to be done which will require a number of parties. The estimate is made for the whole section. If it turns out that the Grand Trunk have completed the surveys for a reasonable distance, we would use a portion of this money to pay them for their surveys instead of organizing independent surveys.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the sum now asked for cover the whole cost of the surveys between Winnipeg and Moncton ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This estimate we think will be the cost of operations within the present year. I do not know that it will cover the whole cost of the surveys, I should think not.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the hon. gentleman any idea as to what they will cost ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They will cost very much more than that. These are the estimates for the first year's operations.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose if the Grand Trunk Pacific Company had made some surveys the hon. gentleman would be in possession of that information.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We know they have made some surveys, but how far they may be adapted to the government's purpose and how far they relate to branches which belong to the Grand Trunk proper, will be a matter for investigation.

Mr. MONK. How much is allotted to each party of surveyors ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. About $30,000 or $31,000 for each party for the year. But as a portion of this year is already past we are not taking a full year's appropriation.

Mr. MONK. When will they begin operations ? I understand that these operations can be carried on during the winter.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, so far as the season will permit. They will begin immediately. After the passing of the legislation I presume the government will take the necessary steps to give effect to the intention of parliament. We desire to get the surveyors into the field with the least possible delay.

Mr. MONK. How many are employed in each party ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The chief engineer has made a report to me, but I have not it at hand. If my hon. friend wishes for the information before concurrence, I will get it to-morrow.

Mr. MONK. Is there a staff out already ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not on behalf of the government. The Grand Trunk people, according to current report, have some surveyors at work. But there has been no work on behalf of the government yet.

Mr. MONK. Have you any report from any staff working at present on these surveys ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, we have no such reports. We have no communication with them on the subject whatever.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I noticed some time ago that a gentleman by the name of McGinnis, of the Geological Survey, returned home, and I saw interviews from some of the men who had been in his party,

and one of them said that for upwards of 100 miles where this road was going, there was nothing but muskegs. Has the minister heard anything about it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Trent canal—to pay Messrs. Corry & Laverdure interest on increased prices awarded them by Messrs. Hobson, Surtees and Brophy, as arbitrators, from the dates the several quantities were returned in estimates and paid at original prices, up to July 1st, 1903, at 5 per cent per annum, $29,067.11. Interest on one-half cost of arbitration, $4,419, viz., $2,209.50 from date of payment of same by them, January 21, 1902, to July 1st, 1903, at 5 per cent, $159.20 ; also one-half cost of arbitration, $2,-209.50 (correction of item in previous estimates), $31,435.81.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I wish to make a change in the first item for interest, $29,067.11, and reduce it to $26,533.14. This is interest on the claim of Messrs. Corry & Laverdure in connection with the Trent canal, the principal sum of which was allowed to them some time ago. It was a case in which certain work was done by them for which no prices were fixed in the contract, and the matter of determining the prices was referred to the judgment of the three engineers here named. These gentlemen made an award, and the principal sum has been paid, and this is to pay interest. There was an item in the estimates at an earlier stage that I struck out, because there was a difficulty in fixing the date at which interest should begin. It is not so much as these gentlemen claim, but we think the vote now proposed is a fair adjustment of the matter. The total should be charged to $28,901.84.

Soulanges canal—to pay J. & M. O'Leary interest on $17,467.28, from March 1, 1900, to August 28, 1903, at 5 per cent, $3,050.79.

And interest on $3,943.50, from March 1, 1900, to August 13, 1903, at 5 per cent, $680.66.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why was that not settled before ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This claim has only recently been paid, although the work was done some time ago. The final estimates were not made up for a considerable time. The principal sum had been paid to them, and we are now proposing to pay them interest from the date at which it should begin, at five per cent. Where we pay interest at all I think there is much to be said in favour of taking the standard rate. Interest is a matter of grace, and we may not pay it at all, but in a case where these contractors have to borrow money from the banks, it is not unreasonable that they should be allowed five per cent for any delay on the part of the government.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there any revenue received from the lease of water-power ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the deputy thinks it is about $3,000 a year.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria).

Elections—to pay the account of the Prince Albert 'Advocate' for advertising the proclamation and notice of the Saskatchewan election of 1900, notwithstanding anything in the Dominion Elections Act, $297.48.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This item is inserted at the request of the Auditor General who became satisfied that the charge is a fair one, but he is not certain that he has the authority to pay it and he therefore asks for a vote of the House.

Mr. BLAIN. How does it come that there is an item of $297 in connection with this election and nothing at all in connection with any other election in the west ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). This was ordered without authority ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, I am told it has been the custom to publish this advertisement and that it has been paid for on a previous occasion. The returning officer in his report says :

It has always been customary here (Saskatchewan) to publish proclamations and election notices in both English and French. The reason for this is the territory is so large and many settlers so isolated that it is impossible to cover the district thoroughly with postal notices of proclamation. If it were not for the circulation of newspapers undoubtedly many persons would be in ignorance on election day as to where they should vote or would have great inconvenience in finding out. . . . As an aid in distributing this information as it should be distributed the newspaper is invaluable and the necessity of its use is beyond question.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Did the Conservative paper not get the advertisement too ?

The MINISTER OF FINACE. I do not know whether this is a Conservative or a Liberal paper.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Why did the Conservative paper not get it ? I am surprised at the hon. minister pressing a matter of this kind. I hope that in future he will see that the Tory papers get it so that the poor Tories will know where to go and vote. Will the hon. Minister of Finance make a promise to that effect ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That will be taken into consideration.

Mr. BLAIN. What amount was paid in the general elections in 1896 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the amount, but I am informed by one of my officers that he has discussed the matter with the Auditor General and he says it was paid on a previous occasion.

Mr. BLAIN. Was it paid by a special vote ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At that time it was paid without a special vote, but the Auditor General has become a little more critical and he likes to have votes.

Mr. BLAIN. This is to help the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) in his next election, I suppose ?

Mr. CLANCY. It seems to me that the returning officer has neglected his duty. Surely a notice in a newspaper is not the notice to be given to the electors by proclamation. There seems to be an irregularity in that explanation. It would appear that the returning officer did not post up the proclamations in order to give the people notice of the election, but that he paid the newspaper to do his duty.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What I would understand from the information furnished is that the legal notices were given, but that they would be insufficient and that they were supplemented by this newspaper advertisement.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In the dual language ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I presume so.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance if he intends to take up any items that have been passed in connection with the Post Office Department ? The reason I ask is that there is an item standing which the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) was to give some information about. It will not take much discussion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What was that ?

Mr. CLANCY. In regard to a post office in the west. The hon. Postmaster General was to bring down certain petitions and letters in connection with it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. Postmaster General promised my hon. friend that certain information would be brought down I will see that he gets it, so as to have an opportunity of discussing it whether it is on this item or any other.

Mr. BLAIN. We did not get an explanation as to why it is necessary to publish the proclamation in this special newspaper in all western Canada and not necessary to do the same thing in any other constituency.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I noticed the other night when this matter was under discussion that the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) said that he recognized that the conditions of Saskatchewan were exceptional and that it might be quite reasonable and necessary to publish the notice there and not necessary elsewhere owing to the territory being so large and the difficulty of distributing the notices.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. minister should not add insult to injury by trying to stuff the committee. There is no reason for any such explanation. If the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) had stated that in his own constituency that there was some need for this same thing there would be some sense in it. In Saskatchewan there is no settlement east of Prince Albert, settlement to the north only extends for 21 miles and south and west this paper will not circulate. The hon. minister's explanation was that these poor people would not know where to go and vote but for the publication of this notice. If it is necessary to tell the Liberals how to vote, and I admit that they require a little more information than the Conservatives do, I insist that the Conservatives should also have an opportunity of knowing where to vote. Do I understand my hon. friend to promise that if one paper gets it next year the other paper will also get it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I may not have control of it next year.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Will the hon. minister give it serious consideration ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, I will agree to that.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister states that a similar amount to this was paid in 1896.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am informed by one of my officers that he learned from the Auditor General that an amount for the same purpose was paid after the general election of 1896.

Mr. BLAIN. Why did the Auditor General pay the amount in 1896 without a special vote of parliament, and why does he require a special vote now ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are a number of things which the Auditor General has been doing for years, the legality of which he now questions, and asks that they be done in a different way.

Mr. CLANCY. He is getting suspicious.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Perhaps so ; he has written a letter asking that this vote be taken for the reason that the Election Act does not sanction this method of publication.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the hon. gentleman know what is the circulation of this paper, or does he know if it was done without the instruction of the returning officer ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is evident that the returning officer authorized it, judging from a reference in the letter of the Auditor General, who asks us to be good enough to include the amount in the supplementary estimates for the present fiscal year.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The Auditor General asks for this vote.

To provide for expenses of investigation into trade combinations, Customs tariff Act, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to provide for any investigations which may be held under this Act. Mr. Justice Rich-

ards is now inquiring into the alleged lumber combine in Manitoba. We have had no report yet.

Contribution by Canada to Queen Victoria memorial, $146,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is an appropriation which the ministers in London last year agreed with Mr. Chamberlain to recommend to the consideration of parliament, as a contribution to the national memorial to the late Queen. The different colonies of the empire have, I think, all contributed, and the ministers agreed to recommend to the Canadian parliament a vote of £30,000 sterling. This memorial is to be erected in London, near Buckingham palace. The idea is that the memorial shall include designs to represent the various portions of the empire, but it is not advanced far enough at present to go into details.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Carried.

To pay Charles Miller $3,713.32 and Robert Miller $3,339.05 for amounts deposited by them in the post office savings bank at St. Scholastique and fraudulently withdrawn by the assistant postmaster, $7,052.37.

Mr. BLAIN. This item stood over for some information. If there were any other depositors who lost money why were they not paid ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These are the only persons who lost money.

Mr. CLANCY. One of the questions asked was that the principal and interest should be separated. It arose on the question of how large a sum might be deposited at one time.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I find on inquiry from the superintendent of the savings bank that the rules admit of a deposit of $3.000 at one time.

Mr. BLAIN. There was also a point about the insurance fund. Would the hon. minister give us a statement in respect to the amount paid out of this fund and how the fund stands at the present moment ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Bonds are taken only from postmasters and not from subordinates. The person who did this embezzling was an employee of the postmaster. It has never been the practice of the department to require bonds or security from the subordinate officials in an office of this kind.

Mr. BLAIN. Were there no bonds to be attached and was there no responsibility resting upon the postmaster ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The postmaster himself gives bonds but the bonds taken from a postmaster at an office where the revenue is not very large are small in amount and quite inadequate to meet any loss that might happen. The postmaster himself has given bonds of a private character. This was an old appointment not occurring under our administration or under the modern system of security by assessment. Nothing has been recovered on it and it is not thought that anything will be recovered from the postmaster.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand that the postmaster appointed had bonds that were of no value to the department ? Are we to understand that the department were so, shall I say——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Say anything you like ; make it good and strong.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend I hope is not inviting special criticism. The statement he has now given to the committee is different from the statement which he made the other day.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL I said that the general system adopted in the department to-day was to insure by the system of assessment and that I was under the impression that it was probable that this deputy postmaster was insured under that assessment system. On inquiry I find that the postmaster was an old officer who had given his security before the assessment system was adopted.

Mr. BLAIN. What steps were taken to find out whether these bonds were valueless or to recover from the sureties ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know what steps were taken to recover : the Deputy Postmaster General states that nothing has been recovered.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that bonds are taken from a postmaster and not from a deputy postmaster ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The system is to take bonds from the postmaster. We have not an arbitrary rule although I encourage and favour the assessment system in preference to the private bond system. When the hon. gentleman is in a responsible position in a government, he will find that it is not always so easy to recover from private sureties. I have endeavoured to have the assessment system adopted in all new appointments, although even in the case of new appointments an option is given to the postmasters where the amount of security is comparatively trifling.

Mr. BLAIN. Might I ask the minister what system he has of investigating and examining into the value of bonds given by postmasters in such a case as this. There seems to have been slackness on the part of the hon. gentleman.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No doubt the department took all the proper business steps to find out whether the bondholders were good or not. I presume that an inquiry was made by the inspector of the district. The bond was taken by our predecessors, and no doubt at that time the

sureties made the usual affidavit of justification and the bond was assumed to be of good value. But when you try to recover on a bond, you will find it frequently impossible to get anything. Sometimes sureties will swear to their solvency, and yet when a loss occurs you cannot recover. Moreover people's conditions alter.

Mr. BLAIN. Was there a law suit in this case ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What does the hon. gentleman mean ?

Mr. BLAIN. What steps did the department take to recover the sum of $7,000 which we are asked to vote ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not say that the bonds were for $7,000. I am quite satisfied that they were for no such sum.

Mr. BLAIN. Nor did I say they were, but I am asking the hon. gentleman to state what steps were taken to recover from the bondsmen who went security to the amount of the loss.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend has misunderstood me. I did not say that there were bonds for $7,000. It is not the practice to exact security to that extent, and I have no doubt that in this case there was no departure from the rule and that the amount of the bond was comparatively small as compared with the loss. My officer informed me that nothing could be recovered and I did not see what could be gained by a suit. As to the real embezzler, he has no means, but his family are very well off, and it was thought at one time that they would, for the honour of the family, come forward and make some contribution. However, they have not done so.

Mr. CLANCY. Can the hon. gentleman give me the information I asked for with regard to the dismissal at Port Lambton of a postmistress ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Are we through with this estimate ?

Mr. CLANCY. If the hon. gentleman wishes to go on, I will not delay him.

Mr. CALVIN. Do I understand that it is within the power of any postmaster to name a deputy, and if that deputy has power to do all the work of the office and receive money on deposit and yet not give any bond ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The postmaster must give security and he is responsible for the official he engages to assist him. Those he engage are sworn in by the inspector, who is supposed to exercise some discretion and in that way there is some departmental supervision as to who shall assist the postmaster. But the postmaster himself is the only one the government knows. In this case the postmaster gave a bond but the securities were not good for the amount, so that it was not considered possible to recover anything from them. Neither the sureties nor the postmaster are worth anything. The postmaster is responsible for the defalcation of his agent and his bond would cover that defalcation. It would not be practicable to obtain security from everybody engaged to work under the postmaster in a small post office. The emoluments of any of those postmasters are comparatively trifling and the value of the business trivial, and yet it would be possible for them to embezzle considerable sums. The postmasters are men of standing and character, which is the best security one can have, although one must not disregard ordinary business precautions and the taking of proper security.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not think that the hon. minister has given a satisfactory explanation. In the first place, under the rule only $3,000 can be deposited; but it seems that there were two depositors in this case and the amount was $7,000. How could $7,000 belonging to two individuals get into the hands of this deputy ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The man who committed these frauds got possession of the pass books of the depositors. In one instance he received $2,000 or $3,000 and only transmitted to the department a portion of that money, so that the superintendent of the money order branch was not aware that an attempt was being made to deposit more than the regulations allowed. It was not known by the department that that amount of money had been delivered to this man until the defalcation was discovered in the fall of 1892. The embezzler altered the entry in the pass book, and for a long time retained possession of it. It was only when the depositor insisted in getting possession of the pass book and not getting it communicated with the superintendent of the savings bank at Ottawa that the frauds came to light.

Mr. FOWLER. The depositor must certainly have known that he was exceeding the legal limit of the deposit.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, the difference was in the interest.

Mr. FOWLER. Then this thing must have lasted a long while to have accumulated all its interest.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It began in 1895 and lasted until 1902

Mr. FOWLER. Then for seven years this depositor never saw his pass book ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not say that.

Mr. FOWLER. The moment he saw it he must have known.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He was an illiterate man—could neither read nor write.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems strange that this could be carried on for seven years and nobody any the wiser. Would not the postmaster know what deposits were being made ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This man was the assistant.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems that the postmaster might as well——

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It was a postmistress.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the postmistress still retain her position ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think so, but am not sure.

Mr. FOWLER. The Postmaster General does not seem to know more than the law allows about this matter. Of course, the amount is not very large, but this seems to be establishing a precedent, and the committee should have the facts so as to be able to judge whether the money should be voted or not. The information must be in the hon. gentleman's department, and the item was left over in order that he might inform himself. On the basis of the facts made known, it seems to me we are not legally bound to pay this money. There may be an equitable claim, and that, of course, we should recognize. But it seems to me that this assistant postmaster was simply the agent of the Millers. He was handling their money and investing it for them. Of course, he may have made a bad investment of a considerable portion. I suppose there were pass-books ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) was not present when I made the explanation before. The assistant postmaster received money to transmit, but did not transmit it all. In one instance, I think he received $3,000 and only deposited $1,000. Having the pass-book of these men, I think he forged the amount in the deposit book, or falsified the entries. He threw the men off their guard and retained custody of the pass-book. Another method of embezzlement was to forge the name of the depositor to applications for withdrawals, transmit the pass-book of which he had the custody, and, as it was easy to recognize the envelope in which it came, intercepted the pass-book when it was sent back addressed to the depositor. Then he would forge the endorsement on the cheques issued on the savings banks. I am not familiar with all the details, but the case was in the hands of the Minister of Justice.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. He retained some of the money, $2,000. Then he forged requisitions on the department and intercepted the cheques payable to the order of the Millers. Then he forged the endorsement of the Millers on the cheque, and so the money never legally left the custody of the government.

Mr. FOWLER. Did he take all the money ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. He took the whole business—simply left the books.

Mr. MONK. Would not the banks be responsible when he forged the endorsation ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There was the forged requisition in the first place.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The government issued a cheque on the forged requisition ?

Mr. FOWLER. The forgery of the endorsation would not make the government liable, but the forgery of the requisition.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps the hon. Postmaster General would give me the information now on the item that was allowed to stand—the petitions and correspondence with regard to the Lambton post office.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am sending to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) the papers he asked for.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not wish to delay the consideration of this item to go over these papers. Do I understand that there are in these papers, which the hon. gentleman sent me, all the petitions and letters that passed ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think that everythinig the hon. gentleman asked for is there.

Mr. GOURLEY. I have a letter from the postmaster at Tatamagouche post office, in Colchester county, asking what is done with the money kept as a percentage from the postmasters.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the officer at Tatamagouche is insured under the assessment system, his assessment goes into the common fund. There is an insurance fund that is deposited in the post office savings bank as an insurance fund, and in the event of a defalcation on the part of any officer so insured, the amount for which he is insured in the fund is withdrawable from the fund by Order in Council. It is the same as with a corporation that issues fidelity bonds. They accept premiums from those insured, and these premiums are the means wherewith the company carries on its business and makes its profits and meets its losses. I think in a place of this size the postmaster would give a bond of perhaps $400 at the outside.

Mr. BLAIN. Where can we find a report of that insurance fund ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not entered in the public accounts, it is a trust fund. Under the Act there is a trust fund which is not handed over to the receiver general or to the Postmaster General, but it is deposited in the savings bank as a special trust fund to be drawn upon to meet any loss occasioned by the defalcation of an officer.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it in the report?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no statement of that in the report. I could get a statement from the savings bank. We have an officer who looks after that in the books of the department.

Amount required for compensation for price of islands and improvements to be made on islands in the St. Lawrence river, $12,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The American authorities have several islands which have been kept as open parks with public landings. But there is no similar accommodation among the Canadian islands, and the purpose of this is to establish several public landings and to purchase sufficient grounds for the purpose, so that Canadians passing up and down may have some public landing places.

Mr. TAYLOR. This is in accordance with an arrangement entered into between the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the Department of Public Works, with a deputation from the United States several years ago. The American government purchased and set apart a number of islands at certain points for public parks, both for Canadians and for Americans, and the Canadian government agreed to do the same. The islands that are set apart by the Canadian government belong to the Indian Department, and the government must vote the money and place it to the credit of the Indian Department in order to acquire the lands. I am glad to see that the government have acted on this arrangement after several years.

Mr. CLANCY. Before the committee rises, I wish to ask the Minister of Finance with regard to a petition to retain a post office where it was in the first instance, and where it had been for years, in a building belonging to a man by the name of McNulty, who was then postmaster. I do not see that petition among the papers.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I brought down all the papers my hon. friend asked for. I told my deputy to go through the 'Hansard' and see all that my hon. friend asked for, and transmit all the papers asked for. He says he has sent me more than the hon. gentleman asked for.

Mr. CLANCY. I asked for all the letters, papers and petitions in connection with it. I am not saying the hon. gentleman is withholding anything. I am merely asking if he has complied as far as possible with my request.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have here a memorandum from my deputy in which he tells me he has sent me all that the hon. gentleman asked for, if not more. I have not looked at the 'Hansard' to see what my hon. friend asked for, but if he will go through the 'Hansard' he will find that what he asked for is there, or else my deputy has misinformed me.

Mr. CLANCY. I only wish to be sure that all that is in the department in connection with the matter has been brought down. Of course it may have been that the petition was not sent to the department, but I know it was intended to be sent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I find there is one small item of $1,300 which has been omitted in the estimates, and I have procured the consent of His Excellency for the same.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL—FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) delivered a message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows:

MINTO.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons further supplementary estimates of sums required for the public service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1904, and, in accordance with the provisions of 'the British North America Act, 1867,' the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House, Ottawa,
21st October, 1903.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the message of His Excellency together with the estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think I will anticipate the wish of the House if I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to again leave the Chair for the House to resolve itself into Committee of Supply to consider this estimate.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Administration of Justice—to supplement the retiring allowance of Mr. Justice Henry, $1,333.34.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is one of the judges of the province of Nova Scotia who has been laid aside by a very severe illness, and who is now about to retire. It has been agreed between himself and the government that for one year he shall be allowed his full salary. He is a comparatively young man who but for his illness would have many years of service on the bench. It has been agreed that the

government shall recommend the payment of his full salary for one year after which he will receive the ordinary superannuation.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903—CONFERENCE WITH THE SENATE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE presented a report from the special committee appointed to draw up reasons to be offered at a conference with the Senate for disagreeing with certain amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 21) entitled an Act to amend and consolidate the law respecting Railways.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved :

That a conference be desired with the Senate for the purpose of communicating the reasons which induce this House not to concur in the amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. (21) intituled : 'An Act to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways.'

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved :

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours therewith.

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MONK. What will be the order of business for to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The resolutions touching the Quebec bridge.

Mr. MONK. After that ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Concurrence and any matters which remain on the paper generally.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.55 a.m., Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, October 22, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

FIRE PROTECTION OF STATIONS, &c., INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. BENNETT—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. How many stations, freight sheds, and restaurants are there under control of the government on the Intercolonial Railway ?
2. What precautions have been taken to protect such properties from loss by fire ?
3. If any protection is provided for any of such buildings, what are the names of those so protected ?
4. What losses have there been by fire, and the cause of the same, in the past two years ?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) :

1. Stations, 252 ; freight sheds, 76 ; restaurants, 1.

2. The railway takes usual and reasonable precautions according to the locality and the importance of the buildings to protect them from loss by fire. Some are protected by water pipes, fire hydrants and hose, others by tanks, and others by portable fire extinguishers, and some by wells.

3. Halifax, Wellington, Shubenacadie, Truro, Debert, Wentworth, Oxford Junction, Athol, Aulac, College Bridge, Moncton, Anagance, Norton, Lakeside, Quispamsis, Brookville, Canaan, Kent Junction, Derby Junction, Red Pine, Belledune, Eel River, Flat Lands, Assametquaghan, Sayabec, St. Flavie, St. Fabien, Isle Verte, St. Alexandre, St. Phillippe de Neri, Ste. Louise, St. Valier, St. Joseph, Chaudière Curve, De Lotbinière, Lavergne, St. Leonard Junction, St. Cyrille, Bagot, Pictou, New Glasgow, Scotsburn, Tatamagouche, Pugwash Junction, Richmond, Enfield, Stewiacke, Dartmouth, East Mines, Westchester, River Phillip, Maccan, Sackville, Memramcook, Boundary Creek, Penobsquis, Bloomfield, Nauwigewauk, Rothesay, Cold Brook, Coal Branch, Rogersville, Newcastle, Gloucester Junction, Jacquet River, Dalhousie Junction, Matapedia, Causapscal, St. Moise, Rimouski, St. Simon, St. Arsène, St. André, L'Islet, St. Michel, Lévis, Chaudière Junction, Kingsburg Junction, Daveluyville, Ste. Perpetue, Drummondville, St. Henri, Brown's Point, Trenton, Meadowville, Malagash, Pugwash, Bedford, Elmsdale, Alton, Waverly, Londonderry, Greenville, Salt Springs, Nappan, Dorchester, Calhouns, Salisbury, Sussex, Passekeag, Jubilee, Riverside, St. John, Adamsville, Barnaby River, Beaver Brook, Bathurst, New Mills, Campbellton, St. Alexis, Amqui, Little Metis, Sacré Cœur, Trois Pistoles, Cacouna, Ste. Helene, Rivière Ouelle, Montmagny, St. Charles Junction, Hadlow, St. Apollinaire, Moose Park, Aston Junction, Mitchell, St. Germain, Nicolet, Westville, Pictou Landing, River John, Wallace, Conn's Mills, Windsor Junction, Milford, Brookfield, Belmont, Folleigh, Thomson, Spring Hill, Amherst, Upper Dorchester, Painsec Junction, Petitcodiac, Apohaqui, Hampton, Model Farm, Torryburn, Berry's Mills, Harcourt, Chatham Junction, Bartibogue, Petite Roche, Charlo, Moffatts, Millstream, Cedar Hall, St. Octave, Bic, St. Eloie, Rivière du Loup, St. Paschal, Ste. Anne, St. Pierre, Harlaka Junction, St. Romuald, Laurier, Forestdale, St. Wenceslas, Carmel, St. Eugène, St. Monique, Stellarton, Scotch Hill, Denmark, Wallace Bridge, Oxford, Oxford Junction, Glengarry, Merigomish, Antigonish, Bayfield Road, Pirate Harbour, West Bay Road, McKinnon's Harbour, Boisdale, Sydney, Indiantown, Valley, Hopewell, Barnaby's River, South River, Afton, Mulgrave, River Denys, Iona, George's River, Pointe du Chêne, Mill-

erton, Riversdale, Ferrona Junction, Marshy Hope, Pomquet, Tracadie, Point Tupper, Orangedale, Grand Narrows, North Sydney Junction, Shediac, West River, West Merigomish, James River, Heatherton, Harbour au Bouche, McIntyre's Lake, Alba, Shenacadie, North Sydney, Dalhousie.

4. 1901—St. Anaclet Station, forest fires; Dartmouth engine-house, cause unknown. 1902—Ste. Rosalie Junction telegraph office, sparks from engine; Rivière du Loup coal shed, sparks from engine; Rocky Lake flag station, cause unknown. 1903—Green Point flag station, over-heated stove; Forestdale station, forest fires; Aston Junction station, forest fires; Moose Park station, forest fires.

INTEREST ON PUBLIC DEBT.

Mr. BUREAU—by Mr. Calvert—asked:

By what amount will the interest on the public debt be decreased from June 30, 1903?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The information has already been furnished to the House, and the hon. gentleman will find it in another form.

JUDGES IN QUEBEC AND EXTRA LEGAL BUSINESS.

Mr. GRANT—by Mr. Calvert—asked:

1. Is the Minister of Justice aware that some of the judges of the court of King's bench and of the Superior Court, in the province of Quebec, occupy remunerative positions, such as directors of banks, financial and industrial corporations, which business and affairs may come within and under the jurisdiction of said judges?

2. Is the Minister of Justice aware that some of these judges are administrators, executors and trustees of estates, which are engaged in general pursuits, the affairs of said estates being liable to come under the jurisdiction of said judges?

3. If so, is it the intention of the government to amend the laws concerning provincial courts in the province of Quebec, so as to remedy the evils of which the public complains?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick):

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. It is not within our jurisdiction to do as suggested by the question.

LIGHTHOUSE KEEPERS AND INCREASE OF SALARY.

Mr. GAUVREAU asked:

1. Did the honourable the Minister of Marine and Fisheries receive the following petition?

Quebec, December 2, 1902.

To the Honourable
Raymond Préfontaine,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

Honourable Sir,—We, the undersigned, keepers of the floating lighthouses at l'Ile Rouge, Ile Blanche and Bas de la Traverse, most humbly request you to take into consideration the fact that we have been obliged to undergo, during the present season, heavy expenses for wages and food for the crews of the vessels under our control; and that during a full month more than in former seasons.

We commenced, last spring, fifteen days earlier than usual, and this fall we closed fifteen days later. When our salaries were established, they were fixed for seven months of service, and we have always been paid for that lapse of time. This year, the requirements of navigation demanded an additional month of service. We are always ready to do all in our power to be of service to navigation, both early in the spring and late in the fall. To do so it is necessary to keep a complete crew, and a greater amount of provisions, which costs a large amount.

We, therefore, beg of you to allow us an additional month of salary, pro rata, in order to indemnify us for such expenditure and for the services that we rendered. We also desire to draw your attention to the fact that early in the springtime navigation work is cold and hard; and in the fall it is not only cold and hard, but also dangerous. Hoping that you will take our petition into favourable consideration, we have the honur to be your very humble servants.

CAPT. JOHN IRVING,
Keeper of Ile Rouge Floating Lighthouse,
CAPT. REGIS LEBLANC,
Keeper of Ile Blanche Floating Lighthouse.
CAPT. ESDRAS LEBEL,
Keeper of Bas de la Traverse Floating Lighthouse.

2. If in the affirmative, what answer has been given by the department?

3. Is it the intention of the minister to grant to the signers of the said petition the allowances which they ask for and to grant them this year?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. R. Préfontaine):

1. Yes.

2. Yes, an answer was sent stating that their petition would receive consideration.

3. All matters of increases will be considered after the session, and in this case the increases which I propose to give will date from 1st of July of this year.

THE SLATER SHOE COMPANY AND ALIEN LABOUR.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the attention of the government to a matter of some importance to the workingmen of the city of Montreal and throughout the country generally. I will read an extract from the minutes of a meeting of the members of the Canadian Federation of the United Shoemakers of Canada, held on the 9th of October instant, at the meeting hall of their society in Montreal:

Extract from the minutes of a meeting of the members of the Canadian Federation of United Shoemakers of Canada, held on the 9th of October instant, at the meeting hall of their society at Montreal.

The following resolution was proposed and unanimously carried:—

That the following facts be brought to the notice of the Dominion government:—

1. That the Canadian Federation of the United Shoemakers of Canada was founded, several years ago, for the purpose of bringing together Canadian shoemakers, with a view to improving their social conditions and ensuring fairer dealings between employers and employees in the shoemaking industry.

2. The said association is termed national, being purely Canadian, its membership wholly made up of Canadians, who select their officers in this country and keep their funds in Canada.

3. The said association has been endorsed by all the boot and shoe manufacturers in the district of Montreal, barring one. The said association has made rapid progress, and comprises at present over 1,700 members ; it has accomplished a great deal in the way of ensuring more equitable dealings between capital and labour, and has given satisfaction to the manufacturers and to employees in the boot and shoe industry.

4. On the 20th of July last, the Slater Shoe Company, Limited, boot and shoe manufacturers of Montreal, who employed largely members of the Canadian Federation, without reason or justification decided that its operatives should join the Boot and Shoe Workers Union, an international association, having its leaders and its funds in Boston, United States, and which exacts from its members a weekly contribution of twenty-five cents, the two-thirds of which are forwarded to the board of management in the United States, while the Canadian Federation requires from its members a contribution of only ten cents per week.

5. At the same time, the Slater Shoe Company stated that they had decided to adopt the national brand of that foreign association to be stamped on their goods, and had resolved to withdraw from the boot and shoemakers' union of the city of Montreal, who endorsed the Canadian Federation of Shoemakers.

6. The employees of the company who belong to the Canadian Federation, numbering 500, refused to submit to these tyrannical, unjust and arbitrary terms, and were obliged to leave the employ of the Slater Company on account of this refusal.

7. The Boot and Shoe Workers' Union aforementioned, whose membership in Montreal is limited to a few hundred, undertook, by all possible means, to supply the said company with hands to replace the members of the Canadian Federation, and tried to recruit men elsewhere.

8. The Slater Shoe Company, finding itself unable to carry on operations without the help of other operatives to replace those who had left their employ under the circumstances above mentioned, had recourse to the importation of shoemakers from the United States.

9. The said company despatched emissaries to the United States to recruit hands, and by advertising in various localities in that country and through the efforts and help of the foreign leaders of the international association and their agents, succeeded in bringing to Montreal to work in their factory, about forty or fifty foreign operatives imported from the United States.

10. Such importation of alien labour is in open violation of the Federal Act 60-61 Victoria, chapter 11, as amended by I Edward VII., chapter 13.

11. Such infringement of an Act, the object of which is to protect Canadian labour against the competition and importation of alien labour, is extremely hurtful to our workingmen. The aforementioned Act provides that the Dominion government may interfere in cases where foreign labour is imported contrary to the provisions of the above statute and may send back to their country of origin hands thus imported, at the expense of those who employ them.

12. The United States government are strictly enforcing a similar law in their own territory, whenever foreigners are imported to work there. Our government would not only be justifiable, but even should feel themselves in duty bound to act promptly towards the enforcement of the aforementioned statute, with a view to protecting Canadian labour, particularly in the case of a company such as the Slater Shoe Company, who, for several years past, got from the government heavy contracts for the supply of boots and shoes.

13. The Canadian Federation is prepared to prove all the facts herein stated, if the government are willing to make an investigation into the matter. The Federation wish to protest at the same time against the report which appeared in the 'Labour Gazette,' to the effect that the strike at the Slater Shoe Company's factory was over.

Therefore, the Canadian Federation requests that the Dominion government should interfere promptly in connection with this difficulty between the Slater Shoe Company and their former employees, members of the Canadian Federation of United Shoemakers of Canada ; that the government, in accordance with the powers conferred by the Act 60-61 Victoria, chapter 11, as amended, should oblige the Slater Shoe Company to send back to the United States the hands imported from that country who are employed in their factory, and that in the event of the company failing to do so, the Dominion government should send these operatives back at the expense of the said Slater Company. The Canadian Federation is ready to reveal the names of the workingmen so imported to persons designated for that purpose by the government to look into the circumstances and make inquiry.

In consequence, the Canadian Federation urgently appeals to the government to enforce the law and to duly protect Canadian labour ; and hopes that the government will do its duty.

That a copy of the present resolution be forwarded to the right honourable Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Prime Minister of Canada, and to Sir William Mulock, the Minister of Labour.

True copy of the minutes of the said meeting.

(Signed) T. BEAUPRE,
President.

(Signed) A. J. DIONNE,
Secretary.

My right hon. friend will see that this is a grave question in a factory which does a considerable quantity of government work. The authorities of the manufactory dismiss a large number of Canadian workingmen, and contrary to law, import from the United States, from Boston and vicinity a certain number of American workmen to replace those Canadian workmen, who, under coercion and contrary to their own interests, are obliged to quit the factory. I will not ask the hon. Minister of Labour (Hon. Sir William Mulock), because I am afraid he has not proved during this session that he has taken up the case of the workingmen with any desire to protect their interests,

but I would like to ask the right hon. First Minister what is being done to put an immediate stop to this state of affairs ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Could my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) give me the date upon which the resolution was passed ?

Mr. MONK. The 9th October. I understand they communicated it immediately to the government.

The PRIME MINISTER. Not that I am aware of. I received on Friday a delegation of this very body of the Canadian Federation of United Shoemakers of Canada.

Mr. MONK. They brought it up with them, I suppose.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, they did not bring it up that I am aware of. They brought up a further subject but not this one. Of course, the moment the matter is brought to my attention it will be my duty to attend to it. I am not aware that the matter has been brought to my attention and this is the first intimation that I have received of it unless it came in the regular way in the correspondence and was transferred to the Department of Labour. At all events this is the first intimation I have had of the matter and I will make it my duty to give it my immediate attention.

NEWSPAPER AGENTS AND POSTMASTERS IN QUEBEC.

Hon. J. I. TARTE (Montreal, St. Mary's). Mr. Speaker, although the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) is not in his seat it is my duty to call the attention of the government to a state of affairs that to my knowledge has never existed before. I intend to move the adjournment of the House to put myself in order, seconded by Mr. Bell. The agents of the government newspapers are going to every postmaster in the province of Quebec and insisting on getting from these public officers the names of the subscribers to all the newspapers which have not either the privilege or the disadvantage of being government organs. I speak from personal knowledge. I speak of facts that I am in a position to establish when I say that they get from nearly every postmaster in the province of Quebec the names of subscribers to newspapers—I say it again—who have not the privilege or the disadvantage of being government organs. I would like to know whether the same privilege would be extended to all the newspapers or if the privilege which has never been exercised to my knowledge during the last twenty-five years is to be confined to the agents of government newspapers. This is a very serious state of affairs. The postmasters do not any longer keep secret what is going on in their offices. Not only have government officers been allowed to canvass for government papers, but the postmaster of the Public Works Department, a gentleman whom I appointed myself, has been given a leave of absence under the pretext of illness.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He is not an officer of my department.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It does not matter, I am addressing myself to this House and the country. I am placing before them a particular state of affairs which is a very serious one. A public officer, the postmaster of the Department of Public Works, has been given leave of absence under the pretext of illness and he has been acting as chief circulation agent of the government organ in Montreal. His son, who, I believe, is not of age, has been appointed to his place at $1,200 a year. The gentleman to whom leave of absence on account of illness has been given has not been sick at all. He was not sick and the hon. minister knew he was not sick. I state the fact ; he knew he was not sick. He has been canvassing as chief circulation agent of the government organ in Montreal and his son has been receiving his salary. In addition to that the postmasters of the province of Quebec have been forced to give the names of the subscribers of newsapers, which, in the estimation of some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, are not friendly to them, to the agents of government organs. I want to know whether the same privilege will be given to all the newspapers. For instance, will the agents of 'La Patrie' be allowed to go to the postmasters in the province of Quebec and ask for the names of the subscribers of the newspapers received in their locality ? I will not object at all if the rule is applied to everybody. I do not rise to personally complain. As far as the newspapers I am connected with is concerned we have not suffered in spite of what may have been said in the past. Our circulation is larger to-day than it was a year ago.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes, that is true to-day. I observe that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) says hear, hear. I am prepared to issue a challenge to him. I repeat that our circulation is larger to-day. The circulation of our two newspapers is larger to-day than it was a year ago, so that I do not complain personally, only I want to know whether such a state of affairs as that which I have described is to be allowed to continue. Will a postmaster in the province of Ontario be allowed to give the names of the subscribers of the 'Mail,' or the 'World,' or the 'Globe' and if so I want to know whether the same privilege will be extended to us in the province of Quebec. The hon. Postmaster General. I hope will give us a satisfactory answer on that point.

Mr. TAYLOR. May I ask my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) what use this gentleman

makes of the information he obtains from the postmaster ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I do not know that we should go farther on that point. I am only discussing the question of privilege. As to the use that is made of it, it is a very simple thing. Of course, the agents go to the subscribers of the papers that are supposed not to be friendly to my hon. friends on the treasury benches and offer their own newspapers. This is being done all over the province of Quebec. Provided the same laws apply to all I do not care.

The PRIME MINISTER (Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier)). It is evident that my hon. friend is proceeding under a delusion. He magnifies the work of a probably over-zealous agent into a government system. The hon. gentleman charges that the postmaster of the Public Works Department has obtained leave of absence from the minister under the pretense of illness, and he says the minister knew this official was not ill. I refuse to believe that the minister would give leave of absence, knowing that the official was not ill, but the minister will be here to speak for himself. I believe that if this official asked for leave of absence, he did it in the regular way, and I do not think that the minister had reason to suppose that he was imposed upon, if he was imposed upon.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It is a question of fact. If the right hon. gentleman will apply to some of his friends in the House, they will tell him that the minister was approached and asked that Mr. Latour should be sent out as he was a very essentiai agent.

The PRIME MINISTER. We heard a similar statement in this House a few days ago, and I understand the Minister of Public Works did not admit its accuracy. At all events, if the minister has given an improper leave of absence, it will be for the House to deal with the minister who is responsible. It is also stated that this officer is now acting as a canvassing agent for certain newspapers, and that he goes to the postmasters in several parts of the country, and asks to see the lists of subscribers to different newspapers. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has made the charge in such a way as to imply, that the postmasters had received an order from the Post Office Department to allow an agent for papers friendly to the government, to have access to the list of subscribers to other papers. On that point, the hon. gentleman is absolutely under a delusion. No such order has been given by the Postmaster General's department. If any postmasters have done that, they have done it without authority, and on their own responsibility, and without being ordered by anybody to do it.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. My point is that I want to know if it is proper for postmasters to act in this way. I can tell my right hon. friend that not one but twenty men are doing the same thing now. Nearly all the postmasters in the province of Quebec—a great many of them are Liberals now—have been told that they have to do it, and they are doing it every day. I am prepared to prove to my hon. friend that it is actually a system now. If it is proper for the postmasters to do this, then I have nothing to say.

The PRIME MINISTER. As to that, I had better give the floor to the Postmaster General who will answer.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I understand the hon. member (Hon. Mr. Tarte) to make three distinct statements. He states, that the postmaster of the Public Works Department has been engaged in canvassing for a newspaper, and that in the course of his canvass he has obtained information from the postmasters as to the names of persons to whom other newspapers were being sent.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I did not allude to him more than to any other agent.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. member further states that, the minister gave leave of absence to this officer, although the minister knew that the illness on which he obtained leave of absence did not exist.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Does the hon. gentleman allude to me ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Not by any means.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then, the Minister of Public Works will deal with that, and he probably will be here before this discussion ends. I have no doubt that the Minister of Public Works will give a satisfactory explanation. The third statement of the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) was, that postmasters were being forced to give information of this nature.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I did not say forced.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I took down the word 'forced' as it fell from the hon. gentleman's lips, but if he used it inadvertently he can modify the statement. Does the hon. gentleman say that the postmasters have acted under the direction of those who alone can give orders.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I say they have so acted.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. At whose instance ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I say that gentlemen acting for government organs in Montreal are going to these public officers telling them that they represent the Liberal party, the government, and asking them in that capacity for the names of subscribers

to other papers. I say that in not one case, but in a hundred cases and perhaps more, this information is disclosed.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) distinctly said that postmasters have been forced to give these names.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. They have been practically forced ; I repeat that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman desires to suggest by that statement that any pressure has been brought to bear upon postmasters by the responsible head of the department, or by any official of this department ; he has been misinformed. Further, I challenge him to make good that statement.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Let the Postmaster General keep cool as I do. What statement does he want me to make good.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman said that postmasters had been forced to give the names of subscribers. If he implies that the Postmaster General or any official in the employment of the Postmaster General, or any officer of the government, forced postmasters or brought pressure to bear upon the postmasters to disclose the confidential information they possess by giving the names of the addressees of mail matter, I say that he cannot make good any such charges as that.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I never said that the Postmaster General or any of his officers gave instructions to that effect, but I do say that nearly all the postmasters in the province of Quebec, and even in the province of Ontario are giving that information. I say that they have been approached by agents of the party in office, and told that they have to give that information, and they are giving it. Surely the Postmaster General will not shield himself behind words. If you give me a Committee of the House I will prove within twenty-four hours that the postmasters are giving that information, in not one case, but in one hundred cases. Is it permissible for the postmasters to do that ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman has qualified his original statement.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. We will see; we will see.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Perhaps I may be permitted to present my view of it. We are winding up a session in a debate not of to-day only, but of several days, of misrepresentation. This is in keeping with the tenor of previous debates. The hon. gentleman has sought to convey the impression that the postmasters of this country were more or less, by reason of the authority of or pressure from the government——

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I did not say that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman said that postmasters were being forced to disclose the names of subscribers of newspapers. I challenge my hon. friend to prove—we will give him a chance to do so if he can—that the government or any officer of the government, with any consent of the government, or with their acquiescence or knowledge, has invited, or pressed, or authorized, or in any way warranted, the postmasters to disclose the names of the addressees of newspapers in any part of Canada. If my hon. friend had been attending to his duties in parliament he would not have felt it necessary to raise this question to-day; because in Committee of Supply the other day it was raised by an hon. gentleman opposite, and I was asked to state my attitude in regard to the matter. The view I announced then is my view to-day, and it has been the attitude of the government ever since this government has been in existence. I stated then, and I state now, the information which postmasters possess as to the names of the addressees of mail matter of any kind, whether it consists of letters, parcels, newspapers or any other matter that may pass through the mails, is confidential; and they are not warranted in disclosing that information to any human being except the addressees themselves. I stated that in the most unqualified way. I stated then, and I state now, that if any hon. gentleman will specify the name of any officer of my department who has been guilty of any breach of confidence, I will feel it my duty to discipline that officer in a way appropriate to his offence. Is that a fair attitude ? Does my hon. friend take exception to it ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I do not take exception to that statement; very far from it. My hon. friend has made the right statement, and I congratulate him upon it. It is worthy of a Minister of the Crown. But I state again that over one hundred postmasters in the province of Quebec and in other provinces also have given freely the information which I have stated to the House. If my hon. friend wants me to make charges against them all in order that he may dismiss them, I am prepared to do it, although I do not wish any ill-luck to anybody; but these are the facts of the case. I will give him, with pleasure, the names of these officers, if he wishes to have them. What I meant to convey was this, that the postmasters, being approached by agents of the party in power, thought they were obliged to give that information, and they have given it freely. I am glad my hon. friend the Postmaster General has vindicated his position, and I congratulate him on the statement which he has just made and which I accept altogether.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then my hon. friend will see that it is only fair

for him to modify his views. He overstated what he had in his mind.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I have not.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will my hon. friend permit me to suggest that perhaps now he owes a duty to this House. He as a man of affairs knows that men enjoying the good will of a particular party, the party in power for the moment, may go about canvassing. Our supporters, our friends, our sympathizers are legion in number, and they perhaps act as agents to procure subscribers for newspapers. Men who are engaged in canvassing for anything are zealous, and these men may go to a postmaster, and may bring to bear whatever arguments may occur to them in order to obtain such assistance as will enable them to succeed in their enterprises; but that does not mean that they are agents for the government or have any authority from the government. There is no human being authorized by the government to exact such information as my hon. friend says has been imparted by postmasters. The postmasters themselves ought to be possessed of sufficient intelligence to know that any person who drops in and asks them for the names of the addressees of mail matter, have not any authority to demand it, simply because they choose to ask for it; and I would ask my hon. friend, since he says he can do so, to furnish me with the names of the postmasters who he says have been transgressors; and, as I stated before, these cases will be duly investigated, and the postmasters will be disciplined. The officers will of course be given an opportunity to explain what they have done, and steps will be taken to prevent any repetition of such action in the future.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Would it not be well for the hon. gentleman to issue instructions to the postmasters generally that they must keep confidential what my hon. friend wants to be kept confidential? I accept with pleasure the hon. gentleman's offer, and I undertake to give him the names of dozens and dozens of postmasters——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hundreds.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Dozens and dozens of names from hundreds of postmasters. I will undertake, with pleasure, to give the names to my hon. friend; and if he feels that the proper discipline would be dismissal, it is for him to say.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, I will undertake that the postmasters who he says have transgressed will never repeat the offence. Throughout the whole of this country there has been a practice for many years of postmasters acting as agents for newspapers, and they are not interfered with. Postmasters are permitted to act as agents to receive subscriptions for all papers, without regard to the politics of the papers. If the House desires that that practice should be put an end to, the government and the department will give every consideration to that view. It will cut both ways.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I understood that there was a charge made in this House, not only to-day, but some two weeks ago, that an officer of the government, while ostensibly absent on his vacation, had been engaged in canvassing for a newspaper, and had been obtaining from postmasters in the province of Quebec the names of subscribers to certain newspapers in that province.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I do not make the charge directly against that officer. I make the general charge that postmasters in the province of Quebec have given information to agents of government organs. I do not know whether Mr. Latour himself has gone to these postmasters.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know how that may be. The matter was discussed in the House some ten days ago, and I think it would have been very well for the Postmaster General then to have issued the circular which he now proposes to issue. The men who are engaged in this work are inducing the postmasters to commit a breach of the law. Is it not an offence under the Post Office Act, or a breach of the regulations of the department, for postmasters to communicate information of this kind? Would my hon. friend inform me as to that?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot say what the regulations are; but if there is no regulation covering the case, there ought to be one. I think I have made my view quite clear. Regulation or no regulation, the duty rests upon the postmaster to observe the strictest confidence as to the names of addressees. I would not think a regulation was necessary in order to impress that duty on a postmaster. And the other evening when the matter was brought up, no specific charge was made; the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) made a statemen that this particular officer had been engaged in the work, and that night I asked the member for Compton to give me the information which I now ask from the hon. member for St. Mary's division, Montreal (Mr. Tarte), to give me the names of the officers whom he says have offended. I promised to investigate the charge if that information was given me, but it has not yet been given, and again we have an indefinite charge made.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I will give the information.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was in hopes that my hon. friend the Postmaster General could have told us what the law in regard to this is. I agree with him that if there is no regulation there should be one, and if

there is a regulation then we have a provision in the statutes that any man who violates that regulation is guilty of a misdemeanour. The men who are going through the province of Quebec doing this work, are engaged in the work of inducing officers of the Crown to commit a violation of the law. It would be the duty of the government, upon the matter having been brought to their attention, to take legal proceedings against these men who are corrupting officers of the law, if the provisions of the law are sufficient for the purpose, and if the law is not sufficient I hope it will be amended so that this work will be stopped. The Postmaster General challenges us to show that his department or any officer of his department has been guilty of this conduct.

Mr. GALLIHER. I understood that the Postmaster General made this challenge to the hon. member for St. Mary's division, Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte); I understood my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to say that the Postmaster General challenged the opposition.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I presume that there is some point in my friend's observation, but I do not exactly see it at present. Whether the officers of the department are doing this or not—and I am bound to take the statement of the Postmaster General that they are not doing it—certain persons representing organs of the government, are going, with the pretended authority of this government, to postmasters in Quebec and by means of that false claim, however false it may be, are obtaining information to which they are not entitled. That is one point of the observations of the hon. member for St. Mary's division, Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte), and it is a matter which invites the attention of the government, because whether or not any officer of the department is guilty of these acts, they cannot shut their eyes to the fact that their own supporters are, by their false pretenses and claims, coercing the postmasters of Quebec. They urge the fact that they are supporting the party in power, and they claim to have the right to have these postmasters dismissed or otherwise dealt with in case they do not furnish that information. I say that this demands the immediate attention of the government, and that the government should take proceedings against the postmasters themselves, but more especially against the men who are urging the postmasters, by threats of poltical influence, to do that which it is improper to do, and which, as I understand the law, it is unlawful to do. My hon. friend may issue as many challenges as he likes about the officers of the department, but my understanding is that this is being done by supporters of the government under the claim that they have the force and power of the government behind them. An admittedly wrong thing is being done, even according to the statements of the Postmaster General, who says that he does not know whether there is such a regulation. But he admits that if there is not a regulation there ought to be one. Under these circumstances I think that some action should have been taken by the Postmaster General before this; action cannot be taken by him too promptly under the circumstances that have been disclosed to the House to-day. And let me tell my hon. friend the Postmaster General who spoke in a somewhat sneering way of the absence from the House of my hon. friend from St. Mary's division (Hon. Mr. Tarte), that I do not think any member of the government is in a position to say very much about that, because we have now before us this matter involving the Department of Public Works, and the Minister of Public Works cannot be found to answer the statement of the hon. member for St. Mary's division, Montreal. We have had ministers of the Crown very frequently absent from their places in this House when we were discussing estimates in regard to which they could have given information that was desired. I quite understand that this absence is sometimes necessary, but yet I might advert to the fact that the Solicitor General—I do not know for what reason—has hardly made an appearance in the House during the present session. If we come to investigate the absence of presence of members, the hon. member for St. Mary's division can at least say that he has been in his seat in the House during this session about as much as any minister of the Crown.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I believe I have, yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do hope that the Postmaster General will give this matter the attention which its importance demands, and I am led to believe that he will give it that attention by the fact that he has to-day very properly and promptly said that if the names of these postmasters are furnished to him he will take steps to investigate. But I do not think he should stop there; he should take steps to punish the men who have been inciting postmasters in Quebec and in Ontario as well—if the statement of the hon. member for St. Mary's division can be substantiated—under the guise of the pretended authority of this government, to commit a breach of their duty and of the law.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend says that I should immediately take steps to deal with this subject. Permit me to suggest that perhaps a duty is cast on those who say that they possess information as to the misconduct complained of. Some days ago it was stated by the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) that certain postmasters had disclosed confidential information and had given the names of subscribers to newspapers. I then asked the hon. gen-

tleman to furnish me with the names of the postmasters whom he said had transgressed, and that information was promised to me. Some days have elapsed, but that information has not yet been given to me. How could I investigate the cases when I did not know the names of the accused? I then pointed out that we have ten thousand and more postmasters.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was not urging action with respect to names not furnished; I admit at once that it would be impossible to do that, but I say that the names have been promised to-day, and when these names are furnished he should proceed to punish not only the postmasters, but those who urged them to commit a breach of the law.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I told the House that when the names, are furnished to me I will then, for the first time, be in a position to intelligently investigate this charge. Can my hon. friend give me the names of the officer of my department whom he stated in the House yesterday had made certain threats against an express company?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know the name of the officer; I promised to give it yesterday, but the matter escaped my mind. I will give it to my hon. friend to-day. The name of the officer can be procured, I think, because the information has been furnished to me by the express company which was threatened.

Mr. EMMERSON. The question raised by the Postmaster General as to whether it is proper for postmasters to act as agents for the newspapers is a very important question. I know, as a matter of fact, that in the constituency which I have the honour to represent there have been in the past, and there may be now, postmasters who are acting as agents for a very large and important newspaper in the city of Montreal. I consider such acts very reprehensible, as against public interests and against the other newspapers, for the simple reason that such postmasters know what is the circulation of every newspaper that goes through their office. It is very unfair to the general public that any postmaster should be permitted to act as the agent of any newspaper. I wish to emphasize the point raised by the Postmaster General, and trust he will take action to prevent any postmaster acting in any such capacity.

Mr. GALLIHER. I must disagree with my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson). The salary of many postmasters throughout the country is very small, and I see no harm in a postmaster earning an honest dollar by acting as agent for a newspaper.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). This practice, to which our attention has been drawn by the hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte), is not confined at all to the province of Quebec. To my knowledge these agents of newspapers supporting the government are travelling through the country seeking to obtain from the postmasters information as to the subscribers to all newspapers not friendly to the government. The postmasters are not the real culprits. We can find the remedy right here. One remedy would be for the Postmaster General to advise the postmasters not to give this information. They may not view the matter seriously and may give information to one side or the other without thinking they are doing great harm, and they may readily yield to the pressure brought on them by the agents of newspapers supporting the government. Another remedy would be for members of the government, who are behind these newspapers, to call off these men who are seeking this information. The real evil is not so much the postmasters giving the information as the agents of the government demanding it from them.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are not agents of the government.

Mr. CLANCY. They are in an indirect sense.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In no sense.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman and his friends profit by it. My hon. friend beside me suggests that each minister has a paper of his own. We have no objection to agents of government newspapers going around the country getting information, but we object to its being furnished by the postmasters. The Postmaster General need not wait for an inquiry. All he need do is inform the postmasters what is their duty.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). I see an announcement in the 'Citizen' this morning which I would draw to the attention of the hon. the Postmaster General. It is to the effect that two special trains will leave the capital to-day with Conservative campaign literature.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is out of order. That has no connection with the question before the Chair.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). To my mind the difficulty brought up by the hon. member for Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has its origin in the defective regulations of the department. The regulation plainly conveys to any postmaster the idea that he is free to give every information respecting the subscribers to newspapers which go through his office. Here is the regulation:

Article 176. No information can be given respecting letters which pass through the post office except to the persons to whom they are addressed and the senders on inquiry respecting delivery. The postmasters are not permitted to

furnish any information respecting the names and addresses of persons who receive correspondence at their respective offices.

There is nothing in that regulation regarding newspapers. It is entirely restricted to letters. An agent therefore could readily persuade the postmaster that the intention of the government was that he should give that information. I think that until these regulations are revised and reprinted in the postal guide, a special regulation should at once be sent out to all the postmasters, making this rule 176 applicable to newspapers as well as to letters.

Motion to adjourn (Hon. Mr. Tarte) negatived.

THE USE OF MAIL BAGS.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (South Leeds). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to ask if the hon. First Minister and the hon. Postmaster General have had a conference and what explanation he has to give the House ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). I am pleased to inform my hon. friend that the difficulty to which he alludes has been successfully overcome. It involved considerable effort and a considerable expenditure of money, but we have done all that the resources of the country will permit. We ordered an additional supply of 1,000 mail bags, but I am sorry to say that that number was inadequate, and we have had to order 2,000. The delivery of these bags commences this afternoon and will continue rapidly, so that we hope soon to be able to place at the disposal of hon. gentlemen opposite all the bags now used in this very interesting and important public work. With reference to the dissemination of this literature, which my hon. friend characterized rather irreverently as 'stuff'——

Mr. TAYLOR. The right kind of stuff, too.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. A rose by any other name would smell as sweet. I say with reference to this literature that we have made arrangements which I trust will successfully solve the difficulty. It is quite true that we have already chartered one special train, which will leave Ottawa as soon as the staff of special employees can be obtained to man it, I think, by to-night. You will observe a mountain of literature already adorning the front of the House of Commons, and that trainload is being conveyed to the station as rapidly as the available supply in this city will admit, and as fast as steam will carry it to its destination it will be despatched. I am sorry to say—no, I am not sorry, but the fact is that a second train, and perhaps a third train will be necessary. But our duty, we think, is first of all to clear the lobbies and halls of this building, as soon as that interesting task is performed, we will then proceed to try and clear out all the floor space that is occupied by this literature in the city post office. I hope that in the course of at least three days we will have despatched all these pieces to their destination, and they will afford, I am sure, most interesting reading to the addressees, and perhaps they will then consider, upon a careful perusal of them, whether the game has been worth the candle, whether the cost to which the country has been put is fully warranted by this very extraordinary procedure. However, it is probable that the country will demand some amendment of the franking privilege. It certainly has been grossly abused.

Mr. CLARKE. By none more so than by the hon. gentlemen opposite.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no case on record since Canada had an existence where such an abuse of the system has occurred as in the present instance.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is a somewhat remarkable thing that a certain amount of mail matter which, as we were told yesterday, could not be forwarded to its destination inside of six weeks, is now to be forwarded in 24 hours.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I made no such statement.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That shows what my hon. friend the Postmaster General is capable of, under a little pressure ; and I would suggest to my right hon. friend that if he is ever met with difficulties of this kind put forward by the Postmaster General, all he has to do is to exercise a little pressure upon him such as was exercised by my hon. friend the member from Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Taylor) yesterday, and he will find him capable of almost any feat. Why, yesterday this mail matter paralyzed the Ottawa office, it was piled up in mountains, it would require six weeks of special exertion to forward it to its destination. But only last night an officer of the hon. gentleman's department said it could all be cleared out within 24 hours. My hon. friend himself has practically repeated the same thing to-day, and he desires to make a little political capital by talking of the expenditure of public money. But he has never contradicted the statement that the equivalent of 25 or 30 bags have been sent out daily by hon. gentlemen opposite during the past six, or seven, or eight weeks. He has never contradicted that statement, nor has any hon. gentleman on the other side contradicted the statement that practically during all these weeks the addressing of envelopes has been done by servants of this country, paid by the people of this country, for hon. gentlemen opposite. That charge was made

some days ago in the House, and I have not heard up to this time any absolute denial of it, except that I believe it was denied by the gentleman in charge of the Department of Public Works. The Postmaster General thinks, under these circumstances, that he is making a little political capital by talking of the expenditure of public money in forwarding this literature, which I venture to say, does not amount to in bulk or in cost of transmission to one-half of the campaign literature which has been forwarded by hon. gentlemen themselves during the present session. I am here reminded of the fact that my right hon. friend the Miniter of Trade and Commerce, if we are to talk about the franking privileges, distributed I do not know how many hundred thousand copies of a speech of his some years ago, when the House was not in session, and in violation of the rules which were laid down by Order in Council with respect to transmission of documents of that kind out of session ; and I think the Minister of Trade and Commerce was invited at that time to contribute the sum of $25,000 to the treasury of Canada, being the amount which he ought to have paid for the distribution of that literature. I do not know whether that is the exact amount. The Minister of Trade and Commerce will, no doubt, make it good in time, because I am sure he expects to pay it before he ends his public career. It may not be convenient for him to do it at present, but we all appreciate the fact that he intends to do it at some time or other, and I do not think the department will be disposed to charge him interest on it. However, I am very glad indeed that the Postmaster General has been able to cope with this difficulty, and that we shall have these mail bags removed that have so long remained here, owing, so far as we can judge, to the fact that his department was not disposed to make a reasonable and moderate effort to forward this matter to its destination.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. the leader of the opposition is developing, if he will permit me to say so, a disposition to present a case in a very unfair light. I explained to him, I think, and it was something he well knows, that there is a vast difference between the surplus space that is afforded in mail cars for the extra literature such as this, and the case of a whole train, or a special train, set apart exclusively for work of that kind. The regular trains of the country have to carry much mail matter for the general public. What I stated was that the service supposed to be available for the extra postal matter here would not admit of more than 40 bags per day being handled in these postal cars. But, under the special arrangements which have been made, we have engaged trains and set them apart exclusively for this service, and with these extra trains we expect to be able to solve this problem within the next three days.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to ask the right hon. the Prime Minister if it is his intention to insist upon the Postmaster General refunding to me the $32 that he illegally and illegitimately forced me to pay——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. TAYLOR—as express charges on matter that he should carry through the mails free. I want to say this one word—if the hon. gentleman, having been fortunate enough in his youth to receive an education——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. If the hon. gentleman wants to ask a question he can do so in the usual way, that is to say, without any discussion and without any statement of facts, simply putting the question.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman just criticised the words I made use of yesterday and I think it is my duty——

Mr. SPEAKER. There is nothing before the Chair.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, it will come before the Chair. My statement is this—it will only take a minute—I think I have a right, in justice to myself, to make an explanation. The hon. gentleman referred yesterday to the fact, and did again to-day, that I used the word 'stuff.' Now, I can find that in the dictionary.

Mr. SPEAKER. This is not a personal explanation.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is a personal explanation to myself. He accused me of using a word that can be found in the dictionary. But he used a word, 'sortation,' a word that cannot be found in any dictionary.

The PRIME MINISTER. I hope my hon. friend the Postmaster General will refund to my hon. friend from Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Taylor) any undue expenditure he may have had to make; in the same way as he has asked my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce to refund to the treasury a sum which may be due for a similar purpose. But, to proceed with the business of the House, my hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) asked a question a moment ago of my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). My right hon. friend is now in his place if the hon. gentleman would repeat his question.

INSPECTION OF BINDER TWINE.

Mr. ALCORN asked :

1. By what method does Joseph Haycock, inspector of binder twine, proceed to collect penalties from storekeepers or dealers whom he finds exposing for sale binder twine improperly marked or deficient in quantity ?

2. Has he collected such penalties without process, under the 'Summary Conviction Act,' or other proceedings, on information before a justice of the peace or other court ?

3. If so, from whom, when, where, and in what sums in each case has he so made such collections ?

4. Has he made a return of such moneys so collected to any and what authority, and when and by what means ?

5. If not what disposition has he made of such moneys so collected ?

6. What instructions were given to the said Joseph Haycock as to collections of penalties under 'An Act respecting the Packing and Sale of certain Staple Commodities ? '

7. Had he instructions from any and what department of the government, or any and what officer thereof, that he has the power, as inspector of binder twine, to collect such penalties any and how otherwise than by proceeding under the 'Summary Convictions Act' or than through a court ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) :

1. The methods of the inspector of binder twine in collecting penalties from parties whom he finds offering for sale twine improperly marked or deficient in quantity is to point out the requirements of the Inspection Act and the penalties therein imposed for its infraction. He has collected penalties without process under the 'Summary Conviction Act.' In no instance has the party subjected to penalty objected to the payment of the minimum penalty rather than have the matter brought up and prosecution entered under due process of law.

2. Answered, as above.

3. Total collected, $506.75.

4. The fines so collected have been regularly deposited to the credit of the receiver general.

5. Answered as above.

6. No special instructions were given to the inspector with reference to the collection of penalties. His instructions were to see that the terms of the Act were carried out.

7. When the question of the collection of penalties was submitted by the Department of Trade and Commerce to the Department of Justice, the reply was that 'Under subsection 2 of section 7, as amended by 2 Edward VII., chapter 32, it is provided that all binder twine deficient in quantity shall be confiscated to the Crown. The binder twine seized in this case appears to have been deficient in quantity and would, therefore, be liable to be confiscated to the Crown and could then be dealt with by your department (Trade and Commerce) in any way that it sees fit.' However, the deputy minister adds that he does not see anything in the Act that would authorize the confiscation of the twine upon view, and that it might be strictly necessary to take legal proceedings to enforce confiscation. That this, however, is scarcely worth while for such small quantity, 'and I see no objection to selling the twine back to the owners, as suggested.' The action taken in connection with this twine matter has been such as to cause the least possible annoyance to parties with whom twine not in compliance with the Act was found.

FISHERY OVERSEER AT BATHURST, NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (King's, N.B.). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine), if he has received any complaint concerning the alleged misconduct of an officer of his at Bathurst, N.B., named William C. Robichaud, who is accused of using his office as a fishery overseer at Bathurst for the purpose of gaining votes for himself in an election in which he is a candidate ? The accusation is that this man is allowing persons who promise to support him to fish illegally and a complaint to that effect has been made to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and an investigation asked for. I would ask the hon. minister if he has received any such complaint and what is his intention in respect to an investigation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I received such information this morning only.

CATTLE-GUARD COMMISSION.

Mr. R. A. PRINGLE (Cornwall and Stormont). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. acting Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Fielding) if the commission appointed to investigate the cattle-guard question, and for which we voted a large sum of money, have made a report and if we will have the report laid upon the Table before the House adjourns I think that last year we voted some $5,000 towards the expenses of the commission, and the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) assured us in committee from time to time that before the House rose the report would be forthcoming. This is a report in which the public are very much interested. I understand the report has been made but that it is not yet before the government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The report has been submitted and there is no objection to it being laid on the Table. The cattle-guard question has been dealt with by legislation at the present session, and I did not suppose that there was any particular desire for the report, but there is no objection to it being laid on the Table, and I will have it placed on the Table before the House closes.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, may I ask the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) for a moment? I think he promised to give us a statement showing the number of miles of railway subsidized and the aggregate subsidies promised for each of the provinces. I would like to know if he is prepared to give that statement now?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the statement has been made, and I am having it copied. I think that during the day I will be able to hand it to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell).

STEAMER 'EUREKA.'

Hon. J. I. TARTE (Montreal, St. Mary's). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask to be allowed to put myself right in reference to a matter with which I was occupied in my capacity of Minister of Public Works. I have read some reflections in the press regarding the matter. I refer to the use by Mr. Lacoste of one of the boats of the Department of Public Works named the 'Eureka.' I agreed with Mr. Cantin to have an invention of Mr. Lacoste applied to the boat a year ago when the season's work was over. When I left office the installation of the invention was not completed. The boat was still in the dock. I resigned or withdrew from the government on the 20th of October last. A test of the invention was made this spring or during the first months of the summer. I never loaned the boat to Mr. Lacoste for the test. I simply made an arrangement with Mr. Lacoste that was carried out by Mr. Cantin to the effect that the department would pay $3,000 for the installation of the invention, the government taking the right of using the invention free of charge if it should be successful. The test which has been made since has not been made under instructions from me written or verbal. I do not blame the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) for having made the test. It is his business; it is not mine. I never loaned the boat, and I never made any arrangement with Mr. Lacoste that he should use the boat this spring. On the contrary my intention was to test the invention under the control and direction of the officers of the Public Works Department. That was my intention, and I did not make a bargain with Mr. Lacoste or any one else to the contrary.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am afraid I did not even read the answer which I gave to the question before I presented it to the House. The statement is made by the officers of the department who are responsible for giving the official information of the department in answer to questions. Several answers were prepared that day, and I submitted them as they had been prepared by the department, supposing that the officers were in possession of the information and knew the facts. I shall look into the matter.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The information is altogether incorrect.

CAMPAIGN LITERATURE AND SPECIAL TRAINS.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (Toronto). I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General as to the time the special trains conveying the Conservative literature are to leave, and from what depots? It will be an important departure; and we would also like to know how many bags there will be in each car, and what accommodation will be provided for the officials. There will be a crowd there to see them depart.

The PRIME MINISTER. The matter is under consideration.

EXPENSE INCURRED BY GLOUCESTER COUNTY, N.B., FOR CARE OF SMALL-POX PATIENTS.

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (King's, N.B.). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if any application has been made from the county of Gloucester, N.B., for assistance in respect to paying an amount of $9,000 expenses incurred in that county on account of small-pox. Small-pox was introduced into the county by some person coming over the Intercolonial Railway from Quebec or some other part of the country in the west and considerable expense has been incurred. I would like to ask if any application has been made to the government for a contribution on the part of the government towards defraying that expense.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no recollection of it at this moment. Perhaps it may have been made. I will inquire in the Department of the Interior and give an answer to my hon. friend.

ALASKAN BOUNDARY COMMISSION—CORRESPONDENCE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I desire to lay on the Table of the House certain correspondence between the government of His Excelelncy the Governor General and the imperial authorities concerning negotiations which led to the treaty to refer the Alaskan boundary question to a tribunal composed of judicial experts and upon the appointment of experts. I may say that the correspondence is not complete. I expect to be able to lay on the Table some more correspondence on the same subject.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the correspondence which has been brought down afford the House any information as to whether the Canadian commissioners have published a so-called protest, which has been cabled and published in the Canadian newspapers? I understood yesterday that the Prime Minister had no information on the subject, but possibly he may have information to-day. I would also ask if the government have information as to what were Lord Alverstone's reasons for ceding the islands at the mouth of the Portland canal to the United States. The so-called protest of the Canadian commissioners to which I have referred, contains this statement:

A memorandum was prepared and read to the commissioners, embodying our views, and showing it to be beyond dispute that the Canadian contention in this branch of the case should prevail, and that the boundary should run to the northward of the four islands named, thus giving them to Canada. Notwithstanding these facts the members of the tribunal, other than ourselves, have now signed an award giving two of the islands, Kannaghunut and Sitklan, to the United States.

It seems to me that the exact facts with regard to that part of the award, should be laid on the Table of the House at the earliest possible moment. If necessary, the government should cable for the information, so that we may have it to-day.

The PRIME MINISTER. The only information which we have on that point is what is common property, and has been published in the newspapers. I do not suppose that we can expect to have authentic information upon that point until we are in possession of the official proceedings of the commission, which will no doubt contain the reasons of the commissioners, individually and collectively, as well as the dissent of our commissioners. It would be a good thing that at the earliest possible moment, the government should issue a blue-book—even during the recess—containing all the proceedings and negotiations, from the time the joint high commission parted at Washington, up to the very last paper we have on the subject.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the correspondence which has been laid upon the Table, and the correspondence which the Prime Minister proposes to lay on the Table during the day—does it include all the correspondence and proceedings up to this time, or are certain portions of it regarded as confidential, on account of some objection which I understand has been raised?

The PRIME MINISTER. The British authorities have not allowed the communication to parliament of certain portions of the correspondence. The matter is still under the consideration of the colonial authorities. As soon as permission is given, that correspondence will be made public during the recess, if not before.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The correspondence when it is brought down, will include all documents to the publication of which certain objections have been raised.

The PRIME MINISTER. Everything.

Mr. CLARKE. There has of course been no objection raised to the publication of the correspondence from this government to the imperial authorities?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, there has. The colonial authorities have objected to the publication of the correspondence which has taken place between them and us, both as to what has been sent from here and as to what we received from England. In the course of time, everything must certainly be published and will be published.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903—CONFERENCE WITH THE SENATE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Borden (Halifax):

That twelve managers be appointed to meet the managers appointed by the Senate at the time and place fixed for the holding of the conference desired upon the amendments made by the Senate to the Bill entitled: An Act to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways.

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved:

That the said managers be: Sir William Mulock, Mr. Fielding, Mr. Fitzpatrick, Mr. Haggart, Mr. Blair, Mr. Borden (Halifax), Mr. Monk, Mr. Barker, Mr. Emmerson, Mr. Clarke, Mr. Demers (Iberville) and Mr. Wade.

Motion agreed to.

QUEBEC BRIDGE AGREEMENT.

On the Order being called for the House to go into committee on certain resolutions respecting the granting of aid to the Quebec bridge:

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). In moving that you do now leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of having the House consider in committee certain resolutions which have been submitted with respect to the granting of aid to the Quebec bridge, I wish to take advantage of the opportunity to make a brief statement. The importance of another bridge across the St. Lawrence, at or near the city of Quebec, has been recognized for many years by gentlemen on both sides of the House. Several years ago this government came to the conclusion that the time for action had arrived, anl it was authorized to assist the company which had undertaken to bring about the construction of that bridge. A company was formed in the city of Quebec, with a capital of $200,000, with power to issue bonds in the usual way in connection with such public undertakings. The movement was recognized as one of

great importance in the city of Quebec, in the province of Quebec and in the Dominion generally. The city of Quebec manifested its substantial interest in the movement by contributing a subsidy to the bridge of $300,000 ; the government of the province of Quebec manifested its interest in the enterprise by contributing a subsidy of $250,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is that an absolute gift ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, in both cases a free and absolute gift, and the money has been paid. The government of the Dominion also agreed to aid the undertaking by a guarantee of $1,000,000. The grants given by the city of Quebec, and by the government of Quebec have been paid, and of the grant offered by the parliament of Canada of $1,000,000, there has been paid the sum of $374,353. The company, with a capital of $200,000 nominally, have actually paid up and put into the treasury $65,585 of their private funds. With the capital of the company, with the aids granted by the city of Quebec, the province of Quebec and the Dominion of Canada, and with the power to issue bonds, the company proceeded to construct the bridge and they have made very considerable progress.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What has actually been paid by the government here ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Three hundred and seventy-four thousand three hundred and fifty-three dollars. The company proceeded to let contracts and enter upon the undertaking. The substructure has been completed, and a portion of the superstructure. The work actually done by the company up to the present time represents an expenditure of $1,416,394. That expenditure has been made from private capital, from the gift of the province of Quebec, which has been paid in full, from the gift of the city of Quebec, which has also been paid in full, and from the gift of the Dominion government, which was $1,000,000, but which has been paid to the extent of only $374,353. The company have been obliged to issue bonds to assist the undertaking, and these bonds to the amount of $472,000 are outstanding. These bonds were given to the contractor in part payment, and he accepted them at 60 per cent of their face value ; so that while they represent a bonded indebtedness upon the enterprise of $472,000, the actual cash received from them was $283,279. There is now due to the contractors and others $779,551. This includes, however, the $472,000 of bonds at their par value.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. To whom is the balance of $779,000 due ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a cash balance due the contractors, besides the outstanding issue of bonds. There are some charges for engineering and other things, but it is substantially due to the contractors. The company find themselves unable to prosecute the undertaking further, although the commercial prospect of the bridge is fairly good. I think most people who have looked into it as a business enterprise will agree to that. But even when an enterprise has an excellent prospect of commercial success, it is not easy to raise capital for a very large undertaking. This is a very large undertaking. The total cost of the bridge is estimated by Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, the chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals, at $7,503,725. That includes not merely the bridge proper, but the approaches, and the terminal facilities in the city of Quebec.

Now, inasmuch as the company are not likely to be able to prosecute the work successfully, the government have deemed it wise to come to the relief of the company and the enterprise, and to change their form of aid. As I have already stated, we have granted $1,000,000, of which only $374,353 has been paid. The remainder is still in the treasury of Canada. We propose to cancel that balance, and to say that the company shall receive no further aid in the way of a subsidy or a gift, but that instead we shall grant them aid in the form of a guarantee, which we think, from the information which we have, will not ultimately cost the Dominion one cent. We quite realize that in all guarantees there is a measure of risk ; but so far as information is obtainable from competent railway men, we think there is a fair ground for the statement that the earnings of this enterprise will meet all its obligations, and that in adopting the form of a guarantee instead of actually contributing anything more to the bridge, we are cancelling an obligation of some $600,000 or more, which we would otherwise be obliged to pay. Of course, we give the company more valuable assistance for the moment by the guarantee, because by that means the enterprise will be carried to a success. With our grant of $1,000,000, the company would not have been able to finance the enterprise so successfully as they will be with the guarantee. We propose, therefore, to guarantee a sum of money, in the form of bonds bearing 3 per cent interest and running fifty years, to a sufficient extent to meet the outstanding indebtedness and to complete the bridge.

But when we come to deal with the question of outstanding indebtedness, we find, as I have pointed out, that while as respects the bonds there is an indebtedness of $472,000, the actual value of the work which they represent is only $283,279, the difference representing a discount on the bonds, which the contractors were only willing to take on the basis of 60 cents on the dollar. We think we ought not to be called on to cover that discount or deficiency by a gov-

ernment guarantee. It is perhaps very common, in connection with the financing of an undertaking of this character, that bonds have to be sold at a discount. The discount in this case is perhaps larger than usual. However, the fact remains that there is outstanding in bonds secured by first mortgage on this bridge, the sum of $472,000, while the actual value represented in cash we have placed at $283,279. We think the difference, representing a discount of $188,000, should be met by the company themselves, and should not be covered by the government guarantee. We have, therefore, required them to subscribe for and pay up new capital to the amount of $200,000, which will practically all be applied to the payment of so much of these bonds as represent the discount. So that in applying our guarantee to the debts of the company, we shall be applying it only to that portion for which we have value received, while that portion which does not represent value received, but which represents a discount on the bonds, must be provided for by a further subscription and payment of private capital.

The company, as it stands now, has an actual paid-up capital stock of some $65,000, and it will issue a further sum of $200,000, making a total capital subscribed and paid up of $265,000 ; and we provide that no new stock of any kind shall be issued upon the undertaking, except the bonds which are to be guaranteed by the government, and that no liabilities can be incurred in the meantime except with the consent of the government ; so that the security which the government will have, will be, we think, very good.

The amount required to pay the outstanding debts and to complete the undertaking is estimated at $6,866,882. But that includes the payment of these bonds at par. We, therefore, deduct from that amount $188,721, which the private capitalists are obliged to provide for. That brings the balance required to pay the debts and complete the undertaking to $6,678,200. That amount we propose to guarantee in bonds bearing interest at 3 per cent for fifty years. We propose that the interest of the government shall be protected by having three directors on the board.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Do you repay the bonds themselves, or only guarantee the interest ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We guarantee both the principal and interest. On the question of the earning powers of the bridge, we have some information which has already been laid before the House in the document entitled : 'Papers relating to the Quebec Bridge.' We have had estimates as to the probable number of cars which will use the bridge, and as to the probable revenue from various sources. There are a number of railways which will use the bridge immediately, because they touch both sides of the river ; and undoubtedly, with the early development of trade, especially in connection with the new transcontinental railway, which will cross the Quebec bridge, there is no reason to doubt that any returns based on the present traffic will be sound and safe, because there is every prospect of a large increase at no distant date. We have information as to the probable earnings of the bridge from various sources. The late Mr. Walter Shanly, an eminent engineer, made an estimate as far back as 1885, in which he placed the earnings at $250,400. Mr. Walsh, the general passenger agent of the Quebec Central, in 1897 estimated the earnings at $259,164. Mr. J. G. Scott, the general manager of the Lake St. John Railway, in 1899, confirmed the estimate of Mr. Shanly, placing the figures at $250,000. And Mr. Grundy, of the Quebec Central, a gentleman of high standing, who still takes a very deep interest in this work, has estimated the earnings at substantially the same amount as Mr. Shanly and Mr. Walsh. Substantially therefore these gentlemen, the late Mr. Shanly, Mr. Walsh, of the Quebec Central, Mr. Scott, of the Quebec and Lake St. John, and Mr. Grundy, estimated some years ago that the earnings would be $250,000 per year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. And we did not know anything then about the transcontinental.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No; my hon. friend, with his natural sense of fairness, points out that at that time they knew nothing about the transcontinental project. Nor did they even know that the Great Northern was to be constructed. The conditions have therefore been changed since these reports were made, but whatever change has taken place is in favour of the enterprise, because the volume of business is increasing. We have had inquiries made very recently by officers of our own government, officers of the Intercolonial, into the probable earnings of the bridge. Mr. Tiffin, the general traffic manager of the Intercolonial, has made a report on the subject, the substance of which will be found in a letter addressed to me by Mr. Schreiber, chief engineer of government railways, dated Ottawa, September the 19th. Mr. Schreiber sums up as follows :

> With reference to the matter of the probable extent of traffic over the Quebec bridge, when constructed, as to which you desire some information. I have to state that, under date the 1st instant, Mr. Tiffin, the traffic manager of the Intercolonial Railway, has furnished an estimate of the number of cars that, it may be anticipated, would cross the 'Quebec bridge' daily, not taking into consideration traffic that may arise from the construction of the proposed Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. This estimate is as follows :—

	Estimated number of cars daily.
Intercolonial Railway	130
Grand Trunk Railway	75
Quebec Central Railway..	71
Total..	276

Extended to a full year, the aggregate is 276 cars per day plus 313 days equal 86,388 cars, which at $4 each, amounts to $345,552 per annum.

As to the rate of $4 per car, I find that it is higher than the rates paid in Canada at some points, but lower than the rates paid on some of the large bridges in the United States.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Did you take the working expenses into account ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not come to that. I am speaking of the possible earning powers. We have therefore, on the advice of the chief engineer of railways and canals, the probable earnings estimated at $345,552 per annum. Let us see now what our obligations are on the other side. Three per cent on the amount to be guaranteed will be $200,346. We are providing in addition that there shall be one-half per cent on the amount of guaranteed bonds set apart each year for the purpose of a sinking fund. That will not be sufficient to extinguish the loan in the fifty years. It will take about sixty-five years to extinguish the whole loan at that rate, but, in the common practice, we do not aim at extinguishing the whole loan but at having a very substantial sinking fund to assist in doing so. If this enterprise should continue in the hands of the company to the end of the fifty years, we shall have a sinking fund sufficient to extinguish about $3,750,000 of the debt, and there will be no difficulty whatever in financing the balance upon a new issue of bonds. However, I do not anticipate that that contingency will ever arise. No doubt long before that this bridge will be taken over and become the property of the government. We shall have annual interest, $200,346; the half per cent sinking fund, $33,391; or a total of $233,737 to pay every year. The working expenses are estimated by Mr. Frank Grundy of the Quebec Central at $85,000. Adding this to the $233,737 gives a total of $318,737, against which we shall have an income, which is estimated according to the estimates I have already given, confirmed by the chief engineer of railways and canals, at $345,552.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Do the working expenses include repairs and depreciation ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Under our contract repairs and renewals are considered as working expenses, and I take it for granted that these working expenses are included in the estimates I have given I am not sure whether Mr. Grundy did include working expenses, but I assume he did because he is a very capable railway man and would no doubt include them in his calculation.

Mr. BELL. I thought I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the interest would be about $200,000. But three per cent on $8,000,000 makes $240,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The amount we are guaranteeing is not $8,000,000 but $6,678,200. The whole cost is estimated at $7,500,000, but the amount we shall require to pay off existing indebtedness, not including discount on the bonds, and to complete the undertaking we estimate at $6,678,200. We have therefore a very safe margin on which to base our assurance that this bridge will, from the beginning, guarantee us against any loss; and while, by the step we are taking, we shall be giving aid in a better form and securing the completion of the bridge, we shall on the other hand not be adding to the obligations of the country ultimately, and be avoiding the payment of over $600,000, which otherwise we would be obliged to pay out of the million dollar grant already authorized and only partially paid.

My hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) reminds me too that in this estimate of the cost we are including the customs duty to an amount approximating from $700,000 to $800,000, which will come back directly into the treasury. That is an additional fact to be taken into account.

While for the present we are assuming that it will be wise to allow this enterprise to remain in the hands of the company and let them complete the undertaking, we do not look forward to its remaining permanently in the company's hands. In view of the importance of the bridge and the number of railways which will pass over it and its relations to the new road we are about to construct, and for various other reasons, we think it is highly probable that, at no distant date, the government of Canada, no matter who may be in power, will desire to take possession of the road as a national work. Therefore, we are providing in the contract that we shall have power to take possession of the enterprise any time after completion, upon one month's notice. If we do, we shall then pay to the company the amount of net cash they put into the enterprise, which, according to the contract, will be $265,000, with interest at the rate of five per cent, less any dividend that may have been earned in the meantime. And we will pay them a premium of ten per cent on the par value of their stock, which is not an unusual thing in taking over an enterprise. That par value as fixed in the contract will be $265,000. Thus they will receive their money back with interest at five per cent, less any dividends which may be earned, and ten per cent advance on the money they have put in.

Mr. MONK. How soon does the hon. minister expect that the government will be obliged to take over the undertaking ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The government will not be obliged to take it over at all.

Mr. MONK. But, as a matter of policy, my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Fielding) said that undoubtedly before long the undertaking will be taken over and become the property of the government. My hon. friend has touched on that point, and I would like to ask him if it is a matter of two or three years, or if it is to be taken over simultaneously with the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That would be a matter for consideration. The company is allowed three years in which to complete the undertaking, and from the moment that the undertaking is completed we will have the right to take it over upon one month's notice. We can take it over at any time after 1906, whether the road is completed or not. On whichever event shall first happen, either the completion of the road or the arrival of that date three years hence, the government shall have the right to take over the undertaking, and I am inclined to think, as I said before, that any government which is in power will find at no distant date that it will be to the advantage of the Dominion to take over that bridge. However, there has been no arrangement in that form, but we have thought it wise to protect the people's right to acquire that bridge at any time after its completion or after 1906.

Mr. CLANCY. Is any time fixed in the contract at which that bridge is to be completed ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is to be completed on the 1st December, 1906. In addition to that, the Minister of Justice calls my attention to the fact that if, during construction, we are not satisfied with the progress made, if the road is not being pushed forward to successful completion, the government shall have the right to take it over, apart from the general right they would possess afterwards. If we should take over the bridge at any time we would find ourselves in this position : The Quebec government would have contributed $250,000, the city of Quebec would have contributed $300,000; the government of Canada would have contributed in cash $374,000. So long as the enterprise remains in the hands of the company we treat these sums as free gifts, as they were intended to be, to the enterprise ; but if the Dominion takes over the bridge, we shall then become accountable to the government of the province of Quebec and to the city of Quebec to the extent of the money they have placed in the bridge.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why should you pay them for their advances ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Because we think that if we take possession of the property as a national work, we should then be willing to account for these advances, but we become accountable to the province and the city of Quebec only for profits which the bridge may earn. We shall, under the contract which we have made with the company, have the right to take possession of the bridge, and the bridge becomes the property of the Dominion of Canada without any question as to title whatever. We do not recognize any title of the government of Quebec or of the city of Quebec in the bridge, but we do recognize the fact that they have contributed their respective sums of $250,000 and $300,000, and we will place these contributions in precisely the same position as the $374,000 which we have contributed. If the bridge earns anything beyond its working expenses and beyond the interest on its bonded indebtedness, if there are profits, we will divide these profits equitably among the contributors of the three amounts, but there shall not be paid to the government of Quebec or to the city of Quebec more than three per cent interest on the amount of their contributions. If the bridge does not earn anything beyond the working expenses and the interest on the bonded indebtedness, neither the city of Quebec nor the province of Quebec will receive a cent.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Have you fully provided for that ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is in the contract, section 21. If it becomes a profitable enterprise and we are making money out of it, we will account to the province of Quebec and the city of Quebec for three per cent on their money so long as we are making money out of it. If we do not earn money, neither the city nor the province of Quebec can receive a penny. They will have no title, but will have what I may call a deferred interest in the bridge to the extent of the amount they have contributed, and we may at any time extinguish that by paying the amount they have contributed to the bridge.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Have they any lien on the bridge ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. None whatever.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why, then, do you create one ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We do not so long as the bridge remains in the hands of the company. They will give that as a free gift, but if we dispossess the company, take the bridge over and make money out of it, we think we should account to the city and province of Quebec for their share or pay off the indebtedness.

Mr. CLANCY. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the division of profits

was to be made on the sum contributed by the government, the $374,000, as against the contributions of the city and province of Quebec, or as against the whole sum which the government will advance in taking over the bridge ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The $374,000 will be the only sum ; if we take the bridge over we will have the bonded indebtedness to carry, and that will be the first charge before any one can get any money other than the working expenses.

Mr. PRINGLE. Would it not be more advisable, in view of the government intending to take over this bridge, to simply guarantee the $472,000 bonds instead of contracting this issue of $200,000 of stock, which they may have to take over at a premium ? Would it not be better to simply guarantee the $472,000 at once and be done with it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No ; because in this case we will oblige the company to pay the $188,000 themselves out of their own pocket. No new stock can be created under this contract. The amount we will have to pay as premium on the stock will be one-tenth of the $265,000, or $26,500. That is the limit of the premium, and it is a small amount.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Do you think that you can get the stockholders to put their hands into their pockets and pay the $200,000 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They must pay the $200,000 more of their own money, every dollar of which must be paid up before they get this guarantee.

Mr. MONK. That is a good investment ; they get 5 per cent interest and 10 per cent premium.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is a good investment, except that it might be fifty years before they can get it.

Mr. MONK. That is very doubtful.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I say frankly that I think some of these days the bridge will be taken over. Of course, we cannot guarantee that a good government like the present will be here forever.

Mr. KAULBACH. Would it not be more advisable for the government to take it over at once as their own property and complete it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is something to be said in favour of that suggestion, but after full investigation we have concluded, since the company have made negotiations and have carried on some of the work, that we had better let them finish the work.

Mr. PRINGLE. Does the hon. minister consider the clause in this contract sufficient to guard the expenditure of this money ; that is, that the money shall be expended only in the construction of this bridge ? Are there sufficient guards thrown around the expenditure of the proceeds of these bonds ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We think we have sufficiently protected it in that respect. Money can only be paid for value put into the bridge upon the certificate of the government engineer.

At one o'clock, committee took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, I think it is a great pity that a matter of this importance has been brought to the attention of the House on the last day of the session ; I mean that to-day we are called upon to discuss a scheme of great magnitude, a very interesting scheme, and we have really not the time to bring to the consideration of that project its importance deserves. I see no necessity for such a wonderful and hasty proceeding. The condition of the Quebec bridge, its need of assistance, existed prior to the meeting of this House on the 12th of March last. It was fully discussed during the sitting of the Quebec legislature ; it formed the subject of a very careful investigation there, and of a lengthy discussion ; and it was stated during that discussion, as my hon. friend the Minister of Justice knows, by the Prime Minister of Quebec himself, the president of this undertaking, that he would apply to the Dominion government for assistance. He was asked in the legislature if he contemplated seeking assistance from the city of Quebec and he said that he did not, neither did he contemplate seeking assistance from the legislature ; and if I am correctly informed, when asked whether he intended to apply for it here in Ottawa before the meeting of this legislature, he stated that he did. Under these circumstances, does it not appear rather unfair to the House that my hon. friend the Minister of Justice should, in the last hours, in the last minutes, one might almost say, of this session, come down with such a complicated plan as the one which he has presented to this House ? I mention this because I have always been favourable to that project, and the Conservative party, as members of this House are well aware, was committed to assisting the construction of the Quebec bridge before 1896. Circumstances of which I have little knowledge prevented the party then in power from carrying out its pledge. But the project was sanctioned, the necessity of that undertaking was admitted, and it was merely a question of knowing how best to help carry out that great enterprise. Therefore there is no difference of opinion in regard to the policy, at least that is the way I understand it ; the only difference of opinon is as to the way in which the thing can best be done.

Now, what I submit to this House, briefly, is that under the agreement of my hon. friend which he has submitted to the consideration of the House to-day, he confides the expenditure of a sum of over $6,500,000 to a company that has only put into that undertaking, so far as we can see, the sum of about $50,000, a company which is concentrated in the hands of a very few men, and they are charged with the expenditure of this sum of nearly $7,000,000 without any accountability to this House. According to the statement of my hon. friend, which of course we must take as well founded, it is the expectation that before long, if the transcontinental railway is going to be carried out, we shall take over that work, and it is going to become the property of the government. When I asked my hon. friend the acting Minister of Railways and Canals how soon he expected that would be done, he said that three years would be given to terminate the bridge. Under the expectation that the government are going to carry out that transcontinental railway as soon as possible, and if that bridge is terminated within three years, we will at that time, perhaps before, at any rate very soon after, under the general policy in connection with the transcontinental railway, be called upon to take up that work. So that we are confiding the construction of this bridge which we intend to make our own property, and the expenditure of a sum of over $6,500,000 to parties who are not responsible to the government. I say that we have no control over the spending of that money, no supervision, and that the interests of the city of Quebec and its vicinity, and the construction of that bridge and its approaches in such a way as to satisfy clearly the wants of the public at that point, are confided to a select few who form this company, without any accountability.

Clause 14, is the one under which this government is empowered to name three directors. But those directors are not obliged to make any report to the government, they are a minority in the board, and consequently that company that has a paid-up capital at the present moment of about $50,000—it is alleged $65,000—that company is going to have the spending of all this money and the carrying out of the work. Under these circumstances, the policy of the government being to see to the construction of that bridge, there being, as I understand it, no controversy about its utility, it seems to me it would have been far more proper for the government itself to undertake the construction of that bridge. My hon. friend may say that the government is only guaranteeing these bonds. But we must couple that statement with the statement made by the minister that we are going to take over that property, that it is a necessary link in the transcontinental railway, and I think—because I do not want to go into the details, the calculations have been placed before this House by my hon. friend—but I think there can be no doubt in the mind of any member in this House that we are going ultimately to take up that property and make it a Dominion government property. Under these circumstances are we right to confide the spending of this money and the conduct of this undertaking, with its approaches to Quebec on one side and to Lévis on the other, to a company concentrated in the hands of so few people, when it appears to be obvious that the control of that important undertaking and the progress of the work ought to be continually under the eyes of the government and under the eye of this parliament.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I find that that company has not given conclusive proof of its competency to carry out an undertaking of that magnitude. Here let me call attention to a very important motion which was made before the legislature of Quebec by the member for Dorchester, in which the history of the operations of this company is fully gone into. The facts connected with the working of that company are enumerated in that motion, which I will not read to the House, but only point out some of the facts, and if those facts are correct, I submit that this scheme has been prepared hastily, at the last moments of the session, and that if the proposition which I lay before you is correct, it would be the duty of the government themselves to carry out these important works rather than to confide them to this company. At least I think we ought to have in this measure some provision whereby, from time to time and regularly, we should know, in the interests of the public, exactly how this money is being applied and how the works are being carried out. Let me call your attention to the fact that an estimate was prepared for the use of the Quebec government which then had control over this bridge, of what the bridge would cost. That estimate was prepared under the instructions of the then Minister of Public Works of the province of Quebec, the late Mr. Duffy, and on the 6th of August, 1902, was placed before the Quebec government.

Under the estimate made by a very careful engineer the cost of the substructure of this bridge was placed at $819,450, and the cost of the superstructure, after having been very carefully gone into by Mr. Vallee, the government engineer, was placed at $2,800,000. The province of Quebec subscribed to that undertaking the sum of $250,000 to be payable in instalments. That amount was to be paid to the builders of the bridge as the work proceeded, 20 per cent according to the estimates of work done on both substructure and superstructure and never more than $30,000 in one year. The amount granted by the city of Quebec was payable at once, and it was so paid. Under the conditions of the sub-

scription, although up to the present time the substructure alone is terminated, the province has already, as I understand it, paid $90,000 in cash, and Mr. Parent, the provincial premier, who is also mayor of the city of Quebec and president of the bridge company, in spite of the conditions of the subscription of the province of Quebec, has, as president of the bridge company, pledged the province of Quebec to a loan made by the Bank of Montreal of $160,000. So that, although the bridge is not advanced in degree sufficient to authorize the total payment of the provincial subsidy to the structure, the whole of the subsidy under the management of this company, has become pledged to the company, and the whole amount is practically paid already.

Mr. CLANCY. Is that in addition to the amount of subsidy already paid?

Mr. MONK. That is in addition to the $90,000 already paid. The contractor for the construction of the bridge is obliged, under the contract which he made with the bridge company, to pay for the construction of the bridge and for all contingencies and expenses of the company, whatever that may mean, with the federal subsidy, with the subsidy of the city of Quebec and also with the subsidy of the province, so that in reality it is he who has disbursed up to the present time all the amounts connected with the construction of this bridge. The substructure has been finished. The cost was estimated by a competent engineer at $819,000, and yet we find by a document produced before the legislative assembly of Quebec, bearing No. 37 of the documents filed during the last session, that the amount due to this contractor for construction as far as it has progressed is not $819,000, but $1,217,359.38. On the one hand, an estimate made by Mr. Vallee, a competent engineer, of a little over $800,000 for the work to be done; on the other hand, an amount of expense incurred for the bridge so far of over $1,200,000. This claim of $1,200,000 due to the contractor has been approved by the company. That is a fact which we know. The company has also approved of an account due to the contractor for the beginning of the work done upon the superstructure of $199,000. These two items united form a total amount of expenditure due now by the company of $1,416,394. That is the amount due now, although, as far as I know, there is no superstructure yet upon the substructure and the substructure was valued at $819,000. In the Quebec legislature an effort was made to obtain some light upon this extraordinary expenditure, and a motion was made there having for its object the placing before the legislature of the details of all these claims, and notably of the moneys which the contractor, being liable for all contingent expenses, had paid to the law firm in Quebec of which Mr. Parent, the Prime Minister, is a member, in connection with the construction of this bridge. The legislature denied that motion upon the supposed ground that in the Public Works Department at Quebec there could be found no information upon that important point, the object of the motion, which was made on 11th March last, being to find out how it could be possible that such a large indebtedness as an amount of over $1,400,000 could have been incurred upon the undertaking which had advanced to such a point only as would warrant the expenditure of say $1,000,000 or almost $500,000 more than this work was valued at. I mention this fact to give the House some idea of how the work was carried on. Up to the present we have an expenditure upon the substructure of $1,217,000, which should have cost, according to the estimate of the engineer, $819,000, and an expenditure of $199,035 on the superstructure, making $1,416,394, part of which has been paid with the discount obtained at the Bank of Montreal, of the amount which was payable by the province of Quebec, 20 per cent of which was to have been paid as the work progressed, and not more than $30,000 in any one year.

Of the debentures of the company, as I understand it, $533,594 have been issued in payment of part of this construction account. With half a million of debentures they have paid indebtedness due on construction account to the amount of $213,258. Surely there has been a profit to somebody upon these debentures? There was a sum of $213,258, or thereabouts, payable, and there was a sum of $188,721, which is the amount of the discount at the Bank of Montreal. At any rate, the debentures having been paid for at the rate of 60 per cent of their face value will yield a profit to somebody. At the present moment, the city of Quebec has paid $300,000, the province of Quebec has paid $250,000, and the Dominion government, on account of the $1,000,000 vote on account of this undertaking, has paid $374,533, or there has been a total on account of subsidies paid of $924,533.

When Mr. Vallee, the engineer of the provincial government, was commissioned by the Hon. Mr. Duffy, provincial treasurer, to make an accurate report upon the cost of these works, he reported the cost to be $819,000 for the substructure, and $2,800,000 for the superstructure. The estimate we have now before us and which was made in September last by Mr. Schreiber, brings the cost up to $4,767,500, or $1,148,050 more than Mr. Vallee said the cost would be. We have no accurate information as to the cost of the approaches beyond what is contained in the estimate of Mr. Schreiber, and that estimate is very unsatisfactory because we do not know on what it is based. For the south approach, the estimate is $21,000 for land and damages, and $459,800 for the construction of the double track and a yard (presumably at Lévis). The land and

damages estimated for the north approach is much larger, being $414,000. We have no information as to what this estimate is based on, as to its details or as to whether it is correct. For the construction of the double tracks and the sidings the estimated sum is $533,060. The total amount in the estimate of Mr. Schreiber up to the 17th of September as to the amount necessary to completely finish the undertaking is $6,725,360. The debentures which will be issued by this company, and the control of the proceeds of which will be entirely in the hands of the company amount to $6,678,500. The estimated cost, as I have said is, $6,725,360. I would ask the Minister of Railways and Canals or the Minister of Justice, if it is intended to repay the province of Quebec and the city of Quebec with the proceeds of these bonds. The amount of subsidies given so far is $900,000 and that has gone into the construction of the work.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend is omitting the duty.

Mr. MONK. I have omitted it purposely, because the steel rails may be made in Canada.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not for the steel rails. It is for the superstructure of the bridge which is being made in the United States at the present moment.

Mr. MONK. Even so, I do not think the figures meet the amount paid by the Dominion government, by the provincial government, and by the city of Quebec.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Absolutely.

Mr. MONK. I may say that so far the work has not been carried on by the company in a manner which would warrant us in believing that the company is more competent to carry out the work than is this government. From the papers submitted, to the House, it will be seen that probably four or five individuals control the whole company. What they have paid in so far they will have returned in paid up stock, and they are asked to invest a further sum of $200,000, but they will do so with a certain prospect that the government is going to take over the bridge, and they will receive five per cent upon the investment, plus ten per cent bonus, when the government takes over the whole undertaking. Under these circumstances, I feel that although the project is an excellent one; the people of the Dominion who are now interested in that work since it has become a national undertaking, and the people of the immediate district as well, would have far better security if the government had direct supervision over the expenditure of this six and a half million dollars. Since a commission is to be appointed for the express purpose of building the Transcontinental Railway, a part of which this bridge will become, it is my opinion that every interest would be far better safeguarded if the work were entrusted to that commission. I believe that the people in the vicinity of Quebec would prefer that this expenditure shall be under government control, through this commission of experienced men, so that they would have absolute knowledge of how every cent of this money would be spent. If we take the facts set forth in the motion made in the legislature, and the facts contained in the documents submitted to us here; there can be no controversy but that a great saving of money would be effected if the construction of this work were carried out by the commission, or under the direct supervision of the Dominion government. We would thus secure absolute control of a work which is ultimately going to fall into the assets of the Dominion, which is part of a railway which has been sanctioned by parliament. If it was deemed necessary and useful to commit the construction of that railway to an independent body or a quasi independent body, to a commission composed of competent men, why should an exception be made of the Quebec bridge ? Why should not that large sum of $6,500,000 which we are ultimately going to pay—we have that admission from the Minister of Finance, and there is no doubt about it in the mind of anybody—be confided to the same body, with such a control over the expenditure by this legislature as would ensure the money being spent in such a way as not to afford an opportunity for any company or individual to derive any profit from the carrying out of the undertaking, but to ensure the largest possible measure of public benefit.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). Mr. Speaker, It is very pleasant indeed to hear my hon. friend admitting the absolute necessity of this undertaking. In fact, it would be impossible for any man with any knowledge of the local conditions existing at Quebec, to doubt, not merely the advisability, but the imperative necessity of the construction of such a work. For the last twenty-five years it has been the dream of every man in Quebec to see this work accomplished. We labour there under exceptional disadvantages. There are three important railways on the south side of the St. Lawrence—the Intercolonial, the Quebec Central and the Grand Trunk—none of which have connection with Quebec ; and a population of half a million people in a district tributary to Quebec are completely cut off from access to the city, except by means of a ferry, on which the rate in summer is two cents per 100 pounds, and in the winter four cents per 100 pounds. These rates are relatively prohibitive. It is gratifying to observe that the criticism of my hon. friend has reference not to the scheme, but to the method in which assistance is to be given to the com-

pany. His chief criticism is with respect to the organization of the company itself. I am sure that my hon. friend must be labouring under a complete misapprehension when he imagines for one moment that the men connected with this company are liable in any way to divert any of the money they receive, or to be parties to an expenditure that is not absolutely necessary in the interest of the enterprise. It will suffice for me to give the names of the gentlemen who are connected with it. Take, for instance, the names of Mr. Chateauvert, Mr. Lemoine, Mr. Audet, Mr. Garneau, Mr. Breaky, Mr. Boswell, Mr. Laliberté, Mr. Rioux, Mr. Price. These are the names of the most prominent citizens of the city of Quebec; and when my hon. friend learns that these men are directors of the company and are in control of it, he will realize the absolute impossibility of any such eventuality as that which he suggests occuring. My hon. friend will be glad to learn also that new capital is to be brought into this enterprise. I am sure that he will be pleased when I tell him that I am authorized to say that of this new stock of $200,000, Mr. John Sharples, of Quebec, takes $50,000, the Allan firm, Mr. Hearn and others, $25,000, the Grand Trunk Company, $25,000, and the Quebec Central Company, $25,000.

Mr. MONK. If my hon. friend will allow me, I do not think these men are very heroic. If I had money to invest at 5 per cent, with a 10 per cent premium, I should be quite willing to put it into that company.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am pointing out the absolute impossibility of such eventualities as my hon. friend suggests occuring, with such men at the head of the enterprise. My hon. friend practically says that the directors are not to be trusted. What benefit have they to derive from the enterprise? They are putting their own money into it, and what position do they occupy under this contract? Not one dollar's worth of work can be done without the approval of the government. Every plan and specification has to be submitted to the government.

Mr. MONK. Plans have to be approved of by the government, as in the case of every public work of that nature; but they make the contracts, and they have absolute powers in regard to the location and construction of the work.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Let my hon. friend just read the last part of paragraph 6, of the contract, and he will find that the proceeds of the bonds are to remain in the possession of the government that the money is to be paid out on progress estimates, that the certificates of the work as it progresses must be made by the government engineer. What greater control could the government have? If my hon. friend will read this contract, he will see that the result of it is that this is a government work, carried on for the government through the agency of these men whose names I have mentioned. Not a dollar's worth of work can be done without the approval of the government, not a toll can be levied or a farthing charged except with the consent of the government. What more direct control could there be?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is the contract already let for the completion of the bridge and the approaches?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, it was let years ago; and if my hon. friend will look at the contract, he will see that provision was made fixing the price of the iron at the time that it should be required—a very important provision; because as the result of that we have saved the consequences of fluctuations in the iron market, and are able to contract with the company under very favourable conditions. The contracts both for the superstructure and for the approaches have been submitted to the government engineer.

Mr. FOWLER. Were they submitted before they were signed?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, before they were executed.

Mr. PRINGLE. Has the Phœnix Bridge Company the contract for the superstructure?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

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

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Three million three hundred and eighty-eight thousand three hundred dollars for the steel part, $156,500 for the wooden part, and $4,800 for the track on the bridge.

Mr. MONK. Are all these contracts with the same company?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, they are all in the one contract.

Mr. GOURLEY. What is the length of the bridge?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I cannot give the length. I know that the centre span, the cantilever span, will be something like 1,800 feet in length. It will be close on 200 feet longer than the span of the bridge of the Frith of Forth, which at present is the largest span in the world.

Mr. GOURLEY. What is its length in miles, in a general way?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I imagine it would be a mile from the abutment on the north side to the shore abutment on the south side. Of course, the expensive part of the bridge will be the cantilever portion; the centre span.

Mr. PRINGLE. Does the hon. gentleman know whether the cost of the substructure exceeded the estimate, owing to the difficulty of finding a proper foundation ? I understand that the contractor had to go down a greater depth than he at first anticipated.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is the cost of the superstructure already existing, but I would like to say that the estimate made by the provincial government engineer in that connection does not happen to agree with the estimate made by the Dominion government engineer. There was over $300,000 extra expenditure as the result of the discovery, when the south pier was put down, that it was practically on quicksand, which made it necessary to go down some 15 or 18 feet deeper than was originally contemplated. I may say that the estimate of the work done is not an approximate estimate, such as is made before a work is begun. The figures now submitted are based on the work actually done and approved by the Dominion government engineer. In so far as the subsidy granted by the Dominion government is concerned, it was necesssary that the progress estimates of the work done each month should be approved by the Dominion government engineer before any subsidy could be paid, so that the figures given here are not an estimate made by Mr. Vallee, who may or may not be a competent man, and who may or may not have seen works of this magnitude carried on before, but they are an estimate of the actual work done.

My hon. friend has referred to the estimate of the cost of the approaches. He says that we have not sufficient detail. But it is a very easy matter to make an estimate of the cost of the approaches. The first question to be considered is the question of land damages; and any one who has any knowledge of the conditions in the neighbourhood of Quebec can easily determine the probable cost of the land grants. The whole territory covered by the approaches on the north side of the river will not exceed six miles, and it is very easy to estimate within that distance what the cost of the land is likely to be. The next question is what is the cost of construction likely to be, that is to say, the embankment, the grading and the iron. But that is all very simple. There is no great trouble making an estimate of that description, and in any event we have the statement made by Mr. Schreiber, the government engineer, on whose experience we may safely rely.

Mr. MONK. How is the approach made on the north side of Quebec ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The approach starts from the north abutment of the bridge and goes down along the river front, extending to the city of Quebec and ending in a place called Champlain market, at which point the existing railway systems —the Great Northern and the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Lake St. John—will connect with the contemplated terminus.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is that near the dock which the government built ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. About a quarter of a mile from it. The point I speak of now is immediately below the Dufferin Terrace.

Mr. GOURLEY. Does it go around the bank of the river ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes. The result will be you will not only have a bridge at Quebec, but material for the best harbour in the world. You will have six miles of river front served by this line of railway, and you will have 42 feet of water over the whole course, with a very small expenditure. Instead of being, as now, absolutely dependent upon the Princess Louise Basin, where you have got but two berths for steamers drawing 30 feet of water, you will have this whole river front covered by this line of railway. Not only are we now providing for a bridge to connect the north side of the St. Lawrence with the south, but also for the harbour improvements; because when you get down towards the city of Quebec to within about a mile of the terminus, you then run along the wharfs, and it will be necessary to build an embankment along the wharfs, which will afterwards serve as a magnificent embankment for sea-going vessels. You are not only providing this means of communication between the north and south shores, but further equipping the harbour of Quebec, so that you can have then a most commodious and complete harbour.

Mr. MONK. How is it contemplated to get down from the height of the abutment of the bridge on the north side to the level of Champlain market ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. According to the profile now in existence, it is intended to start from the upper level of Cap Rouge, then go along the cliff to get down to the lower level at Pointe à Pizeau, immediately below Sillery church. There you will reach the lower level, and from Pointe à Pizeau there will be an approach of three and a half miles into the city on absolutely level ground.

Mr. GOURLEY. I had an idea that the fortification went sheer down to the water.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, but the government property does. The natural fortification does. The basis of the citadel goes down to the water ; but at the base of the rock on which the citadel is built, there is a narrow piece of ground where the Allans wharf is situated.

Mr. GOURLEY. How broad ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. About 100 feet, and then you immediately come to the water.

Mr. GOURLEY. Sufficient for a harbour and the transaction of business ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, there is not a single house in that locality. My hon. friend will remember that that is where the landslide took place some years ago, and there have been no houses there since.

Mr. GOURLEY. That is what gave me the impression that there is no room for wharfs there.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, there is. That is where the Allans formerly brought their vessels to discharge and take on passengers. There are about 25 to 30 feet of water there, and out from the wharf we have 40 to 50 feet.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will the railway track run along this narrow strip ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, the intention is to run by that place and down to the terminus, which is about a quarter mile further down. My hon. friend made reference to the contribution of the city of Quebec and that of the province, and asked how they ought to be dealt with ? When that enterprise was started, the city of Quebec voted $300,000 to aid it, and the provincial legislature, realizing that it was a work of provincial importance, voted it a sum of $250,000. With respect to that $250,000, my hon. friend made reference to something that occurred in the local legislature, and said that I probably knew all about it. Well, I know very little about what takes place there. We have as much as we can take care of here, without paying attention to what goes on in the legislature at Quebec. But I do know something of this transaction. The $200,000 was voted in aid of the construction of this bridge, payable at the rate of $30,000 per year, but if before the total amount of $200,000 would be paid at that rate, the work should be completed, then the total amount would become payable at once. As the work progressed rapidly, the money was earned very rapidly. The substructure was begun and completed within two years.

I am now speaking in the hearing of the chief engineer of the government, and I say it is acknowledged and admitted that there is no more perfect piece of work on this continent than the work which has been done in connection with the sub-structure. The work was all completed within two years, the provincial contribution of $250,000 was earned but was not available because, under the contract, the money payable by the provincial government and by the city of Quebec was payable pro rata on each progress estimate. The money was very rapidly earned but was not available because under the terms of the statute it was payable to the amount of only $30,000 a year. In order to enable them to meet their obligations and to pay their contractor, the company went to the bank of Montreal and the bank of Montreal advanced the money, taking as collateral security this $250,000 due from the province ; that is the whole transaction. The province agreed to pay $30,000 a year and instead of paying the contractor they pay the bank which advances the money. My hon. friend referred to the advances of the city and province. In so far as the city and province are concerned, I may say that the city is much interested in the construction of the bridge and that the $300,000 which they have contributed was contributed as a voluntary gift with the intention that the shareholders of this company should benefit to that extent. That is the intention. I have here the resolution of the city council of Quebec in which they say that this is intended as aid to the enterprise. They did not expect any part of this money to be returned. The province of Quebec gave their contribution as a subsidy absolutely, as the Dominion government agreed to give $1,000,000 and have paid $374,000. Thus you have the Dominion, the province and the city all realizing that this is an important work municipally, provincially and from a Dominion standpoint and they all contributed to the work. Now it comes to pass that possibly the work may be taken over, under this agreement, by the Dominion. That is to say that one of the parties who contributed to the construction of the enterprise may take the whole enterprise over at a certain time. If the Dominion should take it over and provide for the expenditure they are called upon to make under the existing contract, then this will happen : After the Dominion has been released of all obligations with respect to the bonded indebtedness or the sinking fund for the amount paid to the shareholders, on their stock, then you will have the Dominion interested in this enterprise to the extent of $370,000, the amount of the subsidy. You will have the province of Quebec interested to the extent of $250,000 and the city of Quebec to the extent of $300,000. Then the Dominion says : After we have been relieved from all liabilities under the new arrangement, and after we go back to the old condition of things, then we shall deal with this enterprise as an enterprise in which three parties are interested ; and after we get rid of all our obligations, if there is any profit, we do not want to take the profit, we are not entitled to it any more than the others who contributed to the enterprise. Then all of those who put money into the enterprise will receive their money back. The government will have the right either to pay back the capital or to keep the money in the enterprise and pay the province and city so much per cent per annum

on their investment. It seems to me that that is a perfectly fair proposition and one which places all those who have put money into this project on the same footing. I do not know that there is any thing in what my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) would criticise.

Mr. MONK. I did not make any particular criticism of that, but if my hon. friend will allow me, I will read the resolution to which I referred. The resolution says :

On the 10th of August, Mr. Vallée, the engineer of the provincial government reported that out of the $250,000 to be paid by the province to the company, $56,600.45 would have to be allotted to the substructure and $195,399.55 to the superstructure. On the 21st of September following the Order in Council was passed adopting the conclusions of this report and in spite of the fact that the payment of the subsidy has been divided, although, the superstructure alone was constructed the province have paid already $90,000 instead of $56,000. Moreover, on the 4th of December following, the Minister of Public Works made a report the object of which was to contradict the Order in Council of September 21, 1900, in which report of the September 21st, it was declared that the whole $250,000 was then fully earned and that the government of the province of Quebec should bind and oblige itself to pay that sum of $250,000 to the Bank of Montreal in contradiction to the Premier's Order in Council and although the work was not completed and the conditions of the grant by the province had not been observed.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If my hon. friend will look at the statute he will see that it has been literally complied with. I am not dealing with the motion, because motions can be so easily made to read so as to suit a particular purpose. I refer to the statute of the province which provides for the subsidy and my hon. friend will find that the transfer to the Bank of Montreal was made literally under the terms of that statute.

Another error into which my hon. friend has fallen is the statement that nothing has been done in connection with the superstructure. There has been expended on the superstructure the modest sum of $156,000 ; two short spans have been completed and are now in place and can be seen by any one who passes by the bridge. $156,640 have been expended in connection with the superstructure. The subsidy of the province of Quebec has simply been transferred. It is paid over to those who have earned it, and it has gone into the enterprise, there is no dispute about that and it has gone in on progress estimates certified by Mr. Vallée the government engineer who certifies to the payment of progress estimates by the province of Quebec. My hon. friend has referred to the motion of Mr. Pelletier, I would like to refer to something which occured in the city of Quebec about two nights ago when my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) and his leader (Mr. Borden, Halifax) were entertained in that city and it was a great pleasure to me to observe that when the gentleman went to Quebec that city maintained its reputation for hospitality and that a magnificent reception was given to him. I congratulate him. The gentleman who made that motion, speaking of the bridge at the banquet in the hearing of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) said :

The Quebec bridge has been promised to us by important Conservatives. That promise was not kept, and that was an error. The electors should always insist upon the accomplishment of any promises made and they should prefer that fewer promises he made and that those made be carried out.

Mr. Pelletier did not say that that promise was not kept by the present administration and like my hon. friend he approves of the building of the bridge.

Mr. MONK. Not of this proposition ; he did not know anything about this.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No ; that motion in the Quebec legislature to which my hon. friend refers was probably made for the purpose of making party capital, but I am glad to see that here we are broader and do not try to make political capital out of a public enterprise.

I do not know that there is anything more for me to say at this stage but when we are in committee if there are any questions which hon. gentlemen desire to ask and which I can answer I shall be glad to answer them. I may say to my hon. friend that I have a very great interest in this bridge.

Mr. GOURLEY. Not a financial one ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Not to the extent of a farthing, direct or indirect and I do not think any one suspects me of having an interest.

Mr. GOURLEY. No, I did not say so. You have too much sense.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This goes into my constituency, into the heart of one of the most important parishes I represent, my native parish Sillery. It goes through a part of the county with which I am very familiar and runs down to the constituency of my hon. friend for Quebec West (Mr. Power) and both of us are much interested, for as I said, for a quarter of a century the dream of every man in Quebec was to see this bridge built. It was promised and promised to us but we never saw the realization of it. We have now come within, I think, measurable distance of the end. I have made myself familiar, as far as I could with the abilities I possess, with all the particulars of the enterprise and I assure this honourable House that any information I can give I shall be glad and delighted to give.

With respect to the discount on the bonds I may say that this is the position : When this contract was let the company had, as paid up capital, $50,000. It had available for the construction of this bridge, subsidies

of the Dominion government, of the local 'government, and of the city of Quebec. That is to say, $300,000 from the city of Quebec, $250,000 from the provincial government, and $333,000 from the Dominion government, for there was then available out of the Dominion subsidy for the substructure only one-third, and more than that has been paid out of that Dominion subsidy in connection with the superstructure. That was the financial condition of the company at that time. Now, this contractor entered into a contract with this company to build that work, a most important undertaking. As I say, at that time no man knew what the result of this undertaking might be with respect to the foundation. They have been obliged to put in this foundation sixty feet below the bed of the St. Lawrence river, at a place where the tide rises eighteen feet. At times his men were working at a distance of thirty-two feet below the surface of the water.

Mr. GOURLEY. What is the tide at that place ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It varies from fourteen to eighteen feet.

Mr. GOURLEY. The Shubenacadie bridge was built in forty feet of water.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The conditions under which the Shubenacadie bridge was built did not at all compare with those prevailing here. Those were the conditions under which the contract was taken, and this contractor agreed to take 80 per cent of his progress estimates in cash and 20 per cent in bonds of the company—one-fifth of the whole cost of the substructure in bonds of the company, and the company in the financial condition I have described. Now what was the outlook for him at that time ? Was the outlook such as that he could ever expect under these conditions, if he did not take considerable risk, even to receive the payment of 60 cents on the dollar ? There was large risk, and he took that risk, and the result has been that the enterprise has turned out a success. Now he says, I want a hundred cents on the dollar, that is the condition of the contract. Now what position does the government take ? The government says : This is a binding obligation on the company. The company undertook at that time to enter into a contract and to assume this binding obligation. They agreed to pay that 40 cents on the dollar, it is an obligation that can be enforced against the company at any time. The government say to the company : Very well——

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What was the object of the company to pay the difference ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The position the government took was this : The government said : Very well, that is a binding obligation, a legal obligation that may be enforced against the company, and they must provide the means necessary to pay that obligation. Provide the means necessary to pay that obligation, subscribe an additional $200,000, which will be sufficient to pay that discount of $183,000, let the company pay that, and then when the company has liquidated that liability to its contractor and paid that discount, we will step in and guarantee their bonds, but we won't do it until the company have paid the difference. That is the position the government took. I do not see that there is anything wrong in that. It is merely providing that the company should liquidate its own liabilities with respect to that particular contractor. The company is asked to liquidate this liability, and in the result we have the additional guarantee that the construction of this enterprise will be properly looked after, because of the additional investment that these gentlemen are going to make in the enterprise, they are putting $200,000 more of their own capital into the enterprise. The hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has this in his mind, that if the government take this enterprise over, of course the shareholders will be paid the $200,000. But the government will not take this enterprise over if it is not a success, the government are under no obligation to take it over.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. They can do it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. But they are under no obligation to do it, and the government will see to it that this enterprise is not taken over if it becomes a financial disaster ; but if it becomes a success, and if the government do take it over, why should we not assume this liability as well as any other liability ? If it is a legal obligation, a fair and honest debt due by the company, why should it not be paid ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Can you do this without coming to this parliament and getting a grant of that money ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We could not get it of course without the sanction of parliament, and we make that provision.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Under the contract you are empowering the government to enter into an arrangement of that kind. If you have entered into an arrangement, the question is whether you will not be bound by that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We would have to come to parliament for the money to do it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But it may be obligatory upon the Crown.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This is a provision which will enable the government as against the company to exercise its rights. But that does not mean that if parliament does not sanction the act of the government

they can do it. If parliament does not give its sanction there is no obligation.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We are empowering the government to enter into an arrangement of that kind if they think proper.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Let my hon. friend read section 23 :

If at any time, and with or without notice, the government shall pay or cause to be paid to the government of the province of Quebec and the city of Quebec, or either of them, the amount of their respective subsidies of $250,000, and $300,000, all payments, whether in respect of capital or income, to be made under the foregoing provisions to the said government of the province of Quebec or the city of Quebec, respectively, shall at and from that time absolutely cease and determine.

We are under no obligation to pay them anything. This is a provision that if we do pay them that, in order to get rid of even a moral claim, they may possibly have, that we shall pay them this amount with the interest mentioned in the clause. There is no other obligation upon us to do it.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask if the government have considered the claim made by the city of Montreal for aid to the Longueuil bridge, in connection with this matter.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am under the impression that the company that was incorporated for the Longueuil bridge has no legal existence, I do not think that a company was ever formed. The incorporation Act was passed, but I do not think that the companay ever took any action under it. Let me remind the hon. gentleman that this is not a local matter. Let me also remind him that there are at Montreal and in the immediate vicinity three bridges across the St. Lawrence.

Mr. MONK. Private bridges.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Very private. Look at the estimates of what they have cost the country, and you will find that the country is largely interested in them. There is the Victoria bridge, the Lachine bridge and the bridge at Coteau, and now we are providing this session for the Bout be l'Ile bridge.

Mr. MONK. That does not cross the St. Lawrence river.

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (King's, N.B.). I think the House will agree that this is a very necessary work in carrying out the general transportation scheme. But while this is the case, there is certainly some difference of opinion as to the manner in which this scheme is being carried out. The hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) did not clear up all the difficulties which I discovered on looking through this contract as it appears before us. In the first place, there seems to be no accounting for the amount of stock, of which a great deal has been made, that is supposed to have been paid up by the company. In looking over the estimates as given us in the preamble of the agreement, and also in the letters of Premier Parent, in connection with this matter, I find that the amount paid out to the contractor on account of the work done is exactly equal, with the exception of a difference of $56, to the amount of the subsidies which have been received, so that no part of the capital stock of the company has gone into construction, and I fail to understand where the capital has gone.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There was a great deal of preliminary work before the contract was entered into at all. There was no more difficult engineering work to be done anywhere than in connection with the location of the bridge.

Mr. FOWLER. That is all taken into consideration in the estimates we have from the Department of Railways and Canals, and yet the amount paid out of the capital stock remains unaccounted for. I fail to see why the government should be called upon to guarantee or to make the company guarantee 100 cents on the dollar in the payment of these bonds. The contractor took them at 60 cents on the dollar in payment for work done. These bonds are drawing interest at their full face value of 100 cents on the dollar, so that the contractor has made a very good bargain with the company. The difference between $283,279, which the bonds realized, and the $472,000, which is the face value of the bonds, is $188,000. It would follow that $283,000, being the amount which the contractor gave the company credit for, this $188,000 is an amount which may be called the water of these bonds. The government by this process are performing a modern miracle ; they are turning water into gold instead of turning it into wine. It seems to me that this is a matter with which the government should have nothing to do, and that it is a matter which should be settled by the contractor and the bridge company. I notice that the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals estimates the total cost of this bridge at $6,725,360, and I must congratulate the deputy minister upon the way in which his estimate coincides with the amount of the contract. The hon. Minister of Justice tells us that the amount of the contract for the steel superstructure is $3,388,800. That is exactly the amount of the estimate of the deputy minister for that work. The hon. Minister of Justice tells us that the contract for the wooden floor beams is $156,500. That also coincides exactly with the estimate of the deputy minister. The hon. Minister of Justice tells us that the contract for the track on bridge is $4,800, exactly coinciding with the estimate of the deputy minister. We find then that $6,725,360 is the estimated cost of this work, an estimate which, as I say, agrees exactly

with the contract. There has been paid for this work in cash, the proceeds of the subsidies, $914,862, which leaves a balance of $5,811,000, which, according to the estimate, will be the amount required to complete the bridge. But Mr. Parent, president of the Bridge Company, and Premier of the province of Quebec, has requested that $6,900,000 of the bonds be guaranteed in order to complete the bridge. The government have not seen fit to accede to the whole of his request, but they have agreed to guarantee bonds to the amount of $6,678,200. That leaves an apparent difference of something like $1,000,000. That is attempted to be accounted for by the duty on the steel superstructure. I presume that the contract is given for the steel superstructure. The estimate is placed at three and a half cents per pound, which is a fair price at the present time for heavy bridge material. If it were lighter bridge material, it would probably amount to three and three-quarter cents a pound. It is not proper to add the duty to the cost of construction of the bridge. That is already accounted for in the contract price, and at any rate the steel should be bought in Canada. There is a million of difference in that, and there is $188,000, the difference between the amount which the bonds realized on their face value, which have not been accounted for. The members of this House are all agreed as to the necessity for this bridge and that the work is one which should be done in carrying out the general transportation scheme of this country and providing the necessary transportation facilities for the great trade development which is going on. For anything which is going to a national undertaking I am perfectly willing to vote any necessary amount, but I do think that this scheme as proposed is not a proper one. We know something about these bridge matters in the province of New Brunswick, from which I come. There is just such another bridge, only a cheaper bridge, in the city of St. John, owned by a bridge company, and built by the bridge company just as this bridge is being built at Quebec. It was built under the old government. Almost the entire amount of the money used in construction was loaned by the government, as I understand it, and upon it they paid a certain rate of interest—I think 4 per cent or 4½ per cent. I am not sure as to the details of the undertaking, but the members of the government will know them. As a matter of fact, that bridge company have made a splendid revenue out of that bridge, although the amount of money they put into the bridge was very small. I am told on the best authority that every year the stockholders in that bridge company receive actually more than double the amount they put in. I have understood—I do not vouch for the accuracy of these figures—that the actual amount paid in by each stockholder was $700, and that each year they have an income from the bridge of $1,100 or $1,200. That is done at the expense of the general public. Certainly a handicap and a hindrance to trade are caused by allowing these people to charge a greater amount for the carriage of trade over this bridge than should be allowed.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. They cannot do it here.

Mr. FOWLER. The conditions in this case, I do not think, are different from the conditions of the other. I think the conditions in both cases are about alike. The government should build this bridge themselves. They are actually undertaking all the risk of this enterprise. They are guaranteeing, not only the interest, but they are absolutely guaranteeing the principal of the bonds; they are guaranteeing the whole amount, and if there is any profit the company will reap the benefit of it. It is shown here, if we are to believe the estimate of receipts, that there is going to be a fine thing in this for the company. The expectation is that they will be able to divide $56,000 a year on the lowest estimate of profit. After they pay interest on the bonds and after they provide for the wear and tear and other expenses of maintenance, they will still have a profit of $56,000. They actually pay in $200,000, and the amount of $65,000, which the hon. Minister of Justice says was put into preliminary work, or $265,000 in all, and they divide a profit of $56,000, which is a pretty nice income from an investment of $265,000. That is equal to 25 or 30 per cent.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The government has no liability at all.

Mr. FOWLER. It has been presented to us as an essential feature of the scheme, that it is a profitable scheme and that the government will not incur liability. There are contingencies which might throw liability on the government, and so far the government are incurring the only liability in the whole case. They are not only guaranteeing the bonds to be issued but they are actually guaranteeing at least sixty per cent of the bonds already issued by the company. There is no responsibility whatever upon the company; with them it is a case of heads I win tails you lose. Why do not the government do the work themselves, when they can do it better and more economically.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If it is not a success and the government does not take it over, what becomes of the $200,000 of new money that is to be invested?

Mr. FOWLER. The Minister of Justice quite understands that it would be a very easy matter to provide $200,000 without a cent being put up.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Oh, no.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not say that it will be done in this case, but there are instances on record where it has been done and I could tell the hon. gentleman how it could be done.

The PRIME MINISTER. Don't.

Mr. FOWLER. I will not, because in case the Minister of Justice does not know, if I told him perhaps he would communicate it to the company and I want to avoid that. We are assuming all the responsibility, and if the bridge is not a success we are the losers. While I am very strongly in favour of the building of this bridge, and while I believe it will be as beneficial as the Minister of Justice thinks, and will enable the harbour of Quebec to get trade in increasing quantities which we would all be glad to see; yet I cannot but think that it would be much better for the government to build the bridge under the Railway Commission, or by a special commission, believing as I do that it would then be built in a more economic manner, and that the money of the country would not be wasted.

Hon. J. I. TARTE (Montreal, St. Mary's). I was one of the promoters of the Quebec Bridge Company years ago, and I have always taken a great interest in this work. The country is now invited to guarantee $6,678,000 in addition to what we have contributed in the past. The Dominion treasurer has paid $374,000, the province of Quebec, $250,000; the city of Quebec, $300,000; in all, $924,000. If I understand the position, the contract for the substructure is the only contract that has been awarded. I do not exactly know the amount of the contract entered into with Mr. Davis, but the amount estimated by the chief engineer for the substructure is $1,217,400 and the cost of the superstructure, for which a contract has not yet been given, is estimated at $3,388,000. That will make $4,600,000 for the substructure and the superstructure of the bridge itself. The balance of the money which we are asked to guarantee is for land damages, construction of double track, tracks on the bridge, wooden floor, &c., the whole reaching the large sum of $7,500,000. About $1,000,000 is going to be employed in land and damages, and the purchase of land. I lived for fifteen years very near the spot where the bridge is built, and I know the locality very well. The land on the north side belongs to private parties who will be very glad indeed to sell it. There is to be $414,000 for land and damages on the north side, and a little more for the south side. The Minister of Justice has said that the government is providing at the same time six miles of water front accommodation. Well, the new project, as it is placed before us to-day, will not provide for one foot of water front accommodation in Quebec. There is no money voted for deep water wharfs, and with the amount of money placed at the disposal of the company to purchase land, it cannot build one single foot of wharf. If the Minister of Justice will refer to the records of the Public Works Department he will find that it will cost about $7,000,000 or $8,000,000 to provide proper accommodation at the very place he has spoken of. There is a batture right opposite——

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The hon. gentleman must know the Mariners' Chapel at the immediate entrance to Diamond Harbour. From Diamond Harbour down to the Champlain Market there will be three-quarters of a mile where you are absolutely on the shore of the river. You have to go along on the wharfs with your railway, you cannot go anywhere else. There is no use talking about a batture.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I know that, but the Minister of Justice knows as well as I do, and perhaps better, that there is a batture there which prevents ships from coming to the shore.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Not at all.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Why, the batture begins at the upper end of Lampson's cove and goes up to Sillery.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Surely the Minister of Justice knows that the bridge is being built at Cap Rouge, much further up than Sillery. The bridge is being built at Cap Rouge; and I say that to give proper water accommodation in those six miles would involve an expenditure of $10,000,000. There are reports in the Department of Public Works to show this.

Mr. BELL. What have the improvements at Montreal cost, and what length of water front is there ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There is no possible comparison between the two. I speak of the Quebec case as I know it to be. My hon. friends have only to look at the expenditure provided for here. There is not one cent for wharf accommodation. The money is provided for the purchase of land, for the building of sheds, stations, and so on, for the bridge itself, and for the approaches on both sides of the river ; but not one foot of water accommodation is provided for. This point I think I have made very clear, and it cannot be disputed by anybody who knows.

As to the financial aspect of the project, it stands thus : This government at first agreed to give $1,000,000 of subsidy to the company, the Quebec government and the city of Quebec supplying the balance of the subsidies, which this very same company declared to be sufficient to carry out the undertaking. My hon. friends on both sides of the House have only to refer to the debates which have taken place in the Quebec House and also here, and to the reports

of the company, as proof of that fact. Well, the company have been mistaken in their calculations. I do not blame them too much for that, because in the case of such large undertakings I quite admit that we are all liable to make mistakes. I know that Mr. Davis, in order to have safe foundations for his piers, has been obliged to go much deeper than he anticipated. Of course, he should have looked carefully into the nature of the soil at the bottom of the St. Lawrence before undertaking this contract. At the same time, not desiring to be unfair to him, I grant that that cost him a pretty large amount of money ; but it is only a detail. The two governments and the city of Quebec have already paid nearly $1,000,000. In my opinion, if the subsidies had been capitalized and if the undertaking had been floated in a business-like manner, there was enough money to carry out the work. Many able business men have expressed the same view. However, the project has not been carried out, and we have now to say whether or not we approve of the scheme placed before us. The government are to guarantee fifty-year bonds for over $6,000,000. If I understand the seventh clause of the contract, the government will issue these bonds as the company earn the money. In other words, the contractor will be paid by the company with the proceeds of the bonds as he earns the amounts so paid. I want to ask my hon. friends on the treasury benches whether this is a very good financial method. If the bonds were floated in one block——

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Look at paragraph 8. Provision is made first for getting the money. That is to be got in any way the government shall determine most advisable under the circumstances ; that is to say, by making one issue of the bonds at one time, or by making partial issues at different times. It would be premature to say now how that should be done.

Mr. GOURLEY. The government holds the money and pays it out on progress estimates ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I would like the point to be made clear. Suppose the bonds are issued in one block, how is the money to be disposed of ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It goes to the credit of the government, and will be paid out on monthly progress estimates as the money is earned.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The Minister of Justice said a moment ago that the contract for the superstructure has not been awarded. What interest have the contractors to do work as cheaply as they can when they know that the government will take over the work ? The Minister of Finance has said that very distinctly. In my humble opinion, the position in which we are placed is that we are giving without tender a contract to a contractor. The government have stated that the work is of a national character ; and having stated that, they will take it over, what is the use of our giving a guarantee of 3 per cent to a private company ? What is the use of leaving the whole thing in the dark ? Because we do not know whether the bonds will be floated in one block or in several small blocks ; that is a question to be decided. The only thing we are sure about is that we guarantee fifty-year debentures at 3 per cent interest. The money will be borrowed on our own credit at 3 per cent. Under the circumstances, as some hon. members who have preceded me have said, would it not be better for us to take over the work now ? I do not see any reason why we should guarantee bonds at 3 per cent for private parties, undertaking at the same time to take over the work ; because there is no possible doubt that the government will take it over. There is one very clear reason that will oblige them to take it over, and very soon. I say all success to the bridge, but I believe there is not much doubt that the work will not pay its working expenses and the 3 per cent at the beginning and for some years. This means that we will take over the work as soon as it is completed. Therefore I say again that we are only giving without tender a contract to the Quebec Bridge Company, and we are giving the guarantee of our national credit without having complete control over the work. In my humble opinion, the government would have done better if they had settled immediately with Mr. Davis and the company, and had taken over the work, and borrowed the money to complete it on the national credit, instead of borowing for the benefit of a private corporation. It is beyond question, and we cannot blame them, that the men expect to make a profit out of the transaction. If they were not expecting that, they would be fools indeed. They are in business to make money, and not for love ; but if it were not too late, and I do not think it is, and if the company were disposed to come to an agreement to that effect, I think it would be better for the government to carry out the work themselves. I am for the equipment of the port of Quebec, and I hope that this guarantee will not prevent the government from equipping that port at a later period. That is a greater necessity than the building of this bridge. The bridge will be a useful thing, works of that kind are always useful, but it will not bring to the city of Quebec one-tenth of the trade which would be brought by the proper equipment of the ports of Montreal, Three Rivers, Quebec and our lake and canal ports. In my humble opinion, the government should lose no time in making up their minds to complete the equipment of the St. Lawrence route.

Mr. R. A. PRINGLE (Cornwall and Stormont). I agree with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that an important measure of this kind should be brought down earlier in the session instead of being presented to us a day or two before prorogation. However, there seems to be a consensus of opinion that the work would be of great benefit, not only to the province of Quebec, but to the Dominion of Canada. If I remember rightly, two or three years ago the Quebec Bridge Company was incorporated; and in the letters of incorporation the government reserved full powers to control rates, as is usually done in cases of the kind. As I understand it, the city of Quebec gave a bonus of $300,000 to this company, all of which has gone into the enterprise; the province of Quebec gave $250,000, and the Dominion government has agreed to give $1,000,000, on which it has paid $374,353. We find, therefore, that the company has received from the city, the province and the Dominion, $924,253. It has also received payments on capital stock amounting to $65,585.70, making total cash receipts of $889,938.70 already invested in the project, and the company now finds itself in this position, that it is not able to finance the balance of the scheme. It seems to me, Sir, that the position is such that the government has authority to come to the assistance of this company. If it should not, the company will not be able to go on with the construction of this work. I have listened attentively to what was said by a number of gentlemen who spoke on this question, and I quite understand the importance of having a bridge at that point. We find that there is no bridge east of Montreal, and there is a distance of 180 miles which is practically closed during five months in the year, between the south and north shores, from Montreal to Quebec. West of Montreal we have the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge, the Canada Atlantic Railway bridge and the Ottawa and New York Railway bridge—three bridges spanning the St. Lawrence within a distance of some 67 miles. I can quite understand, therefore, the importance of having a bridge at the city of Quebec. The only question to my mind is whether this contract properly safeguards the public interest, and if I am wrong in any statement I may make, I should like to be corrected. I understand that on consideration of the government guaranteeing these bonds, amounting to $6,678,200, the company releases and foregoes all claim to the $625,647, being the balance due on the million dollar subsidy. Then, the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) raised a question with regard to the stock. As I understand the condition, there is $65,000 worth of stock, or rather $55,000, paid up on the stock subscribed, and under section 3 the company agree with the subscribers to the capital stock, that they shall surrender such stock to the company, and in lieu thereof accept paid-up stock to that amount paid by them on their shares and be relieved from further liability on the stock so surrendered.

Section 4 provides for issue of stock to the extent of $200,000, the proceeds to be applied in payment of the discount at which the bonds of the company were issued.

So far as I am concerned, I quite conceive that the $472,000 are a legal liability, and shall have to be discharged, either by the company or by the government, if they assume this work, but it did seem to me that the wise and proper way would have been for the government simply to have guaranteed the bonds for an amount including the $472,000.

With regard to section 7, the hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) raised an objection. As I understand that section, the bonds guaranteed by the government shall be issued and the proceeds thereon paid to the company as the construction is proceeded with, to the satisfaction of the government, and in such sums as the chief engineer of the government railways, or such other officer as the government may appoint, may certify or justify. How far do these words 'or justify' go? Would the engineer of the government have the right to inquire whether the amount paid was a proper one, having regard to the value of the work, and whether any contract was given at a greater amount than it should have been? Would the government engineer be justified in inquiring into the value of the work done? I think the public interest should be protected on that point. I do not wish to detain the House, but simply wish to understand thoroughly this matter, as it is important. I understand, of course, that under section 12 the plans and specifications have to be approved by the Governor in Council, and further, that the government will control the tolls. I understand it lies largely in the power of the government to fix the tolls.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Absolutely.

Mr. PRINGLE. In that case, the government can fix the tolls at such a rate that they may collect a revenue sufficient to pay 3 per cent interest on the $6,678,200, or $200,346. Judging by the reports we have, it appears to me that even at a moderate rate of tolls, there will be no difficulty in collecting an amount sufficient to pay the 3 per cent on the bonds guaranteed by the government. It seems to me that the position of the government is such, if it had to intervene and either take the works entirely out of the hands of the company or adopt some means such as the plan now submitted of seeing that the works were completed.

Mr. S. E. GOURLEY (Colchester). I am glad to see that my hon. friend from Corn-

wall (Mr. Pringle) supports this motion. The support should come from other provinces. We have been accustomed to seeing a fight between the provinces when any measure was proposed that benefited any one province and I am glad to see the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) supporting this scheme. I read the contract thoroughly and as far as the terms are concerned it is well enough, if there is nothing behind it. If the provisions here set forth are carried out there can be no harm in the transaction, but unfortunately the trouble with these schemes is that it so often happens that people suspect that some one is going to get boodle out of the project; that is the misfortune of our public life, the suspicion that there is some steal. In the past Canada has been divided into two parts by the River St. Lawrence, and in the old days had it been in Europe it would have been two countries; but now, with the construction of railways and the building of bridges, countries are united that in the old days would be separate and I say that this bridge should have been built years ago. Quebec should have been united and as a maritime province man I have always felt when I approached Lévis that it was a most awkward thing that there should be no bridge joining the south shore of the St. Lawrence with the north shore, because that river interrupted the whole communication from the north. The construction of this bridge has been my dream, as well as the dream of every man in Quebec. As far as I am concerned I have no objection to the building of this bridge if it is honestly carried out and I would have no objection to the amount involved.

I would like the Minister of Finance to have a little conference with his late colleague the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals with regard to a pension scheme on the Intercolonial Railway. This Quebec bridge and the pension scheme on the Intercolonial should go hand in hand; they are both in the interest of transportation. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals became very popular among the railway people in the maritime provinces; they had great confidence in him, and I think it will be very hard for any other Minister of Railways and Canals to get so thoroughly into the confidence of the railway people as did the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, chiefly because he was broad enough and liberal enough to propose a system of pensions for the Intercolonial Railway men. I am told that when a man has served on the Intercolonial, especially on the new large engines, for twenty or twenty-five years, he is unfit to continue in that business or any other. And are we going to turn our public servants out upon the street, after serving this country for twenty years, without the slightest care? In the interests of the transportation system of this country, we must look after the men who are engaged upon the Intercolonial Railway. Although I am opposed to the government and to the Minister of Railways and Canals, as far as politics are concerned, I do not hesitate to support that measure and justify it as a wise expenditure of the public money of Canada. I have received a communication from a number of railway employees in Nova Scotia, asking me to obtain information as to how far that scheme has progressed. I understand that a scheme was prepared by the men, revised by the officers of the department, that a workable scheme had been developed by the officers of the department, and that it awaited the approval of the Minister of Railways and Canals and the subsequent approval of parliament. Of course, I understand that with the change that has taken place in the Department of Railways and Canals there may be a little delay, there must necessarily be a hiatus. I know hundreds of employees of the Intercolonial Railway who are anxious to take advantage of such a system as this but who inform me that they are unable to retire as they have no means of support and therefore it becomes very important that action should be taken in this matter because otherwise you will have a number of men employed on the Intercolonial who know that they are not fit to be entrusted with the duties they are discharging. But these men have no choice, they must continue at their posts, and therefore, I commend highly the far-seeing, statesmanlike view of the late Minister of Railways and Canals. Of course, I have had no personal communication with him, but I understand from association with the railway men, that he had approved of the general system of pensions for the Intercolonial Railway employees, of course without committing himself to the details. I approve of that scheme and I am prepared to justify it at any time and at any place. I would like to learn from the hon. minister and the ex-minister just what position this matter is now in.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am aware that the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) had this subject under consideration, and had interviews with the railway officials about it. The matter was not pressed to a conclusion and since the change in the department nothing further has been done; therefore, I am unable to do more than to say that the matter is under consideration.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. I have to make suitable acknowledgments to my hon. friend (Mr. Gourley) for his kind and complimentary reference to myself personally.

Mr. GOURLEY. They were the truth, Sir.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. While I do that and may avow at once that I have very strong sympathy with the policy of providing a pension system for the employees on the

Intercolonial, I confess that I do not at the moment see any very close relevancy between the subject of the Quebec bridge and the subject of a pension system for the Intercolonial.

Mr. GOURLEY. I made it the occasion; of course, I had finished my remarks on the Quebec bridge.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. I understood my hon. friend to convey the idea that they were associated together, and ought to be dealt with at the same time. That is rather in conformity with log-rolling ideas that are sometimes practiced. I have no doubt that the subject will receive the consideration which its claims merit. Before retiring from the department, officers, or experts, or actuaries were engaged making a report on the subject. They had inquired into the system which is in operation upon the Canadian Pacific Railway and upon the Grand Trunk Railway, and these two systems were placed alongside the proposals made by the men themselves. The men sent in a scheme, when they understood the subject was going to be taken up, which they desired the department to consider. I did not think it was comprehensive enough, for reasons which I need not go into. I think they were of the opinion that a much less sum would suffice than I thought was necessary. It always appeared to me that when you are adopting a system of that description it is necessary to deal with a considerable number of old employees, men who have been a long time in the service, and who could not hope by any system of contribution to derive any benefits from that system. They would have to be provided for, therefore, in some reasonable way, and would not come within the scope of that scheme. However, under the circumstances I thought it necessary to have this expert inquiry made. We had persons in our employ, and they are still in the employ of the department, I presume, who are engaged in making this inquiry, and when their work is completed, I have no doubt the minister will see the advisability of giving the subject his earnest consideration, and of calling the attention of his colleagues to it.

Passing from that matter to the subject immediately before us, I would like to say one word before I sit down. I am more than pleased to see that the proposal to ensure the construction of the bridge across the St. Lawrence river at Quebec, meets with such general favour on both sides of the House. I have been very warmly disposed towards the enterprise myself during all the time I was in the department, and my sympathy with it was owing to the fact that it meant a good deal for the advantage of the government railway system. I did not look beyond that at the moment, nor do I think it necessary to look beyond it now, to justify the adoption of a sound scheme. I presume, from all I have heard to the contrary, that there are no serious objections to this scheme to ensure the construction of the bridge. The extension of the government road to the Georgian bay, which hon. members know has been a pet idea of mine, is one which I think would be much strengthened by the construction of the bridge at Quebec. If we are to ensure over Canadian territory and by Canadian seaports the export of our western produce, it will always be necessary and important that this great water-way should be used. In using the water-ways of Canada, we must not lose sight of the port of Quebec as one of the most important to be found anywhere, standing as it does as compared with other important outlets through which this traffic will necessarily have to pass. The better and more adequately you equip that port, the more surely will you guarantee the future use of that port as a gateway for the imports and exports of Canada. As my hon. friend the Minister of Justice suggested, the port of Quebec is only accessible by one railway, but when this bridge is completed, with the splendid equipment with which it will be provided, in conjunction with the railway along the northern shores of the St. Lawrence, the port of Quebec will be second to none, in my opinion, upon this continent. When you provide an adequate and efficient equipment for a great port at the head of deep water navigation of the St. Lawrence, you guarantee that the people who have grain and other produce to ship will be able to do so speedily, and will be afforded economical means of getting their freight across the ocean.

Now there are one or two things which have been said in relation to this matter that I would like to allude to before sitting down. I think it desirable that the contract should contain a clause that, before the option which is referred to here, is exercised, the opinion of parliament should be taken upon it. I understood the Minister of Justice and the acting Minister of Railways to concur in the suggestion. If that suggestion meets with favour, it would be necessary to incorporate it in the agreement. I take it that the present contract is only provisional, and will be made more complete before it is finally signed. But in my judgment, it will be necessary to insert such a clause if the object be that parliament should have a further say upon the matter. The hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler) said that under this arrangement opportunities would be possible for a great deal of private benefit to be realized out of the profits which would accrue from the operation of the bridge. He instanced the case of what is called the St. John Railway and Bridge Company. That bridge, which was constructed across the falls at the city of St. John, was built by a private and incorporated company, and largely built, as he has properly said, by means of a loan made to the company by the Dominion government. There should

be in this contract a clause similar to that which was originally put into the agreement under which that loan was made to this railway and bridge company, namely, that it should be optional with the government at any time, I think also subject to the approval of parliament, to take over that bridge upon paying to the company, or the individual members of the company, the amount of the loan which had been made, with an additional percentage to cover any reasonable claim as probable benefits that would have accrued to those who entered into the contract and carried it out. Well, it so happened that after the lapse of some years, and while that option was a living option, which might be exercised at any time in the future, it was deemed advisable for some reason or other, which reason I cannot state, because I never heard what the reason was, to expunge that clause from the contract, and the result is, that, notwithstanding, as the hon. member for King's has said, individual persons who made small subscriptions have been reaping handsome profits out of the undertaking, the government has no power to retake the property except under the general expropriation power which it possesses. I would hope that if a clause of this kind is inserted in the present agreement, empowering the government at any time in the future, particularly if the property be a paying one, to take it over, it will be accepted.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). Mr. Speaker, I am not as sure as the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) that the project which we are now discussing meets with the general favour of the country, as the hon. gentleman seems to think it does. Why? We have only been made acquainted within the last twenty-four hours of the particulars of this scheme. We have had no means of learning from the country at large what it thinks of the project, and I am very much inclined to agree with the opinion, after reading what has been put before the House, which was expressed this afternoon by an hon. member from the province of Quebec, when he said that the scheme looked very much better on paper than the project itself did. I must say that I am not in a position to give an intelligent opinion. I do regret very much that the government is called upon from time to time to come to the relief of projects of this kind. The city of Quebec, no doubt very anxious to secure the construction of this bridge, entered into certain obligations, at any rate the citizens of Quebec did so, and it seems to me a most remarkable thing that a company with a stock of only $200,000 and only $65,000 paid up, should undertake such a gigantic project as is now being considered by the government, a project that will ultimately cost seven millions of dollars. It seems to me that either the scheme has been gone into without any mature consideration or else those who were at the start of the undertaking must have had a very faint idea of what they were about to accomplish. I repeat that it is a matter of regret that from various parts of the country the government of the day is called upon to come to the rescue of schemes of this kind which have been entered upon without any serious or mature consideration. I am sure the bridge will be of very great importance to the city of Quebec. I am not going to doubt but what it will be of very great importance to the country at large, but I express the opinion which has been expressed before that it is a matter of great regret that we should not have known all about this several months ago and that we should not have been able to put ourselves in possession of all the facts and figures concerning it and been able to express an intelligent opinion in voting such a large sum of money. I am not going to-day to enter any special protest against this project. I am quite sure that such would be useless, because I have no doubt it is the intention of the government to carry through this scheme. I am sure it would have been better had the government made it known to the country months and months ago, because, if it is a good project, it should have been put before this House with the intelligent endorsement of the people instead of having to receive the sanction of the people's representatives without any real knowledge of what they are about to do. In regard to the money that is being contributed by the city of Quebec and the province of Quebec, I understand from the hon. acting Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Fielding) that the government may take over the whole project, and I have no doubt that will be done in a very few years. I have not the slightest doubt that the next demand to be made upon the government will be to take this whole scheme out of the hands of this company and assume all the burden. I question very much the propriety of giving back to the city of Quebec the $300,000 and to the province of Quebec the $250,000 that they have contributed towards this scheme. The city of Quebec is going to benefit a great deal more than any other part of the country by this bridge. The province of Quebec is going to benefit more largely than any other province. I think it is only fair that they should contribute something more than the rest of the Dominion should be called upon to do. Then there is another point: How are these stockholders to be dealt with? Are they to be given back their money? Are they to be repaid the money that they have put into it, or are they to be continued as partners of the government when the government takes over the whole scheme? If they are not to be continued as partners, and I do not suppose for a moment that the government would desire that they should continue as partners in this scheme, then the government of the day

practically relieves not only the province of Quebec and the city of Quebec, but all the stockholders who put their small sums into it to start the undertaking from every bit of actual responsibility and liability and returns to them their money with a premium on account of it. I am not sure that it is a very good policy for us to adopt such a course. I think we are only holding out inducements to others in various parts of the country to start undertakings that they have no possible hope of carrying through, depending entirely upon the government to come to their rescue and bring their schemes to completion. I do not approve of the policy which has been adopted in this matter and I regret very much that more time has not been given for its proper consideration.

Mr. GOURLEY. I hope the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) did not understand me to suggest that there was much logical connection between the Quebec bridge and my suggestion in regard to pensions——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Gourley) has already spoken.

Mr. GOURLEY. I just want to make an explanation, and I will only take a minute. I would like now to ask the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) whether he will at an early date undertake to consider the scheme which I have brought to his attention and give an answer ? The people who are concerned are in the very awkward position of not knowing what to do. There are fifteen or twenty men men living in my own town who are interested in it. I do not want to press the hon. Minister of Finance unduly, but if he would undertake to consider the matter and give an early answer, it would, I think, suit the purposes of those people on whose behalf I make this suggestion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would be very glad to consider the matter, but there would be no means of giving any answer. The matter would have to be taken up by parliament, and action on it could only be taken later.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee on the resolution.

Resolution reported.

On the order for the second reading of the resolution.

Mr. MONK. I saw a statement in 'Le Soleil,' that the government has given more than was asked for in this matter. Is that statement correct ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If my hon. friend will apply to the Minister of Finance, he will find, I think, that we have given less than was asked for.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The statement which is attached to the papers shows that the request was in excess of our compliance.

Mr. MONK. I thought it was a strange statement, but 'Le Soleil' said that you have given more than was asked for.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is not the habit of the Minister of Finance.

Resolution read a second time, and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 272) to authorize aid to the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company towards the completion of its undertaking, and to confirm an agreement between His Majesty and the said company with respect to such aid.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903—CONFERENCE WITH THE SENATE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As the time has arrived for the conference with the Senate with respect to the amendments made to the Railway Act, I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to call it six o'clock.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received a message from the Senate informing this House that the managers of the conference on the part of the Senate would meet in the Senate Committee Room No. 8 at 8.30 o'clock this evening.

QUEBEC BRIDGE—AGREEMENT

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved second reading of Bill (No. 272) to authorize aid to the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company towards the completion of its undertaking, and to confirm an agreement between His Majesty and the said company with respect to such aid. He said : Before the dinner hour, the House was disposed to proceed at once with the later stages of this Bill ; but it was reserved in order that an amendment might be made in it.

Mr. HENDERSON. Was that the amendment suggested by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. It was claimed that after this contract was confirmed the government might possibly have the technical right to take over this property without the consent of parliament. That not being the intention, we have drafted a clause providing that that power shall not be exercised unless we have the consent of parliament previously obtained.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Bill (No. 270) to authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned, read the second time, the House went into committee thereon.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). In this Bill the changes made, as compared with the resolution, consist in the inserting of the word 'bridges' in a number of cases. For instance, in section 5, where it is provided that the subsidies may be granted to such companies as established to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council their abilities to construct and complete the said railways respectively, the word 'bridges' is added. In like manner the word 'bridge' is inserted wherever the word 'railway' occurs in a similar connection. My hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, asked very properly whether, in view of the provisions of the new Railway Act, we should adhere to the old drafting in the Subsidy Act. For example, where it requires that the rates be fixed by the Governor in Council, should we not replace the Governor in Council by 'the Railway Commission'? On reflection, we have concluded that it would be better to let the clause stand as it is, because we have a contractual obligation with the companies, by which their rates are subject to the supervision of the Governor in Council. There can be no harm possible, and good might come from leaving that clause as it is.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The point I suggested was that you are retainnig the control of the Governor in Council while at the same time you have appointed a new tribunal to deal with the rates.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It creates a double supervision of rates, which may not be necessary, but which can do no harm.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). You are giving the Governor in Council co-ordinate power with the Railway Commissioners.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it will mean that they will both exercise the same power. If it were not a matter of contract, the general provision of the Railway Act would apply, that all railway rates must be fixed by the board. But in this instance, there is a special contract, and we think that the obligation is one which should be retained. I do not think it creates any new power. The most that can be said is that it may be perhaps not necessary.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My recollection is that the resolutions bind the companies to fix their rates in accordance with the order of the Governor in Council. The Governor in Council fixes the rates through the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. You retain that in the Subsidy Act, but at the same time you establish a different tribunal and take away the powers of the Governor in Council. You are creating a co-ordinate jurisdiction, which may give rise to difficulties. I have not sufficiently considered the question to say that it will do so, but I remember curiously enough hearing exactly the same question debated in the Imperial House of Commons, some years ago, with regard to the government of Ireland Bill. They were establishing two jurisdictions, and the point raised was as to which jurisdiction was to prevail. Suppose the Railway Commission would fix one set of rates and the Governor in Council another, which is to prevail ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The Bill providing for the establishment of a Railway Board has not yet got through the shoals of the Senate, and if any accident should happen there, we might fall back on the provisions of the Subsidy Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We dealt with that contingency in the National Transcontinental Bill by providing that the Governor in Council, or such other authority as for the time being has power to regulate railway rates, shall have jurisdiction.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is a provision in the Railway Bill providing for the establishment of a Railway Commission to take the position of the Governor in Council.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We might desire to have a more favourable rate than the average rate established by the board, and we might want to make it a matter of obligation that, in consideration of the subsidy, a railway company should charge a lower rate.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the hon. gentleman desires to accomplish that result, he should use plainer language than he does in this statute. You may have disputes as to which tribunal really should prevail.

Mr. HENDERSON. Would this clause in the Railway Act have any bearing on the question, subsection 2, of section 8 :

2. Whenever by an Act or document the Railway Committee of the Privy Council is given any power or authority, or any duty is cast upon it, in regard to any company, railway, matter or thing, the power or authority so given, or the duty so cast upon the said committee, may or shall, as the case may be, be exercised by the board.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Minister of Justice is of opinion that that would apply in this case.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would it apply to an Act passed this session ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think so. I do not think there can be any doubt about that. Both Acts will come into operation practically at the same time.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have seen, but I cannot recollect the instance, declaration made in a statute that its general provisions shall apply to Acts passed during the same session. I do not know whether it is necessary, but I remember instances of that kind.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Except as to the amendments to which I have drawn attention, this Bill is an exact copy of the resolutions with which the House has already dealt, and unless hon. gentlemen wish the whole Bill read, we might safely adopt it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have no desire to have the whole Bill read, but the hon. minister will remember that when we adopted resolution 31, namely :

To the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company, for a line of railway from Woodstock northerly to a point on the Grand Trunk Railway at Berlin, or from Ingersoll to Stratford, or to any point on the Grand Trunk Railway between these places, not exceeding 35 miles, being in addition to, and continuation of the 9 miles mentioned in item 1 of this section.

—it was on the distinct understanding that the wording of this resolution might be changed. The contention was that this was a double-barrelled resolution, that it gave this railway company the power to hold up Woodstock, Berlin or Stratford, and get the one to bid against the other. I think that is a scarcely fair way in which to treat those municipalities. In my opinion the company should be restricted to a particular route and not be given alternative routes. I still hold to the idea that a subsidy having been granted from Ingersoll to Woodstock, the new subsidy provided in this case should extend from Woodstock north to Berlin, instead of going back to Ingersoll and running a road from there to Stratford. I assume if this clause be adopted, that possibly the road may never be built from Ingersoll to Woodstock. I do not know what the intentions of the promoters may be, but it would be absurd to run nine miles out to Woodstock and stop there. We have granted a subsidy already from Ingersoll to Woodstock, and this clause should be so amended as to provide for the road going on from Woodstock to Berlin.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not in a position to recommend any change. The message I received from the hon. member who is much interested in this railway Act said that the wording, as it now stands in the Bill, had been submitted, after very careful consideration, on behalf of the company. My hon. friend from Grey moved in amendment that this subsidy should be given for 35 miles northward to the Grand Trunk Railway by the most direct route. The hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Seagram) showed me a message which he had from the board of trade, urging that the company should be compelled to go by Berlin. On the other hand, I have a message from the Board of Trade at Stratford urging the contrary. Under the circumstances, not having knowledge as to which is the best route in the public interest and in the interest of the company, I am not prepared to take the responsibility of deciding which should be adopted. I therefore hardly think that I can consider the rival interests of those who desire that this railway should go through their municipality, and I think we would be perfectly safe in standing by what we agreed to the other night. My hon. friend from Grey has had representations made to him as I have had to me, and on the whole we thought that we had better leave the resolution as it stands. I do not know who is going to choose between the rival municipalities. I do not like to assume, not having any information that I could submit as an argument, that it would be better in the public interest the company should go one way or the other. I imagine that each municipality will look at rather its own interest, and it is rather late now to propose a change.

Mr. INGRAM. I think that to meet the wishes of the company I could move an amendment which would be more acceptable to them than the present proposition, namely that the subsidy be granted from the town of Collingwood for the distance provided in the Subsidy Bill, and that it apply from Collingwood for the distance mentioned here. That would give them an opportunity of getting material more cheaply from Collingwood than they can now by extending the line to Ingersoll. I am satisfied the company would prefer that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no one here representing the company ; and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) having stated that this was submitted after careful consideration by the board and he himself being away ; I cannot support any change at present.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have never considered the question of applying this subsidy from Collingwood southward. Even from Berlin to Collingwood, it would be a distance of upwards of 100 miles. That is a portion of the road for which this company has asked no subsidy.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The company pressed very hard for a subsidy from the present terminus to Collingwood, but there are a great many applications for subsidies. They have succeeded in building forty or fifty miles by means of

subsidies received from time to time, and I think it was felt that they might not get anything at all if they pressed for the whole this session.

Mr. HENDERSON. I beg to move that the words in the third line of clause 31 'From Ingersoll to Stratford or to any point on the Grand Trunk Railway between these places be struck out.' The clause would then read :

To the Tilsonsburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company, for a line of railway from Woodstock northerly to a point on the Grand Trunk Railway at Berlin, not exceeding thirty-five miles, being in addition to and continuation of the nine miles mentioned in item 1 of this section.

That would make good English and common sense, because a subsidy has already been granted to Woodstock. It would be quite proper to say that this would be in addition to the nine miles mentioned in item 1 of this section. The object of the road is to supply a means of conveying coal from Port Burwell northward to the agricultural country through which it will pass, and the various manufacturing towns of Ingersoll, Woodstock and Berlin and other points between. To subsidize a road from Collingwood, with the idea of building from that end first, would not for years accomplish the purpose the promoters have in view, namely, to secure a cheap and speedy means of conveying coal from Port Burwell on Lake Erie into these manufacturing centres. I hold that it is certainly in the interests of the municipalities that the one should not be held up against the other. I still stand by what I said on a previous occasion, that to go to Stratford you would for a considerable distance parallel an existing line. You can get on board the train at Stratford and go to the Georgian bay and in so doing you would parallel the proposed road.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Seventy-five to a hundred miles apart.

Mr. HENDERSON. Perhaps five or ten miles at some places and a great deal more at others. The distance widens as you proceed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. How far from Wiarton to Collingwood ? It must be over 100 miles.

Mr. HENDERSON. Probably about 50 miles, but at the Stratford end they would be close together. North of Waterloo and Berlin there is a section of country which has no railway running through it. This would supply a territory that is not provided with railways ; and I think would on the whole supply a town more deserving of a railway subsidy than even those further west.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I must stand by the proposition, under all the circumstances, and ask my hon. friends to vote for the resolution as submitted. I have not sufficient information to say which route should be adopted.

RAILWAY ACT 1903—CONFERENCE WITH THE SENATE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As there is urgent business of importance to be attended to, namely, our conference with the Senate, I must ask that the committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. HENDERSON. I wish to do justice to the Minister of Public Works. I forgot entirely that Woodstock was his home and had no intention of making him vote against something that would be in the interests of his own town.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

Mr. SPEAKER. The time fixed for holding a conference between the two Houses on the question of certain amendments to Bill (No. 21) intituled : 'An Act to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways' having come, the Clerk will read the names of the managers on the part of this House.

The Clerk of the House read the names as follows :

Sir Wm. Mulock, Mr. Fielding, Mr. Fitzpatrick, Mr. Haggart, Mr. Blair, Mr. Borden (Halifax), Mr. Monk, Mr. Barker, Mr. Emmerson, Mr. Clarke, Mr. Demers (St. John and Iberville), Mr. Wade.

Mr. SPEAKER. I declare the proceedings of the House suspended during the said conference.

And the sitting of the House was suspended accordingly.

And Mr. Speaker having resumed the Chair.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE, one of the managers of the conference on the part of the House of Commons reported that they had proceeded to the place of conference and had delivered to the managers of the conference on the part of the Senate the communication of the House, giving the reasons of the House for disagreeing to the amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 21.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 270) to authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.

Mr. HENDERSON moved to strike out from section 3 of clause 2 the words, commencing in the third line :

Or from Ingersoll to Stratford or to any point on the Grand Trunk Railway between these places.

Amendment lost on division, and section 2 agreed to.

On section 5,

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved to add the words 'and bridges' between the words 'railways' and 'respectively' and also between the words 'lines' and 'for' in line 43, and also after the word 'lines' in line 54.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 6,

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved to strike out the word 'those' in line 6 and to insert in lieu thereof 'the railways and bridges,' and to add the words 'and bridges' between the words 'railways' and 'hereby' in the last line.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 8,

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved to amend section 8, by adding the words 'and bridges' between the words 'railways' and 'for' in the thirtieth line and by adding the words 'or bridge' after the word 'railway' in the thirty-fifth line.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Bill, as amended, reported, read the third time, and passed.

CONTROL OF PUBLIC WORKS.

Bill (No. 269) respecting the management and control of public and other works—(the Minister of Justice)—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. BARKER. I wish to call attention to what I regard as a very material alteration in the responsibility for public works as affected by this Bill. This Bill purports to authorize the government, by Order in Council, to transfer matters within the jurisdiction of the Minister of Public Works, for instance, to any other department. Parliament has seen fit to prescribe certain regulations with regard to all works within the jurisdiction of the Minister of Public Works and these are established for the protection of the public. For example, in section 13 of the Act respecting public works, the minister is compelled :

> To invite tenders by public advertisement, for the execution of all works, except in cases of pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest, or in which, from the nature of the work, it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and staff of the department.

There are various other clauses in the Act passed in the year 49 Victoria, chapter 36, for the protection of the public in the administration of the public works of the Dominion. Now, what do we find here ? The Governor General in Council, if this Bill becomes law,

> May at any time transfer the management, charge and direction of any public work, or any power, duty, or function with respect to any work or class of works, whether public or private, which is assigned to, or vested by statute in, any minister or department, to any other minister or department ; and from the date appointed for that purpose by the Governor in Council, such power, duty, or function shall be transferred to, and vested in, such other minister or department.

Nearly all of the departments of the government are free from the restriction of any statutory provision, but it has been found necessary, or at all events expedient, in the interests of the public, that as regards the public works and as regards another department to which I need not refer here, but particularly as regards the Public Works Department, that there should be certain restrictions and certain provisions for the guidance and direction of those who administer that department. There are other departments which have no restrictions whatever. The Postmaster General, for example, has a free hand in almost everything he undertakes. The Minister of Inland Revenue has a free hand. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has a fairly free hand. And yet, by this Bill, the works pertaining to the Minister of Public Works may be transferred to any one of the ministers who have a free hand. The government may transfer the handling, the conduct of works involving millions of expenditure, without the provisions, without the restrictions, that would pertain to those works if they were administered under the department to which they properly belong.

Now, I think that this is a most material matter for the consideration of the House. I do not know why it should be found necessary at the present moment to bring in such a Bill as this ; I do not know any particular reason at the present moment why it should be necessary for the government to transfer from one department works that ordinarily belong to another department. But if it is necessary, if for any reason it is found that the minister administering one department of the government is unfit, or unable, or incapacitated from performing the functions relating to his department, and it is necessary to transfer some of his functions to another minister, I do not see why, in doing that, it should be necessary to deprive the public of the protection which has been deliberately and thoughtfully provided by parliament with respect to such works. I do not think that anybody will dispute that under this Bill, as it has been introduced, a minister to whom certain public works may be transferred, will be absolutely free from the restrictions which would affect that work if performed in the department to which it properly belongs. The Minister of Pub-

lic Works may have authority to build canals and improve harbours, to do all works of that nature; but in letting out the contracts respecting those works he is bound by the restrictions and provisions of the Public Works Act. Apparently the government think that it will be convenient to transfer those works to some other department. But there is not a word in this Bill, now introduced, that would provide for the public the protection in the other department that has been provided as regards the administration by the Minister of Public Works. Without any personal allusion whatever, I may ask, why should the Minister of Public Works, who is bound by certain statutory provisions and restrictions, be enabled to transfer, for example, to the Minister of Justice the construction of enormous canal works, and that the Minister of Justice should thereby be enabled to let out those contracts, to accept tenders, to deal with the whole subject involving millions of dollars, perhaps without one restriction that would be applied to those works if they were carried out according to the statute I have referred to.

I do think, Mr. Chairman, that this Bill has been introduced without reflection, that it has been introduced for a particular purpose, to enable the government to transfer certain works from one department to another without the slightest sequence to the public. There is nothing in this Bill to indicate to what particular minister it is intended to transfer works or duties of the Minister of Public Works. We may have suspicions upon that point—I prefer not to deal with the suspicions—I do not care to what minister it is intended that the superintendence, or management, or whatever you may call it, of the Public Works Department shall be transferred, whether to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, to the Minister of Inland Revenue, to the Minister of Justice, or any other one. I say that under this Bill, when these ministers get the management of the works, they will be absolutely free from every provision that has been made in the statutes of this Dominion for the protection of the public. Now, I would like to ask the First Minister whether he really intends that. Surely when the Public Works Act was passed putting in certain restrictions and provisions for the protection of the public, to provide against, I may say, fraud—I do not hesitate to say fraud—to provide against an unreasonable letting of contracts or anything of that kind, it was the intention of parliament to protect the public. There was no question then, there was no intention then, to discriminate between one minister and another; the intention was that whoever should have the control of the expenditure of the enormous amount of money that is under the control of the Public Works Department, that whoever should have the power to expend that money, to distribute it to friends or opponents, should come within the provisions and restrictions of this Act. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that these few innocent looking words, the short provision of this Act, is intended, or at least calculated, to operate in removing every protection the public has, and I protest earnestly against the passage of a Bill of this kind in its present form.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker), I think, is somewhat in error when he assumes that this is a departure from the established principles such as we find them in the Acts affecting the different departments. Let me refer him to chapter 24 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, the Act respecting the Department of Agriculture, where he will find that section 5 provides absolutely for what may be done under the Bill introduced to-night :

> The Governor in Council may at any time, assign any other duty or power to the Minister of Agriculture and may also assign any of the duties or powers hereinbefore enumerated to any other member of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada.

That is to say, by Order in Council it may be possible to take from the Minister of Agriculture some of the duties assigned to him by the Act repecting that department and hand them over to another minister. If my hon. friend will refer to the Act respecting the Secretary of State's Department, chapter 26 of the Revised Statutes, section 5, he will find a similar provision.

Mr. BARKER. I do not dispute that the duties of the Minister of Agriculture might safely be transferred to other ministers, but the Department of Public Works and the Department of Agriculture are very different things. There is no comparison. The hon. Minister of Justice cannnot argue from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Public Works. It may be reasonable to allow the Department of Agriculture to transfer the sowing of cabbage seeds or anything else to the Minister of Public Works or to the Minister of Justice.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am afraid I would not be a success with the cabbages.

Mr. BARKER. But to transfer the enormous works of the Department of Public Works to the Department of Agriculture is a different thing.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend will observe that not only do we find that provision in the chapter which has reference to the Department of Agriculture but we find it also in the chapter which has reference to the Department of the Secretary of State.

Mr. BARKER. That is worse still.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I would like to draw his attention to the words of section 8 chapter 36 which is an Act respecting the Department of Public Works, because he will find something similar there. Section 8 of chapter 36 reads as follows :

If at any time a doubt arises whether the management, charge and direction of any public work belongs to the Minister of Public Works or to the Minister of Railways and Canals, the question shall be decided by the Governor in Council, and the works and property which shall be under the management, charge and direction of either minister may, from time to time, be determined in like manner.

Then the Act goes on to say :

And the Governor in Council may determine by which minister any power vested in the Minister of Public Works on the fifteenth day of May, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-nine, shall be exercised.

Provision being thus made for the transference by Order in Council of any of the functions or duties performed by one minister to the other. My hon. friend will find in the Act relating to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, chapter 25, the Revised Statutes, section 3, that the same provision exists. Not only is that the case but if my hon. friend will read section 3 of the Act respecting the Department of Marine and Fisheries he will find that if this Bill is intended to be applied to the Department of Marine and Fisheries it is almost apparent that a transference can be made without new legislation at all by Order in Council. Section 3 reads as follows :

The duties, powers, and functions of the Department of Marine shall extend and apply to the subjects and boards and other public bodies, officers and other persons, and services of properties of the Crown, enumerated in the schedule to this Act, of which the said department shall have the control, regulation, management and supervision.

What are the provisions of the schedule ? Sub-section 24 of the schedule provides :

That the minister may have assigned to him any other duty or power which the Governor in Council may assign to him.

So that, generally, the terms of the Act respecting the Department of Marine and Fisheries authorize what my hon. friend says ought not to be done. Then my hon. friend objected to this legislation on the ground that public interest would be safeguarded by the provisions which are to be found in the Public Works Act in respect to tender. My hon. friend said that works which are now under the direction of the Department of Public Works ought to remain with the department because the provision of the law affording a safeguard in respect to tenders applicable to the Department of Public Works would not be applicable to any other department. If my hon. friend will turn again to the Act respecting the Department of Public Works, chapter 36 of the Revised Statutes, section 13, he will find the following provision :

The minister shall invite tenders, by public advertisement, for the execution of all works, except in cases of pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest, or in which, from the nature of the work, it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department.

That is the protection, as my hon. friend sees, that is contained in the Public Works Act. My hon. friend will see that the Act respecting the Department of Marine and Fisheries, section 5, is in terms similar to section 13 of the Public Works Act, so that the terrible calamity that my hon. friend imagines would result from a transference of a work belonging to the Department of Public Works to the Department of Marine and Fisheries would not take place because the same provision which exists in the Public Works Act in respect to tenders exists in the Act respecting the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. BARKER. Does the hon. minister contend that every department of the government is subject to the same restrictions and provisions in regard to these various works that the Department of Public Works is subject to ? He may transfer under the operation of this Bill the operations of the Public Works Department to a department which is not subject to these restrictions. That is what I object to.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the object of this Bill is the object indicated by the hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick). There is no doubt that in the definition given by the law of each of the departments of state, in so far as I recollect, at the end of each chapter defining the duties of each department it is stated that generally the Governor General can assign to the head of the department other duties.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Not in all cases.

Mr. MONK. I think it is in nearly every definition of the duties of the departments.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not think so.

Mr. MONK. I do not think there are many chapters defining the duties of the departments where that provision is not found. Nor is there any doubt that where doubt exists as to which department should be entrusted with certain works a special mode is provided in the law for defining the department which shall have charge of these works. That is not the object of this little Bill which appears to be a very innocent Bill, but it is intended to effect a very serious object. The object of this Bill is to take work which is clearly within the functions of one department and by Order

in Council transfer it to another department. It is very different from the case as pointed out by the hon. Minister of Justice, and it is very different from the case where there is doubt and where the legislators provided a mode of solving that doubt. It is by Order in Council taking work which has been assigned to one department and transferring it to another. What is the reason ? This is the reason : When the present hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Prefontaine) came before the electors of the district of Maisonneuve it was charged against him that the department which he had undertaken was not as important a department as the one which was held by his predecessor and it was claimed before the electors of Maisonneuve that we had lost something and that some explanation should be given as to why a department less important than the other had been confided to that minister. He said at every public meeting that it was intended to transfer from the Department of Public Works to his department all the public works having reference to navigation—wharfs, bridges, in fact, according to the statement made by him to the electors, the Department of Public Works was virtually going to be transferred to his own department. He has not been able to cause that promise to materialize because the present hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) very properly has objected to breaking up his department. It is intended before the next general election to transfer all the works connected with navigation in and around Montreal to the Department of Marine and Fisheries by Order in Council and in face of the law which assigns these works to the Department of Public Works, in order to tell the electors that the government has broken up the Department of Public Works and has transferred all the works in and around Montreal and all the works connected with navigation from Montreal to Quebec, and as the hon. minister himself said, all the works connected with navigation from the Yukon to the Straits of Belle Isle, to his department. When the elections are over these works will, by Order in Council, be retransferred to the department of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. That is the object of this Bill clearly and evidently and we claim, as my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has claimed, that the law ought to be contrary to that. It is for the parliament of Canada to assign to each department the duties which shall appertain to it. The ministry is but a Committee of this House; it belongs to the House alone to decide what attributes shall be given to each department of government. This is an attempt to obtain from the House power to switch over by Order in Council certain works from one department to another, for the purposes of the election, and afterwards to re-transfer them again. That is why this Bill is introduced at the last moment.

The PRIME MINISTER. If my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) looks into the statute constituting the different departments of government, he will find several provisions to the effect that the attributes of one portfolio can be transferred to another, according to the judgment of the Governor in Council.

Mr. MONK. Then why do you want this ?

The PRIME MINISTER. That is the case in some instances but not in all. For instance, the mounted police are under the jurisdiction of the president of the council, but the very section which says that, enacts that the control of the mounted police can be transferred to any other minister as may be deemed advisable. There is therefore a good deal of latitude in that regard. It is not the object of this amendment to give to any minister the power to build and construct, which is now vested in the Minister of Public Works. The object is simply to enable another minister to manage and administer public works already in existence. I believe that to be a wise provision. If the departments were organized as I would wish, I would give to the Minister of Public Works the duty of building and constructing, but when the works have been constructed, I would transfer them to the different departments to which they belong. I would place wharfs under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries ; armouries under the Department of Militia and Defence, and post offices under the Postmaster General. But, I would not give to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or to the Postmaster General the power of building and constructing. I would reserve that exclusively for the Minister of Public Works. If it were thought advisable that contracts should be given, then there would be no necessity for introducing this Bill. Every one will agree that it is far better to allow a minister to administer the works which come within the purview of his department. My hon. friend has said that under this law you could transfer to the Minister of Justice all the works of the Department of Agriculture. Parliament has already trusted the Governor in Council that no such absurdity would be committed, and I think parliament can trust the Governor in Council in this case. These general powers are often taken, but they are subject to the discretion of the Governor in Council, and subject always to the superior jurisdiction of this parliament. It seems to me, therefore, that there is no reason to say there is anything extraordinary in this legislation, and I think my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) will, on reflection, agree with me.

Mr. BARKER. If the First Minister had in view the transference of certain works

from one department to another concerned in similar works, this Bill would have been framed in very different words. This clause says :

> The Governor in Council may at any time transfer the management, charge, and direction of any public work, or any power, duty, or function with respect to any work, or any class of works.

If the right hon. gentleman can tell me any broader language that could be used for the transference of all the works of any class from the department of one minister to that of another, I would like him to tell me what those words are. If the hon. gentleman wishes power to transfer to the Department of Agriculture all the works concerning the harbours of Canada, he can use no better language. If the Governor in Council should see fit to transfer from the Railways and Canals Department the management of our canals, this Bill would authorize it. You can transfer any work from the Public Works Department to another department, and that without the restrictions which are provided in the statute for the guidance of the Department of Public Works. That is my point, and neither the Prime Minister nor the Minister of Justice has given an answer to it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) that the words of this Bill are wide enough to transfer the entire jurisdiction with regard to any class of public works, from one department to another. The section provides that :

> Any power, duty or function, with respect to any class of works, whether public or private.

These words are ample to transfer all the wharfs under the control of the Department of Public Works to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and so on, I do not understand why this Bill should be necessary now. Is there likely to be any public emergency by which the delay between one session and another would be injurious to the public interest is such a matter ?

I submit that the proper course is to deal with each case by itself when the emergency arises, and to deal with it by legislation. If you desire, as my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier states is the intention of the government, to transfer part of the works now under the control of the Minister of Public Works to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, bring in your Bill for that purpose. If you desire to make any other transfers from one department to another, bring in your legislation for that purpose, and let the House deal with it. Why should the House delegate this power to the Governor in Council ? There seems to be no good reason for that, and no emergency is likely to occur which would make a delay from one session to the commencement of another session in any way injurious to the public interest. It does not seem to me that this statute is necessary. For the more important departments there are provisions which have been found sufficient for the public interest up to the present time, and it seems to me that some explanation should be given as to the reason which induces the government at this time to bring in legislation of this character. What new feature is there in the transaction of public business which makes it desirable that legislation of this general character should be enacted ? No reason whatever has been given for it except that my hon. friend the Minister of Justice says that in respect of three or four departments legislation of an analogous character already exists. Well, has that legislation not been found sufficient ? What is the real reason for the introduction of this Bill, and what does the government propose to do under it ? If the government have nothing in mind which they propose to do under it, then the legislation should not be proceeded with. If they have any proposal before them with regard to the transfer of some works from one department to another, they should tell us the nature of their proposal. Unless they can assign some definite reason for such legislation, it seems to me to be unnecessary.

The PRIME MINISTER. Let me say to my hon. friend that the reason for this legislation is to be found in the statute which has already been quoted, but which I will take the liberty of reading again in more detail, with regard to the Department of Agriculture. Section 4 of chapter 24 says :

> The following subjects shall be under the control and direction of the Minister of Agriculture, that is to say :
>
> 1. Agriculture.
> 2. Immigration and emigration.
> 3. Public health and quarantine.
> 4. The marine and immigrant hospital at Quebec.
> 5. Arts and manufactories
> 6. The census, statistics and the registration of statistics.
> 7. Patents of invention.
> 8. Copyright.
> 9. Industrial designs and trade marks.
> 10. Experimental farm stations.

This vests in the Department of Agriculture certain very extensive powers ; but the Act goes on to provide that it shall be in the power of the Governor in Council to add to these duties of the Minister of Agriculture or to transfer to some other minister some of the duties assigned to him ; and this is the power proposed to be exercised under this legislation, if it becomes law. The subjects of immigration and emigration have been transferred by the Governor in Council from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior. Then, I think it would be more proper to have the Marine and Immigrant Hospital at Quebec transferred either to the Department of the Interior or to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. With regard to this Bill, my hon.

friend from Jacques Cartier says it is for the purpose of enlarging the Department of Marine and Fisheries. It will certainly be proper at some time or other to recast the Department of Marine and Fisheries, the Public Works Department and the Department of Railways and Canals. At present a steamer leaving say Fort William for Quebec or below Quebec, while on the great lakes, is under the jurisdiction of the Marine and Fisheries Department; when it reaches the canals it is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Railways and Canals; when it reaches the St. Lawrence between Montreal and Quebec, it is under the jurisdiction of the Public Works Department; below Quebec it is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Marine and Fisheries again. I think this is very absurd. That steamer throughout its whole journey ought to be under the control of one department. It might have an accident at one place and another at another place, in which case it would have to deal with two departments instead of one. For my part, I think we should make these laws more in accordance with common sense, to say nothing else. In my opinion the Department of Public Works ought to be a great building department. But when a public building is put up, if it be a lighthouse, for instance, it ought to go to the Department of Marine and Fisheries for administration; if a wharf, it ought to go to the same department; if a drill shed, it ought to go to the Department of Militia; if a post office, it ought to be put under the control of the Post Office Department. But to-day you have the absurdity of having the whole management of the post office building in the city of Toronto or in Charlottetown, or anywhere else, put under the Department of Public Works instead of the Post Office Department. All the caretakers and the menial officials are under the Department of Public Works. I would rather have the control of these buildings assigned to the respective departments to which they belong; and this is the object of this legislation.

Mr. BARKER. My right hon. friend refers to the statute relating to the Department of Agriculture. I hardly imagine the right hon. gentleman is serious in referring to that department as one to which we might transfer the public works of the country. Surely there is no analogy at all between the two departments. The provision in the Act relating to the Department of Agriculture, enabling the government to transfer to that department some other functions, means, I think, the transference of something analagous to the functions of the department. Surely he would not transfer to the Department of Agriculture the management of the railways of the country. No one would imagine that the Act respecting the Department of Agriculture would give the Governor in Council power to transfer to that department all the railways of the country. If you can transfer the Public Works, you may transfer the Railways and any other department to the hon. gentleman who, with the assistance of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell), manages the Department of Agriculture. The hon. gentleman refers to the Department of Railways as an analogous department. If the right hon. gentleman wishes to transfer from the Department of Public Works to the Railway Department, certain works, such as the harbours or anything of that kind, in some measure connected with railway work, let him bring in a Bill and it will receive respectful and careful consideration, and the right hon. gentleman may have some grounds for an argument in favour of the transference; at all events, that question will receive careful consideration from the House. What I object to, and what I think ought to be objected to by every member in this House, is giving to the Governor in Council the power to transfer important duties and functions at will from one department to another. I do not wish to expend time upon the subject, it seems to me so clear that it would be an offence to hon. gentlemen opposite—I am sure it would be an offence to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House—to argue the thing. If there is anything whatever in the Public Works Department that can be properly transferred to any other department, let the right hon. gentleman bring down his Bill to again define the functions of the respective departments, and the House will pass upon it. Those functions are defined in the statues of the country; they have not been left to the ministers to apportion. The right hon. gentleman wants to reverse all that parliament has, from time to time settled as to the functions of each department. The right hon. gentleman wants to take something, he does not tell us what, from one department and put it into another department. As parliament, when organizing these departments, said what the functions of each were to be, let us follow out that arrangement and when a change is needed let parliament make it, but the right hon. gentleman has no right to ask us to delegate that authority to the ministers of the day.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Might I ask the hon. gentleman if he has examined the Bill very closely, and if he has come to the conclusion that the words:

> The Governor in Council may at any time transfer the management, charge and direction of any public work——

would include the construction of a public work?

Mr. BARKER. But it goes on:

> —or any power, duty or function with respect to any work or class of works.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Let me get down to that point. Would the words

I have just quoted include the building of a work? My own view is that they would not. They would mean to transfer the management and direction of a work after the work is completed.

Mr. MONK. It includes the wharfs in Montreal.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. After their construction.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Suppose, as we find from the estimates is very often the case, one of these works is destroyed and we have to spend $40,000 or $50,000 in repairing it. Would not the words even so far as we have gone include that?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is a question whether it would or would not. I am not prepared to say whether it would or would not. What I mean to say is that it does not seem to me that these words would imply authority to carry on work of original construction.

Mr. BARKER. Would the construction of the eastern section of the transcontinental railway be a public work?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The eastern section of the transcontinental railway would be a public work; construction is another question. The question I put now is whether the management and control of a public work includes construction? It seems to me it does not. Then if you go on, you will see:

Or any power, duty or function with respect to any work or class of work whether public or private.

It seems to me that any power, duty or function would imply that sort of power, duty or function which the public works exercise, for instance, over public commissions like the Harbour Commission, at Montreal or Quebec. This does not include construction, but simply a sort of supervision or control over what is done by these particular corporations. I quite understand that if these words can be construed so as to mean original construction, it would be necessary to go further and to add a section which would protect these particular public works. If my hon. friend thinks there is any danger in that direction, and that the provisions I have already pointed out as existing in one of the Acts at all events, is not sufficient, you might add:

And the provisions of the Public Works Act shall so far as they are applicable apply to any work or property, the maintenance, control, or management of which is hereby transferred.

So as to protect the public in the way he has indicated.

Mr. BARKER. Does a public work mean a work completed?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I want my hon. friend to realize that what is being transferred is the management or direction of public works. What it is important for him to consider is the meaning of the words 'management, charge and direction.' Do either of these words include original construction?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Those are not the important words, because they are not carried down into the latter part of the clause, as the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) has just pointed out to me:

The Governor in Council may at any time transfer the management, charge and direction of any public work, or any power, duty, or function with respect to any work or class of works, whether public or private, which is assigned to, or vested by statute in, any minister or department, to any other minister or department; and from the date appointed for that purpose by the Governor in Council, such power, duty, or function shall be transferred to, and vested in, such other minster or department.

Leaving out altogether the words on which the Minister of Justice is laying so much stress, the important words are those which are repeated the second time in the section, and these it seems to me obviously include what is suggested by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) whether the Minister of Justice thinks so or not. I think the first expression might include it, they certainly would include repairs, but the words in the latter part of the section undoubtedly include construction. I do not think the Minister of Justice would venture to say they do not. How could you get wider words than the expression any power, duty or function with respect to any work or class of works.' I would defy any man in this House to get a broader form of expression, including construction and everything else, than these words. Beyond doubt, in my opinion, they include construction as well as management.

Mr. MONK. With all due respect to the Minister of Justice, I do not think it is possible to entertain any doubt on this point, that the management, charge or direction of any public work means the execution of that work. If my hon. friend has any doubt about that, if it is his intention to transfer a public work to another department, why not use the word 'maintenance'? But the Minister of Justice will not make that change, because the Prime Minister has let the cat out of the bag; he has stated in reply to my own observation that it would be advisable to transfer the works connected with navigation between Quebec and Montreal, for instance, where several departments are interested, to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. That was the argument used in the Maisonneuve election, that is what is contemplated. But the Minister of Public Works will not consent to a legislative change such as was promised by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and as he won't consent, it is contemplated to do it by Order in Council in order to carry us over the period of the next election. Will

my right hon. friend the Prime Minister state here upon his responsibility, that it is not intended within the next six months to transfer some of the powers of the Minister of Public Works to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries? If my right hon. friend will make that declaration, while I still consider that the Bill is useless and improvident, he would give me great satisfaction. My right hon. friend will not make that statement, because he has let the cat of the bag, and reveals that is what this Bill is for; and I think that on the question of principle, as well as because it is an election dodge, it ought to be opposed.

The PRIME MINISTER. I can say that if it is transferred, it will not be retransferred; it will remain transferred.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to know whether my hon. friend the Minister of Justice will say that these words do not include 'instruction'? And if they do include instruction, why do you put to one side the safeguards which now surround the public works of the country?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I certainly think that the safeguards which are now provided in the Public Works Act ought to be put in here, and for that purpose I move that the following words be added to the first clause:

And the provisions of the Public Works Act shall so far as they are applicable apply to any work or property, the maintenance, repair, control or management of which shall be transferred under this Act.

Mr. COCHRANE. Will the Minister of Justice tell us how much he is going to leave to the Minister of Public Works?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is not my business.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MONK. I think it is very important that these changes should be made only after very careful consideration, and I move in amendment that this law shall come into force on the 1st day of September, 1904.

Mr. COCHRANE. Time can't wait.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries can't wait.

Amendment negatived.

Bill, as amended, reported, read the third time, and passed.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House again in Committee to consider of the ways and means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The determination of the government in relation to the tariff was announced at an early stage of the session, and in accordance with the established practice in Canada the changes then proposed took effect immediately. But it becomes necessary for us to give more formal effect to them, as usual at the close of the session, by having the resolutions adopted and included in a Bill. I therefore beg to invite the attention of the Committee to the resolution which is placed upon the Notice paper, and which will be found on page 194 of the Votes and Proceedings, bearing date the 16th of April. It will be found that this is a resolution, put in proper form, for enactment of the few changes that were then announced, and I now desire to move that the resolution therein set forth be agreed to, with one amendment to which I desire to invite the atttention of the Committee. In the resolution providing for the imposition of a surtax upon certain foreign goods we read as follows:

Such surtax shall not apply to any goods actually purchased on or before the 16th day of April, 1903, by any corporation, firm or person in Canada for immediate transportation to Canada.

It was subsequently determined and so announced in the press that the thought contained in these words 'for immediate transportation to Canada' should be expressed more definitely and therefore a circular was issued by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) and announced in parliament at the time that in respect to these words 'for immediate transportation to Canada' the privilege of importation without the surtax should be applied to all goods which were actually purchased prior to the date of the budget but which might not be imported into Canada until a later period, it being held that the orders having been given and the contracts made a reasonable time should be allowed to permit importers to bring in their goods. We made no change in the principle that all goods not actually purchased prior to that date should bear the surtax, but if they were actually purchased prior to the date that the duty was established the parties might have until the 30th of September to import their goods without the tax taking effect. That arrangement was carried out and I have reason to believe that it gave very general satisfaction to the trade which would otherwise have been very much embarrassed. I therefore propose to carry out the amendment by moving that the words 'for immediate transportation to Canada' be struck out and that the words 'if imported into Canada on or before September 30th, 1903,' be substituted. Otherwise the resolution stands as announced at the time of the budget.

Mr. GOURLEY. What was the date announced? My recollection was that it was the 15th September.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, the 30th.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What was the position then—that the surtax would not apply to goods purchased at any time before the 30th September of this year ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not purchased before but imported before. To obtain exemption from the surtax purchase must have been made before the date of the budget, but the actual importation was permitted until the 30th September. The date has since passed and the exemption is now practically at an end. The surtax applies to all goods that are imported.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the hon. minister whether any Order in Council was passed and what date it bears ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. An Order in Council was not formally passed for the reason that we could not pass an Order in Council until this Act passed. But following the practice of Canada in these things immediate action was taken upon the announcement in the budget. The regulations which were made had the same effect but they were not based upon an Order in Council, because, until the passing of this Act, we had no legal power to make an Order in Council.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course there is rather an anomaly in all these matters inasmuch as you have to pass an Act to indemnify yourself for an Act of illegality, and in this case there was a double illegality, because, in the first place, there is no statute and in the second place there is no Order in Council under the terms of a statute.

Mr. HENDERSON. I see a good deal of controversy in the papers as to who pays this surtax and I would like the hon. minister's opinion on that point.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Just at the present moment it would be very convenient to accept my hon. friend's contention that the consumer does not pay the duty.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) has really no convictions on the subject.

Resolution, as amended, agreed to.

On section 4,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the meaning of that ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Under the Act of last session a license fee was substituted, but that Act did not at once come in force, it having been reserved for the imperial approval. We did not repeal the old section of the tariff, but the Act having since been approved, we will now collect the duty in the form of a license. There is one other resolution, notice of which has been given. It has reference to the posters and handbills of an objectionable character. At present we can exclude such things when they are immoral, but it was represented to us by a deputation of gentlemen that it was not desirable to have the walls of our cities covered with pictures depicting crime. It was thought that easy familiarity with these scenes is not the best way of causing our youth to pursue the path of virtue, and we deemed it wise to provide for the exclusion of posters and handbills depicting scenes of crime or violence.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this intended as a covert attack upon the Conservative campaign literature.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, although I am inclined to think that if one wanted to be critical, the literature referred to might be brought within the Criminal Code. However, we are in a generous frame of mind.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend misunderstands me. The Conservative literature depicts scenes of crime and violence committed by the government.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It does not pass through the customs.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It may be comforting for my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) to know, that that home industry can still be carried on.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes, there is a very large factory on the other side of the House.

Resolutions reported, read the first and second time, and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 273) to amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1897.

Motion agreed to, Bill read a first and second time, considered in Committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

CATTLE-GUARD COMMISSION.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I beg to lay on the Table of the House the report of the Cattle-Guard Commission.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It's big enough to block a train.

Mr. CLANCY. Do you propose having it printed ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The matter having been dealt with by legislation, I doubt that this very interesting report is so valuable now.

Mr. CLANCY. It might be interesting to have the experience of the one-eyed steer.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Will it be published ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We lay it on the Table ; that is for the House to say.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

The House proceeded to consider certain resolutions reported from the Committee of Supply.

On resolution No. 20,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before that is concurred in, I would like to bring to the attention of the government the fact that the employees of the Halifax post office forwarded to me some time ago a copy of a petition which they had presented to the Postmaster General, in which

> They humbly and respectfully beg leave to request that the salaries paid to the employees of the outside service of the Post Office Department be increased to the same rate as those at present paid to the employees of the inside service.

The petitioners mention two reasons on account of which they believe themselves to be justly entitled to the advance asked for, one the increased cost of living, the other the responsibility of post office work. They set forth in this petition that :

> All classes of labour have been compelled to ask for more wages to meet the increased cost of living; and in the case of post office officials whose duties require that they be at the office at a very early hour in the morning and also late at night, it is necessary that they reside near the office, and to make this possible a higher house rent has to be paid. Those who cannot afford to pay this rent and have to occupy houses at a great distance from the office, or in the suburbs find it arduous to maintain a necessarily punctual attendance.

They also set forth in the petition that the work is very irregular and strenuous, necessitating attendance at the office early in the morning and late at night the same day, that the responsibilities and duties of the office are very great and severe and for these reasons they ask the consideration of the government. This subject, I think, was discussed to some extent in connection with the measure which was introduced by the Postmaster General with respect to the officers of the inside service. The petition appears to give good ground for the consideration of the claims of these officers in the outside service; I know from my personal observation that their duties are in many cases very arduous, and I believe their salaries have not been increased, although the cost of living has greatly increased during the last eight or ten years. I therefore ask, on their behalf, the consideration of the government to the facts set forth in this petition.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will call the attention of my hon. friend the Postmaster General to the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax).

Hon. Mr. FIELDING.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903—CONFERENCE WITH THE SENATE.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the following message had been received from the Senate:

> The Senate on the 22nd of October, 1903, resolved that a message be sent to the House of Commons to acquaint that House that another conference is desired with the House of Commons for the purpose of communicating to them the further reasons which induced the Senate to insist on their amendments to the Bill entitled: 'An Act to amend and consolidate the law respecting Railways,' and that the managers on the part of the Senate will meet in room No. 8 of the Senate at eleven o'clock to-night.

The PRIME MINISTER moved that the House agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to ask, having regard to the peculiar formalities of these proceedings, whether it might not be necessary to take authority for what is called a free conference. It would appear from the ordinary procedure that one House simply submits resolutions adopted by that House to the other, and there appears to be some difficulty about any conference or discussion which might lead to some medium course. I would suggest to the right hon. gentleman who leads the House that it might be wise to give the managers of the conference some power for what is called a free discussion or free conference.

The PRIME MINISTER. The suggestion is a good one, but for my part I confess that I am rather ignorant of these formalities. I have had no time to look into the books to see what is to be done. But if we have power at this stage to move for a free conference, I would certainly add that to my motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. The procedure, according to Bourinot, appears to be this : That when a Bill is sent from the House of Commons to the Senate and the Senate makes amendments to the Bill, in which they persist, then the House of Commons asks for a conference, and managers are appointed to go to the Senate to confer with the Senate and give reasons why they cannot consent to their amendments. If the first conference is unsuccessful, then the Senate has a right to ask for a new conference, and to give the reasons why they persist in their amendments. That is what they are doing now, they are now asking for another conference with the House of Commons in order to give the reasons why they persist in their amendment. After that, if there is no agreement, then a free conference can be held. Here is what Bourinot says :

> The report of the managers is then to be considered and disposed of by the House to which it is sent, which may take place immediately or be postponed to a future time. The result will

be communicated to the other House by a message. Sometimes a second conference will be necessary, when the first has not led to an arrangement between the Houses. Or a free conference may be held when two conferences have been fruitless.

After two conferences have been held a free conference may take place.

The PRIME MINISTER moved :

That Hon. Sir William Mulock, Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick, Hon. Mr. Fielding, Hon. Mr. Haggart, Hon. Mr. Blair, Mr. Borden (Halifax), Mr. Monk, Mr. Baker, Mr. Emmerson, Mr. Clark, Mr. Demers (St. John and Iberville), and Mr. Wade be managers of the conference on the part of the House of Commons.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER. The time fixed for holding the second conference between the two Houses on the question of certain amendments to the Bill (No. 21) intituled an Act to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways,' having come, the Clerk of the House will read the names of the managers on the part of this House.

The Clerk read the names.

Mr. SPEAKER. The members named will proceed to the place of meeting, and in the meantime the sitting of the House will be suspended.

The sitting of the House was accordingly suspended.

The Speaker having resumed the Chair.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) on behalf of the managers of the conference presented the reasons of the Senate for insisting on their amendments made to Bill (No. 21) entitled an Act to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways, as follows :—

1st. Under section 3 of the Bill as passed by both Houses the Act is made to apply to all persons, companies and railways (other than government railways) within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada.

2nd. Under section 4 as passed by the Commons and adopted by the Senate as section 6, the Act is also made to apply to all local railways which may be declared works for the general advantage of Canada.

3rd. The above two sections cover the whole field of the jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada on the subject matter at issue.

4th. Section 7, as passed by the Senate, applies to all local railways the principle applied to street railways and tramways by the Commons under section 7 of the original Bill.

5th. Section 6 of the Bill, as passed by the Commons, is objectionable on the ground that it seeks to make once for all, as applying to all local railways happening to cross or connect with federal railways, the declaration which under section 92, subsection 10 of the British North America Act, 1867, should be made only as to individual cases as they arise.

6th. The same section is also objectionable on the ground that it brings under the jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada works owned and operated by corporations which remain creatures of provincial legislatures.

7th. The same section is objectionable on the further ground that the declaration in question would take permanent effect, although the crossing might be only temporary.

The Senate doth also insist on its amendment numbered 11 for the reason already assigned, and also for the following reasons :—

First : That the decisions of the Board of Railway Commissioners will from their nature apply to a multitude of cases and involve important interests.

Second : Because instead of being inconsistent with the spirit and with other provisions of the Bill, it merely extends the right of appeal provided for in the latter paragraph of sub-clause 3 of clause 44 of the original Bill to cases where leave is obtained from two judges of the Supreme Court of Canada, which right of appeal was limited in such original Bill to cases where leave was obtained from the board.

The PRIME MINISTER moved :

That a message be sent to the Senate requesting a free conference on the proposed amendments to Bill (No. 21) entitled : An Act to amend and consolidate the law respecting Railways.

Motion agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER moved :

That the managers of the conference on the part of the House be Sir Wm. Mulock, Hon. Mr. Fielding, Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick, Hon. Mr. Haggart, Hon. Mr. Blair, Mr. Borden (Halifax), Mr. Monk, Mr. Barker, Mr. Emmerson, Mr. Clarke, Mr. Demers (St. John and Iberville) and Mr. Wade.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House again resumed consideration of resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Progress reported.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903—CONFERENCE WITH THE SENATE.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Senate agree to a free conference, and that the managers on the part of the Senate will be the same as those who acted in the two former conferences.

The sitting of the House was accordingly suspended.

The SPEAKER having resumed the Chair.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Mr. Speaker, I am perhaps able to report what in substance occurred at the conference that was held in one of the rooms of the Senate. It was decided that amendments 5, 6, and 7 of the Bill, should be accepted, and that the amendment with respect to the right of appeal, section 11, should not be accepted. The Senate concurred therein, and that clause will remain as when it left this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The report of the conference will go on the Orders to-morrow,

and I presume a motion will be made in accordance therewith.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. Lest there be any misapprehension, I may be permitted to say that the House of Commons managers agreed that amendments 5, 6, and 7, of the Senate should be accepted. There was a modification, however, agreed upon by the Senate, accepted by the managers on behalf of this House, that section 5 of the original Bill was to be restored with some slight verbal alterations. That will appear in the report which the Minister of Justice will submit to the House in writing.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It would be more satisfactory if a formal report would be made to-morrow.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That would be better, because it is desirable that it should be made to the Senate in exactly the same form in which it is made to this House, so as to prevent any misunderstanding hereafter.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was fully expected that prorogation would be reached this afternoon, but because of an intimation given to us in the course of the conference with the Senate, it is not likely that we can have prorogation to-morrow, and that being the case, we may assume that it will take place on Saturday at an hour to be agreed upon at our next sitting. There is no object to be gained therefore by sitting later.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then my hon. friend expects prorogation some time on Saturday ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 1 a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, October 23, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

ACT RESPECTING CERTAIN LOAN COMPANIES.

On the Orders of the Day being called,

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That item No. 35, consideration of amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 24) An Act to extend the power of Loan Companies.—Mr. Thompson—be placed on government orders.

He said : The amendment made by the Senate to this Bill simply changes the title from 'An Act to extend the power of Loan Companies' to 'An Act respecting certain Loan Companies.' There is no other alteration.

Motion agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER moved :

That the amendment be read the second time and agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

ALASKAN BOUNDARY COMMISSION.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I think this House should not prorogue without giving a little consideration to the Alaskan boundary award.

The PRIME MINISTER. If my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) will allow me to interrupt him, I would say that I think it is quite a proper subject to be brought up, but I would suggest that we dispose of the formal business, which I think may be disposed of in a very short time, so that we can send all the procedure to the Senate, and the matter can be taken up again.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider certain resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Post office—additional amount for outside service, $15,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I wish to call the attention of the government to a complaint which has been made to me with regard to the postal service at Vankleek Hill. The complaint is as follows :

For the past year our mail service between Vankleek Hill and the following offices, viz.: Stardale, Barb, St. Eugéne and St. Anne de Prescott, Plantagenet, Alfred, Caledonia Springs, McAlpines, &c., has been simply exasperating and the government through its autocratic Postmaster General has declined to even see that the officials do their duty with the present fourteenth century service.

For example, Barb is eight miles from Vankleek Hill, St. Eugéne ten miles, Stardale, three miles, Caledonia Springs, eight miles, Alfred, fifteen miles and Plantagenet, twenty-two miles. It takes three days for letters to make these offices.

Here is a specific example. The Eastern Ontario 'Review' leaves Vankleek Hill every Friday morning at eight o'clock. This is Monday afternoon and these papers have not yet been delivered at Stardale or Ste. Anne de Prescott.

You will readily understand that in the country the farmers are greatly disappointed and annoyed if they fail to receive their weekly paper for Sunday reading.

Considering the very short distances, I would think that the correspondent who has communicated these facts to me was very much justified in asking me to bring the matter to the attention of the government, which I do in this brief way.

The PRIME MINISTER. Will you kindly send me the papers ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have only the letter which I have just read, and I will hand it to 'Hansard' so that the right hon. gentleman may be able to bring it to the attention of the Postmaster General.

WAYS AND MEANS—SURVEYS ON NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House go again into Committee to consider the ways and means for raising the supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before you leave the Chair, I would like to ask the government whether any report has been received from the surveying parties which have been sent out over the eastern section of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, and if so, what is the nature of the reports.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We had that matter up in the House, yesterday, I think, and I stated we had no reports on the subject. We have no surveyors out in that section. The Grand Trunk Pacific have had some surveying done.

Mr. CLARKE. Where ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. All my information comes from the public press. I understand they had surveying parties between North Bay and Winnipeg. Whatever their arrangements may be, however, we have no knowledge except that which is in the possession of the public. Any reports which may have been made are made to the company by their surveyors, and have not been communicated to the government.

ALASKA BOUNDARY COMMISSION

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I may mention to the Minister of Finance that I propose to make some remarks with regard to the Alaskan boundary award. So far as I am concerned, it would be convenient for me to do so now, but I see the Prime Minister is not in his place, and I will delay doing so at the convenience of hon. gentlemen opposite.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) rose for the purpose of making some observations on that question, and the Prime Minister requested that he should postpone doing so until the routine business was completed, as we desired to complete some measures in order to send them to the Senate, and then an opportunity would be afforded for discussion. I may inform my hon. friend that if he desires to bring up the question no objection will be taken, and an opportunity will be afforded during the day.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will let the matter stand then until a more convenient time, on the understanding that an opportunity will be given for discussion during the day.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly.

THE LUMBER TRADE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to bring to the attention of the government, on this motion, a telegram which has been received from a large manufacturing industry in British Columbia to the following effect :

> Cannot duty on lumber and shingles be imposed before close present session. Trades here will be ruined, as Washington state lumber trade badly demoralized, and large quantities American lumber and shingles being dumped into our markets. Our territory has been given away by Great Britain. Does our government intend continue giving away our trade ?

This telegram was addressed to another member of the opposition, not to myself. I am not personally aware of lumber dealers of Washington state bringing lumber into Canada at the present time, but I am informed by the gentleman to whom this telegram was addressed that one single contract to the extent of $276,000 has recently been awarded to an American lumber concern at prices slightly under Canadian prices, the price being fixed at such an amount as to preclude Canadians from supplying the demand ; and the suggestion is made that owing to the demoralized condition of trade in the state of Washington goods are being put in at these prices with the object of driving Canadians out of the business. Whether these allegations are true I do not know, but if they are true, it seems to me that the situation demands consideration by the government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It will cause surprise perhaps to some people to learn that there is a demoralized condition of trade in the United States in any branch, because I think we have been advised by many hon. gentlemen opposite that if we only had the tariff as high as the United States, there could be no demoralization of trade in Canada, and that everything would be lovely. It would seem, therefore, that a demoralization of trade may exist as well under a high tariff as under a low tariff. However, that is a large matter of controversy. I have received the same telegram as that which my hon. friend has read. Without discussing the merits of the question, I think he will agree with me that at the present stage of the session it would be impossible to take up the question, and perhaps it is not worth while to debate it. At all events, that is the view of the government.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). So far as I am concerned, I have never taken the ground that there might not be demoralization of trade in the United States. On the contrary, I have pointed out that many industries in our country are being and will be injuriously affected by American goods being dumped into Canada.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Why do they want to dump them ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). To get rid of their surplus.

Mr. F. OLIVER (Alta.) As this matter has been brought to the attention of the House, I would like to remind the House that there is at present an investigation being conducted by the government under an Act of Parliament, in regard to the existence of a lumber combine in British Columbia, the allegation being that this combine has unduly and improperly increased the price of lumber to Canadian consumers. If lumber is being dumped, as it is said, into Canada from the state of Washington, all I can say is that it is a very good thing for Canada that it is able to get lumber from the state of Washington at reasonable prices.

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I beg to move the following resolution :

Resolved, that towards making good a supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending June 30, 1904, the sum of $29,385,-685.46 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

This, I may say, is the sum which is ascertained by the officers of the House as the result of the various votes which have been passed.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance if he has included the $32.04 that I have been forced to pay illegally for express matter.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I might say that in order to include that we should require to get a special message from His Excellency the Governor General and perhaps the hon. gentleman would not urge it for the present.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will allow it to stand over until next session.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not understand this procedure. Why do we need a resolution of this kind when we have already voted these sums by resolutions which have been passed in Committee and concurred in by the House ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is the usual procedure of the House. These sums are gathered into a total which can be expressed in the Supply Bill and these details are attached to the Supply Bill.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. TAYLOR. Has this money been voted ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, certainly.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have been in the House for twenty-one years, and I do not remember of a resolution of this kind having been passed before.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend is entirely mistaken. It is the universal practice.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes, it is always done.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time, and agreed to.

SUPPLY BILL.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 271) for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1904.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first and second time, considered in Committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved :

That order 19 'House again in committee on Bill (No. 215) to further amend the Criminel Code,' be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

He said : These amendments to the Criminal Code were prepared for the purpose of meeting certain grievances that existed in certain places and which have been complained of, but during the discussion I ascertained that the amendments did not go as far as it was considered they should. Since my attention has been brought to the matter it has not been within my power to give the amendments the consideration that they should have, and therefore, under these circumstances, I think I had better allow the amendments to remain over until next session, because we must have another session at an early date, when the whole matter will be considered.

Motion agreed to.

WORKS IN OR OVER NAVIGABLE WATERS.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That order No. 20 'House again in committee on Bill (No. 206) to amend the Act respecting certain works constructing in or over navigable waters,' be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

Motion agreed to.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That order No. 21 'House again in committee on Bill (No. 3) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900,' be discharged, and that the Bill be withdrawn.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the reason of altogether abandoning this Bill, which contains some very important provisions, provisions which were stated to be absolutely necessary by the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) in moving for the special committee. The hon. Minister of Finance, as the House will recollect, spoke of a very serious condition of things in connection with the election law and subsequently moved for a committee to which this Bill, originally introduced by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), was referred. I was not present when the Bill was recently discussed. I was present during the first discussion, but I was under the impression that the principal portions of the Bill, outside of the clause which was called the compulsory voting clause, commended themselves to the judgment of the House, and the members of the government. I would consider it very unfortunate that the Bill should be withdrawn, because it is necessary that amendments should be made to the Election Act at the very earliest possible date. My only regret was that the report of the special committee did not go further and contain certain other provisions the necessity of which I have already pointed out.

The PRIME MINISTER. The principal feature of this Bill, viz., compulsory voting, failed to meet with favour in the House, because although it received some support there were very strong objections to it on both sides. There were other provisions of the Bill which personally I would have highly favoured, but when this Bill came up for discussion the second time, serious fault was found with the drafting of it, and the Minister of Justice undertook to supervise the redrafting. In the pressure of business the Minister of Justice has been unable to give it that attention which so important a matter required. I therefore think it is preferable to let the matter stand until another session, when the election Act should be revised.

Motion agreed to.

JURISDICTION OF EXCHEQUER COURT AS TO RAILWAY DEBTS—SENATE AMENDMENTS.

House proceeded to consider amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 155) respecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to railway debts.—The Prime Minister.

The PRIME MINISTER. The Bill as it left the House gave permission to any creditor or person at the instance of the Minister of Railways and Canals, to exercise the power given under this Bill. The first amendment of the Senate adds the words :

Or with the approval of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council at the instance——

This enacts that an ordinary creditor may not exercise the power under this Bill, except with the approval of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does it mean that no person can take any proceedings under this Act for the sale of a railway in the Exchequer Court, without the consent of the railway commission.

The PRIME MINISTER. No ordinary creditor.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose the words : 'Railway Committee of the Privy Council' will hereafter be interpreted to mean the Board of Railway Commissioners.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax.) I approve of this amendment ; in fact I suggested when the Bill passed this House, that it was an extraordinary power to give a creditor of the company.

Amendment concurred in.

The PRIME MINISTER. The second amendment provides that the company shall have failed for thirty days to operate the railway, instead of ten days, as in the original Bill.

Amendment concurred in.

The PRIME MINISTER. The Bill as it left this House read :

At the instance of a creditor of such person or company having a lien or charge upon the railway or section, or of a mortgagee of such railway or section, to order or decree a like sale of such railway, &c.

According to the amendments of the Senate it will read :

At the instance of a creditor of such person or company having a 'first' lien or charge upon the railway or section, or of 'a holder of a first mortgage.'

The word 'first' is inserted before the word 'lien' and the words 'holder of a first mortgage' are inserted instead of the words 'mortgagee.'

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). How is this going to affect the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway in my county ? This Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway has been transferred over to the trustees for the bondholders, and they represent a road on which some $300,000 is due to the people of my county. Are they to remain eternally in possession of this road, debarring all

other creditors from being paid ? They are obliged by law to run two trains a day both ways, but for the past year they have only been running one train both ways. I have also a complaint from the municipal council of the township of Restigouche, that for the first thirty miles there are no fences on the road, and that it is altogether unsatisfactory. I wish to know if there is any process under the law, by which the ordinary creditors of the road; the labourers, those who furnish material, and those who furnish the right of way, can have any redress ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I regret that I cannot say what may be the effect of the law with regard to this particular road; that is a legal question on which I cannot express an opinion.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. According to the Senate amendment, the action before the Exchequer Court to sell the road, can only be taken at the instance of a person having a first lien.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is what I understand. The Senate amends the 6th clause by striking out the last words :

But such transfers to trustees shall not exclude such railway from the provisions of this Act.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I draw the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Marcil) to the fact, that his railway is withdrawn altogether from the jurisdiction of the court by this amendment. The court can make no order for sale, if the road is in the hands of trustees.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). When this company found it was unable to carry out its undertaking, by a process of law which seems extraordinary to the ordinary layman, the road was handed over to trustees. These trustees are now in the enjoyment of the revenue from that road, and they absolutely refuse to pay one dollar of the debts due to the people of the county. When we ask them to pay anything we are met with the answer : These are Armstrong's debts and we are not responsible for them. The poor people of the county of Bonaventure remain unpaid, while the English bondholders so called, are in possession of the road. Under such circumstances, the law is very unjust to the people of Bonaventure.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It appears to me that any person having a subsequent lien could take possession of the road, and deal with it as he sees fit.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). They are in possession of the road now, but they refuse to pay the debts.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think the leader of the opposition is quite right when he says that the unfortunate labourer whose daily wage is $1.50 a day, will have a chance of getting paid if he redeems the whole of the bonds.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Reference was made to a person having a subsequent lien, and the daily labourer, so far as this road is concerned, is, or ought be, in exactly the same position as he is with regard to all roads. I think his claim should be made a preferential claim.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is made a preferential claim.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understood that it was. That is done under most contracts for the construction of railways, so far as I have been able to observe ; and if there has been any difference in that respect in regard to this railway, it is not only unfortunate but absolutely wrong. The men who put their work on the railway should be paid in the first instance ; but I do not say that on that account the bondholders who supply the money to build the road should be put aside. You can protect the interests of both if you deal with the matter properly in the first instance. The proper course in matters of this kind is very simple. You should make such a contract with the people who build the railway that the money they raise from the sale of the bonds must be applied to pay the labourers in the first place ; but when you have once taken the money from the bondholders and given them a lien on the road, there is no reason for disregarding the rights they have thus acquired. It is not their fault that the money has not been paid to the labourers. I do not know how the difficulty arose in this case ; I do not know anything of its history. All I say is that you cannot disregard the sanctity of contracts ; but you should have seen in the first place that the money was applied in payment of the labourers. Were not subsidies granted to this railway ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Subsidies were granted to build two roads there.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax.) In your subsidy contract it should be a condition precedent to the payment of any subsidy by this country, that the men who construct the road must show that the people who put their labour upon it are paid. I do not know why the subsidy in this case was not dealt with in that manner. I am not suggesting, as the Minister of Justice implies, that the men are not entitled to be paid. I say they should have been paid. It should have been absolutely impossible for the people who built the road to receive the subsides until the men were paid. But I say that consistently with that the men who put their money into this road and obtained a mortgage upon it, must be allowed to exercise their right under their mortgage, because you cannot set aside a contract entered into between the bondholders and the company.

The PRIME MINISTER. All this occurred many years ago, at a time when we were not perhaps as cautious with these matters as we are at present. I do not myself see that there is any remedy for these poor people, because, after all, the bondholders have put their money into the road. It is very much to be regretted, but it is hard to see what remedy can be applied.

Amendment concurred in.

ALASKAN BOUNDARY COMMISSION.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Mr. Speaker, as the House has disposed of the Orders of the Day, I will now proceed with the discussion of the question which I gave notice to the House I intended to bring up. I think it is most important that before we separate some of the real facts in regard to the Alaskan boundary question should be discussed in this House. I quite sympathize with the feelings of my colleagues who think that I might dispense with bringing the question up at this time ; but as there will be no other opportunity, I beg of them to stand the ordeal. In the newspapers of Canada, as well as in the private and public utterances of statesmen and important citizens, a good many things have been said on this question which might give birth to feelings between this country and the motherland as well as between this country and the United States which might just as well be avoided. In the first place, we must remember that the recent tribunal had nothing to do but to give a strictly legal interpretation of the treaty of 1825, concluded between Great Britain and Russia in regard to the line that should divide the Russian and British possessions in the North-west. The two questions which were raised before the tribunal were : What was the Portland channel through which the line had to pass before reaching the mainland ? and, what was the chain of mountains, or, in the absence of mountains, what was to be the line, dividing the British and the Russian possessions, and in what way would that affect access from the British possessions to the sea ? The Canadian claim was that if the line were drawn according to the real meaning of the treaty, we would be entitled to the ends of some of the deep inlets which penetrate through that strip of land, and which would give us access to the sea ; while the American contention was that the strip of territory which was acknowledged as being the Russian possession by the treaty of 1825, was to be uninterrupted, so that British subjects would be prevented from having access for the interior to the sea, except by river navigation through that strip of land. Of course, a good many contentions could be made, and have in fact been made, as to the interpretation of the treaty as it stands ; but the question put before this tribunal, as will be found in the correspondence which has been laid on the Table of the House, so far as that strip of land is concerned, was, not simply what the letter of the treaty meant, but what was the intention of the parties who concluded the treaty of 1825 ? Well, Sir, if one only takes the trouble to go through the British blue-books and read carefully the correspondence that was exchanged for three years from 1822 to 1825, between Mr. George Canning, who was then Foreign Secretary in England, and Sir Charles Bagot, who was British ambassador at St. Petersburg, and afterwards with Mr. Stratford Canning, who succeeded Sir Charles Bagot, and who concluded the treaty, I think no other conclusion can be drawn by any unbiased mind than that it was clearly the intention of the parties that the strip of land should be uninterrupted, and that Great Britain would not have any right whatever to the inlets that penetrated the coast.

Now, Sir, we must remember the facts of the case as it stood at that time. The intention of Great Britain in opening these negotiations was not to delimit territory ; it was to obtain from the Russian government the repeal of Ukase of 1821, of Emperor Alexander, who had excluded all foreign vessels from navigating within 100 Italian miles of the shore of all territories claimed by Russia, whether in islands or on the mainland. Of course, that pretention was preposterous, and in the following year, at the congress of Verona, Lord Wellington endeavoured to have the Ukase repealed, but did not succeed. Joint action was taken by the United States and Great Britain to bring about the repeal of the Ukase, and for two years negotiations were carried on jointly between the Russian, British and American governments. But the Americans were as clever then as they are to-day, and they succeeded, while still apparently acting in conjunction with the British ambassador, in concluding a treaty with the Russian government without the knowledge of the British government ; and in the treaty concluded in 1824, the United States government acknowledged to Russia the right to bring her posessions down to 54 degrees 40 minutes north latitude. Naturally Great Britain was left in an awkward position, because the question of delimitation was thereby forced upon her, and the discussion began. To show that the British government did not care much about territory or about that strip of land or its width, I will quote one sentence from the last despatch sent by George Canning to Sir Stratford Canning, in which he said :

> It remains only, in recapitulation, to remind you of the origin and principles of this whole negotiation.
>
> It is 'not' on our part, essentially a negotiation about limits. It is a demand of the repeal of an offensive and unjustifiable arrogation of exclusive jurisdiction over an ocean of unmeasured extent; but a demand qualified and mitigated in its manner, in order that its jus-

tice may be acknowledged and satisfied without soreness or humiliation on the part of Russia.

They were negotiating 'about territory to cover the remonstrance upon the principle.' This despatch was dated December 8, 1824. At the opening of the negotiations, Mr. Canning had written to Sir Charles Bagot, on the 15th of January, 1824 :

If Your Excellency can obtain the strait which separates the islands from the mainland as the boundary, the prolongation of the line drawn through that strait would strike the mainland near Mount Elias—the lowest point of unquestioned Russian discovery. But if that were too much to insist upon, the 135th degree of longitude, as suggested by Your Excellency, northward from the head of Lynn's arbour might suffice.

It would, however, in that case, be expedient to assign, with respect to the mainland southward of that point, a limit, say of 50 or 100 miles from the coast, beyond which the Russian posts should not be extended to the eastward.

Thus at the very opening of negotiations the British government were ready to grant a strip of land, from the 60th degree of north latitude to the North Pole, of 6 degrees of longitude wider than what was claimed by Russia ; that would have taken as Russian territory the whole Yukon territory. As for the strip of coast below this point, Canning was ready to grant a strip 100 miles wide, which would, of course, have taken in a good slice of the Rocky mountains. We must remember that the British interests on the mainland at that time were represented by the Hudson's Bay Company and the North-west Company alone ; and throughout that correspondence it will be found that at every new step in the negotiations, every time that new offers and counter-proposals were made, the British government consulted the Hudson's Bay Company ; and that suggestion of a strip of land 100 miles wide down to the 56th degree of latitude was approved of by the Hudson's Bay Company. But afterwards, as the negotiations went on, Russia insisted strictly upon coming down to 54 degrees 40 minutes north latitude, which had been acknowledged to her by the United States government as the southerly limit of her possessions. With the southern boundary coming down to that point, the Hudson's Bay Company objected to the strip of land being extended too far inland. Therefore, Sir Charles Bagot suggested different proposals : That the line should run through what is now Chatham strait, then through Clarence strait—and finally consented to the Russian proposal to have the line pass through the Portland canal ; and from the head of the Portland canal he himself suggested to the Russian government that a strip of land, ten marine leagues wide, without any reference to mountains whatever, should be taken as the Russian coast from the head of the Portland canal until it reached the 140th degree of longitude. Upon that proposal, the Russian government suggested that it would be better to take the mountains, because that would be a natural boundary. Some discussion followed, and the only objection that was raised by the British government or the British Ambassador as to the mountain limit was that it might carry that strip too far inland. They were ready to grant the whole strip of coast, but they did not like to have the Russian territory extend too far inland for fear it might come in contact with the establishments of the Hudson's Bay Company and the North-west Company. It was thereupon agreed that the mountain line should be chosen as the frontier, with the understanding that in case the mountains would go too far inland they would fall back on the ten marine leagues limit. The British government knew perfectly at that time that the limit as suggested by the Russians would exclude all British settlers from having access to the sea, as is clearly laid down in the first objection raised by Sir Charles Bagot against the Russian proposal. I quote from the memorandum, a copy of which was transmitted to Mr. Canning on the 17th of March, 1824 :

Comme il a été convenu de prendre pour base de négociation les convenances mutuelles des deux pays, il est à remarquer, en réponse à la proposition faite par les plénipotentiaires Russes, qu'une ligne de démarcation tracée de l'extrémité méridionale de l'Ile du Prince de Galles, jusqu'à l'embouchure du canal de Portland, de là par le milieu de ce canal jusqu'à ce qu'elle touche la terre ferme, de là jusqu'aux montagnes qui bordent la côte, et de là le long de ces montagnes jusqu'à la longitude du 139ème degré, etc., ôterait à Sa Majesté Britannique la souveraineté de toutes ces anses et de ces petites baies qui se trouvent entre les latitudes 56° et 54° 45′ dont plusieurs (à ce qu'il y a tout lieu à croire) communiquent directement aux établissements de la Compagnie de Hudson's-Bay.

Therefore, from the start, the British ambassador knew that an acceptance of the Russian proposal would deprive British subjects of access to the sea, whereupon the Russian government offered to give free access to the sea through all the rivers that flowed from British territory and emptied their water through that strip of land. This was submitted by Canning to the Hudson's Bay Company and accepted by the Hudson's Bay Company as being a sufficient means of communication to the sea, and this was included in Article VI. of the treaty of which I shall give the authorized translation:

It is understood that the subjects of His Britannic Majesty, from whatever quarter they may arrive, whether from the ocean, or from the interior of the continent, shall for ever enjoy the right of navigating freely, and without any hindrance whatever, all the rivers and streams which, in their course towards the Pacific ocean, may cross the line of demarcation upon the line of coast described in article III. of the present convention.

Now, as I have said, this was submitted to the Hudson's Bay Company. And what was the reply ? I have it here. It is dated 9th April, 1824, and is signed by J. H. Pelly. I do not know what his official position was, but all the correspondence of the Hudson's Bay Company at that time was signed by him :

I am to state that if His Majesty's government consider it advisable in other respects to accede to the last proposition made by the Russian government for the arrangement of a line of demarcation between the possessions of Russia and Great Britain on the coast of North America, they see no reason to object to it, as it will affect their particular interests, and more especially as it appears to secure to them a free access to the sea for the purposes of their trade on the whole coast to the eastward of the 139th degree of longitude.

What meaning the Hudson's Bay Company—and afterwards the British government—attached to this was that the British secured free navigation of the rivers, notwithstanding the control by Russia of the inlets and small bays. Therefore, as to the intention of the British government and the Hudson's Bay Company, there is no question that they knew that they were excluded from the bays and inlets, but that they believed that free navigation of the rivers and streams was secured.

So far as the mountain boundary is concerned we must remember that the negotiators both in London and St. Petersburg had no knowledge of the country but had to rely upon such documents as were in existence at the time. The map that was most relied upon was the map of Vancouver. If any one will refer to that map he will find that the only mountains indicated was a chain of mountains along the strip of coast and around the inlets, the Taku inlet, the Lynn canal and others, and parallel with the windings of the coast. That Mr. Canning believed the mountains to go all around the coast, I find evidence in his last letter upon which the treaty was signed ; it is dated 8th December, 1824 :

The Russian plenipotentiaries propose to withdraw entirely the limit of the ' Lisière ' on the coast which they were themselves the first to propose, viz., the summit of the mountains which run parallel to the coast, and which appear, according to the map, to follow all its sinuosities and to substitute generally that which we only suggested as a corrective of their first proposition.

As Canning pointed out in other letters, it might happen—as has been proven—that the mountains might not be as they appeared on the map ; and, in case the mountains should reach too far inland and interfere with the establishments of the Hudson's Bay Company and the North-west Company, he suggested—and his suggestion was adopted by both parties—that a rider should be attached to this stipulation. Therefore, article 4 of the treaty was adopted, which reads :

With reference to the line of demarcation laid down in the preceding article it is understood :—

1st. That the island called the Prince of Wales island shall belong wholly to Russia.

2nd. That whenever the summit of the mountains which extend in a direction parallel to the coast, from the 56th degree of north latitude to the point of intersection of the 141st degree of west longitude, shall prove to be at the distance of more than ten marine leagues from the ocean, the limit between the British possessions and the line of coast which is to belong to Russia, as above mentioned, shall be formed by a line parallel to the windings of the coast, and which shall never exceed the distance of ten marine leagues therefrom.

A great deal of discussion has taken place upon this article of the treaty because of the word ' ocean ' being used there. I shall not deal at length with this part of the treaty. It is sufficient to go through all the proposals and counter proposals, and especially the comments upon them at that time, to show, as Lord Alverstone has very properly said, that the introducing of the word ' ocean ' there could not make obscure the intention of the parties. And, in any case, the word ' ocean ' related only to the mountains. But if you read the clause carefully, you will see that this portion of it which had in view the possible absence of mountains, and was intended to provide for a boundary line, stipulated that such line should be drawn parallel, not to the shore of the ocean, but to the sinuosities of the coast. We may discuss the technical meaning of the word ' ocean,' and the word ' coast,' but it is stated clearly in all the letters that the line shall follow the ' sinuosities ' of the coast and be parallel to them.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. gentleman read then the section which, according to him, provides that it shall follow the sinuosities of the coast ?

Mr. BOURASSA. That is article 4, which I have just read. The words in the article seem clear enough, and, the letters and other documents make it clearer still. I do not wish to weary the House, but I could give a dozen quotations, from George Canning, Bagot and others representing the British government, and from representatives of the Russian government as well, to prove that, so far as the intentions of the parties are concerned, the object sought was to grant to Russia a strip ten marine leagues wide, not from the ocean, but from a line marking the sinuosities of the coast. The object of the portion of the treaty which I have read was only to prevent the Russian possessions from stretching too far inland.

Now, Sir, many facts have arisen since the signature of the treaty to prove what was the meaning the British authorities put upon the treaty, so far as that part of it is concerned. I can refer to official maps published by the British government which show that this reading of the treaty was recognized. I might refer to the case of a

prisoner who was captured by the Canadian authorities in Cassiar district. He was brought through what was claimed American territory, but what we claimed to be our territory. He protested against being held as a prisoner while in American territory. He was tried at Victoria and was condemned. A protest was made by the Secretary of State of the United States to the Foreign Office in London, and an order came directly to the Canadian government to release this prisoner on the ground that he had been held as a prisoner by British officers on American territory. But, to my mind the strongest point of all, so far as posterior interpretation is concerned, is the one raised by the agreement entered into between the Hudson's Bay Company and the Russian American Company.

Mr. GOURLEY. How would that bind the British government ?

Mr. BOURASSA. I will show the House in a moment. Let my loyal friend from Colchester (Mr. Gourley) control his disloyal feeling for a little while.

Mr. GOURLEY. I wish you had such loyalty as mine.

Mr. BOURASSA. Not more than fourteen years after the signature of the treaty, the one body of men most deeply interested in that country—in fact the only body that represented British interests in the country—the Hudson's Bay Company (which company it must be remembered had political and military powers from the British government) made an agreement with the Russian American Company which also had political and military powers from the Russian government. These two companies signed an agreement in 1839, by which the Russian American Company leased to the Hudson's Bay Company most of that strip of coast for five years. The agreement was renewed for several periods of five years. And here is where the official part of it comes in.

When the Crimean war was declared, the two companies thought it advisable, in their mutual interest, to agree that a state of war should not exist in that part of the world. They renewed their lease and had it ratified officially by the British government and by the Russian government. After the war was over, as the members of this House know, there was a change of government in England, and the whole question of the Crimean war and its consequences were made the subject of inquiry. A committee of the House investigated this agreement between the Hudson Bay Company and the Russian-American Company. Sir George Simpson, governor of the Hudson Bay Company, appeared before that committee and was asked what he knew of the nature and purpose of that agreement. He said that the nature and purpose of this agreement was that the Russians, having very little business now upon that coast, and the Hudson Bay Company wishing to do some trade there the latter had leased the coast and got the lease ratified by the British government and by the Russian government, and agreed upon as being a neutral territory during the time of the war. He also produced a map before the House of Commons, and that map is still in the British archives, upon which he had painted in yellow the strip of coast granted by the Russian-American Company to the Hudson Bay Company. That strip of coast as painted upon that map is exactly the territory which is claimed by the American government and has been awarded to them by this tribunal. This is the map which was produced before the British House of Commons, accepted by the British government as showing the title of the Russian-American Company, and it was never contested by either the Canadian government or by the British government. I think this single fact should be sufficient to show that the line of demarcation between the strip of territory belonging to the Americans and the British territory, was acknowledged officially, and the territory outside of that line belonged to the Americans.

The next point I would like to touch upon refers to the Portland channel.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. BOURASSA. Before I pass to the question of the Portland channel, I may add that a good deal of the misapprehension which has existed in this country concerning the respective rights of Great Britain and Russia and the United States over the strip of land, has arisen evidently from the fact that the exact phraseology of the treaty, as viewed in the light of the preceding correspondence as well as of the subsequent facts, was somewhat misunderstood even by some of the Canadian officials. For example, in a report sent to Sir Charles Tupper in February, 1888, Dr. Dawson, referring to that strip of land, spoke of the line as being parallel to the coast, and dropped these expressive words, 'sinuosities of the coast,' which appear in the treaty, and upon which the Russians had insisted all along during the negotiations. This fact shows, I think, a misapprehension on which, for example, Mr. Hodgins of Toronto, has based a very interesting article that was published last year, and that was considered in Canada as a valuable contribution to this question.

To show how far Canadian statesmen were ignorant of the real facts about this treaty, I may ask members of the House to read a couple of pages of the life of Sir John A. Macdonald, by Mr. Pope, in that chapter which relates to the negotiations for the Washington treaty of 1871. There it will be seen that at the suggestion of Sir Donald A. Smith, who had been and perhaps was then still governor of the Hudson Bay Company, Sir John A. Macdonald insisted and

secured, or thought he had secured, a valuable right for Canada in putting article 26 in the Washington treaty, providing that British subjects should be free to navigate the Stikine river—forgetting that by the treaty of 1825 we already possessed the right of navigating all these rivers. Of course article 26 of the Washington treaty also added that we had the right to navigate the Yukon and Porcupine rivers. That was a useful right to acquire, but I think the stipulation including the Stikine, with the Porcupine and the Yukon rivers, shows conclusively that even the Prime Minister of Canada at that time, and the governor of the Hudson Bay Company, did not know that they already held under the treaty of 1825 more than they were asking for in respect to the navigation of the Stikine river. I may also add that in 1874, a report was presented to the Minister of the Interior of Canada, by Mr. J. F. Dennis, Surveyor General of Canada, with reference to the boundary that was to be traced according to the treaty of 1825. In that report Mr. Dennis mentioned as one of the results of the tracing of that boundary. . . . .

The crossing of the following rivers on the Pacific coast by the said boundary, that is to say: The rivers 'Skoot,' 'Stackeen,' 'Taku,' 'Isilcat,' 'Chilkaht.'

So it was considered at that time and was not contradicted, that the boundary crossed those rivers that traversed that strip of coast, and therefore we could not claim the heads of the inlets since we acknowledged ourselves that the boundary line had to cross the rivers which flow into those inlets.

I need not say that this boundary question is by far the most important of all the questions that were submitted to arbitration, because the answer to it was to decide whether we could have a free port on Canadian territory to reach the Yukon. The other part of the question submitted—that is to say: Where does the Portland channel begin and where should the line pass ?—is a much less important one. But so far as that part of the award is concerned, I am at sea to understand the decision that was reached by the majority of the commission. No one who has studied the map, who has read Vancouver's reports of his trips in that part of the continent, can come to any other conclusion than that the four islands, Kannaghunut, Sitklan, Pearse and Wales, either all belong to Canada or all belong to the United States. So I think, we must come to the conclusion that if Lord Alverstone acted strictly according to his judicial functions in regard to the former and most important question, in regard to the latter question, he played the role of a diplomat rather than that of a judge.

Mr. GOURLEY. I think you had better apply that remark to all of them.

Mr. BOURASSA. Of course, I admit, that a good many things can be said in favour of the American contention, and perhaps it is well——

Mr. GOURLEY. Has the hon. gentleman a brief from Washington ? Does he think that in this British parliament he is called upon to argue a case that has been ably argued from the American side by paid advocates from Washington ?

Mr. BOURASSA. I do not intend to be diverted from my argument. Perhaps it would be well for the Canadian people to acknowledge the facts before they indulge in such wild talk as we have seen in some of the newspapers and which perhaps we may hear from the lips of some hon. gentleman in this House.

Mr. GOURLEY. I am very proud of the newspapers in Canada for resenting this slur.

Mr. BOURASSA. I think it is just as well that we should study coolly the facts of this case, so that we may receive a decision like this with a knowledge of the facts, as well as with a certain amount of dignity. When we come to the time of placing the responsibility where we think it should lie, then, perhaps, I might come nearer to my hon. friend in my opinion of British diplomacy.

Mr. GOURLEY. Don't, for heaven's sake.

Mr. BOURASSA. I was going to say that the British Admiralty published a map, dated 15th December, 1896, and corrected in March, 1900—one year after the British plenipotentiaries had held at Washington and Quebec that we were entitled to the northern channel of the Portland canal—in which map the southern entrance, which the Canadian commissioners contended was the entrance to Observatory Inlet, is set down as 'Portland Inlet.' It is not surprising that Lord Alverstone came to the conclusion that the Portland canal was really to the south of the four islands when the British Admirality, even after we had laid claim publicly to the north channel, still published on their official chart the southern channel as being the Portland canal. As far as that is concerned, I leave my hon. friend from Colchester to address his reproaches to the British Admiralty.

Much has been said about the importance of these two little islands, Kannaghunut and Sitklan. As far as their intrinsic value is concerned, I think every body will agree that they are of no value whatever. To speak of their strategic value is to my mind going a little beyond the mark. If Canada should be at war with the United States, I think we would have enough to do, even if my hon. friend from Colchester went in the trenches, to defend other parts of Canada much more important than Sitklan and Kannaghunut islands. The hon. member

from Montreal, St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte), or his organ, 'La Patrie' of Montreal, has gone to the extent of declaring that the possession of these two islands by the United States threatened the security of Port Simpson. Of course, the hon. gentleman has probably based his opinion upon the fact that the Canadian commissioners, Sir Louis Jetté and Mr. Aylesworth, stated, in what we have seen of their report so far, that these two islands commanded the entrance to Portland canal; and probably the hon. gentleman has concluded therefrom that they were of great importance to the security of Port Simpson. But if my hon. friend had looked at the map he would have found out that Sitklan and Kannaghunut islands command the entrance of what we call Portland channel, but that they have nothing whatever to do with commanding the entrance to the southern channel or what we call Observatory Inlet, but what the British Admiralty and the American government call Portland canal. Wales island is the one that commands the entry to the channel.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. How many miles are there?

Mr. BOURASSA. I have not the scale of the map.

The PRIME MINISTER. Between what points?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Between Sitklan island and Port Simpson.

The PRIME MINISTER. Fifteen miles.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Between twelve and thirteen miles.

Mr. BOURASSA. Wales island is about half way between Sitklan island and Port Simpson——

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I have looked at the map.

Mr. BOURASSA. Therefore, if by the possession of Wales island and Pearse island we are not able to protect Port Simpson against any fortifications that the Americans may erect on Sitklan island, we cannot protect it at all. Even with the possession of Sitklan island, Port Simpson would be no more protected than without it. Wales island is between the two. Suppose we possessed these two little rocks, how would we prevent the American government from fortifying the mainland? Therefore, I say that the possession of these islands could afford no valuable protection against attack upon Fort Simpson from the mainland.

Mr. WRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman know the area of these three islands?

Mr. BOURASSA. I do not know the area, but from looking at the map I should judge that Sitklan island is perhaps one mile in length or a little less, while Wales island is quite extensive and Pearse island still larger. Wales island gives more protection to the entrance to Port Simpson than Sitklan island, which is close to the mainland.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Wales island is beside the channel and the two others are outside of it.

Mr. BOURASSA. Wales island is really at the dividing line between the two channels.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. But inside the channel.

Mr. BOURASSA. The southern point of Wales island is between Sitklan island and Port Simpson.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It is something like that, but not quite. The other islands are outside of the mouth of the channel.

Mr. BOURASSA. But aside from the intrinsic value of these islands, there is one feature of this incident which I think we cannot too much deplore as representatives of the people of Canada. It is the spirit which has characterized the decision of the majority of the commissioners, in so far as that part of the question is concerned. To my mind, instead of concentrating all our ire and indignation upon the shoulders of a worthy and learned magistrate, who, in regard to four-fifths of his opinions, had certainly facts to justify his decision, we should go to the root of things and find out where lies the real responsibility which has forced upon the people and government of Canada this unfortunate decision. That, I think, would be much more statesmanlike, and would lead to a much clearer and better understanding in the future as to our rights towards the British government. There were two means of disposing of this question—one by diplomacy and the other by judicial arbitration. If there had been an effort to effect a diplomatic compromise of this question, one would have had to have offered something in compensation; and especially when dealing with a nation like the United States, I think it would have been a very dangerous thing to have gone to them and offered to compromise without having something to offer in compensation. We know too much about their appetite and disposition. Perhaps hon. members of this House will remember that at the time of the denunciation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, I stated in this House that the moment the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was abrogated without compensation to Canada our case in regard to the Alaskan boundary was very much compromised. I was violently attacked at that time by some people who are now very hard on the British government and even on the British Crown. I could not explain at that time the whole of my mind, because I could not give public expression to my opinion of the Alaskan boundary question.

I had been connected with the Anglo-American commission to which the question had been submitted, and I could not speak; but now that the Alaskan question is settled, I may say here what I had in my mind, and that is: That the moment Great Britain voluntarily decided not to set off the Alaskan boundary question against the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, our case was lost, because it was left for decision to judicial arbitration, and in my opinion, we had no case from a judicial point of view. That was the opinion of the Hon. David Mills, late Minister of Justice, who published articles in England, stating that the British government had no right to denounce the Clayton-Bulwer treaty without obtaining for Canada a settlement of the Alaskan boundary question. So far as I am concerned, I declare here and now that I would have been the last man to ask Great Britain to give a quid pro quo as between the Clayton-Bulwer treaty and the Alaskan boundary treaty. I belong to that school of colonials who believe that we should ask nothing from the Motherland and give nothing to the Motherland, while at the same time we should preserve the very slight tie which has united us so far. But, Sir, I leave to my strong imperial friends; I leave it to those who declare from time to time that we must make voluntary sacrifices for Great Britain; I leave it to them to settle their account with the British government, and especially with Mr. Chamberlain, the Colonial Secretary, who, at that time, had in care the welfare of Canada. I may just point out en passant, that at a time when the sons of Canada were shedding their blood for the empire on the soil of Africa, Mr. Chamberlain was coldly sacrificing the interests of Canada, so far as they were involved in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty and the Alaskan boundary treaty. I repeat, that for my part I would not have asked the British Government to make the abrogation of one treaty dependent on the defining of the other. I think, Sir, that the British government should look to their own interests and that we should look to our own interests. But, as the same time, I point out this fact, to show those who think that the bond of empire should be an exchange of mutual services, that if they calmly study the history of the relations between Canada and the United States as affected by British diplomacy, they will find that the services have been very often on the one side, and the favours very seldom on the other.

Let me point out that the special London correspondent of the Montreal 'Star' published the following quotation from the London 'Morning Post,' a journal which is in close contact with the present British government:

> The 'Morning Post' asks, presumedly with some ulterior purpose: 'Has the British government evidence that Canada was anxious above all for a verdict, and also that the Canadian government approved of the selection of an Englishman as a commissioner.'

Within the last day or two, the hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has published articles in his newspaper, blaming the Canadian government for having gone to this tribunal and for having consented to this sacrifice of our interests. Well, Sir, so far as the constitution of the tribunal is concerned, the correspondence has been brought down, and now is the time to apportion the responsibility. As hon. members know, when the Washington conference was adjourned, in 1899, it was decided to leave the settlement of this question to the British and American governments. It was not dealt with until last fall, and then Mr. Chamberlain informed the Canadian government that Sir Michael Herbert—whose death we all regret—had received an offer from Mr. Hay, the United States Secretary of State, to settle this Alaskan boundary question. A tribunal was proposed by the United States government of the very same kind that had been offered in 1899 and refused by the Canadian commissioners. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has asked in his newspaper: 'Why did the Canadian government consent in 1903 to what they refused in 1899?' I am not here to speak for the Canadian government, but I can speak of what I find in the correspondence, and in that correspondence I find that the Canadian government urged upon the British government the great inconvenience of leaving the question to be decided by such a tribunal, and offered to have it submitted to the Hague tribunal. To this Mr. Chamberlain replied that this was impossible, as the United States government would not consent. The Canadian government then gave way to a certain extent, and they said: We will consent to have it submitted to this tribunal, provided that the tribunal be composed of jurists of repute, who will decide according to law. Everybody knows what happened. One day we were informed in the press that Secretary Root and Senators Lodge and Turner were to be chosen by the President of the United States as the American arbitrators. On the 18th of February, 1903, the anouncement came officially in a despatch from the Colonial Secretary to Lord Minto. Three days later Lord Minto cabled that his ministers protested strongly against the choice of these commissioners, because their appointment was certainly a breach of the treaty which provided for six eminent jurists. The protest of the Canadian government was couched in such terms that it left the door open for a refusal by the Canadian government to consent to appear before that tribunal.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. gentleman means that Lord Minto acted on the advice of his ministers?

Mr. BOURASSA. Of course. To that despatch the British government replied that it was useless to make any representations at Washington, and they urged most strongly upon the Canadian government the acceptance of that tribunal. I say 'urged': the language of the British government is polite—they are always polite in their language—but the meaning is there; and it is easy to see that the British government wanted to 'force' on us the acceptance of that tribunal. But there was more to follow. A draft of the treaty was signed and ratified by the British government before they had obtained the final consent of the Canadian government to the constitution of the tribunal, as it had been announced by the government of the United States. Therefore, if we have indignation to express; if we have sore feelings to give vent to; let those who are so anxious about the dignity of Canada, not vent them upon Lord Alverstone, who, once appointed, had nothing left but to give a judgment acording to what he thought to be a strict law; but let them go to the source of all the trouble; let them go to the responsible statesmen in England who concluded a treaty affecting the interests of Canada without waiting for the opinion of the Canadian government representing the Canadian people. After the tribunal had been organized, there was no recourse but to have the question judged according to law. Lord Alverstone has himself pointed out that in his opinion the line of frontier, as provided for by the treaty, is an absurd one; but he very properly added that he was not there to change treaties, but to interpret them. Then, Sir, so far as that is concerned, I must say that I believe Lord Alverstone has done his duty.

Now, on the broader question of British diplomacy, I want to be clearly understood. I do not say that the British government should take any risk in safe-guarding our interests at Washington. I do not belong to the school who would ask from Great Britain one iota of a sacrifice in order to protect Canadian interests; but I think I have the right to ask, and every member of this House and every Canadian citizen has the right to ask, that the British government, for the sole purpose of catching American favour, shall have no right to compromise Canadian interests without the will of the Canadian people. That is all I ask from the British government.

Sir, if the members of this House want to have an idea of the great services rendered to the Canadian people at the hands of British diplomacy, in our relations with the United States, I will refer them to a little episode which happened in 1888. One of the arguments made all through the American press and by American commissioners and American diplomats, is that before the discovery of gold in the Yukon, the Canadian government never raised any protest against the occupation of that strip of land, all along and without any interruption, by the American government. To this we have replied that we raised protests in 1888. But, Sir—and this is a very amusing illustration of British diplomacy—how did those protests reach Washington? The first document was a letter addressed by Mr. Burgess, Deputy Minister of the Interior, to Sir John Macdonald, dated the 19th of June, 1888, in which he said very precisely:

> Captain Moore, of Victoria, British Columbia, who was for some time a member of Ogilvie's expedition to the Yukon, has reported to the government of British Columbia that he believes certain persons are about to receive a charter from the Alaskan authorities to construct a trail from Lynn canal by way of White pass to the interior of Alaska. If our view of the case is correct, the entire route of this trail, as well as the trail by the Chilkoot pass, is in Canadian territory.

To that letter was added a memorandum giving a description of the country, and giving the contention of the Canadian government in regard to the exact location of the boundary. Sir John Macdonald, in a letter dated the 18th of July, 1888, sent Mr. Burgess' note to Sir Charles Tupper. The letter read as follows:

> Dalhousie, July 18, 1888.
>
> My dear Sir Charles,—I send you a note from Burgess, which speaks for itself. As Sir Lionel says that the foreign office disapproves of communications from Ottawa to Washington direct, perhaps you may think it well to call Lord Salisbury's attention to Burgess' suggestion.
>
> Yours faithfully,
> (Sgd.) JOHN A. MACDONALD.

On the first of August, Sir Charles Tupper transmitted these documents to the colonial office. On the 21st of August, the colonial office transmitted them to the foreign office. It had taken three weeks for them to go from the colonial office to the foreign office. Ten days later Lord Salisbury wrote to Sir Lionel Sackville-West, who, as the members of this House will remember, was at that time busy mixing himself up in the American elections, for which he got a clearance in short terms.

Mr. GOURLEY. Tricked by a low Yankee.

Mr. BOURASSA. Sir Lionel Sackville-West replied to the Marquis of Salisbury that he would lay the matter before the Secretary of State; and here is the letter sent by the British Ambassador to the Secretary of State:

> Beverly, Mass., September 10, 1888.
>
> Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that the Marquis of Salisbury has requested me to bring to your notice a rumour which has reached Her Majesty's government that a charter is about to be granted by the authorities of Alaska for certain privileges in a part of that country which is claimed by Great Britain.
>
> Her Majesty's government presume that this rumour is unfounded, as the territory in question is part of Her Majesty's dominions.
>
> I have, &c.,
> (Sgd.) L. S. SACKVILLE WEST.

What was the territory that was claimed, and by what title did we claim that the territory was ours ? The British Ambassador forgot to tell. The result was that the Secretary of State replied that he had never heard anything of the kind. The British Ambassador sent the reply to the foreign office, the foreign office sent it to the colonial office, the colonial office sent it to Sir Charles Tupper, and Sir Charles Tupper sent it to Sir John Macdonald; so that after four months of correspondence and red tape there was nothing left of our claim, and it was never known officially to the United States government that we had once in our life protested against their interpretation of the Treaty of 1825.

My conclusion from all this is that instead of throwing stones at magistrates, instead of complaining in an undignified way of the result of this award, we should take the position as it is, coldly and firmly, and learn from it this lesson, which is not the first nor the last, that if we want to deal with the American government, we should deal directly through an agent at Washington appointed by the Canadian government. Then, instead of it taking three months to have our letters sent to Washington, they could be sent in three days. I do not think I need add any more on this question; but being free, as I have been since this award was given, to speak my mind, which I was prevented from doing for the last five years, I thought I would give a piece of information to the House and the country in regard to what I consider to be the real facts of this case, so that we may draw clear and practical conclusions from the whole history of this Alaska boundary question.

Mr. R. G. MACPHERSON (Burrard). Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to say very much on this question; but as this award affects my own constituency, and possibly takes away some of my voters, I can speak of it with a certain amount of feeling and possibly a certain degree of accuracy. The only reason why we should wish to have any frontier of Alaska, or any part of that country which is contiguous to our own, is because it is a gateway into the golden Yukon. We found in 1897, when gold was discovered in the Yukon, that we were in the position of a man attempting to do business in a store which had only a back door, the front door being closed. We could not get into our own store for the simple reason that somebody else commanded the entrance, and we were obliged to go around by the back way. Prior to the finding of gold in the Yukon, there was little or nothing known of that Alaskan frontier. Skagway and Dyea were not in existence, and they would not be in existence to-day had it not been for the discovery of gold in the Yukon country. The Lynn canal is useful only for ingress and egress for that country, though the navigation from Princess Royal Island up to the Lynn canal is decidedly dangerous on account of the icebergs which come out of Taku inlet and which are carried by the tide backwards and forwards. The terrible disaster which occurred two years ago south of Douglas island, causing the loss of the ill-fated 'Islander' and the drowning of sixty or seventy people, is within the memory of every man in this House. Had our people been alive to the fact, as this House was, that we had a very knotty question to settle when the Teslin Lake and Telegraph Creek Railway was brought before this House, and had they forgotten the ordinary differences that exist between the two great parties in Canada, and joined together to carry through the railroad that was contemplated—I do not say anything of the question of route—there would be none of the soreness that exists to-day.

There would have been no necessity for an Alaskan boundary award and there would be no feeling in the hearts of the people of Canada to-day that any injustice had been done to them by that award. I do not wish to enter into a discussion of the merits of the case. I claim to be as loyal a Britisher as any man in the empire, but I also claim to be a Canadian and a business man, recognizing business principles as circumstances present themselves. We are face to face with a question, and we must meet it. We have a very rich country in the north, and are practically kept out of it to-day. The best thing we can do is not to question why we are placed in that position or the motives which led to the decision, but, recognizing the facts as they are, to take the best possible steps to improve our present position. One hundred miles below Port Simpson we have one of the finest harbours on the Pacific coast, Kittamaht harbour. During the present session I have had the pleasure of fathering a Bill granting a charter for what is called the Kittamaht harbour and Yukon railway. For the past four years many men in British Columbia whom I know, have recognized the difficulty presented to us as Canadians on account of being shut out from that country by the boundary award. We felt that such an award as has been given was bound to come, because we knew, as every man in this country knows, that whenever a question arose in which Canadian interests were at variance with American interests, Canadian interests were sacrificed to those of the American people, who, I might almost say are our hereditary enemies. I do not say that with any desire to be controversial, but we must recognize facts as they present themselves. We have seen this exemplified in the Ashburton treaty, the Oregon treaty, the San Juan Island affair, and now in the Alaskan boundary award—in every instance the interests of Canada were sacrificed. We know that there is no question about the San Juan treaty, and the Ashburton treaty, but the present

decision may have some controversial features, and I do not wish to go into it. We in British Columbia have always felt, perhaps more strongly than the people of the other provinces, that our interests have been sacrificed. In view of that fact, in view of our being shut out of the country, it behooves our government to undertake the construction of a railway from some point which we are perfectly assured cannot be contiguous to American territory. We must be able to discover such a point, for they cannot take anything more from us; they have all that is coming to them. I do not think they should be permitted to take any more, and I would never be a party to giving any more Canadian territory to them. But as a loyal Britisher, I take the position that we must accept the situation as it is; we are practical men and must go to work and overcome the practical difficulties that present themselves. To-day we see the Americans standing at the entrance of our Yukon country exacting tolls, trying to bring trade to their own country, and, recognizing that fact, we must seek a route of our own and be independent of them. Within one year of the construction of a road from Vancouver or Kittamaht harbour, it is immaterial which, the towns of Skagway and Dyea will slumber; they will simply be a monument to the folly of the Americans in not doing the decent thing by us. There will be nothing in them, because there is nothing there to keep them except the trade going into the Yukon country. I would ask the government to consider the question very seriously; to take it up from a Canadian standpoint, and to subsidize or to build a road from Kittamaht harbour or from Vancouver, north into the Yukon in order that we may be able to say to the Americans that they can keep their front door, that we have a front door of our own.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not propose, under present conditions, to discuss very fully the fairness of this award. I agree with my right hon. friend (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that until we get the official documents and have the exact reasons given by the arbitrators on each side, including the protest of the Canadian commissioners, we cannot properly discuss the terms of the award or consider the question whether or not that award is one which deserves censure at our hands. My hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) has undertaken to educate the Canadian people with regard to this matter as to which he says they have been in profound ignorance for some years until he himself saw fit to enlighten them. Possibly he may have got to the bottom of the question; I have in my possession six volumes comprising the British case and a portfolio of maps comprising something like 100 maps, and the argument of counsel from day to day occupying a great many hundred pages. I have had some twenty-five years experience in endeavouring to interpret legal documents, and to analyze facts, but I do not think that, in the short space of time during which these documents have been at my command, or in the short space that has elapsed since some of them have reached this country, I could have brought myself into quite so cock-sure an attitude as my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) has exhibited to-day. I do not think that he or any other gentleman in this House is prepared to say at the present time——

Mr. BOURASSA. Will my hon. friend permit me to say that I had occasion to study this question for five years, as I have been connected with the Anglo-American commission, and a good many documents that have now been made public, I have not mentioned before, because they form part of the case as brought before the Anglo-American commission. Therefore, I had acquired a good deal of information before these documents were made public.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I admit that my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) has had special opportunities to study the matter, yet with all of his opportunities and with the ability which my hon. friend undoubtedly possesses, I greatly doubt whether he is in a position to convince us that the Canadian case, which I believe was very ably presented, is so absolutely absurd and ridiculous as he would lead us to believe. Certainly his comments, if accepted seriously, place Messrs. Aylesworth and Jetté in an uncomfortable position. Mr. Aylesworth has delivered a dissenting judgment occupying three columns of the London 'Times' in support of the Canadian case, which according to my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) is absurd and ridiculous and to which, according to him, the people of this country should attach no importance whatever. Let us remember that Mr. Ayelsworth was sworn to give that question impartial consideration, that he is a lawyer of great eminence in the province of Ontario, and that Mr. Jetté is a lawyer of great eminence in the province of Quebec, and when my hon. friend, even with all the information he has on this subject, stands in this House and tells us that the arguments of these gentlemen, in their dissenting opinion, are unworthy of consideration——

Mr. BOURASSA. I think it would be fair of my hon. friend to admit that I stated at the very beginning of my remarks that as far as the strict legal interpretation of the letter of the treaty is concerned, I did not venture any opinion at all; I simply said that I was going to state the facts as to what were the intentions of Great Britain and Russia before the treaty was made. As far as the effect of these quotations which I have given are concerned, I do not pretend to judge, and therefore Mr. Aylesworth

and Sir Louis Jetté may be right in their interpretation of the treaty without minimizing the force of the documents which I have read.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose that Messrs. Aylesworth and Jetté were either dealing with the point at issue or they were not. I would understand that they were dealing with the point at issue. If my hon. friend from Labelle is not dealing with the point at issue, I do not see from what standpoint he is going to educate the people. Surely he knows enough to realize that it is the terms of the treaty with which we are concerned, and that the negotiations before and the actions of the parties afterwards can only be relied upon for the purpose of assisting us in a minor degree to place the proper interpretation upon this treaty. They are not the point at issue, they only illustrate and possibly explain the meaning of the treaty. Therefore my hon. friend, if dealing not with the terms of the treaty or its legal interpretation, but only with some subsidiary matters, was not in a position after all to throw much light on the subject or to educate the people of the country as to whether the contentions which were put forth on behalf of this country were right or wrong.

I am quite prepared to admit at the present time that we are not in a position to discuss the merits of this award, except possibly so far as the Portland channel is concerned. With respect to the line drawn from Cape Muzon, I am in the same position as my hon. friend from Labelle, I have not heard any explanation, nor do I see how any explanation is possible of the decision of the majority of the commissioners. Taking the line under the terms of the treaty, which is in French, but the effect of which I think I can give in English, it is to pass from the southernmost point of Prince of Wales Island in latitude 54° 40' north—which is used simply for purpose of identification—in a northerly direction along the length of Portland channel until you reach the mainland. Subject to any explanation which may be given, it does not seem reasonable to make that line pass in the circuitous way in which it does pass under the terms of the award, south of Kannaghunut Island and Sitklan Island, and then northerly through a passage between Pearce and Wales Island. But we have not all the reasons before us, as I say, and are not in a position to judge.

But there are one or two matters in connection with the negotiations and the circumstances under which this treaty has been negotiated to which, I think the attention of the House and country might well be called. We all remember, I am sure, that during the years of the Conservative administration, we were told over and over again that the sole difficulty in the way of arriving at a fair and just understanding between this country and the United States on all matters in controversy was that the Conservative government were indisposed to negotiate in a fair manner. We were told that they irritated the United States of America, but that every difficulty would disappear, that there should be peace, amity and concord and the immediate settlement of all difficulties, if my right hon. friend the present Prime Minister and his party were returned to power. And I think that almost one of the first things that my right hon. friends did after coming into power was, on the occasion of a journey made by him to the city of Chicago to explain in an interview with a newspaper reporter how well disposed this government was to the United States and how fully it was prepared to give to the United States, as a matter of concession almost anything the United States might ask, in return for almost anything the United States might offer. I am offering that merely as a compendious exposition of my right hon. friend's views as expressed at that time, and not as a literal statement of what he said. His words can be found at the commencement of the 'Hansard of 1896. Well, I think that my right hon. friend, after he had been a few years in power, discovered that these negotiations with the United States were a little more difficult to carry on than he had believed; in fact, I think he has frankly made that admission on more than one occasion in this House. and he has discovered that it is not always easy to secure what we believe to be the rights of Canada even at the expense of some concession. He undertook to secure reciprocity with the United States, and was engaged upon that work for several years. But, up to the present time, he has accomplished nothing—just as he has accomplished nothing with regard to preferential trade, just as he has accomplished nothing with regard to the fast Atlantic service. And now we have before us the question of what he has accomplished for Canada in connection with the Alaskan boundary. Whether the judgment of the tribunal to which this matter has been assigned be right or wrong, of one thing we are certain, that practically the United States have won on all sides under the award and that, even so far as the Portland canal is concerned, about which we thought there would be no doubt whatever, and as to which there does not seem to have been very great contention before the arbitrators, we are to be handicapped in the future by the fact that two islands, commanding an important strategic point at the mouth of what we call Dixon Entrance, and commanding the approach to Port Simpson, have been assigned to the United States of America.

Now, let us review for a moment what the position of the government has been in connection with this matter. The protocols passed at a meeting of the Anglo-American

Commission were laid before this House on the 5th of June, 1899, and are to be found at page 4259 and succeeding pages of 'Hansard.' In the protocol No. 63, the British commissioners put forward the following proposal as a basis for framing a treaty with regard to the boundary between Alaska and Canada :

> The tribunal shall consist of three jurists of repute, one on the part of Great Britain, nominated by the members for the time being of the judicial committee of Her Majesty's Privy Council, one on the part of the United States, nominated by the president, and of a third jurist to be selected by the two persons so nominated. In the event of their failure to agree within three months of the exchange of the ratification of the present treaty to be selected by——

The commissioners of the United States in opposition to that article put forward as Article 2, the following :

> The tribunal shall consist of six impartial jurists of repute three on the part of Great Britain, nominated by the members for the time being of the Judicial Committee of Her Majesty's Privy Council, and three on the part of the United States nominated by the president.

Now, my right hon. friend, in laying these protocols before the House, said :

> The tribunal proposed by the British commissioners was a tribunal of three jurists of repute —one to be selected by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council for Great Britain, the other to be selected by the President of the United States and the third to be selected by the two, or, in the event of a disagreement to be selected by a friendly power, the friendly power, however, not being named. With regard to the possible questions which might arise on account of arbitration, the British commissioners proposed to follow identically the rules laid down by the Venezuela treaty.

The United States commissioners, as appears by the statement of my right hon. friend, desired to know whether or not the appointment of a third arbitrator by one of the independent states of this continent would be satisfactory to the Canadian government. To this it was replied, as seen at page 4264, as follows :

> To this it was replied that they had considered it and thought it most objectionable in view of the policy long maintained and recently reasserted by the government of the United States towards the other countries on the said continent. The selection of an umpire by any such nation would not in their opinion offer a guarantee of impartiality which is the first qualification requisite for the discharge of the duties entrusted to him.

That is the way the matter was left by the protocol. On the 29th of May, 1899, the Prime Minister in the House used the following language :

> I have only to repeat that the position to-day on the 29th of May, is exactly what it was when the commission adjourned on the 1st of February last. There has been no change and, so far as this government is concerned there will be no change.

Therefore, the position of the matter up to that time was this : that in 1899 the Americans had proposed a tribunal of six jurists of repute, three to be selected by each country. The commissioners for Canada had proposed a reference to arbitration, one jurist being appointed by each country, and provision being made for the appointment of a third independent and impartial jurist. They had proposed that the rules laid down in the Venezuela treaty should apply to the consideration of the subject for arbitration. My right hon. friend had declared distinctly on the 29th of May, 1899, that there had been no change, and so far as this government was concerned, there would be no change. Now, that is not the only observation which my right hon. friend made on the subject, because on another occasion during the same year he used the following language :

> My mouth is closed on the subject and I cannot speak but there has been a statement made officially by the foreign office coming from the commission itself which has given to the public the reason why we could not agree. The American commissioners did not want to have an umpire. They wanted to have three commissioners on one side and three on the other side. To this we could not agree because such an arrangement would not give us a definite settlement of the question. They also wanted it agreed that if the establishments they made at the head of the Lynn canal were found to be in Canadian territory they would continue to remain part of their own territory. We could not agree to that.

And further on, in dealing with the same subject, he said :

> We came to the conclusion after giving the matter our best thought that the only rules which could be adopted in the position of things which existed in that distant part of the country were the rules so recently adopted for the settlement of the Venezuelan question.

And he also declared his intention to be firm by using further on the following language :

> I have only to say this, however, that the attitude which we have taken has the approbation of the people of Canada generally, and it is an attitude which must and will be maintained to the end.

Now, the attitude of the United States commissioners with regard to this question was sufficiently indicated by the protocols which they presented in reply to those which were laid before them by the British commissioners. The proposal presented by the British commissioners was exactly the same proposal as that which had practically been forced upon the mother country with respect to Venezuela, a country in which the United States had no direct interest other than that which arose by reason of the so-called Monroe doctrine. An arbitration in that case was forced upon the people of the mother country—I think I can reasonably use the words in view of what we know took place at that time—was forced upon the mother country with respect to certain territory in Venezuela in which

the United States had no direct interest other than that which I have mentioned. The reply to that was that there must be a reference to six jurists, three upon each side, and that the rules referred to could not be accepted. Further, according to the informal negotiations, if there should be a reference to three arbitrators, the third arbitrator must be appointed by a country over which the United States exercised, or claimed at least to exercise a certain influence under the doctrine that I have already mentioned. That should have been sufficient notice to my right hon. friend of the attitude of the American government.

Now what took place after that? An agitation arose in the United States, or rather an agitation existed in the United States with respect to the control by that country of the Nicaraguan canal. It so happened that under a treaty known as the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, that control which the United States desired could not be obtained by the United States unless the government of Great Britain would consent to a modification of that treaty. But in dealing with the question of the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, which was pressed very strongly upon the mother country by the American government, Lord Lansdowne took a ground which might well have had and certainly should have had the support of the Canadian government. In a despatch which Lord Lansdowne addressed, on the 22nd of February, 1901, to the British ambassador at Washington, it will be seen that the British government at that time thoroughly recognized the fact that these two questions should be dealt with concurrently. The British government recognized the fact that Canada had an interest in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty and in the control of a canal across the Isthmus, and it also recognized the necessity that the latter question should be dealt with only in connection with the Alaskan boundary question, that the Alaskan boundary question should not be left for future determination if that treaty were abrogated. Lord Lansdowne, in a despatch from which I shall have to quote at some length, used the following language:

So far as Her Majesty's government were concerned, there was no desire to procure a modification of that convention. Some of its provisions had, however, for a long time past been regarded with disfavour by the government of the United States, and in the President's message to congress of December, 1898, it was suggested with reference to a concession granted by the government of Nicaragua, that some definite action by congress was urgently required if the labours of the past were to be utilized, and the linking of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans by a practical water-way to be realized. It was further urged that the construction of such a maritime highway was more than ever indispensable to that intimate and ready intercommunication between the eastern and western sea-boards of the United States demanded by the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands and the prospective expansion of American influence and commerce in the Pacific, and that the national policy called more imperatively than ever for the control of the projected highway by the government of the United States.

This passage in the message having excited comment, Your Excellency made inquiries of the Secretary of State in order to elicit some information as to the attitude of the President.

In reply, the views of the United States government were very frankly and openly explained. You were also most emphatically assured that the President had no intention whatever of ignoring the Clayton-Bulwer convention, and that he would loyally observe treaty stipulations. But in view of the strong national feeling in favour of the construction of the Nicaragua canal and of the improbability of the work being accomplished by private enterprise, the United States government were prepared to undertake it themselves upon obtaining the necessary powers from congress. For that purpose, however, they must endeavour, by friendly negotiation, to obtain the consent of Great Britain to such a modification of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty as would, without affecting the general principle therein declared, enable the great object in view to be accomplished for the benefit of the commerce of the world. Although the time had hardly arrived for the institution of formal negotiations to that end, congress not having yet legislated, the United States government, nevertheless, were most anxious that Your Excellency should enter at once into pour-parlers with a view to preparing for consideration, a scheme of arrangement.

Her Majesty's government agreed to this proposal, and the discussion which took place in consequence resulted in the draft convention which Mr. Hay handed to Your Excellency on the 11th January, 1899.

At that time the Joint High Commission, over which the late Lord Herschell presided, was still sitting. That commission was appointed in July, 1898, to discuss various questions at issue between Great Britain and the United States, namely, the fur-seal fishery, the fisheries off the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, the Alaskan boundary, alien labour laws, reciprocity, transit of merchandise, mining rights, naval vessels on the great lakes, definition and marking of frontiers, and conveyance of persons in custody. But serious difficulties had arisen in the attempt to arrive at an understanding, and it had become doubtful whether any settlement would be effected.

In reply, therefore, to a request for a speedy answer with regard to the convention, the Marquess of Salisbury informed Mr. White, the American chargé d'affaires, that he could not help contrasting the precarious prospects and slowness of the negotiations which were being conducted by Lord Herschell with the rapidity of decision proposed in the matter of the convention. Her Majesty's government might be reproached with having come to a precipitate agreement on a proposal which was exclusively favourable to the United States, while they had come to no agreement at all on the controversy where there was something to be conceded on both sides.

Shortly afterwards Lord Herschell intimated that the difficulties in regard to the question of the Alaskan boundary seemed insuperable, and that he feared it might be necessary to break off the negotiations of which he had hitherto had the charge. Upon this Lord Salisbury in-

formed Mr. White that he did not see how Her Majesty's government could sanction any convention for amending the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, as the opinion of this country would hardly support them in making a concession which would be wholly to the benefit of the United States, at a time when they appeared to be so little inclined to come to a satisfactory settlement in regard to the Alaskan frontier.

The language is very significant and very cogent. The British government practically took the ground, in that despatch from the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to the British Ambassador at Washington, that contemporaneously with the proposed amendment to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty there must be some satisfactory arrangement as to the Alaskan frontier. I think the House and the country are entitled to some intimation in addition to any that has already been given by the government, as to whether or not the imperial government in taking that stand not only had the hearty and vigorous support of this government but the energetic and forcible insistence by this government that the treaty should not be abrogated without some satisfactory arrangement being made as to the delimination of the Alaskan frontier. Have we seen the government taking that attitude in this House ? We have not seen anything of the kind, because, on the 5th March, 1902, when I referred to this question in the debate on the address, the right hon. First Minister took the astounding position that Canada had no direct interest whatever in the question as to whether or not the Clayton-Bulwer treaty should be abrogated. No direct interest in it ? I would like to know what part of this empire had any direct interest in the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty if Canada had not. Canada had a greater direct interest in the questions connected with that treaty than any other part of the British empire. What was the interest of the United States in the treaty ? The interest of the United States in the treaty was, that having great possessions on the Atlantic and the Pacific and desiring to develop their trade in the east particularly since the acquisition of certain territory in the far east, they were anxious to have control under certain conditions of the Isthmian canal for the purpose of its construction. Canada had precisely the same interest as the United States. Canada has great possessions on the Atlantic, Canada has great possessions on the Pacific and Canada desires to develop her trade on the Pacific and her trade with the far east. Therefore, if the United States were able to make out a strong case why the treaty should be denunciated, the case of Canada was such as to entitle her to say that before that treaty should be abrogated Canada must be consulted. What position did the right hon. First Minister take on this subject in the House ? He took this position in his speech on that occasion :

The hon. gentleman says that the Clayton-Bulwer treaty is at an end ; that therefore there is nothing to conceal ; that the treaty negotiated between Lord Lytton and Mr. Clayton has been modified by a recent treaty, and that therefore the papers in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty can be brought down. That reasoning of my hon. friend is fallacious. Canada had no direct interest in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty ; Canada had no direct interest in the Nicaragua canal. Canada had no more interest in the negotiation of a treaty which affected the Nicaragua canal than she would have in a treaty in reference to the Suez canal, or in any other question between Great Britain and a foreign power in which she was not interested.

Well, it would thus seem, that, instead of supporting and not only supporting but insisting upon the position which was taken by Lord Lansdowne in the despatch to which I have referred, the government of Canada have taken an indefensible and unpatriotic position. They seem for some incomprehensible reason to have taken the position in regard to the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty that Canada has no real, direct interest in it, and that it was perfectly competent for the Imperial government to abrogate that treaty without coming to any conclusion with the United States about the Alaskan boundary question as to which there was so much delay and so much uncertainty.

The right hon. First Minister has brought down the papers and I have looked through these papers from beginning to end without finding one single word of protest in regard to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. I have looked in vain for one syllable, word, or communication which indicates that the government of this country declared or suggested that the Alaskan boundary dispute must be settled concurrently with the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty'.

Let us look for a moment at the documents which have been brought down. They are obviously very incomplete because one of the earliest, a despatch from His Excellency the Governor General to the Colonial Secretary, dated 18th November, 1902, refers to a despatch of November, 1901, which has not been brought down. This despatch is as follows :—

Ottawa, November 18, 1902.

Referring to your despatch of October 31st concerning the proposal of the United States for the appointment of a tribunal of jurists to record their reasoned opinions upon the Alaska boundary question, my ministers while declining to give final assent to such proposal, would be disposed to consider it favourably provided the reference to the tribunal should include all aspects of the question. They think that such a reference as was outlined in my despatch of last November, 1901, might be acceptable.

(Sgd.) MINTO.

We are still in the dark as to what this despatch means. It is preceded by a despatch on the 31st October, 1902, which is brought down and which is in the following words :

Despatch from Mr. Chamberlain to His Excellency the Governor General:—

London, October 31, 1902.

Proposal unofficially renewed by Secretary of State for United States for appointment of tribunal members of which should merely record their reasoned opinions. See my secret despatch of April 23, 1902. Does this suggestion which would at least afford opportunity to the public in the United States and Canada of comparing their respective cases, meet with the approval of your ministers ?

(Sgd.) CHAMBERLAIN.

On the 11th December, 1902, the Colonial Office replied to the despatch from Lord Minto dated the 18th November, 1902 :

Alaska Boundary.

London, December 11, 1902.

Referring to your cable of November 18th, presume that in event of majority of tribunal agreeing on answer to the reference submitted decision would be accepted as final by your ministers ? Please cable reply.

To which an answer was sent on the 15th December, 1902, which I will not quote in full as I understand this correspondence is to be printed but which expresses the view that : the government of Canada cannot give proper consideration to question submitted till the exact text of the proposed reference or the composition of the tribunal is before them. Then follow certain letters from the British Ambassador to Mr. Hay and from the British Ambassador to the Foreign Minister, Lord Lansdowne. Then follows the text of the treaty which has been entered into, and then the following communication :

London, January 6, 1903.

Secretary of State for the Colonies to Lord Minto.

Alaska—shall be glad to have as soon as possible views of your minsters on draft boundary treaty which was inclosed in Sir Michael Herbert's despatch No. 347 of the 19th December.

(Sgd.) S. of S.

To which the Governor General sent the following reply :

Ottawa, January 10, 1903.

Sir Michael Herbert,

Referring to your last proposed Alaska boundary treaty, a draft of which was submitted to me, my ministers are satisfied with the questions to be submitted to the tribunal, but they still have the same objection to the composition of the proposed tribunal, and before assenting to it, they would hope that another effort should be made to have the questions to be adjudicated upon submitted either to a board of arbitrators composed in part of independent jurists, not subjects of either state, as proposed in my despatch to Mr. Chamberlain of November, 1901, or to the Hague tribunal.

(Sgd.) MINTO.

I submit that is not an answer which this government should have returned. Nearly four years before, the right hon. First Minister had told the people of this country that the attitude which had been taken by the government before the Joint High Commission would be persevered in by this government to the end, and would not be departed from. It was the duty of the Prime Minister to have sumitted that treaty to parliament in pursuance of the pledge he had given. On the 12th of January, 1903, when parliament might have been expected to meet at an early date, why was it that the Prime Minister entered into a treaty of that kind without the consent of parliament, and without a provision for ratification by parliament ? Did not the right hon. gentleman state over and over again in 1899, that his attitude before the Joint High Commission would be persevered in to the end? Why did he depart from that course, especially when he had before him the statement of Sir Charles Tupper, then leader of the opposition, that as to this question there would be no two parties in Canada, and that the opposition would stand by the government in asserting the rights of Canada just as strongly as would their own supporters ? In spite of his own promise and in face of a united parliament, the Prime Minister, within a few weeks of the meeting of parliament, went back on his pledge and agreed that the question should be referred to this tribunal Let me further ask : why did the government, in respect to a treaty concerning the territorial interests of Canada agree that that treaty should not be subject to ratification by the Canadian parliament ? When the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald negotiated the Washington treaty in 1871, he insisted that it should be subject to ratification by the parliament of Canada, so that it might be considered in all its aspects by the Canadian people through their representatives, and be affirmed or not affirmed, as they saw fit. But this government after giving a direct pledge to the people of Canada to the contrary, turned around deliberately, abandoned their position and entered into a treaty which was not subject to ratification by parliament. This was Canadian territory ; it was territory in which the people of Canada were peculiarly interested, and yet the Premier of Canada, in response to a request from the Colonial Secretary and the British ambassador, put Canada's interests to one side and announced that his government was quite content to enter into this arrangement. There is a despatch here from the Secretary of State for the colonies, dated the 12th of January, 1903, in which he says :

Sir Michael Herbert advocates strongly three judges of the United States Supreme Court, with the Lord Chief Justice of England, the Chief Justice of Canada and the Judicial High Court of Great Britain on the one side as forming a tribunal which would command the highest confidence of all concerned.

On the 18th of January, the British ambassador telegraphed to His Excellency the Governor General as follows :

I have despatched the following to-day to the foreign office :—

Re Alaska boundary.

Secretary of State has again asked me for an answer to-day on the ground that present moment they might not be favourable.

I think there must be some mistake in the wording of this despatch, because the language does not seem intelligible. However, I will read it as it is :

Secretary of State has again asked me for an answer to-day on the ground that present moment they might not be favourable for ratification of treaty and if the question is further postponed senators' attitude may change.

I think there must be a clerical error here.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend is quite right. That was a cipher despatch, and it was presumed that it should read :

On the ground that present moment might not be unfavourable.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That makes it perfectly plain. Then, on the 19th of January, 1903, the British ambassador sent the following despatch to His Excellency :

Alaska Treaty ; Canadian reply.

Following sent to foreign office to-day. I am informed by Hay to-day that the Canadian government were satisfied as to terms of reference, but they objected to composition of tribunal and hoped that the United States government would agree to have the questions to be adjudicated upon submitted either to foreign arbitration or to the Hague tribunal. At the same time I pointed out that the Hague tribunal was especially intended to settle disputes regarding interpretation of treaties. Mr. Hay said in reply, that in view of the alterations he had made in regard to terms of reference he had hoped for the spontaneous acceptance of the treaty, and he regretted that the Canadian government still objected to the tribunal's composition. He could only repeat that he had often said before that the form of arbitration proposed was the only one acceptable to the President, and that a treaty involving submission of questions to foreign arbitration or to Hague tribunal would stand no chance of ratification by the United States senate.

Even if that were so, I do not exactly see what this country was supposed to gain from a reference such as that which the United States proposed. Was there any reasonable cause why this question should not have been disposed of under the same terms and upon the same basis as those upon which an exactly similar question with regard to the boundary between Venezuela and the British possessions in South America was disposed of. There was the question of possession in both cases ; the questions were of the same nature ; we were ready to adopt the same rule that was adopted with regard to Venezuela, and we were prepared to abide by it. But when we knew the attitude of the United States, and especially at a later stage, when we knew the gentlemen who were appointed as commissioners by the United States, what was there for us to hope or expect from the only tribunal to which they would agree ? As I stated in the debate on the address during the present session, the very best we could possibly hope from a tribunal of that kind was that it would be evenly divided in opinion, and would accomplish nothing. Was a tribunal of that kind one before which we should consent to appear ? Was it worth while for us to spend $300,000 or $400,000 for the purpose of presenting our case before such a tribunal, when we knew that the very best we could expect would be an even division of opinion ? The time for this government to have withdrawn was in the month of January last when they could very well have explained to the Imperial government that the Prime Minister of Canada had given his pledge to the people of Canada in parliament that he would not withdraw from the attitude which he had taken before the Joint High Commission, and when he could have further told the government of the mother country that in taking that attitude he had the support of both political parties in Canada, and that the people of Canada were united on that point. If my right hon. friend had then taken that position with firmness, if he had said that we must have an arrangement on the same basis as that upon which the Venezuelan boundary was delimited, or that we must have a treaty subject to ratification by the parliament of Canada, I have not the slightest doubt that the result must have been that this treaty would have been in a different form, or at least that it would have been made subject to ratification by the parliament of Canada.

In a despatch of the 19th of January, 1903, from the Colonial Secretary to His Excellency the Governor General, I find the following :

Referring to Sir Michael Herbert's telegram stating that the United States government is unable to agree to modification of tribunal, I trust that your responsible advisers will now agree to his being instructed to sign the draft treaty. Please reply by telegram as soon as possible.

Then follows the word 'secret' :

Should be glad to give an early answer to my telegram of 12th January as to British Ambassador Washington's proposal that Chief Justice of England, Chief Justice of Canada and Judicial High Court of Appeal of Great Britain, should be appointed as British members of the tribunal.

Next comes a despatch from the Colonial Office to Lord Minto, on the 20th of January, 1903, as follows —

Re British ambassador at Washington's cable stating that Mr. Hay would prefer London as place of meeting. I should be glad to receive early expression of your ministers' views as to this.

Then follows a despatch from Lord Minto to the Secretary of State for the Colonies of date the 21st of January, 1903, which is as follows :

My ministers, whilst still regretting that proposed tribunal will not be constituted so as to insure cerainty of a final decision being reached on the reference being satisfied with the terms of that reference will agree to accept treaty as contained in the draft submitted to them.

A complete and absolute withdrawal from the position laid down before the Joint High Commission, a position which, according to my right hon. friend's declaration at that time, was to be persevered in to the end, no matter what might come. Then the despatch proceeds as follows :

With regard to composition of tribunal my ministers are of opinion that it is premature to adopt any final arrangement ; it is sufficient now to have it clearly understood that members of the court to be appointed by His Majesty shall be jurists of repute and British subjects.

They will be quite satisfied if London is selected for sittings of the court.

On the 18th of February the Secretary of State for the Colonies addressed to Lord Minto the following despatch :

H.M.S. Ambassador, Washington, cables President will appoint Mr. Root, Secretary of State for War, and Senators Lodge and Turner as American members of commission Alaskan boundary. Should be glad to have views of your ministers as to British commission.

In the earlier part of the session I brought to the attention of the House—and I will not repeat them—certain views which had been expressed by these gentlemen with regard to the question with which they were to deal in a judicial capacity, and I think it was recognized in this House beyond doubt, if we could believe the statements of reputable journals in the United States, that two of these gentlemen at least, and perhaps three of them, had expressed the most firm and unalterable views respecting this boundary ; and it is needless to say that the views then expressed are in absolute consonance with the decision that has been reached by the tribunal of which they are members. On the 21st of February, Lord Minto addressed to the Colonial Office the following despatch :

Supplementing my last despatch, my ministers call attention to the fact that they agreed to a court of six members on the stipulation conveyed in the treaty that members of said court would be impartial jurists, and in the hope that judges of the highest courts in the United States would be appointed as American commissioners, my ministers also agreeing that British commissioners should be judges of the highest standing.

My ministers most strongly represent that this consideration having been material in causing their assent to the treaty, should be made good. Otherwise the ground upon which they based their assent would be changed and it is feared whole situation would require to be reconsidered.

My ministers would be ready to implement their part of the understanding as to the composition of British side of the commission, but do not think it advisable to submit their views until question raised about American commission is satisfactorily disposed of.

Then follows a long despatch of the 27th of February from the Colonial Secretary, the important part of which is as follows :

His Majesty's government have therefore to choose between breaking off negotiations altogether or accepting American nominations and appointing as their colleagues representatives who will meet the altered circumstances of the case. They would regard the first alternative as a grave misfortune to the interests of Canada and would prefer that the inquiry should proceed, in confident hope that Canadian or British interests would not be prejudiced thereby as, even in the event of failure, much important information upon controverted points would be collected, and placed before the public, and reasonable settlement at some future time thereby facilitated.

I am sorry to say that the somewhat optimistic view which the Secretary of State for the Colonies took has not been realized ; but it may be due to the fact that the very plain suggestion which was made in his despatch was not accepted by the government of this country. I have not the slightest doubt, in view of the language used in this despatch by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, that if this government had insisted upon appointing three Canadians upon that commission, their demand would have been complied with ; and could any one complain if three Canadians had been appointed—men who knew how important this question was to this country, and who realized how strongly the people of this country felt with regard to their rights in that connection ? There cannot be the slightest doubt that if the government of this country had taken that course, their suggestion would have been accepted by the government of the mother country, and we might at least have had a better condition of affairs than that which confronts us to-day, when we have practically lost everything we claimed.

On the 6th of March, 1903, this government addressed a despatch to the Imperial government, which, as it is an important despatch, I had better read in full. Before reading it, let me say in passing that in the debate on the Address on the 13th of March, of the present year, not knowing then that this despatch had passed, I suggested, as strongly as I thought it wise to do, that this government should carefully consider the question whether commissioners for Great Britain should be appointed at all under that treaty. It is true, the negotiations had progressed to a certain extent at that time ; I believe ratifications had been exchanged ; but a treaty of that kind could not result in anything, the tribunal could not be constituted, unless commissioners were appointed on behalf of Great Britain ; and, having regard to the character of the appointments made by the American government to this tribunal, I do not think that any reasonable complaint would have been made by the American government if the government of Great Britain had seen fit to stay its hand until the American government should reconsider those appointments, and should place upon that tribunal gentlemen who were in every sense of the word impartial jurists of repute, as called for by the terms of this treaty. I am not speaking of the ability of these gen-

tlemen as jurists ; I am only speaking of the fact that two of them at least, and I believe three, had publicly expressed opinions, which it seemed to me rendered impossible their consideration of this question in a very judicial frame of mind. Well, this despatch of the 6th of March, 1903, is as follows :

Referring to your despatch of February 27, my ministers regard the situation with much anxiety. They desire to emphasize the fact that their assent to a treaty which provided for the creation of a tribunal so composed as not to insure finality, was obtained on the stipulation in the treaty that the members of the court would be impartial jurists of repute.

There are here, in the document from which I am quoting, certain asterisks, which indicate that a portion of this despatch has not yet been brought down. It may be brought down at a little later date, as I gather from my hon. friend. The despatch as brought down then proceeds as follows :

Their doubts as to the effectiveness of the contemplated arrangement as a means of settlement were in some degree modified by the assurance that the members of the tribunal would approach the subject with unbiassed minds and that a judicial interpretation of the treaty of 1825 would be obtained. The appointment to the tribunal by the United States government of gentlemen who are not judges and whose known views leave no room for exceptation of a judicial consideration of the question, changes the whole situation. If the whole question were now open to be dealt with entirely from the point of view of Canadian interests, my ministers would hesitate to advise any further participation in proceedings.

Then follow asterisks, indicating that a further portion of the despatch as brought down has been omitted.

My ministers have observed from the public press and have also been officially informed that while the matter is still under their consideration, the treaty has been confirmed by His Majesty's government and an exchange of ratifications has already taken place at Washington. It is presumed that this fact precludes further discussion and my ministers will therefore proceed to do whatever is necessary on their part to make good the engagements of His Majesty's government, but they must reserve the right to submit to the Canadian parliament the whole correspondence or such statement of the case as will fully explain the whole matter, and especially the manner in which the assent of Canada was obtained.

My ministers do not agree with the suggestion that the altered circumstances justify a departure on the British side from the disposition previously manifested respecting the composition of the tribunal. If members of the tribunal are to be appointed by His Majesty's government, my ministers are of opinion that only judges of the higher courts, who in the best sense of the words would be impartial jurists of repute, should be chosen.

My right hon. friend and his government perhaps were rather magnanimous in that. I think I expressed the view myself that if we appointed members to that tribunal we should at least appoint persons who had not expressed any opinion on the subject and who were jurists of repute, but I do not remember that we were confined to the judges and I believe that we could have found impartial jurists of repute in Canada whether judges or not, who certainly would have fulfilled that definition very much more completely than the three gentlemen who were appointed by the United States.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What about the two who were appointed ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I hope that my hon. friend does not suppose that I am reflecting on the gentlemen who were appointed. If he had followed my remarks closely he would have seen that my point is that Canada should have appointed three instead of two of the jurists. I am not making any comment on the selection of the gentlemen appointed; it would hardly be becoming of me to do so, even if I entertained any doubts. I have never expressed any such views and I have nothing to suggest on the line my hon. friend has just now mentioned. I am only contending that if the government of this country had suggested three Canadians instead of two—and three Canadians, impartial jurists of repute, could easily have been found—I think the imperial government would have accepted them, and I think we would have been absolutely justified in taking that course.

The next despatch, on the 7th of March, to Lord Minto from the Secretary of the Colonies, declares that the ratifications of the Alaskan Boundary Treaty were exchanged on the third instant, and it goes on to say :

Time for the preparation of the case, article No. 2, has consequently begun to run against us and it is important that composition of British half of court, also appointment of British agent should be settled without delay.

Hope, therefore, your responsible advisers will favour us with their views on these appointments as early as possible.

To this despatch of the Colonial Secretary Lord Minto replied on the 2nd of March :

In view of the short time given for preparation of the case, my ministers desire to proceed immediately, and therefore suggest an early settlement of preliminaries.

As to the composition of tribunal, my ministers suggest Chief Justice of England and two Canadian judges, names to be telegraphed hereafter.

As to counsel, my ministers desire that Mr. Edward Blake, K.C., London, and Mr. Christopher Robinson, K.C., Toronto, be of counsel to uphold the British contention, and a junior counsel.

Under that clause of the treaty which provides for the appointment of an agent to represent each party before the tribunal, my ministers desire that Mr. Clifford Sifton, Canadian Minister of the Interior, be appointed to fill such position.

On the 17th of March Lord Minto telegraphed :

In addition to Chief Justice of England, my ministers propose Sir Louis Jetté, a retired judge of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec and now Lieutenant Governor of Quebec, and Justice Armour of the Supreme Court of Canada, as members of the court of impartial jurists under treaty for settlement of boundary of Alaska.

That closes the correspondence as brought down. Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this government have not properly protected the interests of the country in the matter to which I have referred and which I will briefly summarize. In the first place, having declared their determination before the meeting of the Joint High Commission that this question would not be referred, on the part of Canada, to a tribunal the decision of which could not result in any settlement in favour of Canada and from which we could hope only a division of opinion, the government departed from that position without the consent of parliament or notice to parliament, and in doing so did not adequately protect the interests of Canada. I repeat that I cannot understand the reason which induced my right hon. friend, after he had given that pledge to the people of this country and to parliament, to consent to a treaty which was absolutely different from that arbitration which he insisted upon before the meeting of the Joint High Commission. What were the reasons that actuated my right hon. friend in taking that course, especially without notice to parliament, and in entering into a treaty dealing solely with Canadian interests without making that treaty subject to ratification by the parliament of Canada. By what right did this government, after pledging itself to parliament that a certain attitude would be maintained, depart altogether from that attitude to which they were thus solemnly pledged, and which they had adopted in the first instance and consistently maintained with the assent of the British government before the Joint High Commission ? Lord Herschell, representing the imperial government, had resolutely taken this position, and he never wavered from it.

In the second place, for what reason did this government take the attitude that this country had no direct interest in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and had no right to be heard in regard to the variation of that treaty ? Where is there a line of protest on that subject addressed by this government to the mother country? How comes it that without protest from this country the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty has been abrogated without any settlement of the Alaska boundary being coupled with it. How is it that my right hon. friend took the position that Canada was not interested in this treaty and that this government and the imperial government as well, departed from the position so distinctly laid down in the despatch of Lord Landsdowne to the British Ambassador at Washington when the United States was pressing on the British government the necessity for some modification in that treaty ? I could understand the reasons which might induce the British government to seek to depart from the position it then took, but I cannot conceive any possible reason which would lead the government of my right hon. friend to depart from that position and to assume the position which the right hon. gentleman assumed in this House in the debate of last year. My right hon. friend then earnestly argued that there was no connection between the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty amendment and the settlement of the Alaska boundary question; that it was quite a proper course for the imperial government to yield to the demands of the United States in the one case without insisting upon an equitable mode of settling the dispute which had arisen in the other case.

For the unfortunate result which this country has now to face, the government of my right hon. friend is responsible. My right hon. friend is responsible himself, because if on the occasion I have mentioned the proper attitude had been firmly taken we would at least be in no worse position to-day than we were before ; we would at least have had this matter open and we would not have been confronted with the absolute loss of practically everything for which Canada contended in this case. If the people of this country had been consulted in their parliament, if this treaty had been discussed by the representatives of the people in this parliament and if Canadians alone had been appointed on this tribunal, I believe that the feeling which has been engendered would have been very greatly minimized even in the case of the loss of our rights; and in questions of this kind, which touch the pride of the people, it is always desirable that if we are to lose, we shall lose in such a way that the people will feel that they have been consulted in the matter and that everything has been done to protect their rights which possibly could have been done by the government of this country. It does not seem to me that the situation will present itself to the people of this country in that way. I regret once more that, behind the back of parliament these proceedings were taken; that, without any consultation whatever with parliament my right hon. friend has seen fit to adopt a course, for which the government are absolutely responsible, and which has resulted so unfortunately for the best interests of Canada.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) and myself, however much we may disagree as to certain phases of this question, agree in this—that the time has

not come to discuss the award which has been rendered in this matter. My hon. friend stated in his opening remarks that it was not advisable at this time—nor have we the information which would enable us —to comment upon the decision which has been given. But later on in his remarks my hon. friend stated that Canada would have probably have had more justice if three Canadians had been appointed commissioners, rather than two Canadians and the Chief Justice of England. Perhaps my hon. friend is right; and, perhaps, in selecting the Chief Justice of England, as a jurist of repute, to pass upon these questions pending between the Canadian government and people and the British Crown on the one side, and the United States on the other side, we made a mistake—perhaps we should not have confided our interest to the highest expert in England. But, up to the present time, I fail to accept this view. I do not come to such an opinion as that yet, and I do not think we are in a position to maintain against the Chief Justice such harsh language as that which my hon. friend has just uttered.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I hope the hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will acquit me of using any harsh language towards the Chief Justice. I said that, subject to the consideration of the official reasons which might modify my views, I could not at present imagine any reason for the course of the boundary around these islands. And if my right hon. friend can comprehend it, I shall be glad to hear his explanation.

The PRIME MINISTER. But my hon. friend said also that we had made a mistake in not securing the appointment of three Canadians on this tribunal; that we should have done better, that we should have had more justice, in that case, than we have had by the appointment of the Chief Justice of England. It is rather harsh to suggest that the Chief Justice of England has not treated us as justly as a Canadian would have done.

Mr. GOURLEY. Does not the right hon. gentleman's language seem harsh with respect to the two Canadians who decided differently from the Chief Justice?

The PRIME MINISTER. I pass no opinion upon the decision of any, but I say there is an implication in the language of my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax), when he says that, in agreeing to the appointment of the Chief Justice of England, we made a mistake—when he says that three Canadians would have done justice where two Canadians and the Chief Justice of England have not done justice. I say that there is in that an implication against the Chief Justice of England. It is harsh language to use toward that gentleman, and I refuse to accept that criticism until we have before us the reasoned opinion of the Chief Justice, so that we may know whether he is right or wrong. Much as I regret the decision, much as I am surprised at it, I will not pass criticism of that kind, nor suppose that the Chief Justice of England has given an opinion which would not have been given by a Canadian had that Canadian been in his place.

I have said that I did not rise to express an opinion as to the value of the award. In my opinion, our case on the Lynn canal was not so weak as my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) seems to think it, nor do I believe it to be as strong as has been represented by some hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House. So far as the Lynn canal is concerned, it seemed to me there was a case which was contentious, a case on which a good deal could be said on one side and a good deal on the other side. In reading the case, as it proceeded before the commission, I came to the conclusion that we had the best of the argument. Perhaps in that I was biassed; perhaps I was taking a view which was not absolutely justified; still, that was the opinion I formed. However, I never was free from doubt as to the strength of our case. I always admitted, in my own mind, that there was an argument to be made on the other side; and, perhaps, our case was such a one as all lawyers have sometimes had experience of—when, going into court, they know that they may expect a decision on either side. But on the Portland canal, it seemed to me we had not only a strong case, but one beyond doubt, one in which there was no argument on the other side. Therefore, it is with surprise, with wonder, with astonishment, I find that the award, instead of giving us the whole of our contention, which seemed clear beyond all doubt, takes from us two islands which belong to us. These islands, I believe, do not in themselves amount to much—they are simply rocks. But they have great importance from the position in which they are. It is a great blow to Canadian interests, as I see them, that we are to lose those islands. But this is not the time to discuss that question. I would advise people to be calm and quiet until we have the whole case before us, so that we, every one, can apply his judgment to the merits of the decision that has been rendered.

Nor is this the point dwelt upon by my hon. friend. The position he takes to-day is that we made a mistake in agreeing to refer this question to the tribunal which has settled it. I differ from him, and I think I can make good the position the government took in this matter. The hon. gentleman referred to the position I took in this House more than once, that we would not depart from the position insisted upon before the Anglo-American Commission at Washington with regard to the terms of reference, if they were to involve any surrender of territory. But what I want my hon. friend to agree to now is this—that he has failed to see the difference between this treaty and

the treaty concerning the Venezuela arbitration case. That which the British side wanted to have was a reference on the lines of the Venezuela treaty. This treaty involved a possible surrender of territory. It was agreed between Venezuela and Great Britain that if the territory of one was found in possession of the other, the territory could be given to the party in whose possession it was, under terms of compensation. For instance, it was agreed that possession for fifty years was to constitute a title. Under such circumstances, there was to be compensation for the territory that had been taken possession of. We wished to have a similar provision in this treaty, and to provide that if the territory of one country was found to be in the possession of the other, the arbitrators would be at liberty to leave that territory in the hands that held it, subject to such compensation as might be found equitable. But this was not adopted. What would have been the consequence if it had been adopted ? Suppose that the town of Skagway had been found to be in British territory. That town is now in the possession of the Americans. It would have been in the power of the commissioners to allow this territory to remain in the hands of the Americans on such terms as seemed equitable to the commissioners.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That would follow a certain term of possession under the rules of the Venezuela treaty ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, the term of fifty years. But, at all events, it was to involve a surrender of territory. Under the award that has been given, Canada is to obtain two islands, Pearse and Wales, which have been in possession of the Americans against our protest. Under the Venezuela treaty it would have been in the power of the commissioners to allow these islands to remain in possession of the Americans under such conditions as they deemed equitable. But the present treaty provided a different rule altogether ; the present treaty provided on the one side and on the other that there should be no surrender of territory—and this is the mistake which has been made by my hon. friend. I would advise him to look again at the terms of the treaty, article I. of which enacts as follows :

> A tribunal shall be immediately appointed to consider and decide the questions set forth in article 4 of this convention. The tribunal shall consist of six impartial jurists of repute who shall consider judicially the questions submitted to them, each of whom shall first subscribe an oath that he will impartially consider the arguments and evidence presented to the tribunal.

It was therefore a treaty which involved no surrender of territory. All that was referred to them was the duty of judicially interpreting the terms of the treaty. They were to sit as a court to determine, not what one party was entitled to and what the other party was entitled to—because under no circumstances could there be any surrender of territory by one side or the other—but to determine the meaning of the treaty. Under these circumstances, there was no necessity of referring such a treaty to parliament. If there had been any surrender of territory involved, it would have been not only important but essential that the treaty should have been referred to parliament, because parliament alone can dispose of territory. Even under a treaty of arbitration which involves the surrender of territory, parliament alone can give its sanction to such treaty. But the only thing that was provided for in this case was merely the creation of a court to determine judicially what was the boundary of Alaska by the treaty of 1885.

So far, therefore, our position is very different from what it was in 1899. What were we to do ? I have often regretted, Mr. Speaker, and never more than on the present occasion, that we are living beside a great neighbour who, I believe I can say without being deemed unfriendly to them, are very grasping in their national acts, and who are determined upon every occasion to get the best in any agreement which they make. I have often regretted also that while they are a great and powerful nation, we are only a small colony, a growing colony, but still a colony. I have often regretted also that we have not in our own hands the treaty-making power, which would enable us to dispose of our own affairs. But in this matter we were dealing with a position that was forced upon us—we have not the treaty-making power. I am sorry to say that the whole correspondence which we have had upon this question since 1899 has not yet been placed before parliament; I am sorry not only that we have not the treaty-making power, but that we are not in such an independent position that it is in my power to place before parliament the whole of the correspondence as it passed between the Canadian government and the British government. But we shall have that correspondence, and it will be placed before parliament at the next session—the whole of it, no matter what protest may come from abroad, we shall have the whole of it, and then this country may know exactly what has taken place, and what share of responsibility must rest upon each of the parties concerned in this matter. But we have no such power, our hands are tied to a large extent owing to the fact of our connection—which has its benefits, but which has also its disadvantages—the fact of our connection with the mother country making us not free agents, and obliging us to deal with questions affecting ourselves through the instrumentality of the British ambassador.

The question came before us, and what were we to do ? Were we to leave that question forever an open one ? Were we to

leave that frontier forever a bone of contention ? Were we to leave a condition of things under which it might happen, in case of a discovery of gold being made in the disputed territory, that American miners and Canadian miners would rush in and a clash might occur which would eventuate in conflict and bloodshed, and difficulties which the mind shudders to contemplate ? We had to come to some conclusion, and after long negotiations which will be seen when the whole correspondence is brought down, we did decide upon this reference. The offer was made to us of accepting this treaty which implied a judicial interpretation of the treaty of 1825, the result of which could give nothing to our opponents and could take nothing away from us, but which would simply determine what were our rights under that treaty. I think it was the duty of the Canadian government to put an end to this unfortunate condition of things to which I have referred. That is the position which we took upon the case. We wanted to have the treaty judicially interpreted. We wanted no territory from the Americans, we wanted simply that which belonged to us. That was the proposition made to us, and we decided to accept it.

Now, after we had given our assent to this treaty, after we had consented to refer the question to this tribunal, which was to be composed of six impartial jurists, we were notified that the jurists which were to be appointed by the American government were gentlemen who, with all respect be it said, could not qualify as impartial jurists. They had expressed their opinions upon this question already with a good deal of emphasis. We protested against the appointment of these gentlemen, and we asked the British authorities to convey our protest to the president of the United States, representing that gentlemen who had expressed upon the floors of Congress opinions upon this question, could not come within the term 'impartial jurists,' such as were contemplated by the treaty. And, Sir, what took place ? Before our protest had been taken into consideration the treaty was ratified by the British authorities. Then another difficulty arose. What were we to do under those circumstances, the treaty having already been ratified ? His Majesty had given his assent to it, His Majesty, who is the only person in the British empire who has a right to sanction a treaty. Under such circumstances what were we to do ? I want to know what our friends on the other side would have done. I ask my hon. friend the leader of the opposition what would have been their conduct on that occasion. What would have been the consequences if we had declined to give our assent ? The consequences probably would have been that the American authorities would have planted the American flag upon the disputed territory, and we would have been obliged either to retire with disgrace, or to go to war to preserve our rights. That would have been the consequences. Therefore, we said : No, we will do the best we can in the condition of things in which we find ourselves. We confided our rights to the judgment of men who, we believed, were able to defend them before the tribunal. We thought that we could entrust our case to a commission of impartial jurists, who would judicially interpret that treaty. The proposition was made to us that the British government should appoint the Lord Chief Justice of England, Lord Alverstone, to represent the British side. Well, Sir, according to my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) I made a mistake. I confess that when it was proposed to us that we should have at the head of that commission the Lord Chief Justice of England, I thought that in the hands of a gentleman of his distinction our interests would be secure. My hon. friend suggests that I made a mistake, that we should have insisted upon the appointment of three Canadians instead of two ; he suggests that Canadian interests would have been more secure in the hands of three Canadians than in the hands of the Lord Chief Justice of England, associated with two Canadians. Now, Sir, this means, if it means anything, that the Lord Chief Justice of England, who was charged with the judicial interpretation of that treaty, did not judicially interpret it, but allowed itself to be biassed by influences which it is a shame to mention or to suppose. If it means anything, it means that if the Lord Chief Justice of England could have judicially interpreted the terms of the treaty and apportioned the rights of the parties according to law and justice, then a Canadian would have gone against his conscience and reached a different conclusion.

Sir, I refuse to accept that proposition. But I believe, that, in submitting our rights to the Lord Chief Justice of England, we had every reason to suppose that our interests would be as safe as they could be in the hands of anybody, and that the government of Canada made no mistake in that respect. I would not be disposed to believe it at this moment. I shall wait until we have the reasoned opinion of the Lord Chief Justice of England. But, that is not the proposition ; that is not the remedy. It is not because we accepted one form of commission or another. I shall show a little later on where the remedy is. My hon. friend also made it a matter of reproach that we had accepted a tribunal of six instead of a tribunal of seven or of any odd number. It is true that we objected again and again to a tribunal composed of six members, but for what reason—not that there would not be as much justice in six as in seven, or nine, or five, or any other odd number, but because a tribunal consisting of six members, or of any even number, did not ensure to us that condition of finality which

we thought ought to be a condition of such a reference. If there were six commissioners there might be three on one side and three on the other side. If you had seven you would have an opportunity to have finality, but that is not an argument to show that we would have had any more security with seven than with six. Suppose there had been four commissioners opposed to us. Suppose there had been a seventh commissioner appointed by the republic of France, or by the Emperor of Germany, or by the King of Sweden, or by any other friendly power, and suppose that the seventh arbitrator had stood between Sir Louis Jetté and Mr. Aylesworth, then the tribunal would have been composed of three commissioners on the one side and four on the other, and we would have been no more advanced than we are at this moment. Therefore there is nothing in that argument. The only thing that we feared in having a tribunal composed of six members was that there should not be the condition of finality, but there is the condition of finality as the tribunal has been composed. But the difficulty is not there. The difficulty, as I conceive it to be, is that so long as Canada remains a dependency of the British Crown the present powers that we have are not sufficient for the maintenance of our rights. It is important that we should ask the British parliament for more extensive power, so that if ever we have to deal with matters of a similar nature again we shall deal with them in our own way, in our own fashion, according to the best light that we have.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). May I ask my right hon. friend a question? Did he not state, in regard to the colonial conference, during the debate on the address in the present session that the political relations were absolutely satisfactory and that no modifications of any kind were required?

The PRIME MINISTER. I stated that in so far as the relations between Canada and the empire with the view to an imperial federation or matters of a similar character were concerned, our relations were perfectly satisfactory, but I never stated that we should not have any more power in regard to our own autonomy. I stated that our relations were perfectly satisfactory, but I certainly never intimated that our powers should not be augmented in regard to treaty making. But, the hon. gentleman should remember that we have gained something if we have lost something by the treaty. It is important that we should be calm in regard to this matter. We have lost something, but we have not lost every thing. The Americans have not gained every thing they wanted. They have not gained everything they wanted on the Lynn canal, because, if they had, the boundary would not have been fixed at the summit of the White pass, but it would have been extended to Lake Bennett. Moreover, on the Portland canal we have gained two islands. We have gained those parts of our contention if we have not gained everything. Such is the condition then that we have to deal with at this moment. It is not as bad as some parties are disposed to believe it is, but at all events it will be bad enough to cause us to look to the future to see what will be the condition and to try and remedy it. If there is a thing which I regret it is that in 1898 the Yukon Bill which was passed by this House was not permitted to become law. If the Yukon Bill had become law we would not have had this question confronting us at this moment. The White Pass Railway would in all probability not have been constructed and this Yukon Railway would have been extended to the Stikeen river, and from the Stikeen river to Observatory inlet, so that at this moment we would have had connection upon Canadian territory between Observatory inlet and the waters of the Yukon. But, that was not done. However, it is no use to look back to what is past. It behooves us at an early day to see what steps should be taken to establish communication upon Canadian territory between the rest of the Dominion and the Yukon. I am not prepared to say what we should advocate. I am not prepared to say what we should recommend. But it is a question for all Canadians and they should be prepared for some sacrifice in order to establish communication between that distant part of our country and the more settled parts of Canada.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). May I ask my right hon. friend if he did not say that he accepted as absolutely satisfactory the political relations existing between Canada and the mother country? Here is what he said:

> As to the political relations which exist between Canada and the colonies generally and the mother land, they are perfectly satisfactory, they could not be improved, and any attempt which has been made with a view of improving them has only led to Utopia.

Hon. J. I. TARTE (Montreal, St. Mary's). Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the government when in 1899 the question of the Alaskan boundary was discussed before the joint high commission. A memorandum was then prepared. I hold it in my hand. It contains a statement of the different propositions that were debated then. The government of the United States declined positively to consent to an arbitration. The right hon. Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who was, of course, the leading man on the Canadian side, in Washington, suggested an arbitration. Our United States friends suggested a commission of jurists. The right hon. Prime Minister, and the government, sided with him altogether, declined to accede to such a proposal. In point of fact I am within the memory of the House when I say that the

negotiations of the joint high commission were broken off on that point. The right hon. gentleman, at the opening of parliament, informed the country that the two governments being unable to agree on the Alaskan boundary the negotiations were broken off. That was the position when I ceased to be a member of the administration. We had exhausted every posible means of coming to some understanding. The government of Canada had offered to the government of the United States to give up what we thought were our rights to the Lynn canal provided we got the harbour on the Lynn canal which is called Pyramid harbour. The memorandum which I hold in my hand contains that statement. They declined to accept that offer.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Where is it published that our government consented to give up our right to the Lynn canal ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. During the negotiations that offer was made; it is a public offer. The government of Canada offered to renounce what they thought were our rights on the Lynn canal, provided they were given a harbour at Pyramid harbour. I believe I am responsible for that offer; I believe that under the circumstances it was a good offer.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We have no evidence of that published.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I am stating the facts. The United States government declined to accept our offer.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend is all wrong there.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I am not wrong; I have the document here.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend is referring to things which took place before the negotiations, and which resulted in nothing.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Are these pourparlers published.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am not aware that they have ever been published.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I thought they had been.

Mr. BELL. It was a matter of common knowledge at the time, that the proposition was made, that Dyea should remain United States territory, but that Pyramid Harbour should be given to the Canadians as a free port, and that the United States commissioners considered it for a time, but it was rejected on account of strong opposition from the Pacific coast.

The PRIME MINISTER. It was rumored that there was a compromise suggested between the two sides.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The newspapers reported at the time that the possession of Pyramid Harbour was offered as a compromise, and that the United States refused to accept our proposal. They wanted a commission of jurists, and the Canadian government then broke off negotiations. In 1903, things took another turn. Negotiations for a reciprocity treaty were started—I do not say by this government officially—but by emissaries of this country——

The PRIME MINISTER. If my hon. friend means that we started any negotiations I dissent.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I have stated very distinctly that the government of this country did not start these negotiations but that emissaries from this country, important men from this country went to Washington——

Mr. PARMELEE. Name.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I shall. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) went to Washington and offered his good offices which were accepted, for a reunion of the Joint High Commission. The country has a right to know that at the very same time negotiations started again for the settlement of the Alaskan boundary question. Our American friends were so sure, that we were anxious for a treaty of reciprocity that they simply applied the screws. These are the facts of the case.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, they are not.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. These are the facts of the case.

The PRIME MINISTER. I say no. I say that before Sir Michael Herbert's time, negotiations for the settlement of the Alaskan boundary were going on up to the time of Lord Paunceforte's death, and Sir Michael Herbert simply took up the continuation of them.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I say that the dates coincided exactly with the records of the case as we have them in our possession now. The negotiations started for a settlement in one way or another of the Alaskan boundary question. The right hon. gentleman has made a speech to-day which many of us are able to applaud. I cheerfully approve of some of his words. He has said that we have not been treated as we should have been. He is more than right in that. But he believed that when he consented to the appointment of the chief justice of England as one of these jurists, that our case was in safe hands. I fully appreciate his position. It is rather difficult for the Prime Minister of a British colony to say that our case was not safe in the hands of the chief justice of England; but we are confronted with the fact that the two agents appointed by the Prime Minister, men of high standing, Sir Louis Jetté and Mr. Aylesworth ; they have stated over their own signatures—with the consent and knowledge of the government

of Canada I suppose—that the Chief Justice of England has not decided on judicial grounds. We are not making that statement here; it has been made in England over the signatures of the authorized agents of the Canadian government, and it has been circulated broadcast all over the world. Now, if the chief justice of England has not decided on judicial grounds, he has decided on some other grounds. The right hon. gentleman says that we have not ceded any territory. Permit me to ask him not to play on words. The contention of the Canadian government was that the boundary was to be thirty miles above the mouth of the Lynn canal, and they claimed the possession and ownership of the upper waters. But according to the decision of the tribunal, not only have we not the upper waters of the Lynn canal, but the frontier is thirty-five miles from the shore of these upper waters. If we are not losing and ceding territory by that, I do not know what we are doing. We are losing and ceding thirty-five miles, not of water, but of Canadian territory which we claimed to be ours. It has been said, and I believed it up to a few days ago, that this commission of jurists was not to decide finally. On that point the Prime Minister has not made himself clear. He stated at the opening of the session that the commission would not give any final judgment, but we are confronted to-day with the fact that the judgment is final. Our case is lost, the sentence is given, and it cannot be annulled. The right hon. gentleman also said that we have not enough power in these matters. Will he permit me to ask him what the consequences would have been, if when he found that the American government were in bad faith—because they were in bad faith—he and his colleagues had said: We will not be a party to that commission?

My right hon. friend says we have not sufficient powers. If instead of appointing commissioners, under the circumstances that have been known to us, the government of Canada had taken a firm stand and had simply said to the government of England: We cannot possibly do anything, at any rate before meeting parliament, I believe they would have occupied safe ground. It was a new condition of affairs, which nobody suspected would exist. There was not a member of parliament, not a minister of the Crown, who a year ago would have believed we could have been treated as we have been. It was inconceivable that the British ambassador at Washington could have signed a treaty in which we were after all the only parties interested, without waiting for the answer of the Canadian government; and, in my humble opinion, instead of saying to-day, when our case is lost, that our powers are not sufficient, the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues should have taken a firmer stand then, and should have told the English government: We cannot possibly take part in proceedings of that character. The Canadian people, and the British people themselves, would have applauded such a course. Of course, the Yukon, when it is looked at in the large map of the world in the Foreign Office or in the Colonial Office, in London, may not look very big. The English statesmen have to deal with large problems; they deal with the affairs of the world; and they are naturally anxious to remain at peace with all the friendly nations, perhaps especially with the United States. We all share in the desire to have peace with our neighbours; but we have lost a great deal in our desire for peace—for commercial peace, for peace of all kinds. When the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was denounced, for the sake of peace we did not say a word; we simply bowed our heads. A few weeks ago when Mr. Chamberlain started his campaign for preferential treatment with the colonies, some of the most important newspapers in the United States threatened us with the withdrawal of the bonding privilege if England would dare to give a preference to Canada. That is going a little too far. I beg to assure my right hon. friend that in the remarks I am making now, I am animated by no other desire than to make our position clear. I understand his position; it is a difficult one. I do not feel inclined to blame him too much. I know that he was in a tight corner. The British government were asking him to give his assent. I know it is rather difficult for a governor of a British colony under such circumstances, to say: I will not do it. But would it not have been better, in the interests of the British empire itself, if such a stand had been taken? Suppose that one of these mornings our American friends said, unless this or that is done, the bonding privilege shall be taken away from the Canadian people? The more we yield, the more we shall be asked to yield. In my humble opinion the government should have taken a firmer stand. But it is not too late, after all, to improve our position. I quite share the views of the right hon. gentleman on this point, that if we had had the railway which was not built, perhaps we might have been in a better position. The Americans would not have felt that we were dependent upon them. We can now build railways to the Yukon; but the position, commercially, will not of course be very good. If I remember well the distances, I think it would be necessary to build about 800 miles of railway through the mountains. It is a long distance. We have spent large amount of money in improving the Lewes and Yukon rivers. We are completely shut out from all those waters. Now, I do not share at all the view expressed a day or two ago by an important newspaper published in Ottawa, that we must go on our knees to the Americans, and ask them to give us back those two small islands. Let us try to find another harbour. If the government

act energetically, I believe they will get the support of men of all shades of politics. Let the government make up their minds to build the railway. Let them make up their minds once for all to be independent of the Americans, and the Canadian nation will cheer them. If I have been a little hot in my remarks, I say again that I have no desire to blame my former colleagues, but I believe they should have taken a firmer stand, and I want to impress on them the desire of the Canadian people that the firm stand that ought to have been taken in the past should be taken now.

Let me conclude these few remarks by saying that what is true in this case is true commercially. The United States have been too much led to believe that we are dependent upon them commercially. They are selling to us millions and millions of dollars worth of merchandise, and they laugh at us. They simply take you by the throat every time they have a chance to do so. If we had grappled with them long ago, as we should have done, if we had raised the wall long ago, as we should have done, they would have been dealing with us in a different way. They would have been asking for concessions from us instead of taking us by the throat. Mr. Speaker, this incident which is a calamitous one, will have, I hope, good results. The Canadian people feel badly over that award. They feel badly at the Chief Justice of England. It is a pity indeed ; but, after all, if the Chief Justice of England has not dealt judiciously with our case—and that is the statement of two men in whose honour and calmness I have great confidence, Sir Louis Jetté and Mr. Aylesworth—then, we have a right to feel sore at the Chief Justice of England, and it is our duty to say so. The right hon. gentleman has gone very far to-day, farther perhaps than any other Prime Minister has gone before. The Canadian people will not perhaps reproach him for that, because, being six millions of people, energetic people, we feel that we are quite capable of holding our own. We do not desire to attack anybody, but we feel confident that we can live and grow bigger. If we want to grow bigger, let us profit by this lession. Let us make ourselves independent of our American friends. Let us equip our harbours in winter and summer, so as not to be afraid of the bonding privilege being taken away from us. Let us do it now. Let us arrange our tariff in such a way that they will understand that we can dispense with their markets. We are not selling much to them. They are simply selling to us things which we can buy elsewhere. Let us make ourselves independent of them in every possible way, and let us see that our influence is felt in England. The affairs of England are conducted in the ordinary way of business. I am not sure that my hon. friends on the treasury benches have done everything that might have been done in that respect. I say again it is not conceivable that the British ambassador at Washington would have dared to sign a treaty dealing with the interests of Canada without even waiting for the answer of the Canadian government. On that point the right hon. gentleman has not given the country the explanations that I believe we had a right to expect. He tells us that there is some correspondence which has not been yet published. Ministers of the Crown are, of course, not free to publish all the correspondence that passes under their eyes, but the country will feel more anxious than ever to see the papers that have not as yet been published.

Mr. SEYMOUR E. GOURLEY (Colchester). I have listened with much pleasure to the debate in many of its phases. I stand perhaps on a little different ground from a great many people in this House. I am an imperialist ; I love the British empire and I hope that Canada and all the colonies will remain together for ever. I therefore think that I am in a little different position from the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) and I think he should not have interfered in this family quarrel. This is a family quarrel, and I will admit a Frenchman or a Dutchman or any other man who is loyal to this empire to interfere in this family quarrel. He himself is very civil and kindly, but while I have been in this House he has impressed me with the idea—it may be untrue and if it is I will be glad to retract it—that he does not stand for the empire, but that his ambition is that Canada shall be torn away from this empire and form a little insignificant community by itself. I am expressing my sentiments and I will express them everywhere ; if there were ten million people before me I would express my opinion. I speak with deference, but I do not think that in a matter of this kind the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) should intrude his opinions.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He is not a member of the family.

Mr. GOURLEY. He is but he has taken such a course with reference to the affairs of Canada that he ought not to intrude in this debate. I want to compliment the leader of the opposition on his speech. I think he has taken a strong, a patriotic and a national stand upon this question. I have often in this House attacked the imperial government. I did not attack the imperial government with a view to undermining that government, with a view of bringing about the separation of Canada and the other colonies from the empire, but because I believed in a household where brothers and sisters are growing up if they want a wholesome opinion they should at times sit down and criticise each other in order that the household may stand together before the world for weal or woe. Therefore when I

have attacked the policy of the British government it has not been to undermine British sentiment in this country, but to call the attention of the British public to the fact that they must change their policy in order to make it world-wide and sufficient to meet the new conditions that are growing up in this empire. The hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Macpherson) says that he should intrude in this debate because the territory in dispute touches his constituency. I want to tell him that this territory touches my constituency; it touches the constituency of every man in Canada as much as the constituency of the gentleman who happens to locally represent it. It is Canadian territory, it is British territory and every man who owes allegiance to the flag is as much interested in that territory as the man who lives on its soil. I understand the doctrine of the hon. member for Labelle to be that Canada must not fight or serve the empire unless Canada is attacked. I say that Canada must serve the empire and stand for the empire if India or Australia is attacked, with the same energy and force as if Ottawa were attacked, and therefore I want the hon. member for Burrard to take a little broader view of this question than that it affects his constituency. I say that this affects deeply the interests of Canada and of the empire. It is the most vital question that has been settled in Canada for two centuries. We lost an enormous amount of territory in Maine and we know the difficulties which that loss has brought to Canada. Now on the Pacific coast we have lost 500 miles of the coast line of this country. Canada is only commencing her national career and already we are about to fling a line up to Port Simpson on the southern extremity of this territory which we have lost. But when we want to fling a railway line two hundred or three hundred miles further north to develop this country we find that we are shut out from the sea-coast for 500 miles of our coast line. Canada is a commercial and a maritime country and no misfortune ever fell upon the country of a more grave character than that which has fallen upon the people of Canada. Some people think it is bad enough to lose these islands, but what is that to losing 500 miles of the coast of your country which shuts you in?

The hon. gentleman talks about a railway. A railway will help us out of our difficulty to some extent, but it can never help us in our trade upon the ocean. When the Pacific ocean is exploited, as it soon will be, and bears to Canada, perhaps more trade than the Atlantic, we shall be shut out from that ocean for 400 miles of the most important part of our coast because to-day trade is going north and therefore the United States commands the strategical point in regard to Canadian trade on the Pacific. I do not wish the disaster that has happened to Canada to be minimized because it is a disaster which will grow in importance day by day; but in every misfortune there is some silver lining to the cloud. I see some idle papers in the United States are talking about this disaster which has happened to Canada creating in this country a feeling in favour of the United States. Thank God it will create a bitter feeling towards the United States. Thank heaven that from this moment no man who is a Canadian will cherish anything but the most fearful dislike to the people who have wronged us out of our territory; thank heaven the idea of trade relations with the United States, thank heaven the idea of reciprocity will be killed in the minds of every Canadian. I say unhesitatingly, and I know the question from top to bottom, that we have been wronged out of this territory, wronged absolutely wronged out of this territory. I believe that in my heart and therefore I see amid the difficulties that surround us, one good thing—that there will grow up in the hearts of the people of Canada a determination to have nothing to do with these people who have wronged us for one hundred years out of territory that justly belonged to this country and therefore I see in this award the destruction of all idea of a reciprocity treaty. I hope that now we will build up a tariff wall against these people and let them know we are Canadians.

Mr. BELCOURT. I am afraid that is the mercantile argument.

Mr. GOURLEY. I hope this disaster will bring us this compensation; that is the only hope there is in the situation. Now, I want to deal with one or two of the difficulties raised by the Prime Minister. I think it is unfortunate that the Prime Minister has started the doctrine he has to-day in the interests of Canada. I would not mind the hon. member for Labelle starting this doctrine, but I think it is unfortunate that it should have been started by the Prime Minister of Canada. He endeavours to show that our difficulties have arisen because of our not having the treaty-making power. I want to tell the right hon. gentleman that this correspondence which I have under my hand shows that Canada has had the treaty-making power in relation to this matter just as fully as the imperial government. That is shown in every line of this correspondence, throughout all these negotiations. Let us look at the matter constitutionally. In theory, the treaty-making power is in the hands of the King, but the King exercises that power under the advice of his ministers, where the empire is concerned, where there is no self-governing parliament. But where there is a self-governing parliament, as in this country, the King exercises that power in conjunction with the ministers of the Crown in Canada, because the ministers of the Crown here are as much ministers of the King of England

as the Prime Minister of England is a minister of the King. This parliament is charged with territorial jurisdiction over this country, and we are as much a part of the treaty-making power of this empire, so far as Canada is concerned, as is the imperial government. That, Sir, is the doctrine we must lay down in Canada. Therefore, I take issue with the Prime Minister, and I say it would be a vicious doctrine to advance, that the British government may make a treaty affecting the territory of Canada, against our will and consent. This treaty was made with the consent of the government of Canada, as much as it was with the consent of the government of England. Let us be fair and square in this matter. I am willing to place the blame upon the English government if they deserve it, and I have shown that wherever they deserve blame I have not been slow to blame them.

But when I blame the English government, let no man think I am blaming the English people. I admire the English people, because in this country we are all sprung, those of us who speak English, from the English, the Scotch or the Irish race. But, thank God, the most of us are sprung from them as they were 150 years ago, when they were a dominant race. But in the last 60 years that race has decayed. But that does not destroy the love and reverence we have for the British empire, by any means. What we have to do is to assist Joseph Chamberlain and the other public men, in dumping the present breed into the sea, and starting another generation of Englishmen, who will restore the splendid traditions of the British empire. I have never ceased drawing attention to the fact that the government of England does not, and has not for 60 years represented the great traditions of the British race. The English people are governed by a decadent class, which has grown up weak and impoverished in will. It is the fault of Canada, it is the fault of Australia and, to some extent, of South Africa. We blame the imperial government, but you must recollect that up to within fifteen or twenty years Canada was regarded merely as a source of weakness to the British empire. There were stories told all over the world that we were drifting away from the empire, that we were drawing towards the United States. That being so, can we blame the British government for at times being weak in the presence of foreign powers ? Can we blame the empire, if, in the presence of her foes all over the world, when she was uncertain that her colonies would stand by her in the hour of danger, she should fail to exhibit some of her old-time vigour and boldness ? Therefore, it does not lie in the mouth of the hon. member for Labelle, who is opposed to Canada standing up for the empire, to blame Mr. Chamberlain or any other man for not standing up for Canada. If Canada is not going to stand up for the empire, by what right can we require the empire to stand up for Canada ? I am prepared to require that the English government should stand up for Canada, because I am prepared to stand by the English government and empire in all corners of the earth. Therefore, I have always felt free to criticise the imperial government, and I feel free to criticise them to-day, and also to criticise this government for their action, and to hold them responsible for its consequences. Where there is a wrong committed in a British country there must be responsibility for it. Now, I want to make some comments upon the British government—not that we have any power over that government, but I want to point out to the people of England that their government has gone wrong in this matter, in order that the people of England may deal with their government. I believe that when the people of England are aroused over this matter, as they are in Canada, they will deal with their government as we shall deal with our government, when the poeple sufficiently understand the pusillanimous course they, have pursued in this matter.

Now, let me proceed to say that the right hon. gentleman, in negotiating this treaty, was just as much responsible for it as Sir Michael Herbert or Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, or any other member of the British cabinet. The right hon. gentleman was a party to all of these negotiations from beginning to end, and at any moment he could have said : I will go no further with these negotiations—and there would have been an end of it. The British government says in this correspondence : If you don't agree, then all the negotiations must be broken off. They admitted the power of this government to determine these negotiations. Therefore, you not only had the treaty-making power, but you were the chief factor in the treaty-making power, so far as the boundary commission was concerned. Now, I think it is a little ungenerous for the Prime Minister to seek to arouse prejudice in this country by saying that we had not a right to change the complexion of this treaty. I say we had, and therefore it is that I point to this government as the occasion of the enormous humiliation to which the people of Canada have been subjected. I confess that I have been humiliated past endurance for a week, and I think every man in Canada must have felt the most bitter regret at the untoward and unfortunate events which have happened in this connection. But allow me to refer again to this correspondence and to another remark the Prime Minister made.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. GOURLEY. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, I was endeavouring to show that the treaty-making power nominally rests with the King, that in England it was exercised under the advice of his ministers there, and, so far as Canada was concerned, it was exercised upon the joint advice of his ministers in England and his ministers in Canada. I had proceeded to show that in this case the British cabinet had abdicated their right to advise the King, and had constituted themselves a medium to hand the correspondence from Washington to the cabinet at Ottawa. This being the case, the responsibility for this treaty, in every respect, rests with the right hon. the Prime Minister and his government. And I think it was unfair of the right hon. the Prime Minister to suggest that the unfortunate result in this case was due to the fact that Canada had not the treaty-making power. The government of Canada has the treaty-making power in reference to Canada, and the territorial jurisdiction over Canada as fully as the government in England has the treaty-making power and territorial jurisdiction over the mere affairs of the United Kingdom. I want to show that the government of England made this treaty, step by step, on the advice of the cabinet at Ottawa. There is not a detail that appears in this treaty, that was suggested by the cabinet in Canada, that was not incorporated in the treaty. The government in England admitted the right of the cabinet at Ottawa to advise completely, in regard to this matter. This is proven by the correspondence. In the second letter, in the correspondence brought down, which is from Lord Minto, and addressed to Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, dated November 18th, 1902, we find the following :

> Referring to your despatch of 31st October concerning the proposal of the United States for the appointment of a tribunal of jurists to record their reasoned opinion on the Alaska boundary question, my ministers will decline to give final assent to such proposal.

Why, these words are in themselves an acknowledgment on the part of the ministers that they have the whole negotiations in their own hands :

> My ministers would be disposed to consider it differently, provided reference to the tribunal should include all aspects of the question.

Then, we find, a few days afterwards, Sir Michael Herbert, in Washington, incorporated these identical words in his despatch to the Secretary of State in Washington. This despatch is dated the 18th of December, just a month following the other :

> My dear Mr. Secretary,—Since our interview this morning I have had time to examine the Alaska boundary treaty which you handed me. You will remember I told you that Lord Lansdowne was prepared to entertain favourably the idea of the tribunal, provided the terms of reference were so framed as to include all aspects of the question.

There is the identical language of the despatch by Lord Minto to the Colonial Office incorporated in the despatch to the British ambassador at Washington. This is only another proof that the British government admitted that, in reference to every aspect of this case, the ministry at Ottawa had the fullest rights. Therefore, I think it is very unfair, after the British government had treated our government not merely with courtesy, but with a full acknowledgment of their right to intervene in the negotiation of the treaty affecting the territory of Canada, for the right hon. Prime Minister to make the allusions he did. I do not wish to say anything unkind to any minister; but in a case so delicate as this one, a case in which the words of the Prime Minister will have very special weight in forming and guiding public opinion, I cannot but think his utterance was unfair to His Majesty's ministers in England.

I was astonished to hear the right hon. Prime Minister make the declaration that Canada had not the treaty-making power. While, of course, that power is nominally in the King, yet the King exercises it upon the advice of his ministers. The ministers in England might, I will admit, arbitrarily refuse to allow the advice of ministers of the Crown in Canada to have weight. But, if they did that for an instant, the whole organization of the empire would be upset, and this people would question that right before we took another step in connection with the empire. I had known always that the government of Canada was consulted fully in every matter with reference to treaty-making since confederation. Sir John Macdonald, when Prime Minister was not only consulted, but was made one of the high commissioners to negotiate the treaty of Washington. And that treaty was made subject to the ratification of this parliament —the most complete acknowledgment, on behalf of the Crown, that the treaty-making power, so far as it refers to the territory of Canada, rested as completely with the parliament of Canada as the treaty-making power in relation to the United Kingdom, rested with the imperial parliament. I appeal to any constitutional lawyer in Canada to say if that is not the correct interpretation of the constitution of the empire at the present time. Had any other interpretation been attempted, had the right of the Canadian ministry to advise on this subject been questioned the right hon. Prime Minister could have followed the lead of Cecil Rhodes. Twenty-five years ago the German empire laid hands upon a part of the British empire in British South Africa, trusting to the weakness of the British cabinet, and the hesitation of the ministry to meet these aggressions with an ultimatum, under which Germany would have backed down so quickly that there would have been no time to raise a question. But the British government weakly permitted Germany to appro-

priate a part of South-west Africa. Then, Germany advanced her posts and took Bechuanaland, the design being to cross and join hands with the Boers, which would have cut off the extension of British influence to the north, and would have confined British South Africa to a little strip around the cape. The ministers in England acted supinely. They set no particular value upon South Africa. The cabinet in South Africa spent days and days in cabling, endeavouring to get the British government to take direct and positive action to drive Germany out of Bechuanaland. Receiving no satisfaction, they acted. Under the inspiration and leadership of Cecil Rhodes, that government passed a minute of council and transmitted it to the ministers in England, telling them that if the British Crown would not defend South Africa to pull down their flag, Cape Colony would float its own flag, and would fight Germany alone and single-handed. In an hour came back the answer that fleets would sail and armies would move to save South Africa. Cecil Rhodes solved that question then and there, that, so far as a British colony is concerned, the government of the colony was supreme in power in dictating its policy.

That was twenty-five years ago and if it had not been for that splendid attitude of Cecil Rhodes, the Boers would have united with the Germans in South Africa and the whole domain that we own in South Africa would have been appropriated by the German Empire. Cecil Rhodes had to act the part of a hero and had to act the part of a man with a dominant mind in his dealings with the imperial government. In this instance how differently was the right hon. Prime Minister treated. The right hon. Prime Minister might have followed that distinguished precedent in the negotiations leading up to the composition of the tribunal, but it was not necessary, because, in these negotiations, the government of England only acted as an intermediary to hand the correspondence from Washington to the government at Ottawa. The government at Ottawa alone are responsible for the negotiations leading up to this treaty. As we come to understand the matter better the people know that, and no amount of misrepresentation will avail to colour the situation one jot or tittle. The people of Canada are intelligent and they will soon come to know the truth. They will read the correspondence and they will know exactly the position we are in. I must say that I was amazed when I heard the right hon. Prime Minister undertake to defend himself. Instead of guiding the hon. member for Labelle, instead of telling that young man that he was pursuing a wrong course in this country, a course that could not commend itself to the English or the French speaking people, he encouraged him in it. I believe that the feeling is growing so strong in Canada that there will not be the slightest distinction between French and English in their devotion to the empire. Occasionally they get a bad leader in the province of Quebec and a bad leader can perhaps work more evil there than a bad leader can in one of the English speaking provinces, but I believe the people of Quebec are sound at heart and that though they are misled by the hon. member for Labelle they will go in the right way. Instead of making himself strong in this empire that hon. gentleman will make himself a false guide of public sentiment everywhere and therefore the right hon. Prime Minister, to whom we must look to direct public sentiment in correct channels, should have repudiated the statement of that hon. gentleman that we had not the treaty-making right and that we had been sacrificed by Chamberlain. Chamberlain has done more for this empire in half an hour than a million of hon. members for Labelle could do in a million years. I am afraid that the hon. gentleman is not sincerely interested in the welfare of Canada. I may be wrong, but we have a right to judge men's hearts by the conduct they exhibit and that is my conclusion in reference to the hon. member for Labelle. I hope I am wrong. I do not wish to say that there is any man in Canada who entertains any opinion that it is improper for him to entertain as a citizen of this country, but I am bound to come to a common sense conclusion in reference to a man's heart from the conduct which he manifests. That is my conclusion in reference to the hon. member for Labelle, and it must be the conclusion of the right hon. the Prime Minister, who has had more intimate associations with the hon. gentleman than I have had. Instead of encouraging him in that line of argument he should have depreciated it. He should have said: The government of England gave us the freest hand in reference to this treaty and if there is a mistake the government of Canada is prepared to shoulder it and to meet the people of this country on that issue. I am sorry to have to charge either the government of England or this government with dereliction in this respect but I am much more pleased to be able to charge this government than the imperial government with it, because, if we were to charge the imperial government with this matter, it would create a profoundly injurious feeling in the empire. But, this government, I find from reading this correspondence, are alone responsible for the whole difficulty that has occurred. The right hon. Prime Minister has sought to shield himself behind the name of Lord Chief Justice Alverstone as if that would help the situation. There have been many chief justices of England who have illustrated the genius of the English race and there have been many other chief justices of England who have illustrated the worst features of English character and life. There have been some very learned chief justices

and there have been some—I speak as a lawyer familiar with the law courts of England—who are no more worthy of respect than any judge in Canada. In reference to the Lord Chief Justice of England I would rather have had the Chief Justice of Nova Scotia on that tribunal, or I would rather have had the Chief Justice of British Columbia than the Lord Chief Justice of England. I will frankly say that as a Canadian I believe that there is more will power and active business capacity about a Canadian than about any Englishman be he Lord Chief Justice or Prime Minister. I believe that the average intelligence of the Canadian is infinitely ahead of the average intelligence of the Englishmen in the same rank of life, and I believe that the ordinary lawyer in Canada is all round a much better man than the average lawyer in England. I say that with all respect to the British empire and as a devoted imperialist. We have the highest civilization that exists in the whole world and I believe that more general intelligence exists in Canada than exists in any other country in the world. I have said that the right hon. Prime Minister attempted to shield himself behind the name of the Lord Chief Justice of England. I am not concerned in defending the Lord Chief Justice of England nor am I concerned in attacking him. I think the proper course to take is the course which the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) took, to await the opinion which is said to have been delivered by the Lord Chief Justice. We have no right to condemn any man upon a general opinion until we know the reasons upon which it is founded. When I get the reasons upon which he founded that opinion I will criticise it with the same freedom as if it were the opinion of any mechanic or cabman in the city of Ottawa. I will not be deterred from criticising his opinion any more than I would be from criticising the opinion of any lawyer or judge in Canada. If the right hon. gentleman had consulted men like the Chief Justice of Nova Scotia, a highlander who would have faced these boasting Yankees and told them that they had enough of the territory of Canada and that they could not get another foot of it, the result might have been different. He would not have yielded and he would have brought as much intelligence and discrimination to bear upon the case as the Lord Chief Justice of England. As a Canadian I think that the hon. member for Labelle did not do justice to the position that our Canadian jurists occupy in this country. I am willing that Englishmen shall have all the credit they deserve but I want to put forth the claim that we have lawyers in Canada who occupy a position as high as that of any lawyer in the world. There is no divine superiority for any man because he happens to reside in England. This case is res judicata. On the side of Canada there were three arbitrators. Two of them decided in favour of Canada and therefore Lord Alverstone is the dissenting arbitrator. The majority of the court on Canada's side decided against Lord Alverstone and he should have accepted that decision on the part of Canada. The tribunal as far as Canada is concerned was composed of three members and the majority of the tribunal representing Canada decided in favour of Canada from the facts which they had heard. I shall not imitate the hon. member for Labelle and undertake to review the case. I do not know whether he is a lawyer or not, but I think he followed a very foolish course. This whole matter was left to the court, all the facts have been presented to it, and the members of the tribunal have rendered their judgment. I am bound to believe that Lord Alverstone was wrong and I am bound to accept the decision of the majority of the court composed of Canadians as being the proper one.

I am bound by the majority opinion of the court, and consequently, I must conclude that Lord Alverstone is wrong. I do not know either Sir Louis Jetté or Mr. Aylesworth, and I am not concerned to compliment or eulogize them, but they were chosen by the government of Canada for a very high judicial mission; they heard the full argument as well as Lord Alverstone, they decided in favour of Canada, and I believe that their decision is right. If two English judges had decided a question against a Canadian judge, fancy Englishmen having the slightest doubt as to who was right. So far as Lord Alverstone's opinion is concerned, the thing is res judicata; Canada was right and Lord Alverstone improperly decided against her interests. We must inferentially conclude that Lord Alverstone was wrong, but we have in addition the statement of Mr. Aylesworth, who knows all the facts, that the judgment was not come to upon judicial grounds. Lord Alverstone occupies the unenviable position therefore of being condemned twice over. Judges must submit to criticism, and Lord Alverstone, the Lord Chief Justice of England, must not escape criticism any more than if he were the Lord Chief Justice of Timbuctoo. I am bound as a Canadian, to accept the decision of the two eminent Canadians who were thought worthy to sit in this tribunal, and accepting their decision, I am bound to hold that Canada was not properly supported by Lord Alverstone. Mr. Aylesworth's dissenting opinion occupies three columns of the 'Times,' and in that opinion he says:

> I have merely to say that the course the majority of the tribunal has decided to take with regard to the islands at the entrance of the Portland canal is in my humble opinion so opposed to the plain requirements of justice.

If one of the judges was free to discuss Lord Alverstone, thus, surely, I am relieved

from any qualms when I discuss his conduct here.

—is in my humble opinion so opposed to the plain requirements of justice and so absolutely irreconciliable with any disposition of any branch of the case, upon principles of a judicial character, that I respectfully decline to affix my signature to it.

For a lawyer, trained to use language in a constrained sense, that is a most powerful indictment of Lord Alverstone. I have never been in England, although some of my family live there. However, from knee-high, English papers flooded my home, and before I knew anything about Canadian papers, I became more or less saturated with English public opinion. I have read the diplomatic correspondence of this empire for seventy or eighty years, and I know that for sixty years the diplomacy of England has been chiefly marked by a desire to avoid war at any cost. Why, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries Englishmen would have shot off their guns and sent out their ships, and retribution would follow any who dared to touch part of the empire. Let me say incidentally, that the iniquitous free trade doctrine that Cobden introduced has degraded the public sentiment of England. It seems to strike the very heart of Englishmen and to degrade them. In the history of Great Britain there is a mark, as pronounced as if a mountain range had been erected, to divide the period between sixty years ago and afterwards. There has been evidence of a marked decadence of the great spirit, that once told the world : Don't touch our territory, or we will seek redress with our ships, our arms, and our men. With the era of free trade the most marked indications of decay set in. Germany could steal British territory, the United States could flout her in the face, France could do likewise, and England would bow. That is not the fault of the British empire, but it is the fault of the weak and impoverished race that is living in England at the present day. England has got vastly rich in the last sixty years, the merchants of England find their ships bearing them wealth from every corner of the earth, and the English government has got under the control of the rich merchants and the Jews of London, and whenever her territory is assailed, instead of being revenged these men of commerce say : Take the kicks and the jibes and the outrages of fortune, but don't declare war, because if you do, we may lose $100. And so, England that in the past was honoured the world over, lost her honour, because every nation in the world knew that she would not fight. Let it go abroad that a nation will not fight for her territory and her rights, and every nation in the world will attack her. But, let it be known that the smallest nation on earth will defend her territory, and she is honoured and respected. Look at the history of Switzerland, a little country with a million people, which for three hundred years has defied every power in Europe. She is honoured and respected by the great nations, because every nation knows that if Switzerland is attacked it will be a war of extermination. Switzerland maintains her independence to-day because of her pluck, and a daring and courage, while England with all her wealth, has been buffeted by every nation of the world. The Prime Minister knew the diplomacy of England, and especially her diplomacy in reference to the United States. I am a strong imperialist, but I have been trying to bring public opinion to bear upon the unworthy people of England to-day, to let them know that the time is past for subserviency, and that while the people of the old country may submit to humiliation, we in this young country never shall. No matter how degenerate men may be in England, when the race breathe the free air of Canada, they become regenerated. It is impossible for us to bow to humiliation. I want to find out who is responsible for the appointment of Lord Alverstone, and I am happy to say that this correspondence points out to me clearly that the whole error lies at the door of the government of Canada, so that I am pleased to find that the member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) was wrong in trying to mislead the people of Canada to think otherwise.

With reference to the treaty, I find that when it was sent out to Canada a very important alteration was made in it. That would have given the right hon. the Prime Minister ample opportunity to have said at once : This treaty does not preserve the rights of Canada which were given to us by the treaty made between England and Russia in 1825. In that treaty there was a clear boundary established. If the arbitrators had not been allowed to alter that boundary, there would have been no doubt as to the decision ; and I venture to say that when the opinion of Lord Alverstone comes to this country, it will be found that it is based upon the change that was made in the treaty with the consent of the Prime Minister of Canada. In the old treaty made between Russia and England in 1825 the boundary was set out as clearly as words could define it. The boundary was never at any time to exceed ten marine leagues, or thirty miles, from the coast. Mountains were referred to, but only in case they should be within ten marine leagues of the coast. But what happened ? The United States knew that if that question were submitted to a tribunal the decision would be against them, and what did they do ? When the treaty of arbitration was made, they had a clause put into it which enabled that tribunal to take into consideration matters which had happened before and after the treaty was committed to writing. Everybody knows that when nations get together to make a contract a number of discussions occur. One nation claims this or that ; but in the end, when

the matter is committed to writing and the treaty is once ratified, you cannot go outside of the terms of that treaty. Everything is in it, and it is simply a matter of the interpretation of the words, unless there is found to be some latent ambiguity requiring explanations. In this case it is not pretended that there was any ambiguity. The language was clear and distinct, and if that treaty had been submitted to a judge, even to Lord Alverstone, and he had been bound down by the simple words of the treaty, we would never have lost the two islands, but would have preserved our rights intact. But when the treaty of arbitration was sent out this extraordinary clause was found in, which was no doubt cited by Lord Alverstone in coming to his decision. A draft of the treaty was sent to this government, and I have no doubt that this government must have acted in concert with the English government in order to help them out of this difficulty. The clause I refer to is as follows :

The tribunal shall also take into consideration any action of the several governments or their respective representatives preliminary or subsequent to the conclusion of said treaties, so far as the same tends to show the original and effective understanding of the parties in respect to the limits of their several territorial jurisdictions under and by virtue of the provisions of said treaties.

Under that clause of the treaty Lord Alverstone could throw away the treaty on which we had relied for our rights with regard to the boundary, and could listen to all the cock-and-bull stories set up by the Americans with reference to what had taken place before and after the treaty, and could found his decision upon them. The government of Canada could have insisted that our rights should be preserved in the fullest manner by the treaty, which fixed the boundary in such a way that no court could get over them. I went over this whole matter for a couple of months with the late Mr. Justice Mills. We happened to lodge together in the Russell House, and we went over this matter night after night, and I had the benefit of his vast information on the whole subject. I found him better informed on this question than any Canadian I have since met, and it was his opinion that under the terms of the old treaty the United States had not a leg to stand upon. I hold that the first mistake of the government of Canada was in permitting the introduction of a clause like that, which struck at the very foundation of the article in the treaty by which our rights were secured.

Then, in the appointment of the commissioners the Prime Minister was not taken by surprise. I find by this correspondence that as soon as the American commissioners were appointed he was informed of their appointment. He knew that the English government had departed entirely from their notion of having six jurists to deal with the matter ; and when the names of the United States jurists were submitted, the most ample opportunity was afforded to the government of Canada of stepping out and refusing to go any further. I am bound to say that the government of Canada did remonstrate against the American commissioners. But what happened ? Here is the most ample evidence that the government of England said at once : If you object to these people the negotiations will be abandoned. What more could the government of Canada want ? I understood the Prime Minister to allege to-day that the treaty had then been signed. No matter whether it had been signed or not. Here are the words of the British government :

His Majesty's government have therefore to choose between breaking off negotiations altogether or accepting American nominations and appointing as colleagues representatives who will meet the altered circumstances of the case.

His Majesty's government say that they have nothing to do but to break off the negotiations if the Canadian government object to the American commissioners. That was all that was necessary ; they would have had to say to the American government that if they did not keep their agreement with reference to the appointment of jurists the treaty was off, because that was the very basis of the negotiations. But there seems to have been some secret influence working from London on the government of Canada, because what they rejected by one mail they accepted by the next. We find that the Prime Minister withdrew his objection and suggested the name of Lord Alverstone as one of the British commissioners. I saw that by a paper in London it is made to appear that Lord Alverstone's appointment was forced on the government of Canada by the English government, and I inferred that from what the hon. member for Labelle said. I see that the matter is being discussed in England :

The 'Morning Post' recalls the earnest recommendation of Sir Richard Webb in March last that the British commissioners be all Canadians, arguing the appointment of a single Englishman to be unjust to Canada and impolitic for the empire. The 'Post' asks, presumably with some ulterior purpose : 'Has the British government evidence that Canada was anxious above all for a verdict, and also that the Canadian government approved of the selection of an Englishman as a commissioner ?'

The English 'Post' suggests that some people here were so anxious for a verdit that they were willing to sacrifice the interests of Canada for the purpose of getting a verdict, and willing to take anybody as a commissioner. It asks if there is evidence that the Canadian government nominated Lord Alverstone. I am bound to say that the evidence is here. Lord Alverstone is the nominee of Canada, he was our appointment. If he was our appointment, we should acknowledge that fact and should not leave any doubt about the matter in the English

public mind. I find in a despatch of Lord Minto to the Colonial Office the following passage :—

In view of the short time given for the preparation of the case, my ministers desire to proceed immediately, and therefore suggest an early settlement of preliminaries. As to the composition of the tribunal my ministers suggest the Chief Justice of England and two Canadian judges, names to be telegraphed hereafter.

Then the despatch proceeds to name the counsel who are to carry on the arbitration for Canada. I want to know from the Prime Minister why three Canadians were not nominated. I observe that Sir Richard Webb, in the Colonial Office urged upon this government or the imperial government, that there should be three Canadian commissioners. Who is Sir Richard Webb ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know, and there is no foundation at all for this statement.

Mr. GOURLEY. Is he connected with the Colonial Office ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know him at all.

Mr. GOURLEY. Did you know of him in connection with the correspondence ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I did not.

Mr. GOURLEY. I see in this despatch :

The ' Post ' recalls the earnest recommendation of Sir Richard Webb, in March last, that the British commissioners be all Canadians, arguing the appointment of a single Englishman to be unjust to Canada and to the interests of the empire.

The PRIME MINISTER. If Sir Richard Webb made such a recommendation to the British authorities it was never conveyed to us.

Mr. GOURLEY. I cannot imagine why, in a case of this kind, three Canadians were not selected ; it is a reflection on the people of Canada that the three commissioners should not have been chosen from Canada. Had it been 500 miles of the coast of England along the channel or the North Sea, which had been claimed by France, do you suppose that England would agree to the appointment of two Englishmen and one Canadian as a board of arbitration ? I venture to say that not a man in England would consent to the appointment of any man not an Englishman. Territory should be in the keeping of men living on the soil and no other man should be permitted to dispose of it. Therefore I say that the government of Canada made an extraordinary mistake and a mistake which will become more apparent as it becomes more fully understood by the people of Canada. It is no use hiding from ourselves the fact that the diplomacy of England in North America for sixty years has been weak. I have heard the Prime Minister himself say that he was not in sympathy with the diplomacy of England on this continent. Therefore you were warned and notified that the British diplomacy was weak, and when you had the opportunity of removing it to Canadian diplomacy you should have done so. What is the use of being forewarned if you are not forearmed ? Why did you not insist ? Had I been more familiar with the procedure in this House the first year I was here I would have moved that three Canadians be appointed on the committee. However, when I heard the Prime Minister say that he was no lover of British diplomacy on this continent I thought that when he had the choice he would have had three Canadians and if he had had three Canadians we would not have had this difficulty to-day.

Another thing that has struck me is the fact that there was never any suspicion about the United States commissioners giving in or losing in this arbitration. There was not a word of that kind in their press or the press of England ; they all took it for granted that the United States commissioners would stick to their case. The just settlement of this question is the just settlement of the relations of England and this country and in the settlement of this question we must ascertain whether the English government has done us wrong in not looking after our territory or whether the fault lies at the door of the Canadian government. I would prefer that it should lie here, even if the right hon. gentleman should escape the anger of public opinion in order that it might not create feelings that might prejudice the existence of the empire. Therefore I want to know why it is that from the very moment Lord Alverstone's name was mentioned it was stated in the American papers, professedly inspired, that Lord Alverstone was to decide in favour of the United States. There must have been some agreement between the government of England and the government of Canada that the government of Canada was to consent to the sacrifice of Canada in order to serve some supposed imperial policy. It is clear to my mind that it was communicated from the Foreign Office in London to the Secretary of State in Washington that the United States had nothing to fear, to go on with the treaty that England would appoint a man who would decide the case in favour of the United States, as England wanted to get rid of the case and to preserve the friendship of the United States, and that England was willing to sacrifice the interests of Canada and had succeeded in getting the government of Canada to accede.

The PRIME MINISTER. Does my hon. friend say that seriously ?

Mr. GOURLEY. I believe that in some way or other the government of Canada was overcome by the government of England. The thing was rigged in this way. They said to the government of Canada : You can ap-

point two Canadians and let the Chief Justice of England be appointed as well; the Chief Justice of England will decide in favour of the United States, your two people can dissent, that will protect you in Canada and settle this question for the empire and relieve us of a great difficulty. However there is no doubt that the people will arrive at as correct a conclusion in this matter when it has been fully explained to them, as any logician. Public opinion invariably forms a conclusion better than a logician of the character of Goldwin Smith, who always goes wrong although he is a trained logician.

The PRIME MINISTER. Does my hon. friend pretend to say there was a secret agreement?

Mr. GOURLEY. I was reasoning from the facts.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend is all wrong.

Mr. GOURLEY. Then how did the United States get the knowledge as soon as Lord Alverstone was appointed that he was going to decide for them? And now as a matter of fact after he has decided for them I undertake to say that the State Department at Washington had some information from some source, that he was to decide for them.

The PRIME MINISTER. That I do not know.

Mr. GOURLEY. We must understand the whole question from beginning to end and I do not believe that Lord Alverstone is to blame; I believe that he was appointed on that commission with instructions, in the interest of the empire, to give the award that he has given.

The PRIME MINISTER. Does my hon. friend know that Lord Alverstone had to take an oath that he would interpret the treaty judicially? And does he think that in the face of that——

Mr. GOURLEY. The Englishman's idea of 'judicial interpretation' would be to serve the interests of the empire. I want to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that he must have known—he did know—of the extraordinary opinion in England with regard to the importance of the good will of the United States to the empire. That opinion is incorrect. The people of England have more to gain by sticking to Canada than by kow-towing to the United States; yet, I do not find a single word in this correspondence calling the attention of the English government to that fact. There is the clearest evidence, on the contrary, that this government permitted that opinion in Great Britain to go on, and become stronger day by day. If this government wish to serve the empire, they should let the people of England know that they must look to Canada for their support on this continent, and not to the United States. Every time they sacrifice the interests of Canada, in order to conciliate the United States, the people of the United States become more greedy and grasping, and the people of this country become more alarmed and dissatisfied.

There must have been some understanding, somewhere and somehow, that the commission would uphold the contentions of the United States. Why, the determination of this tribunal was known in the United States three months before it was announced. And three, four or five days before Lord Alverstone had given his decision, the finding of this commission was announced accurately and in wonderful detail in the press of the United States. I intend to investigate this question. I intend to follow it 'secundum artem.' Three, four or five days before the decision, as soon as the argument was closed, announcements were made in the United States as to what the decision would be. How did the facts gets out of Lord Alverstone's head and into the heads of the Yankee newspaper men and the Yankee commissioners? Tell me that, if you can, There is only one conclusion—this was a triumph of the diplomacy of England over the government of Canada. The government of Canada had the matter in their own hands; and, if the interests of Canada have been sacrificed, they must bear the responsibility. They had full power to negotiate, and now that the interests of Canada have been sacrificed, the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) is put up, to charge that upon the British government, and the Prime Minister follows him, virtually in support of the same idea.

There is just one other remark of the Prime Minister to which I wish to refer. He said that the United States was a populous and powerful country, and that Canada was a small colony. If the government of England had attempted to thrust upon us a treaty that was not in accordance with Canada's rights the Prime Minister could have summoned this parliament and there would have been such an expression of public indignation that the government in England would have backed down. All he had to do was to summon this faithful Commons and we would soon teach the English government that they could not thrust upon this country any treaty made to suit the diplomacy of the United States. If this colony is treated in that way, let not the Prime Minister say that it is because it is a weak colony. England would have stuck to us, if we had asserted our rights and demanded the protection of the imperial parliament. We are not a weak colony. Six milions of free people would beat the United States single-handed in the contest. If we fought them as the Swiss people fought the power of Austria, we should beat them to a stand-still. We are a powerful

people, and occupy the best strategic position on this continent.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). We beat them in 1812, when they were relatively forty times as populous as they are now.

Mr. GOURLEY. Of course. And we could do it again. It is not right for the Prime Minister to seek to weaken the great public sentiment of Canada by saying that we are not able to cope with the invader. If we had shown that we were prepared to fight for ourselves, England would have been at our back with her forces and the United States would never have dared to attempt to capture our territory. Therefore, notwithstanding all that has been said, I claim that the government of Canada alone are responsible in this matter. Mr. Chamberlain, in writing, made suggestions. He had a right, as a British statesman, to give his private opinion. Just as I might advise a client that it would be better to compromise rather than fight for his rights. But it would be the right of the client to refuse to compromise. Mr. Chamberlain had a right to make suggestions to the government, but the government were independent men and representatives of Canada, and they should have at once replied : We cannot stand for any sacrifice of the rights of Canada.

As to the Bulwer-Clayton treaty, I think my leader (Mr. Borden) put that matter in the right light. We had the opportunity to get the help of England and to have our rights maintained. But the right hon. Premier of this country took the unexampled course of saying that we had no interest in that treaty. That is a treaty affecting this continent; and, on whatever continent there is a British colony, any treaty affecting that continent affects that part of the British empire, and the colony should assert its rights as part of the British empire. And, when we told the English government that we had no interest in this matter, it showed that we had not the high appreciation of our rights that we ought to have.

I am glad of this debate. It would have been unfortunate if the people of England had been led to fancy that a decision like this could be given, and the people of Canada not resent it. I am glad that the press of Canada have shown to the world that our spirit is not daunted, that we are not weaklings, but that we are of a proud race, that we possess the daring qualities of that race in the highest degree, and that our strength is not sapped by luxury or decay. I am glad to see that the press of England are speaking out for Canada. And, in view of the temper of the people of England, as exhibited through their press, it would be a most unfortunate spectacle for the world had Canada remained silent. When this debate is reported in England to-morrow the press of England will assist, as far as possible, in educating the people of England with reference to the position we occupy in the British empire. I thank the House for the consideration they have given my remarks.

PROROGATION.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received a communication from the secretary of His Excellency the Governor General, as follows :

Office of the
Governor General's Secretary,
Ottawa, October 23, 1903.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber, on Saturday, the 24th instant, at 11 o'clock a.m., for the purpose of proroguing the session of the parliament of Canada.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
F. S. MAUDE, Major,
Governor General's Secretary.

The Honourable
The Speaker of the House of Commons.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903—CONFERENCE WITH THE SENATE.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). On behalf of the managers appointed to confer with the Senate, a free conference was held last night, and I beg leave to offer the following report :

The Senate Committee Room, No. 8.
Friday, October 23, 1903.

The managers, on the part of the House of Commons have the honour to report that they met the managers, on the part of the Senate, at the free conference, which on their part was managed by the Hon. Sir Mackenzie Bowell and others, for the purpose of further considering the amendments to the Bill No. 21, intituled ; 'An Act to amend and consolidate the law respecting Railways.'

The managers on the part of the House of Commons withdrew their objections to the Senate amendments Nos. 2, 3, 4 and 70 to sections 5, 6, 7 and 310 of the said Bill.

The managers on the part of the Senate agreed that the following be added to section 5, as 5-A in the reprinted Bill : —

5-A. All the provisions of this Act relating to railway crossing and junctions, through-traffic, offences, penalties and statistics, shall apply to all persons, companies and railways, whether otherwise within the legislative authority of parliament or not.

The managers on the part of the Senate did not insist on the Senate amendment No. 11, to section 44 of the said Bill.

As a result of this conference, I beg leave to move concurrence in the Senate section 7, instead of the Commons sections 5, 6 and 7.

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I beg leave to move that we dispense with the proposed clause 5a, because that clause is covered by the Senate clause 7, and by the Commons clause 302.

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I move to strike out from Commons clause 310 the words 'section 306.'

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Some doubts have been expressed as to whether amendments 31 and 40 of the Senate have been adopted. In view of that doubt, I move that amendment 31 to section 195 be formally concurred in, as well as amendments 40 and 210.

Motion agreed to.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT—SENATE AMENDMENTS.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I move that the amendments of the Senate to Bill (No. 257) to amend the Civil Service Act be concurred in. The effect of these amendments is to confirm the right of the Auditor General to make promotions in his own department.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—PETITIONS AGAINST NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT (Bellechasse). As the House is about to adjourn, I would crave permission to draw attention to an article which appears in to-day's Montreal 'Star' and which reads as follows:

One of the privileges of a member of the House of Commons is that of saying anything he pleases on the floor of the House without being held to account for what he says before the courts of law.

He may say that which is grossly untrue and slanderous. He may be animated by envy, hatred, malice and all uncharitableness. He may be actuated by a desire for personal or party advantage, or simply by a desire for notoriety He may say just what he pleases without fear of the law.

Such a privilege would in itself serve as a restraint upon the tongue of a high principled man.

Unfortunately, all members of parliament are not high principled, and slanders are frequently uttered on the floor of the House with a recklessness, which is born of immunity from legal consequence.

Three weeks ago that eminent jurist, Mr. Talbot, of Bellechasse, declared on the floor of the House that two of the petitions against the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme were forged. Sir Wilfrid Laurier promptly followed this up by a declaration that the same charge would apply to most of the petitions. Mr. Talbot moved that two of the petitions should be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections for investigation, and Mr. Borden suggested in amendment that all the petitions should be referred to the Committee. Sir Wilfrid, in a moment of weakness, accepted the amendment. There the matter rests. The Committee met once; formally passed a resolution asking permission to sit while the House was in session, and has never met again.

The whole thing was a bluff; the charges were a bluff; the reference to the committee was a bluff. The 'Star,' at the time, denounced the whole business as a bluff and expressed the opinion that the government would never dare to have the charges investigated.

The privileges of parliament were never intended to cover such infamous cowardice; and if used for such purposes the sooner they are abolished the better. The genuineness of the petitions is beyond question, beyond suspicion. If any names at all were forged, they were probably forged by friends of the government anxious to diminish the influence of the vast mass of genuine signatures sent in to parliament. The important and all-significent fact is that the government dared not allow an investigation of the charges it made with such reckless and splendid courage.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it may be that when I made that motion I made a mistake.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon. gentleman intend to make a motion?

Mr. TALBOT. I intend to move the adjournment of the House. It may be said at this late stage of the session I was wrong in bringinig that matter up, but I could not have made it any sooner, for you know as well as I do that these petitions were brought into the House at the very tail end of the discussion of the Transcontinental Railway. On the very day these petitions were read in the House, I drew attention to their character, expressing my doubt as to the authenticity of the signatures. Now, I have in my possession documents to prove that I was perfectly justified in making my motion, although it was so late in the session. I have now in my possession nine affidavits——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I object to my hon. friend going into a matter that is before a Committee of the House. I have not the slightest objection to the investigation going on before the committee, but to read affidavits in the House about a matter that has been referred to a committee, is, I submit, out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is quite new to me. I know there are some authorities upon it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It cannot be a matter that would require very much authority. A question respecting petitions presented to this House which has been raised as a question of privilege surely cannot be considered by this House while it is subject to the jurisdiction of a committee or until that committee has reported. Otherwise it would be competent for every hon. member in this House to bring in affidavits on one side or the other and to contest in this House the question which has been referred to the committee for the purpose of report. That would be a very elementary principle upon which to act.

Mr. TALBOT. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) should be the last man in the world to rise in this House and attempt to prevent a member who, in one of

the most important papers in Canada, is called a coward and a slanderer from availing himself of the only opportunity he has of defending himself. I think I should be allowed that privilege.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not preventing my hon. friend from defending himself in any way. As soon as he made his motion in the House, I rose in my place and said, that, in view of the statements he made, I would unqualifiedly support a reference to the committee. The hon. gentleman has had the matter referred to the committee. It is now under the control of the committee. It has not been proceeded with. What I am objecting to is that my hon. friend should undertake to proceed to deal by means of affidavits with a matter which has been referred to a committee of the House for investigation and report.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. TALBOT. Perhaps we may settle this question which has been raised by the hon. leader of the opposition. I will not read the affidavits but I will give a personal explanation if I am allowed to do so. I have in my possession thirteen affidavits, nine of them proving that the signatures on these petitions were not authorized in any way by the persons whose names appear upon them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend——

Mr. TALBOT. And I have four of them showing that signatures were on the petitions of men who are living in the United States at the present time.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax. I do not think it is a very worthy course on the part of my hon. friend, when a point of order has been raised, to evade it by stating the substance of the affidavits instead of reading them. It seems to me a very plain point of order that when the matter raised by my hon. friend has been referred to a committee he should not endeavour by affidavits to deal with the very same question in the House, because to permit that, would be to permit every member of the House to bring in affidavits pro and con which would take away from the committee the functions which it was designed they should exercise under the reference thereto, and it is as much out of order to state the substance of the affidavits as to read them. To rise for the ostensible purpose of speaking on a point of order and then to endeavour to evade the point of order is not a worthy thing for a member of the House to do, and it is not respectful to Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. I find that the principle generally laid down is that when a question is referred to a committee, the House has no right to deal with the matter itself, but the hon. member (Mr. Talbot)—perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) was not in when he read the statement—has read a statement from a paper reflecting upon his character and upon his reputation as a member of this House. I suppose, if the hon. gentleman wants simply to state the reasons why he brought this question up without entering into the merits of the petitions which have been referred to the committee, he may do so.

Mr. TALBOT. That is my intention. I merely want to state that when I brought this matter before the House, I was justified in doing so, because I have in my possession documents sworn to which justify me as a member of this House in stating that the privilege of this House was grossly abused, probably without the knowledge of hon. members at the time, and which go to prove the statement which I made at the time that half the names were forged. I have documents to prove it, and consequently I say that there is no foundation for the statements which the 'Star' has made, and that the position I took at the time was perfectly correct, according to the facts as disclosed in the documents. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. S. BARKER (Hamilton). As a member of the committee to which this matter was referred, I beg to inform you, Mr. Speaker, and the House, that the committee was called together many days ago, immediately after the reference. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot) had the opportunity of bringing that matter up, but from the time the committee met to the present hour we have never heard one word in support of the charge. The hon. gentleman has made no effort to bring the matter forward. He has made no effort to have the committee take action upon it, and we have never heard a word from the hon. gentleman as to the evidence in support of these charges.

Mr. TALBOT. The article was only printed to-day.

The PRIME MINISTER. I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot) will withdraw his motion, because we may have a motion to adjourn when there is nothing before the House.

Mr. TALBOT. I will withdraw the motion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the motion is withdrawn, I would like to say that my hon. friend (Mr. Talbot) made his statement on the 7th of October, that he has had some fifteen days in which to prove his charges and that up to the present time they have not been proved. My hon. friend will recollect that when he made his motion, I rose and said that I concurred heartily in it. The right hon. Prime Minister then rose in his place and said:

But as there is an impression growing very strong in the country, that in fact there has been an attempt at a conspiracy to impose upon this House, I am perfectly willing to excuse my hon. friend's language.

I had referred to the hon. gentleman's language in presenting the motion. Then the right hon. First Minister further said :

He has referred to only two but I think he could refer to several and perhaps to all.

After my right hon. friend had made these remarks, I rose again and said :

Then I am perfectly willing to widen the motion and to enable an investigation to be made into every petition that has been presented.

They have stood there referred to the committee for fifteen days, and during that time no attempt has been made——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has not the right to refer to what has been done in the committee. I do not know whether anything has been done or not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am referring to the fact that nothing has been done in committee, and I submit that it is perfectly competent for me to refer to nothing.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It will be difficult for Mr. Speaker to find any authority that contravenes that assertion. If there has been a conspiracy in the country to impose upon the House, I do think it a great pity that some proceedings have not been taken. Since the matter has been referred to the committee I have on two occasions at least pressed on the government to proceed with the investigation. I have done my whole duty in the matter.

Mr. BELCOURT. Order.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am aware that my hon. friend (Mr. Belcourt) does not like to hear this. He is particularly disturbed in regard to it.

Mr. BELCOURT. My disturbance is because the hon. the leader of the opposition is breaking the rules of the House when he should set a good example.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. member for Ottawa is qualifying for a judgeship.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. member for Ottawa views with the utmost equanimity many breaches of the rules of the House, but he seems to be particularly sensitive with regard to this special subject. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain how it is that his feelings are so much pertrubed.

Mr. BELCOURT. I have regard for the rules of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend's anxiety for the observance of the rules is particularly apparent on this occasion. I will do my hon. friend the justice to think that he had very good reason for it. He is amply justified in calling 'Order,' when any reference is made to these matters. I do not blame him at all; if I were as unfortunately situated as he is, I would be tempted to take exactly the same course. My hon. friend from Bellechasse, is of course perfectly justified in repelling any attack made against him which he thinks is unfair. At the same time he must remember that when he makes a charge of this kind in parliament, and when after a lapse of fifteen days that charge has not been investigated, he must expect that there will be some reference made to it in the public press.

Motion to adjourn the House withdrawn.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. S. HUGHES (Victoria). I referred the other evening to Col. Denny who has been appointed as head of the Survey Department of the Militia, and in looking over 'Hansard' I find that it is reported that I mentioned the name of Col. Denison. I can understand how the reporter fell into that error knowing that Col. Denison belongs to a well-known military family. It was Col. Denny to whom I referred. Col. Denny is an imperial officer, whom the Minister of Militia has brought here, and I commend his action in that regard. Col. Denny has a wide experience in Asia and in Africa and he has been a most successful intelligence officer.

There is one other typographical error in 'Hansard' which my Scotch friends in the House are most anxious that I should correct. I quoted recently Burns' well-known lines :

Glory is the soldier's prize.

And the proof-reader had it :

Glory is the soldier's price.

My Scotch friends have insisted that I should apologize.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER. As there is nothing before the House I would suggest that the sitting be suspended for half an hour to await further business from the Senate.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am informed that a Bill respecting the incorporation of mining companies has passed the Senate, and I would like to ask my right hon. friend if he knows whether it has been sent to this House or not.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have been informed that the Bill has passed the Senate, but I do not know that it has come to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The sitting of the House will be suspended for half an hour.

The sitting of the House was accordingly suspended.

The sitting of the House resumed.

The PRIME MINISTER moved :

That when the House adjourns this day it do stand adjourned until to-morrow at 10.30 a.m.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, October 24, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 10.30 a.m.

THE USE OF MAIL BAGS.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). I wish to inform the hon. leader of the opposition, that I have had an inquiry into the statement which the hon. gentleman made in the House a few days ago, that one of the officers of the Post Office Department had threatened the express company, that if it ventured to carry any mail matter such as was under discussion, the company would be prosecuted. I have a statement from the controller of the mail service to the effect that the hon. gentleman has been entirely misinformed. If the hon. gentleman wishes I will read that statement.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think it is necessary.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Briefly, the facts are, that Mr. Plumb waited on the express company and pointed out that it would be illegal to use mail bags for the carriage of express matter. He made no reference whatever to their carrying express goods.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There seems to have been some suggestion of prosecution, but according to Mr. Plumb's version it related solely to the use of mail bags. The impression conveyed to the express people as communicated to me was that the suggested prosecution concerned the carriage of this matter by the express company from Montreal to Ottawa. I can understand how one thing may have been intended on one side and understood differently on the other, but certainly the statement was made to me in the most direct and circumstantial manner, that there had been the threat which I have mentioned.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Plumb is in the service of the railway branch and Mr. Armstrong is his superior officer. Mr. Armstrong was instructed to examine 'Hansard' and send a reply. He reported to the deputy that he had examined 'Hansard' and had submitted the same to Mr. Plumb. Perhaps I had better read the reply, which is as follows :

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Ottawa, October 22, 1903.

Memorandum for the Postmaster General.

In reference to the remarks made by Mr. Borden, M.P., in the House, to the effect that after 400 parcels of mail matter expressed from Montreal had arrived in Ottawa addressed to Mr. George Taylor, M.P., an officer of the Post Office Department called upon the express company and threatened to prosecute them because they did not come by mail ; the Postmaster General is informed that no officer of this department called upon the express company under such circumstances, and threatened them with prosecution. The facts are as follows :—

Having been informed that mail sacks were being illegally used by the Montreal 'Star' in the transmission by express of certain printed matter to Mr. Taylor, M.P., at Ottawa, I instructed Mr. Plumb, superintendent of railway mail service, to visit the Ottawa express office and ascertain the truth of the report and, if well founded, to point out to the agent that mail sacks were for the use of the Post Office Department, and could not, therefore be legally used for other purposes than the mail service of the country, through the post office and not through the express office, or otherwise and to make known to him that any one making illegal use of the sacks incurred liability to a fine. Subsequently Mr. Plumb reported to me that acting upon my instructions he had waited upon the express company's agent at Ottawa and made known to him the above view, and suggested that, in order to prevent any violation of the law, through inadvertence or otherwise, it might be well if the agent were to telegraph the express company at Montreal not to accept, for transmission by express, anything contained in post office bags.

Mr. Plumb assures me that in his interview with the express company's agent he confined his observations strictly within the foregoing instructions, and that he made no mention whatever of any prosecution because of the transmission of the political literature in question to Mr. Taylor by express, and said nothing whatever which could be so construed.

I have called Mr. Plumb's attention to the statement of Mr. Borden in the House, to the effect that the express agent reported him as threatening the company with prosecution for carrying this printed matter and he informs me that he made no such threat, and that he took no exception whatever to the company carrying the printed matter in question, but confined his remarks strictly to the subject of the illegal use of mail bags.

B. M. ARMSTRONG,
Controller.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES IN SEVERAL PROVINCES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Some days ago, I was asked to prepare a statement showing the distribution of railway subsidies in reference to the several provinces. I have prepared the statement which, with the consent of the House I shall read. I may say that in regard to bridges, there was a special appropriation of $150,000, and since that we have had a special Act in relation to the Quebec bridge. These were all in the province of Quebec. The following is the statement in reference to the railways :

MILES of Railway provided for in the way of Government Construction, Subsidy, or Guarantee in the several Provinces during the present Session.

Province.	Subsidy Miles.	Guarantee Miles.	Government Construction.		Total.	
			Miles.	$	Miles.	$
Ontario	842	Nil.	810		1,652	
Quebec	1,366½	Nil.	620		1,986½	
Nova Scotia	687½	Nil.	Nil.		687½	
New Brunswick	265	Nil.	235		500	
Prince Edward Island	Nil.	Nil.		$1,393,900		$1,393,900
Manitoba	59	Nil.	105		164	
North-west Territories	202	1,945	Nil.		2,147	
British Columbia	486	596	Nil.		1,082	
Yukon	84	Nil.	Nil.		84	
Total	3,992	*2,541	1,770	†$1,393,900	8,303	$1,393,900

* In the Guarantee Column, 1,225 miles are Grand Trunk Pacific and 720 Canadian Northern.

† In the column 'Government Construction,' the amount voted for Prince Edward Island is given. It is on account of improvement to the Prince Edward Island Railway and the building of a new line of 50½ miles now under construction.

DATE OF CONVENING PARLIAMENT.

Mr. N. BOYD (Macdonald). Mr. Speaker, once more I enter my very strong protest against the late date at which this session was called. It is most unfair to members of parliament, coming from British Columbia, Manitoba, the North-west Territories and the outlying portions of the eastern provinces, that the session should be so late in opening. I do not care what party may be in power, I enter my protest against it. I emphasize most strongly what I have already said: that in the interests of members of parliament coming from a long distance it is an outrage for any government to call parliament together at such a late date as the middle of March. Those of us who are engaged in agricultural pursuits have been here since before our crop was put in, and now it has been reaped, and threshed and sold. The most egregious part of it is that we will not be able to participate in the proceeds of the harvest; the money will be all gone. It is true, the government say that under the circumstances it was impossible for parliament to meet earlier owing to the illness of the Premier. That may be a very just cause in this particular instance; but delay has occurred before, and it may occur again. It is largely brought about through the officials of the departments, to a very great extent governing the actions of the government. The Minister of Justice smiles, but he knows that it is too true. He knows that this report cannot be got ready and that report cannot be got ready; but if the ministers would exercise the power which they possess and which they should exercise, and would say to those men that the reports must be got ready or some other person would get them ready, I think they would be ready. The government must have known the enormity of the business that was before them; if they did not know it, they were at fault. We were promised the Redistribution Bill, and we expected it, and we knew its contentious character.

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose the hon. member intends to conclude with a motion.

Mr. BOYD. If I am not prevented, I shall. I wish to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the length of time we have been kept here. I also want to call your attention to the money voted and the liabilities incurred during this session:

Main estimates	$ 57,109,974 35
1st supplementary estimates for the year ending 30th June, 1903	300,000 00
2nd supplementary estimates for the year ending 30th June, 1903.	5,090,968 27
3rd supplementary estimates for the year ending 30th June, 1904.	10,590,863 12
4th supplementary estimates for the year ending 30th June, 1904.	771,365 55
5th supplementary estimates for the year ending 30th June, 1904.	1,333 34
	$73,864,504 63
Bounties on iron and steel, based on last year's appropriation	1,148,000 00
Bounties on lead	300,000 00
Railway subsides, minimum (maximum $18,000,000)	13,000,000 00
G. T. P. Railway (Mr. Blair's estimate)	120,000,000 00
Canadian Northern Railway	10,010,000 00
Subsidies to bridges in the province of Quebec	150,000 00
Quebec city bridge	6,678,200 00
Guarantee of the G. T. P. bonds from Winnipeg to the Pacific	31,000,000 00
Increase in civil service salaries.	80,000 00
Bounties on binder twine	50,000 00
	$256,280,704 63

Knowing all these things, and the other important items to which I have drawn your attention, is it not strange that the government should have deferred calling this parliament together until the 12th of March? If they decide to go to the country, I do not think we shall have the misfortune of having this government to call parliament together again ; but if they do not go to the country, I as a western man want to enter my strong protest against calling parliament to meet at such a very late date.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that this House was not called together sooner, and whatever government may be in power, I hope it will see its way clear to call the members together earlier in the year in future. I think, Mr. Speaker, that you more than any other member of the House will regret the length of the session, because I notice by the British North America Act that you are not allowed to leave this House for forty-eight hours at a time. Consequently you have been tied here while the rest of us have been able to go away. This is said to be the longest session on record in Canada. If this is a long session, I think the people of Canada are long-suffering in allowing us to remain here so long and to spend so much money as we have been doing. I have sat in my seat and listened to many of the eloquent speeches that have been made ; but when I have listened to some of village Hampdens talking for hours and saying so little, I felt like looking at the door for a prototype of the great protector to come in and order that mace to be taken away and the doors to be closed and us to be sent away about our business ; and I thought that if that happened, the country would not suffer a particle. I hope during the recess that members will think well of the subjects they are about to introduce, and so condense and boil down their speeches after this that they will not last longer than fifteen or twenty minutes.

Mr. WALTER SCOTT (West Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, I desire to take advantage of the present opportunity to correct a misstatement in the press, occasioned, I think, by an inadvertence on the part of one of my colleagues from the North-west at the time the question of North-west autonomy was discussed a few days ago. That misstatement is, I think, calculated to prejudice the minds of people against the demands of the North-west with regard to provincial autonomy. It is to the effect that Mr. Haultain demands compensation for the lands which have been homesteaded. There is no such request in the draft Bill which was presented here about a year and a half ago by Mr. Haultain. The compensation requested was for lands which have been granted to railway companies. I think that was the whole request for compensation for lands.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Might I call the attention of my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) to the fact that the hon. member for West Assiniboia is referring to a past debate.

Mr. BELCOURT. It is after eleven o'clock.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, he has been alluding to a statement in a newspaper.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). He alluded to the debate on provincial autonomy.

Mr. SCOTT. My reference is to a mistaken press report which I have seen. I am going to refer to another statement in the press to the effect that Premier Haultain wishes to establish as a province an area of 2,500,000 square miles. That is even a worse mistake than the other. The territory which we in the North-west wish to establish as a province is an area of less than 400,000 square miles.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). 404,000.

Mr. SCOTT. The present organized territories, with the addition of the district of Athabasca.

Mr. W. F. McCREARY (Selkirk). I wish to emphasize what the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) has said about bringing us here so late in the year. I think I know the feeling of business men in the west on both sides of politics. I speak especially for the city of Winnipeg. There are a number of men in Manitoba and the North-west who would like well enough to come to parliament, and who would be useful members of this House, but, when spoken to on the subject, they express themselves about in this way : We would be called to Ottawa in the middle of March and would get back in the month of November. That would be simply ruinous to our business. It is better for us to keep out of politics. I know men who really should be members of this House, but who positively refuse to run, for that reason. I submit that in the ordinary course of business, with our fiscal year ending with the end of June, it ought to be possible to make the returns so as to open the session in December. Then let us have, say, three weeks of sitting in December, adjourn for two weeks, and reassemble in January. By doing this, I believe we could get through the business of the session by the end of March. To have the session during that period would not be a great inconvenience to business men of the west. But as it is at present, it would be simply ruination.

I notice that, with the long distance telephone and the other facilities for communication and transportation a man from any-

where near Ottawa is practically able to carry on his business. I know of five or six lawyers in this House who go home on Friday night, and by means of this and the long-distance telephone, they are able to arrange so that their business scarcely suffers at all. Of course, I do not find fault with that. But the western man is shut out from his business entirely. Unlike by hon. friend from Macdonald, I am perfectly decided in my own mind that this government is going to call us here again before an election, and I am going to ask the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) to seriously consider if he could not call next session early in January.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). Better start now.

Mr. McCREARY. Well, two weeks' rest might be given us anyhow. But, before this matter becomes a serious one in the west—and it is rapidly becoming so—I would ask that this be considered with a view to arranging to call us together earlier if possible.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I thoroughly agree with all that my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) and my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) have said. As my hon. friend from Selkirk remarks, one serious thing about the lateness and length of the session is that it will have the effect of keeping men out of public life who ought to be here, simply because to enter public life would mean ruin to their business. But one point my hon. friends have not touched upon, which I think is of equal importance. It is important, not only that parliament should meet early, but that government measures should be brought down early in the session. You may call the session as early as you like, but if you keep the government measures back for three or four months, you must have a long session, you must have part of the summer taken up. I can realize—though perhaps not fully—that to accomplish this is not easy in all cases. But I think it should be the aim of the country to endeavour to so arrange the business that this can be done. In case you call your session early in January you might leave here at the end of April at the latest if the government business were brought down within two or three weeks of the opening of the session. It is the duty of the opposition, of course, to see to it that grievances are remedied before supply is granted. No government can expect to make great progress in supply until the opposition are sure that all important government measures have been brought down. When these are once before the House, reasonable progress is always assured, unless you have an opposition that is inclined to be unreasonable—and there has been no instance of that during the last seven years.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). I am not quite certain that I can agree with the last statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) but I can entirely agree with him that it is very desirable that this House should meet early, that business should be ready, and that prorogation should take place within three or four months of the opening. It must be remembered of course, that we have now a very large country under our jurisdiction—about half a continent—and we cannot dispose of its business quite so expeditiously as we could many years ago. But I think I voice the opinion of hon. members on both sides when I say that it is very desirable that the session should be shortened and that there should be no repetition of this unprecedentedly long session. But I think I may add that the opinion of the great majority of the members of the House would be in favour, not merely of shortening the session, but, that as a help toward that desirable end, there should be a shortening of the speeches. Now, I have myself an opinion as to the cause of the lengthening of speeches, and so of the session. I have seen sessions—I think there are few members who can say the same—with and sessions without a 'Hansard'; and I am bound to say that if we want short sessions one of the most practical improvements that we can make—I am speaking for myself alone and under correction—would be to dispense with 'Hansard.' In other respects I agree with my hon. friend that it is most desirable to meet early, though I do not think it would be possible to meet in December. I think that the first of February is as early as we can hope to meet under our present system, with the fiscal year ending on the 30th of June. But I see no reason why, meeting on the first of February, we should not finish our business by the birthday of Her late lamented Majesty, provided we exercise discretion and speak at reasonable length.

PROROGATION.

A Message from His Excellency the Governor General by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod.

Mr. SPEAKER :

His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of your Honourable House in the Chamber of the Honourable Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate chamber.

IN THE SENATE CHAMBER.

His Excellency was pleased to give, in His Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills :

An Act further to amend the Act respecting Public and Reformatory Prisons.

An Act respecting the Manufacture of Binder Twine in Canada.

An Act to enable the City of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine River water power.

An Act to incorporate the Stewart River Development Company.

An Act for the relief of Ellen McDermid.

An Act for the relief of Stephen Wilson.

An Act to incorporate the Alliance Bank of Canada.

An Act to incorporate the Imperial Agency.

An Act to incorporate the Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Company.

An Act to incorporate the Southern Central Pacific Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the St. Chrysostôme Railway Company.

An Act to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Keller Heater Company of Canada, Limited.

An Act to incorporate the Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Ontario and Quebec Power Company.

An Act to amend the Act Respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships.

An Act to incorporate the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company.

An Act for the relief of Harford Ashley.

An Act respecting Penny Banks.

An Act to amend chapter 8 of the Statutes of 1899 respecting the Bounties on Steel and Iron, and to provide for the payment of Bounties on certain articles manufactured from Steel.

An Act to provide for the payment of Bounties on Lead contained in lead-bearing ores mined in Canada.

An Act to assist in establishing and maintaining an independent and efficient Service of Telegraphic News from Great Britain for publication in the Canadian Press.

An Act to amend the Mounted Police Act, 1894.

An Act to amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.

An Act to incorporate the Canadian Transportation and Storage Company.

An Act respecting the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company.

An Act further to amend the Yukon Territory Act.

An Act to increase the Representation of the North-west Territories in the Senate.

An Act to incorporate the Brockville, Westport and North-western Railway Company.

An Act further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act 1898.

An Act respecting the Western Assurance Company.

An Act to amend the Act relating to Ocean Steamship Subsidies.

An Act to amend the Act respecting the Department of Railways and Canals.

An Act to incorporate the Ottawa River Railway Company.

An Act further to amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.

An Act to provide for Advances to the Government of the North-west Territories.

An Act to amend the Act respecting the Harbour of North Sydney in Nova Scotia.

An Act to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act, the Exchequer Court Act, and the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.

An Act respecting the construction of a National Transcontinental Railway.

An Act to amend the Manitoba Grain Act, 1900.

An Act to readjust the Representation in the House of Commons.

An Act to amend the Shipping Casualties Act, 1901.

An Act respecting the Pilotage District of Montreal, and the Port and Pilotage District of Quebec.

An Act to amend the North-west Territories Act.

An Act respecting the Revised Statutes of Canada.

An Act further to amend the General Inspection Act.

An Act respecting the Librarians of Parliament.

An Act respecting the Registrar of the Supreme Court.

An Act respecting the management and control of Public and other Works.

An Act to amend the Customs Tariff, 1897.

An Act to authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.

An Act to authorize aid to the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company towards the completion of its undertaking and to confirm an agreement between His Majesty and the said Company.

An Act to amend the Civil Service Act.

An Act to amend and consolidate the law respecting Railways.

An Act respecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to Railway Debts.

To these Bills the Royal assent was pronounced by the Clerk of the Senate in the following words :

In His Majesty's name, His Excellency the Governor General doth assent to these Bills.

Then the Honourable the Speaker of the House of Commons addressed His Excellency the Governor General, as follows :

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY :

The Commons of Canada have voted the Supplies required to enable the government to defray the expenses of the public service.

In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Excellency the following Bill :—

An Act for granting to His Excellency certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 30th June, 1904.

to which Bill I humbly request Your Excellency's assent.

To this Bill the Clerk of the Senate, by His Excellency's command, did thereupon say :

In His Majesty's name, His Excellency the Governor General thanks his loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this Bill.

After which His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to close the third session of the ninth parliament of the Dominion with the following

SPEECH.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

In relieving you from further attendance after an unusually long and laborious session of parliament, I desire to convey to you my best thanks for the assiduity you have shown in the discharge of your onerous duties.

The session now closing will long be remembered, not only for its great length, but also for the many useful and important measures that have been enacted, all tending to advance the prosperity of the country.

The unprecedented number of private and public Bills that have been passed during the present session may be taken as an evidence of the great industrial development that is going on throughout the Dominion.

A steadily expanding revenue has enabled my government not only to materially reduce the debt of the Dominion, but also to submit for your approval numerous grants for useful public works, in addition to liberal subsidies for the extension of our railway system, which contributes so largely to the development of our country.

In view of the flow of immigrants now seeking homes in Manitoba and the North-west Territories and of the rapid increase of products requiring facilities to reach the markets of Europe via Canadian ports, and in order to promote the settlement of the great areas of agricultural, mineral and forest lands still untouched in the older provinces, my ministers considered it essential to obtain authority from parliament for the construction of a second transcontinental railway, the eastern division of which should serve as a common railway highway from Winnipeg to the maritime ports of Canada. It will be the duty of my ministers to proceed immediately with the necessary surveys so that the work of construction of that portion of the line which extends from Moncton to Winnipeg, may be prosecuted with all possible speed.

The Act authorizing the transfer of the powers heretofore exercised by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council to a permanent board of commissioners who will have supreme control over the administration of the railways of Canada, will, I have no doubt, be hailed with much satisfaction.

The difficult task of readjusting the representation of the people in the House of Commons, in accordance with the British North America Act on a basis not open to fair criticism has been accomplished in a manner that I trust will prove satisfactory to the electorate.

The subsidy granted by parliament for the establishment of a line of steamers affording direct connection with France will, I have every reason to believe, result in a largely increased trade with that country.

The amendments to the law relating to the naturalization of aliens will have the effect of removing the disadvantages under which Canadians desirous of returning to their native land have hitherto laboured, and will also materially facilitate the naturalization of the many settlers seeking homes in Manitoba and the territories.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

I thank you for the liberal provision you have made for the public service.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

In taking leave of you may I express the hope that the sacrifices you have been called on to make by an attendance on this protracted session may be rewarded by the reflection that your labours have been productive of great benefit to the Dominion.

The SPEAKER of the Senate then said :

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

It is HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S will and pleasure, that this Parliament be prorogued until Thursday, the third day of December next, to be here holden, and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued until the third day of December next.

INDEX.

THIRD SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT, 1903.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following :—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading ; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist ; *, without remarks or debate ; Accts., Accounts ; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned ; Amt., Amendment ; Amts., Amendments ; Amalg., Amalgamation ; Ans., Answer ; Ass., Assurance ; B., Bill ; B.C., British Columbia ; Can., Canada or Canadian ; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway ; Com., Committee ; Co., Company ; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence ; Consd., Consider ; Consdn., Consideration ; Cor., Correspondence ; Deb., Debate ; Dept., Department ; Depts., Departments ; Div., Division ; Dom., Dominion ; Govt., Government ; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General ; Hse., House ; H. of C., House of Commons ; Incorp., Incorporation ; Ins., Insurance ; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway ; Man., Manitoba ; Mess., Message ; M., Motion ; m., moved. Neg., Negatived ; N.B., New Brunswick ; N.W.T., North-west Territories ; N.S., Nova Scotia ; O.C., Order in Council ; Ont., Ontario ; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island ; P.O., Post Office ; Par., Paragraph ; Prop., Proposed ; Q., Quebec ; Ques., Question ; Recom., Recommit ; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference ; Rep., Report, Reported ; Reps., Reports ; Res., Resolution ; Ret., Return ; Ry., Railway ; Rys., Railways ; Sel., Select ; Sen., Senate ; Sp., Special ; Stmnt., Statement ; Sup., Supply ; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary ; Wthdn., Withdrawn ; Wthdrl., Withdrawal ; Y.N., Yeas and Nays ; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

Alcorn, Mr. G. O., *Prince Edward.*

Anderson, Mr. J. G., Appnmt. as Fruit Inspector (Ques.) 13372 (vi).

Binder Twine Inspection, Method of Collection, &c. (Ques.) 14684 (vi).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 3° (amt.) 12703 ; Neg. (Y. 35 ; N. 75) 12705 (v).

——— Pets *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections 13274 (vi).

Picton Mail Service, Irregular Delivery, &c. (remarks) 13134 (vi).

SUPPLY :

Public Works : Buildings—B. C. (Rossland, armoury) 13133 ; Dom. (rentals, &c.) 13133 ; Man. (Winnipeg, military buildings) 13129 ; Ont. (Cobourg, P.O. 13118 ; (Deseronto, P. O.) 13113 ; (Picton, P.O.) 13113 (vi).

Angers, Mr. C., *Charlevoix.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5192 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10349 (v).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6493 (iii).

Archambault, Mr. J. E., *Berthier.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co's. Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10071 (iv).

Avery, Mr. M. *Addington.*

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5461 (iii).

Avery, Mr. M.—*Con.*

Enterprise Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 14007 (vi).

Ry. Act Amt. B.21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4710 (ii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11606 (v).

SUPPLY :

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4107 (ii).

Public Works : Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Wolfe Island, shoal) 13252 (vi) : Que. (Crane Island, wharf) 1513 ; (Grande Valleé, pier) 1515 ; (Murray Bay, wharf) 2267 : St. Alexis Bay) 2290 (i) ; Miscellaneous (Ottawa river, surveys) 13345 (vi).

Quarantine (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5500 (iii).

Ball, Mr. G., *Nicolet.*

Atlantic & Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s (B. 36) 1°*, 446 ; 2° m., 852, 1505 (i).

Budget, The, 2234 (i).

Chambly Canal Collector, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 12497 (v).

Drill Hall, St. Johns, Que., Contract, &c. (Ques.) 12496 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10165 (v)

Moreau, H., Collector, Chambly Canal, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 12497 (v).

Ottawa & Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s (B. 36) M. to ref. back to Com., 6617 (iii).

St. Johns, Que., Drill Hall, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 12496 (v).

Barker, Mr. S., *Hamilton.*

Audit Act. Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11163 (v).

Barker, Mr. Saml.—*Con.*

Auditor General and Civil Service Amt. B. (remarks) in Com., 13808 (vi).

Auditor General and Treasury Board, Payment to Members (remarks) 10956 (v).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 157 (Mr. *Stewart*) in Com., 5987 (iii).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7426 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4368, 4963 (ii) 5623, 5634, 5786 (iii).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5883 (iii).

Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4420 (ii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 830 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com on Res., 12521 (ii), in Com. on B., 13808 (vi).

Desjardins Canal B. 183 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 3394 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act (Compulsory Voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 899; in Com., 909 (i), 14416 (vi).

France and Can. SS. Subsidy B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 12296 (v).

G.O.C., Lord Dundonald's Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2410 (i).

Govt. Railways Act Amt. B. 258: *See* 'Ry. Act' B.

Grain Standards, Samples, &c. (remarks) 11181 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5156 (iii), 7852; on M. for 3°, 8062 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8593 (iv); in Com., 10446, 11190, 11249, 11377, 11835, 11918, 11972, 11999, 12187, 12263 (v); on M. for 3°, (amt.) 12768 (vi).

G. T. Pacific, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to read Affidavits (remarks) 14848 (vi).

Halifax Cotton Co., Loan of Steel Rails, &c. (remarks) 14478 (vi).

I. C. R., Expenditure Chargeable to Capital (remarks) 14107 (vi).

——— General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3669 (ii).

——— Gross Earnings, Interim Reps. (Ques.) 4444 (ii).

——— Locomotives, Cars, &c., in Stock, &c. (Ques.) 4361 (ii).

——— Trackmen: *See* 'Trackmen.'

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10762, 11410 (v).

Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Com. on Privs and Elections, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7919 (iv).

Barker, Mr. Saml.—*Con.*

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5093 (ii).

Montreal Terminal Co. (remarks) 6097 (iii).

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12326 (v).

Ont. & Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 2716 (ii).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 4869 (ii).

Over-Expenditures by Depts.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7558 (iii).

Penny Banks Establishment B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10796 (v).

Public Accounts Com., producing census schedules (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7063 (iii).

Public Works Dept. Control and Management B. 269 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14741 (vi).

Railway Accidents, Investigation into (remarks) 1336 (i).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 251 (i); on M. for Com., 2590; in Com., 2598, 3563, 3723, 3833, 3887 (ii); 5252, 5569, 5682, 5768, 6073, 6087, 6179, 6214, 6244 (iii), 8153 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 13841; (remarks) *re* Free Conference, 14760 (vi).

Ry. Act (supplies to I. C. R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12576 (v); in Com. on B., 12952 (vi).

Railway Appropriations, Transfer, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14055 (vi).

Ry. Labour Disputes Settlement B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on Sen. Amets., 5654 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14475 (vi).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 1241 (i); in Com. (Brant) 11101, 11032; on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) to M. for 3°, 12438 (v).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6521 (iii).

Supplies for I.C.R.: *See* 'Ry. Act, B. 258.'

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census schedules) 7063 (iii); (contingencies) 4353; (postage, &c.) 4355 (ii).

Canals: Trent (Corry & Laverdure, contract) 7558 (iii).

Civil Govt.: Finance (Insurance) 12586 (v).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7782 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 6000 (iii).

Militia (Hamilton drill hall) 6950 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Art Gallery) 12589; (Dom. and Prov. arbitration) 12591; (Paris agency) 12589 (v).

Public Works: Buildings, N.B. (Marysville) 5841; N.S. (Arichat) 5830; (Middleton armoury) 5841; (Military college) 5842; Toronto post office) 5842 (iii); Ottawa (census building) 991; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 998; Que. (Montreal examining warehouse) 435 (i).

Barker, Mr. Saml—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Columbia river) 1454; Generally (dredges, repairs) 2615; Man. (Lake Francis outlet) 1449; Ont. (Burlington channel) 1359; (Wendover wharf) 1435 (i); Que. (Hull wharf) 5901; (Isle Grosbois) 5902 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Dixon, F. A.) 2726; (engineers' salaries) 2726; (surveys, &c.) 2721 (ii).

Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 2691(ii).

Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2684 (ii).

Telegraph Lines (Mar. Provs., cables) 2709 (ii); (Quesnel-Atlin branch) 5826 (iii).

Railways: G.T.R. (rentals) 12890 (vi).

I.C.R. (air brakes, freights) 8282; (air signals) 8311 (iv); (Amqui accommodation) 12601 (v); (bridge strengthening) 3699 (ii), 8272 (iv); (Canso ferry service) 12602 (v), 14094 (vi); (Chaudière junction, engine house) 8315 (iv), 12594 (v); (Connolly's claim, &c.) 14103; (double tracking, &c.) 14062 (vi); (draw-bars, exchange) 8288 (iv); (Eel River, agent's house) 12600 (v); (general vote) 12873; (Grand Narrows bridge protection) 14095 (vi); (Lévis accommodation) 3703 (ii); (Miramichi bridge) 8309 (iv); (Moncton accommodation) 12599 (v); (Moncton, station) 14090 (vi); (Moncton work shops) 8312 (iv); (original construction) 3698 (ii); (Ouelle River, spur line) 12599 (v); (Pictou accommodation) 14088 (vi); (Pintsch gas equipment) 8291 (iv); (power saw) 12607 (v); (Restigouche bridge) 8304; (Rivière du Loup work shops) 8314; (Rivière du Loup, yards) 8310; (rolling stock) 8292 (iv), 14101 (vi); (St. John, accommodation) 8315 (iv), 12596 (v); (sidings, additional) 14055, 14081; (steel rails, &c.) 14098 (vi); (Sydney accommodation) 3696 (ii); (Truro accommodation) 12603 (v).

Miscellaneous (Dixon, F. A.) 2726 (ii).

P. E. I. (Charlottetown station) 14131 (vi); (general vote) 12608 (v); (Hillsborough bridge) 14108, 14116 (vi); (Murray Harbour branch) 7530 (iii).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9419 (iv).

Trackmen on I. C. R., Wages Increase, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14087 (vi).

Transportation Commission, Sir Wm. Van Horne's Views, &c. (Ques.) 8330 (iv).

Treadgold Concessions, on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2906 (ii).

Trois Pistoles Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14475 (vi).

Wilson, Stephen, Relief B. 228 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 9152 (iv).

Beith, Mr. R., *Durham W.*

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Bowmanville) 511 (i).

Beland, Mr. H. S., *Beauce.*

Chicoutimi and North-eastern Ry. Co.'s Incorp. (B. 168) 1°*, 2582 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10224 (v).

Belcourt, Mr. N. A., *Ottawa.*

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on Ques. of Order, 7342. (iii).

Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 118) 1°*, 1643 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12337, 12505, 12567 (v); on M. for 3°, 13947 (vi).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com.. 7508 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 14418 (vi).

Dom. Gas Improvement Co.'s (B. 91) 1°*, 1193 (i).

Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3578 (ii).

Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8246 (iv).

Federal Oil Co.'s (B. 30) 1°*, 367 (i).

G.T.P. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. (Mr. *Monk*) that Committee not properly constituted and 'Debates' not being reported (ruling) 10633 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry., Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) 14849 (vi).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 758 (i),

Incorporated Companies B. 94 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3259 (ii).

Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections, on M. (Mr. *Wade*) to conc., 8042 (iv).

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5094 (ii).

New Canadian Co.'s incorp. (B. 83) 2° m., 1512.

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 73) 3° m., 4869 (ii).

Ottawa Electric Ry. Co.'s (B. 108) 1°*, 1378 (i).

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineers, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for Copies, 1318 (i).

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6809 (iii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5864, 5868 (iii).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s (B. 84) 1°*, 1023 (i).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6302 (iii).

Ry. Debts. Bill: *See* 'Exchequer,' &c.

SUPPLY:

Post Office (letter carriers, salaries) 6027; (ry. mail clerks) 6027 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (Ottawa post-office) 438 (i).

Supreme Court Registrar's B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14301 (vi).

Yukon Regulations *re* Dom. Lands, in Com. on Res., 13796 (vi).

Bell, Mr. A. C., *Pictou.*

Alaskan Boundary Commission, Lord Alverstone's Communication, Par. in Ottawa *Citizen* 13671 (vi).

Bell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Alaskan Boundary Commission, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 14819 (vi).
Amherst Postoffice, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 1591 (i).
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4249 (ii).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Delay of Govt., &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14193 (vi).
Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°*, 11170 (v).
Auditor General and Civil Service Bill (remarks) 13811 (vi).
Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6360 (iii).
Budget, The, 1907 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5053, 5074 (ii), 5432 (iii).
Canadian Mail via New York, Tons, &c. (Ques.) 10713 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co. Loan B. (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4367 (ii).
Cattle Embargo in G.B. (remarks) 267 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 368 (i).
Census Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13740 (vi).
See: Supply—Agriculture.'
Chamberlain, Mr.: *See* 'Militia Act.'
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 13811 (vi).
Clergue Co. and Govt. Contract *re* Steel Rails (remarks) 14098 (vi).
Commanders of Govt. Steamers, Names, &c. (Ques.) 446 (i).
Conciliation Boards, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3628 (ii.)
Conciliators, Settlement of Labour Disputes, &c. (Ques.) 4003 (ii).
Customs Act (Surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3076 (ii).
Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 583 (i).
Dom. Elections Act. Amt. B. 3, on M. (Mr. *Fielding*) to ref. to Sel. Com., 3003 (ii).
Dom. Notes Security B. 222 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6913 (iii).
Electoral Lists, N.S., Changes *re* Printing, &c. (Ques.) 8331 (iv).
Financial Review (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 14601; Neg. (Y. 30, N. 68) 14642 (vi).
Fire at Mortimer & Co.'s, Govt. property destroyed (Ques.) 4836 (ii).
Fishing within Three-Mile Limit, Guysboro, N. S. (remarks) 4179 (ii).
Govt. Rys. Act Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12583 (v).
Govt. Steamers, Names of Commanders, &c. (Ques.) 446 (i).

Bell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on Order for Com., 4132 (ii); in Com., 5167 (iii); on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7828 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9784 (iv), 11213, 11243, 11368, 11936, 11991 (v); on M. for 3° (Amt.) 12772 (vi).
———Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13287 (vi).
——— Ques. of Order, 13286 (vi).
See 'Ry. Policy.'
Halifax Marine and Fishery Offices, Resolution of City Council, Tel. (read) 14279 (vi).
House of Commons, Clerks, &c.: *see* 'Civil Service B.'
Hurley, Mr. (remarks) 13744 (vi).
Hydraulic Dredge, Mar. Provs. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13319 (vi).
Hydraulic Leases, Yukon Ter. (M. for cor.*) 288 (i).
Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Sup., 6577 (iii).
I.C.R., Free Transportation, Names, &c. (M. for ret.) 2337 (i).
General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3687 (ii).
——— Lorne Siding, Ry. Traffic, &c. (Ques.) 2918 (ii).
——— Rates for Cattle and Coal, &c. (Ques.) 1857 (i).
——— (M. for Ret.*) 2338 (i).
——— Inquiry for Papers, 3712 (ii).
International Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res, 7975 (iv).
Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 4279 (ii).
Labour Disputes, Settlement, &c. (Ques.) 4003 (ii).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8213 (iv).
Librarians of Parlt., Salary B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 13833 (vi).
Lime Rock, N.S., Postmaster, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 1297 (i).
Mail *via* New York: *see* 'Can. Mail,' &c.
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, sent from H. of C., 14536, 14574 (vi).
Markland, Schr., Seizure, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5995 (iii).
Militia Act. Amt. and Mr. Chamberlain's Suggestions (remarks) 6540 (iii).
Ministerial Changes, on Explanation, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 186 (i).
Minto, Govt. Steamer, Passengers, &c. (Ques.) 3631 (ii).
North Pole Expedition, Govt. Aid to (remarks) 12811 (vi).

Bell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Nova Scotia Bank, Customs Duty *re* Safe (remarks) 13988 (vi).

N. S. and Can., Financial Terms, &c. (Ques.) 3001 (i).

Parliamentary Librarians: *see* 'Librarians.'

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5857 (iii).

Post Office, Deptl. Rep. Distribution, &c. (remarks) 879 (i).

Pugwash, N.S. Lighthouse-keeper (Ques.) 1856 (i).

Quebec Bridge Subsidies B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14696 (vi).

'Ragging' in the British Army (remarks) 3134 (ii).

Railway Policy of Govt., &c., on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7121 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14370 (vi).

Railway Subsidies *re* Provinces, &c. (remarks) 14687 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11028; in Com. (N.S.) 11809 (v).

Safe purchased by Bank of N. S., Customs Duties *re* (remarks) 13988 (vi).

Scotch Hill Station, Pets, *re* (Ques.) 872 (i).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6494, 7214 (iii).

Springhill, N.S., Armouries, Caretaker, &c. (Ques.) 1856 (i).

Steel Rails: *See* 'Clergue,' &c.

Supplies for I. C. R.: *See* 'Govt. Rys. B. 258.'

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census, Coté's circular) 4661; (general statistics) 4429 (ii).

Charges of Management (Dom. notes) 12585 (v); (public dept) 14204 (vi).

Civil Government; Customs (salaries) 325 (i).

Customs (preferential tariff) 3937 (ii).

Excise (adulteration of food, &c.,) 5389; (analysts, &c.) 5389 (iii).

Fisheries (fish-breeding establishments) 4175; (fishways) 4174 (ii).

Geological Survey (Bell, Dr. appnmt.) 6818; (explorations, &c.) 6818 (iii).

Indians: Mar. Provs. (schools) 6414 (iii).

Inland Revenue (wood alcohol) 241 (i).

Legislation: H. of C. (sessional clerks) 14113 (vi); (voters' lists) 5276 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lightkeepers, salaries) 4132; (Montreal pilot commission) 4173; (St. Lawrence navigation) 4159 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 6000 (iii); (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 14250 (vi).

Miscellaneous (arbitration, Dom. and Provs.) 12590; (Art Gallery) 12589; (Mining Institute) 12591 (vi.)

N. W. Mounted Police (pay of force) 5262 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4078 (ii).

Post Office (arrears of salaries, postmasters) 5922; (Dawson and Eagle City) 5923; (salaries, &c.) 5924 (iii).

Bell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works: Buildings, N.B. (St. John drill hall) 13044 (vi); Ottawa (furniture, &c.) 982 (i); (ventilation of Chamber) 13007; Quebec (hospital for trachoma) 14245; (military iron foundry) 14247 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Caraquet wharf) 1176; N.S. (Drumhead breakwater) 1083; (Glace Bay) 1094; (Meteghan Cove) 1137 (i); Ont. (Port Arthur dredging) 13021 (vi).

Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2680 (ii).

Telegraph Lines—Que. (Anticosti, &c.) 5917.

Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 3700; (Lévis accommodation) 3703 (ii); (New Glasgow freight shed) 14096; (Pictou accommodation) 14088; (rolling stock) 14101; (steel rails) 14098 (vi); (Stellarton accommodation) 8299 (iv).

Yukon Ter. (govtl. expenses) 6802 (iii).

Tariff Policy of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4912 (ii).

Thanksgiving Day, Adjournment (remarks) 13379.

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3497 (ii).

Treadgold Concessions, Free Representations, &c. (Ques.) 5990 (iii).

——— Hydraulic Leases, &c. (M. for cor.*) 288.

——— Instructions to Commissioners (remarks) 5242 (iii).

——— Tel. from Dawson Board of Trade, &c. (Ques.) 1195 (i).

United Empire Life Ins. Co.'s B. 163 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 3796 (ii).

Voters' Lists, N.S.: *See* 'Electoral.'

Winter Communication with P.E.I., on M. (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) for Cor., 1044 (i).

Yukon, Hydraulic Leases: *See* 'Hydraulic.'

Bennett, Mr. W. H., *E. Simcoe.*

Alaska, Str., Purchase, &c. (Ques.) 6629 (iii).

Ashcroft-Barkerville Mail Contract, &c. (Ques.) 1595 (i).

Bayfield, Str., Reps. of Mr. Evans and others (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5742 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7379 (iii).

Bonding Privileges with U.S. (remarks) 12761 (vi).

Brunet, Arthur and Dom. Elections Act, on M. (Mr. *Casgrain*) for Pets., &c., 108 (i).

Cane Bros., Timber License, &c. (Ques.) 2757 (ii).

Collingwood Dock, Estimated Cost (remarks) 5871 (iii).

Collingwood Harbour Dry Dock, &c.: Remarks in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4679 (ii).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 4016 (ii).

Cutler, Gore Bay Mail Service, &c. (Ques.) 2308.

Cutler, Spanish Mills, &c., Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 2308 (i).

Cutler and Gore Bay Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iii).

Dokis Indian Reserves, Complaints *re* trespassing (Ques.) 7914 (iv).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 895; in Com., 902 (i).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3007, 4679 (ii).

Georgian Bay Islands, Timber Licenses, &c. (Ques,) 2757 (ii).

Grain Importation through Western Lake Ports (Ques.) 97 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9198 (iv); in Com. on B., 10607, 11372, 11871, 12076; on M. for 3°, 12761; (amt.) 12767 (v).

G. T. Pacific Bill, Pets., *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13268, 13276 (vi).

Grant, J. G., Barrie, Customs Collector, Sureties, &c. (Ques.) 5991 (iii).

Huron Judgeship, Appnmt. of Mr. Holt (remarks) 207, 215 (i).

I.C.R., Stations, Restaurants, Fire Protection, &c. (Ques.) 14663 (vi).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7925, 7970 (iv).

Judges appointed from Local Bar: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10765, 10771; in Com. on B., 11420 (vi).

Judges' Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8089 (iv).

Longford, Output of Wood Alcohol, &c. (Ques.) 98 (i).

Loy, Geo. M., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print evidence, 7918 (iv).

Mail Bags, Repairs, &c., in Aurora, Remarks in Com. of Sup, 6139 (iii).

Midland Water Front *re* Lease to Pratt & Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).

Ministerial Changes, on Explanations, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 173 (i).

Moose Deer Point Islands, Sale, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).

Newmarket Office Specialty Co., *re* Personal Explanation (Sir *William Mulock*) 13256 (vi).

Orillia Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).

Ottawa Supply Co., *re* P.O. Contracts, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6146 (iii).

Pratt & Co., Lease of Water Front at Midland: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5294 (iii).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* Visitors to Corridors, 11564 (v).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5779 (iii).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11467, 11611, 11617, 12294 (v).

Ronan, W. and Ottawa Supply Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Saskatchewan Land Co., Sales, &c. (Ques.) 2502 (ii).

Sault Ste. Marie, Labour Disturbances, Militia Action (remarks) 12719 (vi).

Soulanges Canal, Stewart *vs.* King (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vi).

Standard Chemical Company, Purchase of Wood Alcohol, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 227 (i) 5363 (iii).

Stewart *vs.* King, Litigation Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12912 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census, cost, &c.) 4816; (census, Cote's circular) 4667; (Simcoe census) 4825: (Diamond Baker Lumber Co.'s exhibit) 4613; (St. Louis exhibition) 4612 (ii).

Canals—Peterborough (lift lock) 12927 (vi); Sault Ste. Marie (coaling vessels) 7563; Soulanges (construction) 7550; Trent (construction) 7556 (iii).

Civil Government: Justice (appnmt. of Judges) 207; Railways (salaries) 340 (i).

Customs (Midland collector) 3912; (salaries) 3911 (ii).

Dom. Lands (inspector's expenses) 6768; (land guides) 6768 (iii).

Electric Light (inspectors) 5408 (iii).

Excise (methylated spirits, &c.) 5373; (Standard Chemical Co.) 5373; (wood alcohol) 5373 (iii).

Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5285; (Collins, inspector, &c.) 5131; (Hurley, J. M., inspector) 5131; (steamers, &c.) 5283; (water front lease, Midland) 5294 (iii).

Indians: Generally (legal expenses) 6419; Man., &c. (agricultural implements) 6423; (medical attendance) 6329; N.W.T. (Elkhorn school) 6348; (supplies) 6423; Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6339; (survey reserves) 6410; Que. (Waby trial) 6419 (iii).

Inland Revenue (excise examinations) 5363; (Standard Chemical Co.) 227 (i), 5363 (iii).

Justice (Regina jail, land purchase) 5135 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5735 (iii).

Militia (Martineau investigation) 3753; (Valleyfield strike) 3593, 3754 (ii).

Post Office (jubilee stamps) 6060; (mail bag repairs) 6139; (Ottawa Supply Co.) 6146 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings—B. C. (Rossland armoury) 13133; (Rossland P.O.) 13131; (Vancouver P. O.) 13132 (vi); **Dom.** (Orillia, caretaker) 1016; Generally (armouries) 968 (i); **N.B.** (Marysville) 5835 (iii); **N.W.T.** (Macleod, court house) 959; (Red Deer, court house) 960 (i); **N.S.** (Arichat) 5827; (Guysborough) 5839; (Middleton armoury) 5841 (iii); **Ont.** (Alexandria P.O.) 488 (i); (Deseronto P.O.) 13112 (vi); (Midland) 5832 (iii); (Orillia armoury) 968; (Orillia, caretaker) 1007, 1016 (i); (Oshawa P.O.) 13110, (vi); (Owen Sound) 5832 (iii); (St. Mary's P.O.) 13109; (Sault Ste. Marie P.O.) 13107; (Wingham P. O.) 13122 (vi); **Ottawa** (caretakers, &c.) 982; (census building) 990; (elevators) 1012; (furniture, &c.) 973; (rentals, &c.) 990; (Rideau Hall, light, &c.) 1006; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 998; (Royal mint) 345 (i); (steel shelving) 13088 (vi); (telephones) 1014 (i); **Que.** (Acton Vale P.O.) 13059 (vi); (L'Assomption) 429 (i); (Longueuil P.O.) 13069; (Magog P.O.) 13081 (vi), (Montmagny) 5842 (iii) 13066; (St. John's;

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Con.
examining warehouse) 13069; (St. Louis de Mile End, P.O.) 13080; (Terrebonne, P.O.) 13059 (vi); Yukon (White Horse, P.O.) 13133 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Campbellton wharf) 1164; (Caraquet wharf) 1175 (i); (Miscou, wharf) 13234; (Petit Rocher, breakwater) 13234; **N.S.** (Fort Lawrence pier) 13181; (Gabarouse, breakwater) 13182; (Grand Narrows, wharf) 13198; (Indian Harbour, wharf) 13199; (L'Ardoise breakwater) 13201; (McKay's Point, wharf) 13201; (Middle river dam) 13202; (Morrison's Point wharf) 13203 (vi); (New Harbour) 1143 (i); (St. Ann's, wharf) 13204 (vi); (Tiverton breakwater) 1149; (West Baccaro channel) 1151 (i); **Ont.** (Blind River wharf) 13235; (Bracebridge, wharf) 13236 (vi); (Bruce Mines) 5911 (iii); (Collingwood, improvements) 13239 (Couchiching, Lake Simcoe) 13252; (Cumberland, wharf) 13239 (vi); (Goderich harbour) 1367 (i); (Gore's wharf) 13244 (vi); (Kaministiquia river) 5825 (iii); (Midland harbour) 1376 (i), 5909 (iii), 13246; (Parry Sound, wharf) 13248; (Port Arthur, dredging) 13012 (vi); (Port Colborne) 3368 (ii); (Sturgeon Falls, wharf) 1431 (i); (Thessalon, breakwater) 13254; (Victoria harbour) 13255; (Wiarton, wharf) 13256 (vi); **Que.** (Grande Vallee pier) 1517; (Murray Bay wharf) 2268 (i); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3310 (ii).
Miscellaneous (transportation commission) 13365 (vi).
Railways and Canals: Generally (litigation expenses) 12912 (vi); I.C.R. (Chapman ball-bearing apparatus) 8283 (vi); (Lévis, accommodation) 7520 (iii).
Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7277 (iii).
Transcontinental Ry., Govt. Policy, &c. (Ques.) 2308 (i).
Transportation Commissioners and Tariff Inquiry (remarks) 855, 862 (i).
Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13365 (vi).
Trent Canal Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2319 (i).
Wheat Shipments from Port Arthur and Ft. William (Ques.) 284 (i).
Wood Alcohol manufactured at Longford, Output, &c. (Ques.) 98 (i).
Wood Alcohol, Purchase, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 227 (i) 5363 (iii).
Yukon Stenographers, Appnmt. of Mr. J. A. Valiquette (Ques.) 4005 (ii).

Bernier, Hon. M. E., (Minister of Inland Revenue) *St. Hyacinthe.*
Automatic Grain Weighers in N.W.T., on M. (Mr. *Stewart*) for Ret., 881 (i).
Chabot, Mr. F. X., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2015 (i).
Chevrier Family, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12499 (v).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 13813 (vi).
Electric Light Inspection Act Amt. (B. 187) 1°*, 3708; 2° m., 4007 (ii).

Bernier, Hon. M. E.—*Con.*
Excise Taxation, Revenue for 1896 and 1903 (Ans.) 14284 (vi).
Grain Weighing in Man and N.W.T. in Com. on B. 188 (remarks) 4189 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act. Amt. (B. 186) 1° *, 3708; in Com., 4007 (ii).
Inland Revenue Deptl. Rep. (presented) 89 (i).
Milk Can Bill: *See* Weights and Measures B. 20.
O'Reilly, Mr., Claim *re* Tobacco Factory (remark) 13979 (vi).
Postal Scales Bill: *See* Weights and Measures B.
Standard Chemical Co., Purchase of Wood Alcohol, Remarks in Com. of Sup. 227 (i), 5373 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.: Inland Rev. (salaries) 227 (i).
Electric Light (inspectors) 5407 (iii).
Excise (adulteration of food, &c.) 5389; (analysts) 5389; (Fyfe, Mr., salary, &c.) 5381; (grain weighing machines) 5382; (inspectors' salaries) 5381 (iii) 13974 (vi); (methylated spirits, &c.) 5373 (iii); (Prescott, salaries) 13968; (salaries *re* C. S. Act) 13967 (vi); (Standard Chemical Co.) 5373; (tobacco stamps) 5373; (travelling expenses, &c.) 5373, 5404; (wood alcohol) 5373 (iii).
Inland Revenue (Bourassa, Mr., shortage guarantee) 5405, 5407; (excise examinations) 5363; (Ferguson, Mr., legal services) 5412; (Guay, Mr., compensation, &c.) 5407; (Keilty, Mr., appnmt.) 5365, 5378; (Kelly, Mr., refund, &c.) 5404; (minor revenues) 5404; (Montreal office, reimbursement) 5405 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings, Que. (St. Hyacinthe) 440 (i).
Tobacco Duties collected, 1902 (Ans.) 2104 (i).
Tobacco, Duty on raw Leaf, &c. (Ans.) 446 (i).
Trottier, Louis M., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 8488 (iv).
Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2340 (i).
——— (Postal scales) Amt. (B. 188) 1°*, 3708 in Com., 4009, 4187, 4189 (ii).
Wood Alcohol, Purchase, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup. 227 (i), 5373 (iii).

Bickerdike, Mr. R., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*
Bank of Montreal Co.'s (B 72) 1°*, 814 (i).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of (prop. res.) 820; Agreed to (Y. 103; N. 48) 847 (i).
Cigarettes, Prohibition (B. 133) 1° m., 2014 (i), 2° m., 3286 (ii).
See 'Supply-Excise.'
Companies, Incorporated Co.'s (B. 94) 1°*, 1193 (i).
Dom. Burglarly Guarantee Co.'s Change of Name (B. 92) 1°*, 1193 (i).
Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3581 (ii).
Imperial Co.'s incorp. (B.71) 1°*, 814 (i); in Com., 3170 (ii).
Incorporated Companies (B 94) 2° m., 3257 (ii).
Insurance Rates on Steamers *re* St. Lawrence Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7594 (iv).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2507.

Bickerdike, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Montreal Bridge Co.'s (B. 167) 1°*, 2582 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4459 (ii).
Montreal Savings Bank incorp. (B. 153) 1°*, 2501 (ii).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6109 (iii).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 113) in Com., 3225 (ii).
Shipping Federation of Can. incorp. (B. 93) 1°*, 1193 ; 2° m., 1328 (i).
SUPPLY :
Excise (cigarettes analysis) 5394 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 7594 (iiii).
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3483 (ii).

Birkett, Mr, Thos., *Ottawa.*
Blind River Wharf, Plans, &c. (Ques.) 1298 (i).
Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Co.'s incorp. (B. 189) 1°*, 3864 (ii); in Com. 7479; 3° m., 7485.
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12335 ; (amt.) 12349, 12370, 12500 ; (amt.) 12510, 12570 (v) ; 13812 (vi).
Geological Museum, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 11188 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10216 (iv).
Nepean Point Improvement, &c. (Ques.) 11829 (v).
Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 4869 (ii).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6808 (iii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5859 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse supplies) 4168 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4093 (ii).
Public Works : Buildings—Ottawa (electric lighting transformers) 5844 (iii) ; (geological museum) 352 (i) ; (post office elevator) 5844 (iii) ; (Royal Mint) 347 (i) ; (steel drawers, &c.) 13087 ; (Victoria museum) 14244 (vi).
Roads and Bridges (Ottawa, Dufferin, &c.) 13321 (vi).

Blain, Mr. R., *Peel.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen & Co.'s Deposit, 6969 (iii).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7319, 7361 (iii).
Binder Twine, Cost in 1901-2, &c. (Ques.) 447 (i).
——— Names of Purchasers (Ques.) 3798 (ii).
——— Prices for current year, &c. (Ques.) 203 (i).
See 'Supply—Justice.'
Blankets, Web Cloth, &c., purchased by Govt. (Ques.) 10101, 10714, 10954 (v).
British Cable News Service between Can. and G. B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10732(v).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14438 (vi).
Bruce Mines Shed, architect : *See* 'Gordon,' &c.
Budget, The, 1785 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5853 (iii).
——— (remarks *re* Irish butter) in Com. of Sup., 7627 (iv).
Cable Press Despatches from England : *See* 'British Cable.'
C. P. R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14501 (vi).
Census Expenditure (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 13699 ; Neg. (Y. 35 ; N. 69) 13759 (vi).
Census Schedules, Halton, Cardwell and Peel for 1891 (Ques.) 6894 (iii).
Census Schedules, 1891-1901, Questions *re* Peel, Halton, &c. (Ques.) 11425 (v).
See 'Supply—Agriculture,' &c., 'Halton,' &c.
Civil Servants, Interference in Dom. Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3169 (ii).
Compulsory Voting. *See* 'Dom. Election B. 3,'
Criminal Code Amt. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10758 (v).
Country Postmasters' Salaries : *See* 'Supply—Post Office.'
Crown Tailoring Co., Toronto, Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup , 6152 (iii).
Cummings, James, Payments to, by Govt. (Ques.) 9458 (iv).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 3053, 4038 (ii).
Debates Translators, Rental of Offices, &c. (Ques.) 3799 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13594 (vi).
Doukhobors, Pilgrimage, Govt. Action, &c. (Ques.) 1030 (i).
Dredges, New, Cost, Capacity, &c. (Ques.) 1856.
Election Printing in *Advocate*, Prince Albert, in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).
Fishing Industry of N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13165 (vi).
German Goods, 'Teapot,' Importation under Preferential Tariff (remarks) in Customs Act Amt. B., 3056 (ii).
Gordon & Hellowell, Architects, *re* Bruce Mines Shed (remarks) in Com. of Sup,, 5914 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9495 (iv) ; in Com., 10709, 12100, 12280 (v) ; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12724 (vi).
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13273 (vi).
——— Surveys, Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 14650 (vi).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Halton, Cardwell and Peel, Census Schedules (Ques.) 6436 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iii).

——— *See* 'Census.'

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7928 (iv).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10774 (v).

Kelly, Wm., Census Account, &c., Letter *re* (read) 13705 (vi).

Census Commissioner for N. Hastings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7080 (iii).

Latour, L. J., Leave of Absence, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 6895 (iii).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8214 (iv).

Lunenburg Co., Assistance to Fishermen, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vi).

Macpherson, D. F., Census Enumerator: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4820 (ii).

Mails carried via New York (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7728 (iv).

Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 9351 (iv).

Maps, Printing and Publishing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14274 (vi).

Milk Can Bill: *See* 'Weights,' &c.

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12325 (v).

Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 2718 (ii).

Pilotage Act (Montreal and Quebec Districts) Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 13627.

Postmasters Bonds and Insurance Fund (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14655 (vi).

——— *See* 'Supply—Post Office.'

Postmasters in Rural District, Salaries, &c. (remarks) 5863 (iii) 14039 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5863 (iii).

Post Office Insurance Fund, Rep. (remarks) 14660.

——— *See* 'Supply—Postoffice.'

Post Office Savings Bank Defalcations, &c., in Com., of Sup., 14655 (vi).

Press Despatches B.: *See* 'British Cable, &c.'

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Talbot*) 3127 (ii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B.21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3737 (ii), 6101, 6256 (iii).

——— (Supplies to I.C.R.) Amt. B.258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12969 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14380.

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11623, 12293; (Toronto) 11742 (v).

St. Peters and Louisburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).

Savard, Mr. P. V., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6895 (iii).

Supplies for I.C.R.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 258.'

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13507 (vi); (census enumerators) 4646, 4820; (census, land, &c.) 4638; (census schedules) 7054 (iii); (Clinton, census, &c.) 4820 (ii); (cold storage) 7626; (creameries, N. W. T.) 7633 (iv); (exhibitions, furniture, &c.) 4604; (exhibition, Treadgold exhibit) 4612; (experimental farms) 4553; (Japan exhibition) 4635 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7647 (iv).

Canals: Farran's Point (acetylene gas plant) 14155 (vi); Galops (deepening, &c.) 8268 (iv); Soulanges (Goodwin's claim) 14143; (O'Leary's claims) 14651; Welland (mitre sills lowering) 14148 (vi).

Civil Govt.: Inland Rev. (salaries) 231 (i).

Customs (Bracebridge custom house) 3960; (contingent expenses) 3897; (inspectors, preventive service, &c.) 3958; (legal expenses) 3963; (linseed oil fraud) 3934; (preferential tariff) 3945; (salaries, &c.) 3897 (ii).

Dom. Lands (Banff, roads and bridges) 6788; (tree culture) 6779 (iii).

Excise (methylated spirits contract) 5378; (Standard Chemical Co.) 5378 (iii).

Fisheries (*Acadia*, sale of) 13658 (vi).

Immigration (expenditure) 6868; (Lake St. John Col. Co.) 6888; (Ritchie, U.S. agent) 6848; (U.S. agents) 6848 (iii).

Indians: B. C. (expenditure generally) 7266; (industrial schools) 7256; (surveys, &c.) 7269; Generally (legal expenses) 6416; N. W. T. (supplies) 6425; (Stewart, E., travelling expenses) 6416; Yukon (education) 7274 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7764, 7772; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7764 (iv).

Interior (Amos Barnes, claim) 6924; (Banff museum) 6927; (Howie, F. W., legal expenses) 6795 (iii).

Justice: Miscellaneous (Statutes, Revision) 14643 (vi); (Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3515 (ii).

Legislation: Elections (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing) 14268, 14652 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Halifax harbour buoys) 13638; (Marconi stations) 13641 (vi); (St. Lawrence route, insurance) 5761 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Australia) 13680 (vi); (Can. and S. Africa) 5879 (iii) 7749; (G. B. and Can.) 7728; (St. John and Halifax) 7742; (St. John and London) 7738 (iv).

Miscellaneous (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing, &c.) 14268, 14652 (vi); (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6986; (Martineau defalcations) 6991; (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6969 (iii); (Post Office Savings Bank, defalcations) 14655 (vi).

N. W. M. Police (Yukon) 5005 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, supplies, &c.) 4061, 4104, 5039 (ii); (life-saving awards) 13544; (masters and mates examination) 13531 (vi).

Post Office (box rents, &c.) 6139; (country postmasters) 6053; (mail service) 6065; (superannuations) 5932; (supplies, &c.) 6151 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings—B. C. (Rossland, P. O.) 13161; (Vancouver, P. O.) 13132 (vi); Dom. (heating, &c.) 1065; Generally (Brampton armoury) 966; (experimental farms) 973 (i); N.B. (St. John drill hall) 13051 (vi); N. S. (Arichat) 5829; (Guysborough) 5840 (iii); (Sydney Mines) 13028; Ont. (Belleville, armoury) 13083; (Guelph, armoury) 13084, 13085; (Hawkesbury, P. O) 13119; (Oshawa, P. O.) 13111; (St. Mary's, P. O.) 13110;

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

(Sarnia, P. O.) 13117; (Stratford, armoury) 13125; (Windsor, P. O.) 13113; (Woodstock, armoury) 13125 (vi); **Ottawa** (census building) 993 (i); (coal sheds) 13117 (vi); (furniture, &c.) 980 (i); (gas, &c.) 5845 (iii); (heating, &c.) 1010; (lighting, &c.) 974 (i); (post office, improvements) 13117 (vi); Rideau Hall, light, &c.) 1006; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 997 (i); (steel shelving) 13089; **Que.** (Acton Vale, P.O.) 13063; (Longueuil, P.O.) 13071; (Montreal, examining warehouse) 13059; (St. Hyacinthe, drill hall) 13068; (St. Johns, examining warehouse) 13069; (St. Johns, P. O.) 13060 (vi); Docks (repairs, &c.) 2978 (ii);

Dredging (new dredges) 2674 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Esquimalt, graving dock) 5919 (iii); Man. (St. Andrew's Rapids) 3365 (ii); **N.B.** (Dipper Harbour, breakwater) 13233; (Hopewell Cape, wharf) 13234; (Petit Rocher) 13234 (vi); **N. S.** (Amagandus, wharf) 1069 (i); (Big Harbour, wharf) 13145; (Chezzetcook, breakwater) 13217; (Chegoggin, pier) 13179; (Fort Lawrence, pier) 13181; (Frudes Point, wharf); 13180; (Gabarouse, breakwater) 13182 (vi); (Glace Bay) 1088 (i); (Glace Bay, wharf) 13188(vi); (Green Cove, harbour) 1100; (Grand Narrows wharf) 1094 (i); (Iona, harbour) 13200 (Jeddore, wharf) 13179; (Margaretville, breakwater) 13202; (Melbourne, wharf) 13203; (Middle River, dam) 13202; (Morrison's Point, wharf) 13203 (vi); (Neil's Harbour) 1140 (i); (Noel, wharf) 13204; (Poirierville, wharf) 13205; (Port George, breakwater) 13210 (vi); (Port Hawkesbury) 1147 (i); (Port Hood, pier) 13209; (Porter's channel) 13206; (Prospect, wharf) 13205; (St. Ann, wharf) 13203; (Spry Bay, wharf) 13213; (Swim Point, wharf) 13211; (Victoria Beach wharf) 13216; **P.E.I.** (dredging plant) 13314; **Ont.** (Amherstburg dredging) 13235; (Barry's Bay) 13236; (Blind River wharf) 13236; (Bronte, improvements) 13236 (vi); (Bruce mines) 5912 (iii); (Cumberland wharf) 13239 (vi); (general repairs) 1374; (Orillia wharf) 1377; (Petewawa Narrows) 1443; (Pickering harbour) 1377 (i); (Port Arthur) 3344 (ii); (Port Credit) 13251 (vi); (Wendover wharf) 1438 (i); **Que.** (Cacouna wharf) 5897 (iii); (dredging plant) 2674 (ii); (Grande Vallee pier) 1533; (Murray Bay wharf) 2268; (Pointe St. Pierre) 2278 (i); (Rivière du Nord) 5909 (iii); (St. Alexis Bay) 2289; (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2260 (i); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3311 (ii).

Miscellaneous (arbitration and awards) 13339; (Ottawa river surveys) 13342 (vi).

Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 2698; Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2679 (ii).

Telegraph Lines, B.C. (Alberni Clayoquot) 5918; (Quesnel-Atlin branch) 5827(iii); Generally (Marconi system) 2712 (ii); N.W.T. (Alexander Indian agency) 5918 (iii); (Wood mountain, &c.) 13336 (vi); Que. (Anticosti, &c.) 5917 (iii); (Belle Isle) 2712 (ii); (Yukon, construction) 14042 (vi); (Yukon) 2994 (ii).

Quarantine (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5501; (Rutherford, Dr., duties, &c.) 5509 (iii); (small-pox) 5010 (ii).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways: I.C.R. (air brakes, &c.) 8287 (iv); (car shops machinery) 14106 (vi); (Lévis, accommodation) 7523 (iii); (Miramichi bridge) 8308 (iv); (Moncton locomotive works) 14090 (vi); (Moncton work shops) 8312; (Pintsch gas equipment) 8291; (Rivière du Loup yards) 8310; (rolling stock) 8294 (iv); (sidings, additional) 14060, 14107 (vi); (Stellarton accommodation) 8302 (iv); P.E.I. (Hillsborough bridge) 14108; (Murray Harbour branch) 14120 (vi).

Trade and Commerce (Chinese immigration act) 7759; (commercial agencies) 7761; (international customs bureau) 7760 (iv).

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7276, 7286 (iv).

'Teapot,' German, purchased in N.W.T.: *See* 'German,' &c.

Tilsonburg and Lake Erie Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14380 (vi).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9421 (iv).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).

Web cloth, blankets, &c. (Ques.) 10410 (vi).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2348 (i).

Wood Alcohol, purchased, Tenders, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 231 (i).

See 'Supply—Excise.'

Yukon, Mail Deficit, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14039 (vi).

Blair, Hon. A. G. (Minister of Railways and Canals) *St. John City.*

Alberton Ry, Station, P.E.I. (Ans.) 2503 (ii).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. for 2°, 1510 (i).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Subsidy, Claims, &c. (remarks) 3201 (ii).

Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation (explanation) 6736 (iii).

Bruce Mines and Algoma Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14440 (vi).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5068 (ii).

Cabinet Changes: *See* 'Ministerial,' &c.

Canadian Freight Classification, Approval, &c. (Ans.) 3537 (ii).

——— O.C., *re* (remarks) 3302 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Securities B. 209 (prop. Res.) 4185; in Com. on Res., 4363, 4961, 5089, 5101 (ii); 1°* of B., 5358; in Com., 5589, 5786.

Canadian Northern Ry. Co., Ret. *re* Estimate of Cost laid on Table, 5052 (ii).

Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3227, 3982 (ii).

C. P. Ry. and Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s Agreement (Ans.) 2306 (i).

C. P. Ry. Expenditure for Rolling Stock, 1902-3 (Ans.) 2311 (i).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5556 (iii).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*

Canal Employees, Wages, &c. (remarks) 2303 (i).
Cattle Guard Commission, Appnmt. of Geo. Robertson (Ans.) 668 (i).
——— Names, &c. (Ans.) 875 (i).
——— Rep. to Govt. (Ans.) 669 (i).
——— Rep., &c. (remarks) 1199 (i).
——— Withdrawal of Mr. Robertson, &c. (Ans.) 1034 (i).
See 'Ry. Act B. 21.'
Charlottetown P. E. I. Ry. Station, &c. (Ans.) 4443 (ii).
Commercial Travellers, Fares, &c., in Com. on Ry. Bill, 5680 (iii).
Compulsory Voting: *See* 'Dom. Election B.'
Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) Amt. B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 1325 (i) 3237 (ii).
Demurrage on Cars, I.C.R., collected, &c. (Ans.) 3672, 4959 (ii).
Dixon, F. A., Chief Cor. Clerk, &c. (Ans.) 5319 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13609, 14425 (vi).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3007 (ii).
Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3578, 3982 (ii).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 293, 615 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5139 (iii) 7823 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8406; ('Senator Cox cannot wait') 8410 (iv).
G. T. Transcontinental Ry. and Govt. Subsidy, &c. (Ans.) 675, 1031 (i).
——— *See* 'Transcontinental.'
Hamilton Electric Light, &c., Power, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 3803 (ii).
Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I., Agreement, &c., Amt. paid (Ans.) 2758 (ii).
——— Contractor's Name, &c. (Ans.) 2584 (ii).
——— Preparation of Contract (Ans.) 4444 (ii).
Hudson's Bay, Change of Name B. 173 (Mr. *Maclean*) on M. for 1°, 2795 (ii).
Immigrants for Mar. Provs. (Ans.) 1855 (i).
I. C. R. and G. T. R. Terminal Facilities at Bonaventure, &c. (Ans.) 666 (i).
——— Traffic Arrangements, &c. (Ans.) 2759 (ii).
I. C. Ry., Coal Rates (Ans.) 6167 (iii).
——— Demurrage Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 4672, 4952 (ii).
——— Free Passes, Names, &c., on M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret., 2337 (i).
——— General Statement, on M. for Sup., 3633 (ii).
——— Gross Earnings, Interim Reps., &c. (Ans.) 4445 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for Papers, 3538 (ii).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*

I. C. Ry., Locomotives, Cars, purchased, &c. (Ans.) 4361 (ii).
——— Lorne Siding (Ans.) 2919 (ii).
——— Official Guide, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3535 (ii.)
——— Ouelle River Spur Line, &c. (Ans.) 541 (i).
——— Private Cars (Ans.) 2309 (i).
——— Rates for Live Stock and Coal, &c. (Ans.) 1857 (i).
——— Rep. of Mr. Pottinger, on M. (Mr. *Haggart*) for Copy, 3806 (ii).
——— Scotch Hill Station (Ans.) 872 (i).
——— Sussex, N.B., Roundhouse, Gates, &c. (Ans.) 4673 (ii).
——— Trackmen's Wages, &c. (Ans.) 1298 (i).
——— Traffic Rates, on Inquiry for Papers, 3712 (ii).
——— Windsor Junction Accident, Evidence *re* (remarks) 3301 (ii).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 932 (i).
Inverness and Richmond Ry., Subsidy (Ans.) 873 (i).
Lévis Land Purchase, I.C.R., Payment, &c. (Ans.) 3631 (ii).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2512.
Lorne Siding, I.C.R., Ry. Traffic, &c. (Ans.) 2919 (ii).
Man. and N. W. T. Ry. Co.'s Land Subsidies granted by Govt. (Ans.) 1197 (i).
Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5094 (ii).
Milk Cans Bill: *See* 'Weights and Measures.'
Ministerial Changes, on Mr. Tarte's Resignation (explanation) 145 (i).
——— on Mr. Blair's Resignation (explanation) 6736 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. (*Mr. Fielding*) in Com., 4454 (ii).
Municipal Rights *re* Tramways, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 6080 (iii).
New Canadian Co.'s incorp. B. 83 (*Mr. Lemieux*) in Com., 3222 (ii).
Niagara, Queenston & St. Catharines Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 154 (*Mr. German*) in Com., 4592 (ii).
O'Leary Station, P.E.I., Branch Line (Ans.) 6168 (iii).
P.E.I. Ry., Sale of Tickets (Ans.) 2503 (ii).
——— Total Cost, Misrepresentation, &c. (remarks) 1680 (i).
Private Cars, I.C.R., &c. (Ans.) 2309 (i).
Public Printing and Stationery Act Amt. B. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4206 (ii).
Pugwash, N.S., Lighthouse-keeper (Ans.) 1856 (i).
Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14728 (vi).
Railway Accidents, Duties of Public Officials (Ans.) 1032 (i).
——— Investigations, &c. (remarks) 1331 (i).
——— Loss of Life (Ans.) 873 (i).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 561 (i); (M.) to ref. to Com. on Rys., &c. (agreed to Y. 99 : N. 53) 565 (i).
Railway Act (Consolidation) Amt. (B. 21) 1° m., 244 (i) on M. for Com., 2585; in Com., 2591, 3538, 3713, 3830, 3882, 3974, 3984, 4120, 4564, 4691, 4728, 4743 (ii), 5243, 5322, 5561, 5680, 5765, 6071, 6173, 6206, 6273 (iii), 8139 (iv).
——— Conference with Senate *re* Amts. to B. 21 (remarks) 14763 (vi).
—— (telephones) 5534 (iii).
Railways and Canals Dep't. Rep. (presented) 92.
Ry. Commissioners' Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8123 (iv).
Ry. Land Grants voted by Parlt., &c. (Ans.) 1678 (i).
Ry. Subsidies Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 546 (i).
Ry. Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14440 (vi).
Ry. Subsidies, Interest payable, &c. (Ans.) 3971.
Ry. Subsidies in Land and Money in Man. and N.W.T. (Ans.) 1677 (i).
Ry. Subsidies (money) paid by Govt. in Provs. (Ans.) 1197 (i).
Ry. Subsidies paid by Govt. since Confederation (Ans.) 1198 (i).
Ry. Subsidies voted and paid, 1901-3 (Ans.) 2306.
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 5892 (iii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. (N.B.) 11812 (v).
Resignation as Minister: *See* 'Ministerial,' &c.
Scotch Hill Station, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 872 (i).
Semaphore Lights, P.E.I., Discontinuance, &c. (Ans.) 4443 (ii).
South-eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 452 (i).
Southport and Murray Harbour Ry., Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 2584 (ii).
South Shore Ry., Complaints *re* Safety (remarks) 206 (i).
——— Working of, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 450 (i).
Station Agents, P.E.I., Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 4361.
Steel Rails, Contract, Price, &c. (Ans.) 285 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.: Railways (salaries) 333 (i).
Mail Subsidies and ss. Subventions (St. John and Belfast) 7733 (iv).
Public Works: Buildings, N.B. (St. John quarantine water service) 419 (i).
Railways: I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 3699; (general statement) 3633; (Levis accommodation) 3703; (original construction) 3698; (Sydney accommodation) 3696 (ii).
Telephone Cos. in Mar. Provs., Names, &c. (Ans.) 2585 (ii).
Ties on Govt. Rys., Importation, &c. (Ans.) 1679.
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 4672 (ii), on M. to resume adjnd. deb., 6198 (iii).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*
Trans-Canada Ry. Co., Application for Govt. Aid, &c. (Ans.) 1026 (i).
——— Contract with Govt. (Ans.) 2759 (ii).
——— (personal explanation) 2794 (ii).
——— Pets., &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 672 (i).
Transcontinental Ry., G. T. P. R., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 447 (i).
Transcontinental Ry., Proposals to Govt. (Ans.) 874 (i).
——— *See* G. T. P. Bill.
Treadgold Concessions, Appmnt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2863, 4513 (ii).
——— Appmnt. of Commission (remarks) 3878.
Trent Canal, Hastings and Trenton, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 129 (i).
——— Surveys at Rice Lake, on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2317, 2327 (i).
Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2345 (i).
Welland Canal Water Power and St. Catharines Board of Trade, &c. (Ans.) 668 (i).
——— O. Cs. *re* (Ans.) 1859 (i).
West Lorne Accident, Commissioners (Ans.) 6168 (iii).
——— Rep. of Commissioner (remarks) 5088 (ii).
——— on inquiry for Rep., 5242 (iii).
——— Verdict, &c. (Ans.) 3232 (ii).
White, Albert S., Emplymnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4673 (ii).
Windsor Junction Ry. Accident, Papers laid on table, 3712 (ii).
Winter Communication with P. E. I., on M. (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) for Cor., 1048, 1053 (i).

Borden, Hon. Sir Frederick W., K.C.M.G. (Minister of Militia and Defence), *Kings, (N.S.)*.
Blankets, Web Cloth, &c., Dates of Purchase by Govt. (Ans.) 10954 (v).
Brigade Camp, Sussex, N.B. (Ans.) 3236 (ii).
Canadian (3rd) Mounted Rifles, Medals, &c. (Ans.) 1675 (i).
Can. S. A. Constabulary, Attestation, Discharge, &c. (Ans.) 14287 (vi).
Cartoons in *Military Gazette*, &c. (Ans.) 2103 (i).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6646 (iii).
Dixon, Capt., Rep. *re* S. Africa War (Ans.) 7914 (iv).
Dundonald, G.O.C., Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2404 (i).
Fishery Guardian, J. M. DesRoches, Alleged Fraud, &c. (Ans.) 10955 (v).
G. O. C. Commanding, Rep., &c., Suppression of (Ans.) 670 (i).
Gordon Highlanders' Trophy (remarks) 7253 (iii).
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co., Par. in *Globe*, 5894 (iii).
Hutton, Maj. Gen., on Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 207 (i).

Borden, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*
King's S. A. Medals, Pet. from N.C.Os., &c. (Ans.) 10491 (v).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal, Payment of Militia, &c. (Ans.) 4006 (ii).
——— (remarks) 2505 (ii).
Martineau, Arthur, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3802 (ii).
Militia Act Amt. and Mr. Chamberlain's Suggestions (remarks) 6540 (iii).
Militia Bill, Date of Introduction (Ans.) 669 (i).
Militia Deptl. Rep. (presented) 283 (i).
Militia Pay and Allowance, General Statement in Com. of Sup., 13379 (vi).
Militia Pensions Act Amt. (B. 78) 1°m., 872 (i); and in Com., 2°m., 1116, 2240 (i).
Militia Reserve at Port Moody, &c. (Ans.) 447.
Military Riding School, St. John d'Iberville (Ans.) 8616 (iv).
Military Stores, Erection of Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13055 (vi).
Mills, Mr., Annapolis, Claims against (Ans.) 6167 (iii).
Ninety-fourth Regiment, Senior and Junior Majors, &c. (Ans.) 9080 (iv).
Permanent Corps Officers, Qualifications, Certificates (Ans.) 4443 (ii) 6434 (iii).
Permanent Force, Increase of Pay (Ans.) 13372 (vi).
Plains of Abraham and Military Parades, &c. (Ans.) 3234 (ii).
'Ragging' in the British Army, on M. for Sup., 3132 (ii).
Ross Rifle, Manufacture, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).
Royal Canadian Regiment, Strength, &c. (Ans.) 3802 (ii).
St. Johns Drill Hall, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 12497 (v).
Sault Ste. Marie, Labour Disturbances, Militia Action (remarks) 12718 (vi).
——Par. in 'Star' *re* Militia (remarks) 12939.(vi).
S. A. Constabulary, Complaints *re* Grievances, &c. (Ans.) 1028 (i).
S. A. Contingents and Govt. Employees, Reinstated, &c. (Ans.) 1027 (i).
——Medals, Regulations, &c. (remarks) 8319.(iv).
———Pensions to Canadians (Ans.) 2920 (ii).
———Saddles and Bridles (Ans.) 1675 (i).
See 'Canadian,' &c.
Springhill Armouries, Caretaker, &c. (Ans.) 1857 (i).
Sussex Armoury, Construction, &c., Overseer's Qualifications (Ans.) 8332 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.: Militia (salaries) 221 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 3603; (Association grants) 3767; (contingencies) 3778 (ii); (Cook *vs.* Cole, costs) 6950; (coronation contingent) 6950 (iii); (defence scheme) 3763 (ii); (Dom. ar-

Borden, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Militia—Con.
senal) 7089 (iii); (Esquimalt defences) 3778; (G. O. C.) 3781 (ii); (Hamilton drill hall) 6949 (iii); (Martineau commission) 3585, 3752; (Military college) 3778; (military stores branch) 3608; (pay and allowance) 3584 (ii); (pay and allowance general statement) 13379 (vi); (paving streets, Winnipeg barracks) 6949 (iii); (properties) 3611; (Toronto, drill shed) 3618; (transport and freight) 3752; (Valleyfield strike) 3587, 3753 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—Generally (armouries) 970 (i); Man. (Winnipeg, military buildings) 13127; N. B. (military buildings) 13041; (St. John, drill hall) 13043; N. S. (Middleton, armoury) 970 (i); N. W. T. (Strathcona Horse, barracks) 13130; Ont. (armouries, generally) 13084; (Belleville, armoury) 970 (i) 13082; (Military College, Kingston) 13094; (Toronto, drill hall) 13086; (Toronto, military buildings) 13086 (vi); Ottawa (desks, &c.) 986; (Royal Mint) 346 (i); Que. (citadel, drill shed) 13056 (vi); (L'Assomption) 430 (i); (military buildings) 13054; (Montreal, barracks) 13076; (Quebec, drill hall addition) 13077; (St. Hyacinthe, drill hall) 13067; (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 13079 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers, N. S. (Kingsport, pier) 1103 (i).
Tents for N. W. Mounted Police, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3804 (ii).
——— *See* 'Woods,' &c.
Transcontinental (Can.) Ry., Representations *re* Military Purposes (Ans.) 541 (i).
Valleyfield Labour Strike, Payment of Militia (Ans.) 13571 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply—Militia,' &c.
Veterans, Pet. *re* Indemnity for Military Service (Ans.) 11189 (v).
Volunteers Man. and N. W. T., Land Scrip, &c. (Ans.) 820 (i).
Woods, J. W., Amount paid for tents, &c. 5764 (iii).
——- *See* 'Tents,' &c.

Borden, Mr. R. L., *Halifax.*
Address, on The, 23 (i).
Colonial Conference, 25; Conference between Colonies, 24; Discrimination by Germany, 29; Relations with Newfoundland and French Shore Question, 30; Alaska Boundary, and Bulwer-Clayton Treaty, 31; Naval Reserve, 36; Transportation Question, 37; Tariff Revision, 38; Chinese Immigration Policy, 39 (i).
Adjournment of Hse., Procedure *re* (remarks) 6637 (iii).
Alaskan Boundary Arbitration, Award, Alleged Interview with Mr. Aylesworth (remarks) 13667, 13958 (vi).
——— remarks *re* Com. of Sup., 13963 (vi).
——— Alverstone, Lord, Criticism *re* Award, 13958, 13963 (vi).
——— Alverstone, Lord, Telegram (remarks) 13806 (vi).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Alaskan Boundary Arbitration, Bond-Hay Treaty, Inquiry for Papers *re* (remarks) 878 (i), 14521 (vi).

——— convention respecting (remarks) 480 (i).

——— Notice of Remarks, 14765 (vi).

——— Official Information, Cor., &c. (remarks) 14521 (vi).

——— Mr. Sifton's Telegram *re*, 14530 (vi).

——— Protest of Canadian Commissioners, Cor. *re*, 14689 (vi).

American Cattle purchased for British Govt., Par. in Montreal *Gazette*, 5414 (iii).

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4244 (ii).

Apples, Canadian Packing, &c., on Ques. of Order, 11185 (v).

Arsenault, Capt., Compensation for Damages (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5966 (iii)

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. *re* Debts, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 155, 14771 (vi).

Atlantic Fast ss. Service (remarks) on Notice of M., 13948 (vi).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Delay by Govt., &c. (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 14159; (Neg. Y. 20; N. 58) 14218 (vi).

Requirements of present age, 14159; average time from Can. to G.B. 9, 10 and 11 days; forty years ago, logs of Str. *Asia*, stmt. of mercantile journal, 14159; records, &c. 14159; Sir Chas. Tupper's contract, 1896, 14161; Petersen, Tate & Co.'s tender, 1896, 14161; Allan's contract, Sir Wilfrid's reasons for non-acceptance, 14161; Toronto speech of Sir Wilfrid, 'Economical Govt.,' 14162; deposit returned to Petersen & Co., 14163; unpopularity, &c., 14164; prophecy, 14165; 21-knot service, no 2nd class service, 14166; New York route supplying boats, 14166; Govt. not enthusiastic, inspiration in Ottawa *Free Press*, 14167; tenders from Allan and British North Atlantic ss. Co., 14168; development of western country, willing to assist in giving aid, 14169; freight carried, 14169; cost of building, 14169; negotiations for short periods, 14170.

Atlantic Fast Service, Govt. Policy (remarks) 4007 (ii).

——— Tenders, &c. (remarks) 3882, 4120, 4445 (ii).

——— Petersen, Tate & Co.'s Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6953 (iii).
See "Supply—Mail Subsides", &c.

Atlantic, North Trading Co.'s Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 13372 (vi).

——— *See* 'North.'

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11163 (v).

——— Govtl. Intention *re* (remarks) 13258 (vi).

——— Inquiry for Cor., &c., 11427, 11692 (v).

Automatic Grain Weighers in N. W. T., on M. (Mr. *Stewart*) for Ret., 884 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Autonomy of the N.W.T. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 13856; Neg. (Y. 29; N. 63) 13932 (vi).

——— O.C.'s, Memorials, &c. (M. for copies*) 2778 (ii).

——— inquiry for ret., 5083 (ii).

——— Imperfect Ret. (remarks) 6891 (iii).

——— Return *re* (remarks) 13138 (vi).

——— *See* 'N.W.T. B. 256,' &c., 'Provincial,' &c.

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6365 (iii)).

Binder Twine Bounties Res., on Ques. of Order, 7305 (iii).

Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation, on Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6757 (iii).

——— (remarks) 6522 (iii).

Bonding Privileges with U.S. (remarks) 12758. vi

Bopp, Mr., German Consul, Cor. with Germany and Dom. Govt. &c. (remarks) 12218 (v),

——— *See* 'Budget,' &c.

B.C. Canners: *See* 'Salmon,' &c.

B.C. Statutes, Disallowance of, &c. (M. for O.C.'s, &c*) 706 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2016 (i).

——— (M.) to print cor., 2675 (ii).

Brunet, Arthur and Dom. Elections Act, on M. (Mr. *Casgrain*) for Pets., O.Cs., &c., 106 (i).

Budget, The, 1462 (i).

Prosperity of Canada and former declarations of ministers, 1463; imports and exports, 1476, 1491; taxation, former utterances by ministers, 1465; expenditures, comparisons with former govts., 1468; per capita expenditure, 1470; capital and revenue expenditure of different depts., 1471; Public debt, 1472; surpluses and former utterances of ministers, 1473; Colonial Conference, Mr. Chamberlain's speech *re* preference, 1480; post office revenue, letter carrier's salaries, 1483; I.C.R. 'alleged' surplus, 1483; trade negotiations with other countries, 1484; cor. with Herr Bopp, &c. (remarks) 1484; German surtax former amt. *re*, 1485; Preferential trade, attitude of Govt., 1487–1490; tariff revision, 1493; policy should be, 1494; Canada as an agricultural country, adequate protection, 1495, 1500; and relations with U.S., 1496; fiscal policy of govt. and free trade utterances, 1498; protection to the farmers, 1500; protection to Can. industries, 1501; tariff relations with U.S., 1502; Res. *re* tariff policy 'adequate protection,' 1503; editorial of N.S. paper *re* coal duty, 1503 (i).

Budget, The,—Report of Winnipeg Speech *re* Agricultural Implements, 2192 (i).

——— Amt., Neg. (Y. 54; N. 107) 2235 (i).

Business of the Hse., Announcement *re* Further Govt. Business (remarks) 13667 (vi).

——— (remarks) 1110 (i), 3794 (ii),

——— Delay in printing Bills (remarks) 482 (i).

——— Late Sittings (remarks) 3207 (ii).

——— Misleading Statements (remarks) 4347 (ii).

——— on M. to take in Mondays, 3708 (ii).

——— Procedure on Order Paper (remarks) 2302.

——— Suppl. Estimates (remarks) 4957 (ii).

——— *See* 'Govt. Business.'

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5062 (ii).
Cabinet Changes: *See* 'Ministerial Explanation.'
Cable News Service between Can. and G.B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8234 (iv).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Canadian-German Fiscal Policy, Cor. with Herr Bopp (remarks) 12218 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4371, 4398, 4999, 5091, 5111, (ii), 5590, 5788 (iii).
C. P. R. Lands Exempt from Taxes in Man. and N. W. T. (M. for ret.*) 916 (i).
Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5557 (iii).
Capital Cases, Commutation of Sentences, &c. (remarks) 13303 (vi).
Cardiff Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4591 (ii).
Cargill, Henry, late, M.P., Decease of (remarks) 12938 (vi).
Carlin, Peter J., Postmaster at Whitney Pier, N.S., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 130, 668 (i).
Carver *vs.* King, Commutation, &c., Reps. *re* (remarks) 13303 (vi).
Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) 267 (i).
Cattle Guard Commission, Rep., &c. (remarks) 1199 (i).
——•—— *See* 'Ry. Act B. 21.'
Census, &c. (remarks) 13672 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply—Agriculture, Census, &c.'
Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 5960, 6201 (iii).
Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B., in Com. on Res., 601 (i).
Civil Servants and Dom. Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3191 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12505, 12539 (v).
Civil Service (superannuation) Act Amt. B. 49 in Com. on prop. res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 594 (i).
Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, Cor., &c., Inquiry for Papers *re* Alaskan Boundary, 14521 (vi).
——— *See* 'Alaskan,' &c.
Colonial Conference, Rep. *re* (remarks) 3632 (ii), 7923 (iv).
Columbia River Improvement Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. *Galliher*) on Sen. Amts., 6894 (iii).
Compulsory Voting: *See* 'Dom. Election B. 3.
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6640, 7492 (iii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3045, in Com. on B., 4010; on M. for 3°, 4187 (ii).
——— B. 273 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 14757 (vi).
Dawson Board of Trade, Communication *re* Treadgold Concessions (read) 1024 (i).
——— *See* 'Treadgold,' &c.
Debates, Official (remarks) 6 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Desjardins Canal B. 183 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4213 (ii).
Discriminating Freight Rates *re* Ocean Vessels (remarks) 13683 (vi).
Dom. Elections Act Amt B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 899; in Com., 907 (i); (compulsory voting) 13584; on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to dischg. Order, 14769 (vi).
——— Govtl. Intention (remarks) 12218 (v); 12719 (vi).
——— B. 13 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 95, in Com., 635, 1115; (objection) 945 (i).
——— B. 15 (Mr. *Clancy*) in Com., 1064 (i).
Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6440 (iii).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3023, 3036, 4680 (ii).
Easter Adjournment, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1115 (i).
Election Law, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12218 (v).
——— *See* 'Dom. Election Bills.'
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8244 (iv), on Sen. Amts., 14770 (vi).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 93; in Com., 620 (i).
Farquharson, Mr., Decease of (remarks) 5513 (iii).
Fast Atlantic Service: *See* 'Atlantic,' &c.
Ferries, Control of, in Com. of Sup., 13697 (vi).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 1°, 6538; in Com., 6896, 6910 (iii).
Fishing Industry, N.S., Harbour Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13153 (vi).
See 'Privilege,' &c.
France and Canada, SS. Service (telegram read) 4957 (ii).
Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt, B. 86 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on M. for 2°, 3820 (ii).
Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4789 (ii).
General Inspection Act (hides) Amt. B. 48 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 2787 (ii).
German Consul Bopp, Cor. with Can. Govt., &c. (remarks) 12218 (v).
German Surtax, in Com. on Tariff B. 273, 14757 (vi).
——— *See* 'Customs Bills,' 'Budget,' &c.
'Gerrymander' Bill: *See* 'Representation B 66.'
Good Shepherd Reformatory B. 199 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 4178; in Com., 4842 (ii).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Wednesdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1114 (i).
——— Precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 940 (i).
——— Saturday Sittings, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13264 (vi).
——— Redistribution Bill (remarks) 204 (i).
——— *See* 'Business,' &c.
Govt. Ry. Policy (remarks) *re* Delay, 7298 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Grain Inspection Act (weigh masters) Amt. B. 266 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 13807 (vi).

Grain Standards, Samples *re* &c. (remarks) 11180 (v).

Grain Weighing in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks) in Com. on B. 188, 4189 (ii).

——— *See* 'Automatic,' 'Weights and Measures,' 'Man. Grain B.' &c.

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 4586 (ii); in Com., 5137 (iii); 7816, 7842; on M. for 3°, 8059 (iv).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7828 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Bill Subsidy 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8961; on M. for 1°, 7697; 'Alternative Policy,' 8988, 8994, 9005 (iv); in Com. on B., 11190, 11204, 11240, 11263, 11308, 11395, 12075; in Com. (Amts.) 11833, 11890; in Com. (Amt. *re* securities 11959, 12015 (v); on M. for 3°, 12612; (amt.) 12642; Neg. (Y. 37; N. 75) 12690; on M. for 3°, 12755, 12770; on Amt. (Mr. *Barker*) to M. for 3°, 12770 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Bill, Pets. *re* Authenticity, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Privs. and Elections Com., 13267 (vi).

——— (remarks) 13559 (vi).

——— Meetings of Com.. (remarks) 13671 (vi).

——— on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to read Affidavits, Ques. of Order 14846 (vi).

G. T. P. Ry. Bill, Customs Duties, Legal Opinions (read) 11337 (v).

——— Govt. Policy (remarks) 6805, 6921, 7298, 7399, 8086 (iv).

——— Plans presented (remarks) 8082 (iv).

——— Surveys, Reps. *re* (remarks) 14765 (vi).

Halifax Common, Rights of City, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13079 (vi).

Halifax Museum, Removal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13032 (vi).

Halifax P. O. Employees, Pet. *re* Salaries (remarks) on Conc., 14759 (vi).

Hamilton, Galt and Berlin Ry. Co.'s B. 149 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 4587 (ii).

Haanel, Dr., Duties as Supt. of Mines (remarks(in Com. of Sup., 13764 (vi).

Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 677 (i).

——— (remarks) 1057 (i).

Hides Inspection: *See* 'Gen. Inspection B. 48.'

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 782 (i).

Huron, Erie and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 123 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 4588 (ii).

Immigrants, Accommodation for Settlers (remarks) 1131 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Imperial Conference Cor., Can. Govt's. Refusal, &c. (remarks) 9457 (iv).

——— Report *re* (remarks) 3632 (ii) 7923 (iv).

——— *See* 'Alaskan,' &c., 'Colonial,' &c.

Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2385 (i), 2788 (ii).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 927, 930 (i).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7928 (iv).

——— on M. for Sup. (remarks) 4040 (ii).

——— (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4263; Neg. (Y. 47; N. 91) 4346 (ii).

——— Tariff Protection (notice of amt.) 3864 (ii).

——— (remarks) on M. to adjn., 4260 (ii).

Judges of N.W. Ters. Act. Amt. B. 259 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 12610 (vi).

Judges of Provincial Courts B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 11406 (v).

Judges of Provincial Courts and Sup. Courts, Quebec (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 11821 (v).

Judges Retiring Allowances B (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8093 (iv).

Judges of the Superior Court (Retiring Allowance) B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 93 (i).

Juvenile Offenders Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 94 (i).

Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s B., on M. to receive Pet., 2778 (ii).

Labour Troubles in B.C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 955 (i).

Law Library in England, Establishment, &c., on M. (Mr. *Casgrain*) for Cor., 100 (i).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8197 (iv).

Leprosy at Tracadie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13039 (vi).

Librarians of Parlt., Salary B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res. 13832 (vi).

Lt. Governor of Ontario, Appnmt. of Administration (remarks) 112 (i).

Loan Companies, Extension of Power B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2349 (i).

Long Lake & Sas. Ry. Surveys: *See* 'Supply—Dom. Lands.'

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal Settlement, &c. (remarks) 2676 (ii).

Loy, Geo. M., Privs. and Elections Com., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7919 (iv).

——— on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com., 8048 (iv).

Lumber Combine in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks) 1586 (i).

Lumber Trade in B.C., Tel. from Manufacturing Industry *re* U.S. Duty, &c., Importations, 14766 (vi).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Stmnt. *re* Certain Rooms in H. of C. (remarks) 14530 (vi).

———Forwarding, &c. (remarks) 14569, 14682 (vi).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Threats to Express Cos. (remarks) 14851 (vi).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 8005 (iv.); on Sen. Amts., 13624 (vi).
Man. Judgeship, Delay of Appnmt., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).
Man. School Lands, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 6893 (iii).
Marconi System of Wireless Telegraphy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vi).
Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com. 5098 (ii).
Master and Mates B. 226 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 6544 (iii).
Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*, Haldimand) 5720 (iii).
Militia Pensions Act Amt. B. 78 (Sir *Frederick Borden*) in Com., 1117 (i).
Milk Cans Bill: *See* 'Weights and Measures B. 20.
Mills, Hon. Mr. Justice, Decease of (remarks) 2794 (ii).
Mining Cos. Incorporation B. (remarks) 14850 (vi).
Ministerial Changes, on Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 148 (i) 6757 (iii).
——— (remarks) on M. to adjn., 6 (i).
Ministers, Reduction in Number of Depts.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 274 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 5417 (iii).
Mowat, Sir Oliver, Lt. Governor of Ontario, Decease of (remarks) 1578 (i).
——— *See* 'Lt. Gov.,' &c.
Mulloy, Trooper in S. A. Contingent, Pension by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14595 (vi).
Navigable Waters Act (swing bridges) Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12779 (vi).
Newspaper Despatches from G. B.: *See* 'Cable,' &c.
Nicola, Kamloops & Similkameen Ry. Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6428 (iii).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 13372 (vi).
———Inquiry for Papers, 13667, 13933 (vi).
N.W. Ter. Amt. B. 259 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 13856 (vi).
——— Govt. Financial Aid B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12843 (vi).
——— Naturalization Returns (M. for Stmnt.*) 3804 (ii).
——— Prov. Autonomy: *See* 'Autonomy.'
Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com,, 2719 (ii).
Order in the House (remarks) 12723 (vi).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6452, 6807.
Pacific Cable, Concessions by Australia to Eastern Tel. Co. (remarks) 2675 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Pardons, Preogative of His Ex., &c., on M. (Mr *Casgrain*) for Ret., 567 (i).
Parliament, Delay in Convening (remarks) 14857.
——— *See* 'Sessions,' &c.
Patent Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3625; in Com., 4213, 4676 (ii).
Peggy's Cove Lighthouse, Retirement of Geo. Swinehammer (Ques.) 2312 (i).
Pelletier, Mr. H. L., and *Le Canada* Canvassing (remarks) 13985 (vi).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8261 (iv).
Penny Banks B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 4177 (ii); in Com., 6456 (iii).
Pension for S. A. Soldiers by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14595 (vi).
Petersen, Tatè & Co., Ref. to in Deb. on Atlantic Fast ss. Service, 14159 (vi).
Pilotage Act Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., on Res., 12782; on M. for 2°, 12984 (vi).
——— *See* 'Shipping,' &c.
Posters, Indecent, Handbills, Exclusion, &c., in Com, on Tariff B. 273, 14757 (vi).
Postmasters in Quebec and Newspaper Agents (remarks) 14576 (vi).
Postoffice Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 5657; in Com., 5667 (ii).
Press Despatches Bill: *See* 'Cable,' &c.
Private Bills, Pets.: *See* 'Rules,' &c.
Privilege, Ques of (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) *re* 'Outskirts of Civilization,' Ques. of Order, 13374 (vi).
——— (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* Visitors to Corridors, 11565 (v).
Provincial Autonomy, Further Cor,, &c. (remarks) 7296 (iii).
——— in N.W.T. (M.) to print ret., 5582 (iii).
——— Ret. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6946 (iii).
——— *See* 'Autonomy.'
Public Accounts Com., Addition of Name (M.) 3431 (ii).
Public Printing and Stationery B. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4204 (ii).
Public Works Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) in Com., 4221 (ii).
Public Works Dept., Transfer of Control, &c., B. 269 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com.. 14749 (vi).
Quebec Bridge Co.'s B. 145 (Mr. *Power*) in Com., 4586 (iii).
Questions by Members, Answers *re* (remarks) 544 (i).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 562 (i).
——— Consolidation Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 245 (i); in Com., 2599, 3714, 3746, 3841, 3886, 3974, 3985, 4128, 4564, 4693 (ii); 5699, 5770, 6076 (iii), 8131 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 13835 (vi).
——— on M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Com. to confer with Senate *re* Amts., 14520 (vi).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Ry. Act (fire damages) Amt. B. 23 (Mr, *Demers, Iberville*) on M. for 2°, 2786 (ii).
——— (subsidies) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1060 (i).
——— (supplies for Govt. rys.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12946 (vi).
Ry. Debts B.: *See* 'Exchequer.'
Ry. Employees Safety B. 77 (Mr. *Smith*) on M. for 2°, 2387 (i).
Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2545 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 5654 (iii).
Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14514, 14735; (auditing by Aud. Gen.) 14516; (location of rys., &c.) 14514; (payments, &c.) Suggestions *re* Safeguarding (remarks) 14512; (running powers, Govt. control, &c.) 14515 (vi).
Ry. Mail Clerks, &c., in Com. on Postoffice Bill, 5667 (iii).
Ry. Mail Service, N. W. T., Overcrowding of Cars (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5933 (iii).
Railway Policy of Govt., Delay in bringing down (M. to adjn. Hse.) 7109 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies voted for 1900, 1901, 1902 (remarks) 12805, 12843, 13005 (vi).
Rainy River Mail Service, Tel. (read) 6889 (iii).
Redistribution B.: *See* 'Representation B. 66.'
Reformatory Prisons, B. 221 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8087 (iv).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°, 715; on M. for 2°, 1207, 1265; on Amt. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1290 (i); in Com., 11439, 11589; (Dauphin) 11759; (N.S.) 11793; (Quebec) 11793; (Toronto) 11695; (Waterloo) 11645; on M. for 3°, 12481 (v).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 11618 (v).
——— Evidence laid on Table, &c. (remarks) 11423 (v).
——— N.B., Stmnt. of Hon. Mr. Pugsley, 941 (i).
——— P.E.I. and N.B., Cor. respecting (remarks) 876 (i).
——— Printing of Amendments, &c. (remarks) 11423 (v).
——— Schedules, Maps, &c. (remarks) 877 (i).
Returns, Inquiry for, 5413 (iii).
——— Complaint *re* (remarks) 13138 (vi).
Ross Rifle, Manufacture, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).
Rules, Revision, &c. *re* Pets. for Private Bills, 4441 (ii).
St. Chrysostome Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. *Brown*) in Com., 7771 (iv).
St. James Electoral Division, Vacancy, &c. (remarks) 6999 (iii) 13303, 13377 (vi).
St. Mary's River Ry. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4589 (ii).
Safety of Ships Act Amt. B. 179 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 1°, 3298 (ii); in Com., 6920 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Salmon Industry, B.C., Tel. from Fraser River Canners Ass'on (read) 9970 (iv).
Saturday Sittings, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13264 (vi).
Sault Ste. Marie, Labour Disturbances, Govt. Proposals (remarks) 12717 (vi).
——— and Militi a(remarks) 12941 (vi).
Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meeting, on M. Mr. *Boyd*) 467 (i).
——— *See* 'Parliament.'
Settlers' Claim *re* Rebellion of 1885, on M. for Com. of Sup., 13954 (vi).
Shipping Casualties Act Amt. B. 263 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12802; in Com. on B., 12994; on M. for 3°, 13560 (vi).
——— *See* 'Safety' &c.
Sorel, Deep Water Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12845 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Harbours, &c., Quebec.'
South African Medals, Regulations *re* (remarks) 8267 (iv).
S. A. War, Purchase of Supplies by Imp. Govt. (M. for copies of O. Cs., &c.) 2760 (i).
——— *See* 'Hay and Oats,' &c.
Stanley and *Lansdowne*, Strs., Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup,, 13519 (vi).
Statutes, Revision B. 265 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 13667 (vi).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 225 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 6543; in Com. on B. 6916 (iii).
——— B. 237 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 12777 (vi).
Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron,' &c.
Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7029 (iii).
——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. *Bourassa*) 7204 (iii).
Stuart, Capt. D. C.: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture,'
Supplies for I. C. R.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 250,' &c.
Supply Bill in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5996 (iii).
——— (remarks) *re* Prop. Res., 6003 (iii).
Supply Bill, 218, in Com., 6170 (iii).

SUPPLY:
Agriculture (census, &c.) 4643, 4801; (census tabulators) 4656; (dairying branch) 4671; (Japan exhibition) 4626; (Stuart, Capt., dismissal, &c.) 4353 (ii).
Canals—Chambly (electric stations by-wash) 12906; (tow paths) 12907 (vi).
Civil Govt.—Finance (contingencies) 226; (salaries) 225 (i); Geological Survey (Low, Mr., salary) 13771; (salaries) 13770 (vi); Gov. Gen's Office (salaries) 207; Indian Affairs (salaries) 274; Inland Rev. (salaries) 227 (i); Interior (clerical assistance) 13769 (vi); (salaries) 268 (i), 13762; (Mines branch, salaries) 13763 (vi); Justice (salaries) 212 (i); N. W. Mounted Police (Drake, E. F., salary) 13761; (salaries) 13761 (vi).
Customs (contingent expenses) 3782 (ii); (salaries, overtime) 13985 (vi).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Dom. Lands (Banff, bath house) 13955 (vi); (boundary delimitations) 6790; (homestead entries) 6773; (homestead inspectors) 6767; (inspector's expenses) 6766; (Long Lake and Saskatchewan ry. survey) 6941 (iii); (salaries, outside service) 13773 (vi); (surveys) 6939 (iii); (surveys, plans, &c.) 13776; (tree planting) 13775 (vi).
Electric Light (inspectors) 5407, 5410 (iii).
Excise (Montreal office, reimbursement) 5405; (travelling expenses, &c.) 5404 (iii).
Fisheries (fishery officers salaries) 5122; (lobster factories inspection) 5122 (ii).
Geological Survey (metallurgical, salaries) 13778 (vi); (plans, plotting, &c.) 6826 (iii).
Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6709; (repatriation, &c.) 6709 (iii).
Indians—B. C. (medical attendance) 13785; (salaries) 13785; Man. and N.W.T. (surveys, &c.) 13784; N.S. (land purchase) 13781 (vi).
Inland Revenue (Mr. Bourassa, shortage) 5408 (Mr. Ferguson, legal services) 5412; (Mr. Kelly, refund) 5406 (iii); (wood alcohol) 231 (i).
Interior (Amos Barnes, claims) 6923; (astronomical observatory) 6793; (astronomical work) 6790; (Banff museum) 6927; (Liard River miners, relief) 6926 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Ad Hoc judges allowances) 3402; B.C. (judges travelling allowances) 3399; Exchequer Court (Admiralty, accommodation) 3408; (Admiralty registrar) 3408; Man. (judges' travelling allowance) 3399; Miscellaneous (prisoners in N.W.T.) 3399 (ii); (Statutes, Revision) 14644 (vi); N.B. (divorce court) 3400; Supreme Court (law books) 3405; (library) 3402; (Yukon law books) 3506; (police magistrates) 3422; (sheriff Eilbeck, salary) 3410; (stenographers) 3411; (travelling allowance) 3409.
Lighthouse and Coast Service (*Bayfield*, str., &c.) 5746 (iii); (St. Lawrence route) 4157 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and ss. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 5997 (iii), 7606 (iv), 13673 (vi); Can. and S. Africa) 7752; (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 7756; (Grand Manan and mainland) 7742 (iv); (*Lord Strathcona*, str.) 6003 (iii); Magdalen islands) 7741 (iv), 13675 (vi); Manchester and Montreal) 7745; (P. E. I. and G. B.) 7744; (P. E. I. and mainland) 7742 (iv); (P. E. I. and Newfoundland) 13676; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 13695; (St. John, N. B. and Glasgow) 13674 (vi); (St. John and Halifax) 7742; (St. John and W. Indies) 7740 (iv); (St. Stephen and Black Bay) 13695; (Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence) 13677 (vi); (Victoria and San Francisco) 7741 (iv).
Militia (Cooke *vs.* Cole, costs) 6951 (iii); (Valleyfield strike) 3759 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Alaskan boundary commission) 13958; (Canadian Mining Institute) 13965 (vi); (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6984; (naturalization Act, expenses) 6952; (Petersen, Tate & Co., deposit) 6953 (iii); (salaries) 13966 (vi); (unforeseen expenses) 6952 (iii).
N.W.T., Govt. (additional grant, &c.) 6946 (iii); (registrars, &c.) 13787 (vi).
Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 4116; (Govt. steamers, repairs, supplies, &c.) 4074 (ii), 13519; (masters and mates examination) 13524 (vi); (meteorological service) 4118; (steamboat inspection) 4119; (tidal surveys) 4114 (ii).
Post Office (Halifax) 6004; (P. E. I. winter service) 5943; (ry. mail clerks) 5933; (salaries) 5924 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (architect's staff) 962; (armouries) 967; (clerks of works) 963; (heating, &c.) 1065; (lighting) 1067; (water supply) 1067 (i); **N.B.** (Moncton, P.O.) 13038; (St. John, immigrant shed) 13040; (quarantine station, water service) 13041; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 13039; (Woodstock, P.O.) 13041 (vi); **N.W.T.** (courthouses, &c.) 958; (Dom. buildings, repairs) 959; (Macleod, court-house) 959; (Yorkton, court-house) 961 (i); **N.S.** (Halifax, custom house) 13031; (Halifax immigration shed) 13033; (Lawlor's Island, quarantine station) 13030 (vi); (Middleton armoury) 969 (i); (Sydney Mines) 13028; (Sydney, post office) 13035 (vi); **Ont.** (Alexandria, P.O.) 488 (i); (Belleville, armoury) 13082; (Brantford, drill hall) 13108 (vi); (Clinton, P.O.) 518, 528 (i); (St. Catherines drill hall) 13106; (St. Mary's, P.O.) 13110; (Toronto, military buildings) 13086; (Toronto, P.O., addition) 13101; **Ottawa** (additional rooms) 13007 (vi); (census buildings) 992; (elevators) 1011; (heating, &c.) 1009; (lighting) 1012; (Major's Hill park) 1015; (repairs, &c.) 987; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 996 (i); (Rideau Hall, repairs) 13087; (steel shelving) 13093; **P.E.I.** (Charlottetown, Dom. Buildings) 13036; **Que.** (Acton Vale, P.O.) 13061; (Longueuil, P.O.) 13076; (Montreal, examining warehouse) 13058; (Montreal, postal station) 13081; (Quebec, drill hall) 13078; (citadel drill shed) 13054, 13056; (military buildings) 13054; (St. John's, P.O.) 13050; (Terrebonne, P.O.) 13059 (vi).
Dredging (new dredging plant) 2673 (ii).
Generally (transportation facilities, Port Colborne) 13024.
Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Columbia river) 13304 (vi); **Man.** (St. Andrew's Rapids) 3358; **Mar. Provs.** (dredging plant) 2665 (ii); **N.B.** (Arsenault, Capt., compensation) 13231; (Campbellton wharf) 13005; **N.S.** (Abbott's harbour) 13141 (vi); (Amagandus wharf) 1068; (Bailey's Brook wharf) 1072 (i); (Baxter's breakwater) 13143; (Baxter's Cove) 13143; (Bayfield wharf) 13141; (Big harbour wharf) 13143 (vi); (Big Pond wharf) 1073 (i); (Breton's Cove) 13153 (vi); (Campbellton wharf) 1142; (Cheverie breakwater) 1078; (Cow Bay breakwater) 1079 (i), 13178 (vi); (Digby pier) 1083; (Drumhead breakwater) 1083; (Economy wharf) 1087; (Fort Lawrence pier) 1087 (i); (Gabarouse breakwater) 13182 (vi); (Glace Bay wharf) 1087 (i), 13184 (vi); (Grand River entrance) 1094; (Green Cove harbour) 1100; (Herring Cove breakwater) 1102 (i); (Janvrin's Island wharf) 1102 (i); (Jeddore, wharf) 13179 (vi); (Judique, breakwater) 1103; (Kingsport pier) 1103; (Lingan beach) 1105; (Lunenburg harbour) 1110; (Margaree wharf) 1133; (Meteghan Cove) 1133; (Necum Teuch wharf) 1137; (New harbour) 1145; (Ogden's Pond) 1145; (Petit de Grat) 1146; (Port George breakwater) 1146; (Port Hawkesbury) 1146; (Sandy Cove breakwater) 1149; (Short Beach breakwater) 1149 (i); (Summerville wharf) 13213; (Swim's Point wharf) 13211; (Tenecape breakwater) 13213 (vi); (Three Fathoms harbour) 1149 (i); (Victoria beach wharf) 13215; (Wallace harbour) 13216 (vi); (Washabuck wharf) 1150 (i); (Wentworth wharf) 13216 (vi); (West B ccaro channel) 1150 (i); (West Bay wharf) 13217 (vi); **Ont.** (Belle Rivière) 1191 (i); (Kingston graving

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

dock) 13023; (Midland) 13248 (vi); (Port Arthur) 3344 (ii); (Port Arthur dredging) 13012; (Port Perry) 13249 (vi); Que. (Bonaventure East breakwater) 13446; (Cacouna wharf) 13448 (vi); (Chateauguay river) 3210 (ii); (Grand Valley pier) conc., 6070 (iii); (Kamouraska pier) 13458; (Lake St. John dredging) 13459; (Lotbinière wharf) 13460 (vi); (Magdalen islands) 2265 (i); (Maguasha pier) 13461 (vi); (Maria pier) 2265 (i); (Mistook wharf) 13461 (vi); (Murray Bay wharf) 2266, 2270 (i); (Newport breakwater) 13463; (Paspebiac landing pier) 13465 (vi); (Rivière aux Renards) 2279; (Rivière du Loup, wharf) 2281 (i), 13476; (Rivière Verte) 13471 (vi); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3218, 3308 (ii); (St. Louis river) 13474; (Sacre-Cœur wharf) 13479 (vi); (Sorel wharf) 2296 (i); (Sorel deep water wharf) 3374 (ii), 5921 (iii), 12845 (vi); (Touladie river) 2287 (i).

Miscellaneous (architect's office) 2747; (Art gallery) 2725; (surveys, &c.) 2724; (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2663 (ii).

Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 2695.

Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2680 (ii).

Telegraph Lines (B.C.) 2992; (Ashcroft-Dawson) 2997; (N.W.T.) 2991 (ii); Que. (Bersimis to Godbout) 13332; (Petite Riviere, St. Agnes) 13334; (Ste. Anne de Saguenay) 13331 (vi).

Railways—Generally (Dixon, F. A.) 2730; I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 3700 (ii); (Halifax accommodation) 7520 (iii), 12874 (vi); (Lévis accommodation) 3704 (ii), 7520 (iii); (Sydney accommodation) 3696 (ii).

Scientific Institutions (MacGregor, Capt., gratuity) 6994 (iii).

Trade and Commerce (Chinese immigration act) 7759; (commercial agencies) 7760; (international customs bureau) 7760; (iron and steel bounties) 7762 (iv).

Unprovided Items, 6993 (iii).

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 6940, 7282; (Lithgow, Mr., controller, &c.) 7287; (roads and bridges) 7286 (iii).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2366 (i).

Swinehammer, Geo., Light-Keeper at Peggy's Cove, Retirement, &c. (Ques.) 2312 (i).

Swing Bridges B.: *See* 'Navigable.'

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt, (B. 262) in Com. on Res., 12800; in Com. on B., 12993.

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4931 (ii).

Tariff Negotiations with France, Telegram read, 4957 (ii).

Tarte, Mr., Resignation of: *See* 'Ministerial,' &c.

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9425 (iv).

Toronto Post Office, Tender of Mr. Coleman (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13101 (vi).

Trans-continental Ry. B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°, 7697 (iv).

——— *See* 'G. T. P. R.'

Transportation Commission, &c. (remarks) 1199.

——— Formation, Personnel, &c. (remarks) 4727, (ii), 7206 (iii), 9819 (iv).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Transportation Commission, Further Arrangements, &c. (remarks) 9458 (iv).

——— Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3432 (ii).

——— Instructions, &c. (remarks) 4120 (ii).

——— Inquiry *re*, 4840 (ii).

Transportation Commission and Tariff Inquiry, Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks) 854 (i).

——— *re* Speech from Throne remarks) 3129 (ii).

——— Sir Van Horne's Acceptation (remarks) 7297 (iii).

Treadgold Concessions, Appnmt. of Commission (remarks) 3298, 3303, 3713, 3872, 4727 (ii), 6638, 7297 (iii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) Co m of Sup., 2887 (ii).

——— Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4509 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Rep., 3397, 4840 (ii), 13134, 13258 (vi).

Treadgold Concessions and Dawson Board of Trade (remarks) 1024 (i).

Treadgold Concessions, Free Representations, Tel. *re*, 6427 (iii).

——— Instructions to Commissioners (remarks) 4564 (ii).

——— Personnel, &c. (remarks) 6638 (iii).

——— Representations, &c. (remarks) 6638 (iii).

——— Sec. 14, &c. (remarks) 4593 (ii).

——— Tel. from W. A. Beddoe, *re* Commissioner's Refusal to produce Files, &c. (remarks) 9818 (iv).

——— Tel. from Board of Trade *re* Scope (remarks) 8086 (iv).

——— Telegram *re* Charges (remarks) 9979 (iv).

——— Terms of Commission (remarks) 4120 (ii).

United Empire Life Ins. Co.'s B. 163 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 3796, 3983 (ii).

U. S. Coasting Laws, Regulations *re* Bonding Privileges (remarks) 13137 (vi).

Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.'s B. 87 (Mr. *Macpherson*) in Com., 4587 (ii).

Vankleek Hill Postal Service, Complaint *re*, on Conc., 14764 (vi).

Vegetables imported from the U. S., Duty collected at Toronto and Montreal (M. fo ret.*) 1058 (i).

Ways and Means *re* G. T. Pacific Survey, in Com., 14765 (vi).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2347 (i).

——— (scales for grain) Amt. B. 188 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4189 (ii).

Whitney Pier Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 130 (i).

——— Salary of Postmaster, &c. (Ques.) 668 (i).

Winter Communication with P.E.I., on M. (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) for Cor., 1056 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Wood Alcohol purchased from Standard Chemical Co. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 231 (i).
Woodmen of the World B. 31 (Mr. *Calvert*) in Com., 1854 (i).
Woodstock Post Office, N.B., Inquiry for Ret., 4563, 4593 (ii), 5735 (iii).
Yukon Regulations *re* Dom. Lands, &c., in Com. on Res., 13792 (vi).
Yukon Ter. Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 94 (i).

Bourassa, Mr. H., *Labelle.*
Address, on The, 75 (i).
Alaskan Boundary Commission, History of the Case, &c., 14773 (vi).
——— (remarks) 14764 (vi).
See 'Clayton-Bulwer,' &c.
Business of the House (remarks) 2395 (i).
Canadian Cattle Embargo in G. B. (M. for cor.*) 110 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr, *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4383 (ii).
Chambers of Congress Banquet, Speech of Gov. Gen. (Ques.) 10100 (v).
Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, Abrogaton, &c. (M. for Cor.*) 109 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 7297 (iii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com. (translators), on M. (Mr. *Champagne*) 111 (i).
Dundonald, Earl, G.O.C., Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2399 (i).
Fire Sufferers in Ottawa Valley, Govtl. Assistance (remarks) 3133 (ii).
Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup. 4768 (ii).
G.O.C.: *See* 'Dundonald.'
Gov. General's Speech at Chambers of Commerce Banquet (Ques.) 10100 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5145 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9666 (iv).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Gov., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 689 (i).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 763 (i).
Immigration Agents, Names, Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 289 (i).
Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2373 (i).
Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4329 (ii).
Militia Force, Condition, &c. on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) 5722 (iii).
Minto, Earl of, Speech at Montreal, 10100 (v).
Naval Reserve, &c., in Can., Cor. between G. B. and Can. (M. for copies*) 110 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 7298 (iii).

Bourassa, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Ottawa Valley Fire Sufferers, Govtl. Assistance (remarks) 3133 (ii).
Personal Explanation *re* Stock Gambling, 7204 (iii).
Procedure *re* Adjournment of House (remarks) 6634 (iii).
Speech of Gov. Gen.: *See* 'Gov. Gen.'
Stock Exchange Speculations (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 7005 (iii).
——— (personal explanation) 7204 (iii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2362 (i).
SUPPLY :
Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6669 ; (expenditure) 6616 (iii).
Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4945 (ii).
Veterans, Pet. *re* Indemnity for Military Services, &c. (Ques.) 11188 (v).

Boyd, Mr. N., *Macdonald.*
Assiniboine and Red Rivers, Navigation, Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 12 8 (i).
Automatic Grain Weighers, N.W.T., on M. (Mr. *Stewart*) for Ret., 849 (i).
Business of the House (remarks) 5051 (ii).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5073, 5081 (ii).
Campaign Literature : *See* 'Mail Bags,' &c.
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4393 (ii).
Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 397 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *Wm. Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12367, 12532 (v).
Civil Servants and Dom. Elections, on Amt. Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3172 (ii).
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3280 (ii).
Fyfe, Mr., Salary, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5384 (iii).
Grain Weighing for Threshing in Man and N. W. T. (remarks) in Com. on Weights and Measures Act Amt. B., 4191 (ii).
See 'Automatic.'
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10076 (iv); in Com. on B., 10153, 12094, 12269 (v).
Immigrants, Accommodations for Settlers, Par in Winnipeg *Telegram*, 1119 (i).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints *re* (remarks) 14233 (vi).
Man. and N. W. T. Senators, Increased Representation, &c. (Ques.) 1297 (i).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7992, 8004 (iv).
Man., Judgeship, Delay in Appnmt.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 216 (i).
N. W. T., Govt. Subsidy B. 263 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12320 (v).

Boyd, Mr. N.—*Con.*

N. W. Provincial Autonomy, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 1296 (i).

Parliament, Date of Convening (remarks) *re* Delay, 462 (i), 14853 (vi).

Postmasters' Association of Man., Memorial *re* Salaries (remarks) 14026 (vi).

Postmasters' Salaries, Increase to Rural Offices (remark) 14026 (vi).

Ry. Transportation from N.W.T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2465 (i).

St. Louis Exposition, Live Stock Exhibit, &c. (Ques.) 4837 (ii).

Schooley, W. F. Relief (B. 128) 1°*, 2100; 2°m., 2305 (i); in Com., 3223 (ii).

——— (M.) to return Evidence to Senate, 3224.

Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meeting (M.) 462 (i), 14853 (v).

Settlers' Claims *re* Rebellion of 1885 (remarks) on M. for Sup., 13953 (vi).

Snow Storms in N.W.T., False Reps., (remarks) 11824 (v).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census schedules) 4636; (St. Louis, exhibition) 4608; (Treadgold exhibits) 4621.

Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 216 (i).

Excise (Fyfe, Mr., salary, &c.) 5384; (liquor inspection) 5401 (iii).

Justice, Administration of—Yukon (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3423; (living allowances) 3418; (telegraph operators) 3418 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (masters and mates examination) 13536 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings, Man. (generally) 442; Ont. (rural mail delivery) 514; Que. (Thetford Mines) 442 (i); Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Chateauguay River) 3211 (ii); Telegraph Lines (Yukon, working expenses) 14041 (vi).

Telegraph Operators—Yukon: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3418 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act (scales) Amt. B. 188 (Mr, *Bernier*) in Com., 4187, 4191 (ii).

Brock, Mr. W. R., *Centre Toronto.*

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7330 (iii).

Book-keeping on G. T. R. & C. P. R.: *See* 'G. T. R.,' &c.

Butter Adulteration Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5851 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5635 (iii).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5886 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 844 (i).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3262, 3271 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6641 (iii).

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) Amt. (B. 15) in Com., 3239 (ii).

Brock, Mr. W. R.—*Con.*

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) Amt. (B. 39) 1°*, 541; in Com., 1324 (i), 2779 (ii).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3058, 3071 (ii).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 300 (i).

France and Can. ss. Subsidy B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 12299 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9871; in Com., 10544, 11903, 12012, 12140 (v).

G. T. Ry. and C. P. R. Fiscal Policy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12884 (vi).

International Ry. Appliances Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 40) 1°*, 591 (i).

Irondale, Bancroft & Ottawa Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14394 (vi).

James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14443 (vi).

See Toronto and James' Bay.

Judges' Retiring Allowance B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8092 (iv).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2510 (ii).

Patent Act Relief: *See* 'International Ry. Appliances Co.'

Printing Bureau and Union Organizations, &c. (Ques.) 4179 (ii).

Railway Commission (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies Res., 14352 (vi).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 253 (i); in Com. (drainage) 4747 (ii).

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2554 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 5654 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14352 (vi).

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c. (remarks) 14352 (vi).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. (Toronto) 11705 (v).

SUPPLY:

Canals: Grenville (guide pier) 12909 (vi); Trent (construction) 7551 (iii).

Customs (preferential tariff) 3946 (ii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6684; (U.S. agent) 6877 (iii).

Indians: B.C. (schools, industrial, &c.) 7259 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (St. Lawrence route) 4155 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and ss. Subventions (Can. and Australia) 5881 (iii); (Can. and G. B.) 7600 (iv).

Public Works: Buildings—N. B. (quarantine station, drainage, &c.) 487; Ont., (Alexandria P.O.); (Bowmanville) 507; (Clinton P.O.) 526; (Ft. William) 636 (i); (Toronto, branch office) 5920 (iii); Ottawa (furniture, &c.) 985; (Royal Mint) 354; Que.: (L'Assomption) 427 (i).

Harbours and Rivers: B. C. (Esquimalt graving dock) 5919 (iii); N. B. (St. John river, wharfs) 1179 (i); Ont. (Bruce Mines) 5911; (Cobourg, repairs) 5909 (iii); (Port

Brock, Mr. W. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Arthur, dredging) 13013 (vi); Que. (Cacouna wharf) 5896; (Grosbois Isle) 5903; (Hull wharf) 5901 (iii); (Sorel wharf) 12849, 12869 (vi); (Valleyfield, dredging) 5905 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Ottawa river surveys) 13349.

Telegraph Lines:—N.W.T. (Edmonton and Athabasca) 13335; (Wood Mountain Post) 13336; (Victoria to Andrews) 13335 (vi); Que. (Anticosti, &c.) 5917 (iii).

Railways: I.C.R. (general vote) 12884; (G.T.R. rental) 12889 (vi); (Ouelle river branch) 7526 (iii).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4880 (ii).

——Govt. Policy, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6684 (iii).

Textile Fabrics Inspection: *See* 'Customs,' &c.

Tilsonburg & Lake Erie Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14383 (vi).

Toronto & James Bay Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 14358 (vi).

See "James Bay."

Transportation Commission, Appnmt. of, &c., (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies Res., 14352 (vi).

——(Remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12849 (vi).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14471 (vi).

Broder, Mr. A., *Dundas.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4241 (ii).

Budget, The, 2119 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5454, 5853 (iii).

Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Canal Employees, Wages, &c. (remarks) 2303 (i).

Cattle Purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5478 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 839 (i).

Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. *Bell*) 14641 (vi).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4796 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), on M. for Com. on Res., 9394 (iv) Com. on B., 10702 (v); on M. for 3°, 12695 (vi).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 754 (i).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10783 (v).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks) 14543 (vi).

Mulloy, Trooper in S. A. Contingent, Pension by Dom, Govt. (remarks) 14590 (vi).

S.A.War, Pensions by Govt. (remarks) 14590 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 7616 (iv).

Public Works: Buildings—Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 492; (Morrisburg) 492 (i).

Brown, Mr. J. P., *Chateauguay.*

Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 37) 1°*, 540 (i).

St. Chrysôstome Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 158) 1°*, 2582 (ii); M. to ref. back to Com., 7399 (iii); in Com., 7771 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Quebec (Chateauguay river) 3209 (ii).

Bruce, Mr. F. C., *Hamilton.*

Mutual Life Assurance Co.'s (B. 65) 1°*, 707 (i).

Seeds Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7219 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13507 (vi).

Public Works: Buildings—Ont. (Hamilton P.O.) 439; (Hamilton public buildings) 13113 (vi); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Burlington channel) 1359; (Hamilton, dredging) 2638 (ii).

Bruneau, Mr. A. A., *Richelieu.*

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Sorel, deep-water wharf) 12857 (vi).

Bureau, Mr. J., *Three Rivers and St. Maurice.*

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7379 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 838 (i).

Desjardins, Camille, Appnmt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3537 (ii).

Fielding, Dredge, Plans, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 14283 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9906 (iv).

Montreal Harbour Sheds, Plans, &c. (Ques.) 14282 (vi).

Public Debt, Amount of Decrease, &c. (Ques.) 14665 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse supplies) 4173 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4093 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (electric lighting) 988 (i); Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Chateauguay River) 3217 (ii); (St. Maurice River) 2286 (i) 5904 (iii); (St. Maurice River, dredging) 13469 (vi); (Three Rivers, wharfs) 2297 (i).

Calvert, Mr. W. S., *West Middlesex.*

Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 100) 1°*, 1295 (i).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7362 (iii).

Birkett, Mr. T., M.P., Lease of Lands, &c. (Ques.) 12217 (v).

Brockville and North-west Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 89) 1°m., 1193 (i).

Canadian Order of Woodmen of World (B.31) 1°*, 367; in Com., 1854 (i).

Calvert, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*

Consolidated Trust Corporation incorp. (B. 121) 1°*, 1675 (i).

Empire Accident and Surety Co.'s incorp. (B. 107) 1°*, 1378 (i); in Com., 2755 (ii).

Halton, Peel and Cardwell, Schedules for 1891–1901 (Ques.) 7092 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11584 (v).

Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo Ry. Co.'s (B. 203) 1°*, 4727 (ii).

Calvin, Mr. H. A., *Frontenac.*

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10758 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11909 (v).

Post Office Savings Banks Defalcations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14657 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Canals: Galops (channel completion) 14645 (vi); Sault Ste. Marie (coaling vessels) 7563 (iii).

Campbell, Mr. A., *W. York, Ont.*

Business of the House, on M. to take in Mondays, 3710 (ii).

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 6200 (iii).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B., 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3113 (ii).

Canada National Ry. and Transport Co.'s (B. 27) 1°*, 367 (i).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5360 (iii).

Discriminating Freight Rates *re* Ocean Vessels (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 13686 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. 14423 (vi).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Supt., 4792 (ii).

Grain Weighers: *See* 'Inspection.'

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12044, 12185 (v).

Inspection Act (weigh masters) Amt. B. 266 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 14312 (vi).

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5359 (iii).

Milk Cans: *See* 'Weights and Measures Act.'

Mount Royal Savings Bank incorp. B. 153 (M.) to withdraw Bill, 10831 (v).

Nipissing and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 210) 1°*, 5679 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3561 (ii), 6105, 6290 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14468 (vi).

Campbell, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11007, 11115; (Kent) 11580; (Toronto) 11701; (York) 11667; on M. for 3°, 12461 (v).

Sault Ste. Louis Light and Power Co.'s (B. 113) 1°*, 1462 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings, N.B. (Marysville) 5835; N.S. (Arichat) 5835 (iii); Ont., (post offices) 511; (rural mail delivery) 511; (Toronto Junction, post office) 651 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (St. John, accommodation) 14069 (vi).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s (B. 147) 1°*, 2396; in Com., 4868; M. for Com., 4672 (ii); Resuming adjnd. deb., 5555 (iii); in Com., 7812, 9419 (iv).

——— (remarks) on adjnd. Deb., 5555, 5883 (iii).

——— (remarks) 6105 (iii).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14468 (vi).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. (B. 20) 1° m., 203; 2° m., 2338 (i); on M. for 2°, 3245; (M.) to ref. to Special Com., 3247 (ii).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 205) 1°*, 5238 (iii).

Wilson, Stephen, Relief (B. 228) M. for Com., 9149 (iv).

Cargill, Mr. H., *E. Bruce.*

Animals Contagious Disease B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4226 (ii).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. on M. for Com. of Sup., 395 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10146 (v).

——— Remarks *re* Vote, (remarks) 10538 (v).

———— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5857 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (telephones, &c.) 5521 (iii).

Railways, Comparison of Different Systems (remarks in Com. of Sup., 12891 (v).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10940, 10998 (v).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Touladie river) 2287 (i).

Railways—P.E.I. (book keeping) 12891 (vi).

Carroll, Hon. H. G. (Solicitor General) *Kamouraska.*

Binder Twine, Cost of in 1901-2 (Ans.) 447 (i).

——— Name of Purchasers (Ans.) 3798 (ii).

——— Prices fixed, &c. (Ans.) 1595 (i).

Duchesneau, Dr., Resignation, &c. (Ans.) 286 (i).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 925 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul, Resignation of Warden (Ans.) 286 (i).

Statutes Revision Commission, Names, Progress, &c. (Ans.) 1030 (i).

Carroll, Hon. H. G.—*Con.*
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2358 (i).
Tobacco Combine, Rep. of Commissioner (Ans.) 1297 (i).

Carscallen, Mr. A. W., *N. Hastings.*
Canadian Mint, Erection, &c. (Ques.) 10955 (v).
International Congress of Geology, Visit to Can. (Ques.) 8116 (iv).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8227 (iv).

Cartwright, Rt. Hon. Sir Richard, G.C. M.G., (Minister of Trade and Commerce) *S. Oxford.*
Alaskan Boundary Commission, Opinion of Lord Alverstone, Par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (remarks) 13671 (vi).
Allan Line Steamers, Rate of Speed (remarks) 13672 (vi).
Atlantic Fast Line, Tenders, &c. (remarks) 3882, 4727 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7574 (iv).
Binder Twine Inspection, Method of Inspection (Ans.) 14685 (vi).
——— Inspector Haycock, Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 5588 (iii).
Budget, The, 1596 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *Wm. Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12535 (v).
Commercial Agencies, Duties, &c. (Ans.) 4360 (ii).
Discriminating Freight Rates *re* Ocean Vessels, Provisions (read) 13681 (vi).
——— (remarks) 7583 (iv).
France and Canada ss. Service Subsidy B. 252 (prop. res.) 10410; in Com. on Res., 11422; in Com., 12295 (v).
Grain Inspection Act (weighmasters) Amt. (B. 266) in Com. on Res., 13807; 1°* of B., 13808 (vi).
Grain Inspection, Cost per Car, &c. (Ans.) 4837 (ii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9622 (iv).
——— Pets. *re* Irregularities, Meetings of Com. (remarks) 13671 (vi).
Haycock, Joseph, Inspector of Binder Twine (Ans.) 4959 (ii).
Hides Inspector, Geo. Roy, Appmnt., &c. (Ans.) 3627 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties paid 1890-1903 (Ans.) 11556 (v).
——— *See* 'Supply—Trade and Commerce,' &c.
Japan Trade, Customs Duties *re* (Ans.) 8617 (iv).
Mails carried via New York (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7728 (iv).
Ministers, Reduction in Number, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 274 (i),
Murray Bay and St. Denis Wharf, Amounts paid by Govt. (Ans.) 10496 (v).

Cartwright, Rt. Hon. Sir Richard—*Con.*
N. W. T., Provincial Autonomy (remarks) *re* Ret., 5088 (ii).
Parliament, Delay in Convening (remarks) 475 (i), 14858 (vi).
Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. 11447 (v).
Rideau Canal Employés, Delay in Paying (remarks) 13302 (vi).
St. James Division, Electoral District (remarks) 13303 (vi).
Sessions of the House, Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 475 (i), 14858 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.: Indian Affairs (salaries) 274 (i); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 7573 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7763; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7763; (Man. Grain Act) 7762 (iv), 13698 (vi).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada; and G.B.) 5997, (iii), 7573, 7728 (iv), 13672 (vi); (Can. and Australia) 5880 (iii), 13677 (vi); (Can. and S. Africa) 5878 (iii), 7746 (iv); (freight rates, &c.) 7583 (iii); (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 7756; (Grand Manan and mainland) 7742 (iv); (Halifax and Canso) 6002 (iii); (Halifax and Liverpool) 7730 (iv); (*Lord Strathcona*, str.) 6003 (iii), 13697 (vi); (Magdalen islands) 7741 (iv), 13675 (vi); (Manchester and Montreal) 7745 (iv); (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 13694 (vi); (P. E. I. and G. B.) 6001 (iii), 7744 (iv); (P E. I. and mainland) 7741 (iv); (P. E. I. and Newfoundland) 13676; (St. Catharine's Bay and Tadousac) 13695 (vi); (St. John and Belfast) 7731; (St. John and Digby) 7739; (St. John, N.B., and Glasgow) 7730 (iv), 13673 (vi); (St. John and Halifax) 7742; (St. John and London) 7737; (St. John and W. Indies) 7740; (St. Stephen and Back Bay) 7759 (iv), 13695; (Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence) 13677 (vi); (Victoria and San Francisco) 7741 (iv); (Victoria and Vancouver) 13694; (wrecking plant) 6003 (iii), 13697 (vi).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Lake St. John, wharf) 2246 (i).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese immigration act) 7759; (commercial agencies) 7760; (international customs bureau) 7760; (iron and steel bounties) 7762 (iv).
Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 92 (i).
Treadgold Commission, *re* Tel. from Dawson (remarks) 9980 (iv).
Trent Canal Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2321 (i).
Wheat Shipments from Port Arthur and Ft. William (Ans.) 284 (i).

Casgrain, Mr. Th. Chase, *Montmorency.*
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 2°, 4224 (ii).
Brunet, Arthur, and Dom. Elections Acts (M.) for Pets., O. Cs., &c., 101 (i).
Business of the Hse., Delay in printing Bills, 483 (i).
———(Remarks) 2395 (i).
Cattle Embargo in G. B,, on M. for Com. of Sup., 385 (i).

Casgrain, Mr. T. Chase—*Con.*
Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt, B. 13 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 95 (i).
Ellis, Dr., Immigration Medical Inspector, &c. (Ques.) 3536 (ii).
Gaynor & Greene, Extradition (M. for copies of cor., &c.) 109 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12117, 12122, 12165 (v).
See 'Transcontinental,' &c.
Hides Inspector, Geo. Roy, Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 3627 (ii).
I.C.R. River Ouelle Spur Line, &c. (Ques.) 541 (i).
Judgeship offered by Mr. Dansereau to Conservative (remarks) 13806 (vi).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10760 (v).
Judges' Salaries, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 95 (i).
Law Library in England, Establishment, &c., Cor., &c. (M.) for copies, 98 (i).
Levis, Land Purchase for I.C.R. (M for O. Cs., &c.) 3806 (ii).
———(Ques.) 3631 (ii).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2505 (ii).
Patent Relief B. (remarks) 2397 (i).
Medical Examiner of Immigrants, Quebec (Ques.) 3536 (ii).
N.W.Ter. Act Amt. B. 259 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Scott*) 13855 (vi).
Orleans, Island of, Mail Service, &c. (Ques) 670 (i).
Pardons, Prerogative of His Ex., O. Cs., &c. (M. for ret.) 567 (i).
———Number, Names, &c. (Ques.) 96 (i).
See 'Ticket of Leave,' &c.
Patent Act Amt., Legislation *re* (Ques.) 97 (i).
Pilotage Act (Quebec and Montreal) Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 3°, 13937 (vi).
Plains of Abraham and Military Parades, &c. (Ques.) 3234 (ii).
Quebec Harbour Pier, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 3972 (ii).
Quebec Harbour, Wharf Construction, Contract, &c., Par. in *Le Soleil* (remarks) 2237 (i).
Railway Commission B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 2594 (ii).
Ross Rifle Factory, Establishment at Quebec (M. for ret.*) 109 (i).
———Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 2109 (i).
Royal Trust Co.'s (B. 103), 1°*, 1295 (i).
South Shore Ry. Working, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 449 (i).
SUPPLY:
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4084; (tidal survey) 4115 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—N.B. (St. John immigration) 413; Ottawa (geological museum) 363; (Royal Mint) 346; Que. (Lévis) 431; (St. Hyacinthe) 439; (Thetford Mines) 441 (i).
Docks (commissioner's report) 2984; (Lévis graving dock) 2978; (Montreal dry dock) 2983 (ii).

Casgrain, Mr. T. Chase—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Con.
Harbours and Rivers: Generally (dredges, repairs, &c.) 2632; (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2632; Ont. (Port Arthur) 3351 (ii).
Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2632, 2953 (ii).
Telegraph Lines (Belle Isle station) 2990 (ii).
Ticket of Leave Act, Releases, &c. (M. for ret.) 566 (i).
———(Ques.) 96 (i),
See 'Pardons,' &c.
Transcontinental (Canadian) Ry., Representation *re* Military Purposes (Ques.) 541 (i).
See "G. T. P. R."
Translation of Parliamentary Papers, &c. (remarks) 545 (i).
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).
See 'Supply—Public Works, &c.
Treadgold Concession (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 2796; Neg. (Y. 52; N. 95) 2914 (ii).
———Appnmt. of Commission (M. to adjn.) 3864 (ii).
———Appnmt. of Special Com. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4486, (amt.) 4498; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 88) 4516 (ii).
———(Remarks) 2394, 2424 (i).

Champagne, Mr. L. N., *Wright.*
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7513 (iii).
Debates, Official, Sel. Com. 1st Rep. (presented) 654 (i).
——— 1st Rep. Conc. (M.) 814 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. (presented) 939 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. (translator) Conc. (M.) 1111 (i).
——— 3rd Rep. of Com. Conc. (M.) 1764 (i).
——— 4th Rep. of Com. (presented) 1674 (i).
——— 4th Rep. of Com., Conc. (M.) 1936 (i).
——— 5th Rep. (M.) to ref. back to Com., 7399 (iii).
——— 6th Rep. of Com. (presented) 7658 (iv).
——— 6th Rep. of Com., Conc. (M.) 7922; (Amt.) 9349 (iv).
——— 8th Rep. of Com. (presented) 12216 (vi).
——— 7th and 8th Reps., Conc. (M.) 14053 (vi).

Charlton, Mr. J., *N. Norfolk.*
Address, on The, 67 (i).
Alien (Restriction) Labour Act Amt. (B. 106) 1°m., 1295; 2°m., 2387 (i). 3282 (ii).
Aliens, Naturalization Act Amt. B. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5874 (iii).
Bernier, Capt., Govt. Aid to North Pole Expedition (remarks) 12805 (vi).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7315 (iii).
Budget, The, 1643 (i).
Business of the House, Procedure on Order Papers (remarks) 2300 (i).

Charlton, Mr. John—*Con.*
Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3226 (ii).
Compulsory Voting: *See* 'Dom. Elections B. 3,' &c.
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3268 (ii).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7503 (iii).
Divorce Court in Can. (prop. res.) 568; (M. wthdn.) 588 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 3) 1°*, 92; 2°m., 885; in Com., 905, 1200 (i); (compulsory voting) 13560 (vi).
Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6442 (iii).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3033 (ii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8467 8489, (iv); in Com. on B., 10445, 10594, 11879, 11906, 12124, 12232, (v); on Amt. (Mr. *Barker*) to M. for 3°, 12770 (vi).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 734 (i).
Labour Troubles in B. C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 948 (i).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2508 (ii).
Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Priv. and Elections Com., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7919 (iv).
Lumbermen's Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp, (B. 68) 1°*, 813 (i).
McDermid, Ellen Relief B. 229 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for Com., 9148 (iv).
North Pole Expedition, Govt. Grant to, &c. (remarks) 12805 (vi).
Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineer, &c., on M. for Copies (Mr. *Murray*) 1305 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6453 (iii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5864 (iii).
Preferential Trade, Offer of Can. Govt. to G.B. (remarks) 3221 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Lennox) *re* Visitors in Corridors, 11562 (v).
'Ragging' in the British Army, on M. for Sup., 3130 (ii).
Ry. Act (subsidies) Amt. (B. 2) 1°, 92; 2°m., 545; in Com., 550, 1059; (M.) to ref. to Com. on Rys., &c., 700; 3°m., 1199 (i).
Ry. Act (supplies to I. C. R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. 12964 (vi).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11613; on M. for 3°, 12399, 12426 (v).
Salmon Industry, B. C., Complaint, &c. (remarks) 9972 (iv).

Charlton, Mr. John—*Con.*
Schooley, Wm. F. Relief B. 128 (Mr. *Boyd*) on M. for 2°, 2305 (i); in Com., 3224 (ii).
Sessions of the Hse. Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 470 (i).
Snow Storms in N. W. T., False Reports (remarks) 11828 (v).
Supplies for I. C. R.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 258.'
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (ventilation of Chamber) 13009; Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Port Arthur, dredging) 13013 (vi).
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3459 (ii).
Wilson, Stephen, Relief B. 228 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 9149 (iii).

Christie, Mr. T., *Argenteuil.*
C. P. R. to Brownsburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14458 (vi).
Hawkesbury to South Indian Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14344 (vi).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14458 (vi).

Clancy, Mr. J., *Bothwell.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6957 (iii).
Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11168 (v).
Auditor General and Treasury Board, Payment to Members (remarks) 10956 (vi.)
Bills of the Hse., Delay in Printing (remarks) 482 (i).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7319, 7359, 7383 (iii).
See 'Supply—Justice,' &c.
British Cable News Service between Can. and G.B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10737 (v).
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7425; on Ques. of Order, 7341 (iii).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14439 (vi).
Budget, The, 1681 (i).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Canadian Bridge Co. and South Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14510 (vi).
C.P.R. (Kirkella and Elkhorn) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14498 (vi).
Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 398 (i).
Cattle Guard Commission, Rep., Printing, &c. (remarks) 14758 (vi).
See 'Ry. Act B. 21.'
Census Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13755 (vi).
——— Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 289 (i).
——— Cost of (remarks) 205 (i).
——— Payment to Date, &c. (Ques.) 286 (i).
See 'Supply—Agriculture,' &c., 'Pub. Accts.' &c.

Clancy, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Chateauguay and Northern Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14511 (vi).
Civil Servants and Dom. Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup. 3189.
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12502, 12552 (v).
Country Postmasters, Salaries : *See* 'Postmasters.'
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3094, 4012 (ii).
Customs Salaries, Montreal (Ques.) 8115 (iv.)
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).
Dom. Elections Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 904 (i); (compulsory voting) 14425 (vi).
——— (B. 15) 2° m., 704, 1061 ; in Com., 1062 (i), 3237 (ii).
Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6442 (iii).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 302, 616 (i).
Election Printing in Prince Albert *Advocate*, in Com. of Sup., 14653 (vi).
Ferries on Navigable Waters : *See* 'Navigable,' &c.
Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. *Bell*) 14633 (vi).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6905 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7911 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9683 (iv); in Com. on B., 10554, 10618, 10690, 11221, 11873, 11974, 12077 (v).
——— on M. to adjn. Debate (remarks) 8807 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) *re* Pets., 13265 (vi).
——— Surveys, Expenses, &c., in Com. of Sup., 14649 (vi).
Halifax and South-western Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14332 (vi).
Hawkesbury to South Indian Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14344 (vi).
I.C.R., General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup. 3685 (ii).
International Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14321 (vi).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7926, 7982 (iv).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4300 (ii).
ames Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).
James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi).
Joggin's to Minudie Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Com. on Res., 14329 (vi).
Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8104 (iv).
Labour Day Adjournment (remarks) 10743 (v).

Clancy, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Lake Superior, &c., Ry. (Peninsula Harbour) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14505 (vi).
Lambton Postmistress, Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6166 (ii), 14278, 14657 (vi).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8198 (iv).
Lobster Factory in N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).
Lumber Combine in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks) 1589 (i).
McNulty : *See* "Lambton."
Mabou and Gulf Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14326 (vi).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints, *re* (remarks) 14235 (vi).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14397 (vi).
Martineau Defalcations, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6935 (iii).
Members Rights to speak on Questions before the Chair (remarks) 10535 (v).
Middleton and Victoria Beach, N.S., Ry. Subsidy in Com. on Res., 14330 (vi).
Navigable Waters Act Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 12985 (vi).
Nepigon Ry, Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14396 (vi).
News Cable from England : *See* "British," &c.
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14337 (vi).
N. W. Ters. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12319 (v).
Postmasters and Newspaper Agents, &c. (remarks) 14679 (vi).
Postmasters' Salaries, Increase *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14032 (vi).
Post office Removal, Pet. *re* (remarks) 14661 (vi).
Post office Savings Banks Defalcations, in Com. of Sup., 14655 (vi).
Privilege, Ques., of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys., "Grafters," 10529 (v).
Public Accounts Com., Meeting concurrently with Sittings of Hse. (remarks) 8334 (iv).
——— Producing Census Schedules, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7066 (iii).
Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14697 (vi).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14450 (vi).
Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3727, 4706 (ii) 6183; (telephones) 5535 (iii).
——— Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2539 (ii).
——— Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14321 ; (auditing books by Aud. Gen.) 14518 (vi).
——— (supplies for I.C R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12963 (vi).

Clancy, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c., Res. of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1894 (remarks) 14365 (vi).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10963, 11115, 11438, 11624; (Kent) 11567; (Toronto) 11744; on M. for 3°, 12419; (amt.) on M. for 3°, 12486 (v).

Revenue and Expenditure, Amount for 1903 (Ques.) 12715, 13370 (vi).

Ronan, W., and Ottawa Supply Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).

St. Francis River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14509 (vi).

St. John Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14323.

St. John Valley, Fredericton to Woodstock Ry., Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).

St. Peters and Louisburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).

Sand, Indian Boy, adopted by Mr. Johnston (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6473, 7212 (iii).

Shediac and Coast Ry. Co's Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14325 (vi).

Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3291 (ii).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron,' &c.

Supplies for I.C.R.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 258.'

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (aids to societies) 4432; (archives) 4429; (census) 4594, 4800; (census, cost, &c.) 4816; (census schedules) 4635 (ii), 7066 (iii); (classification of patents) 4433 (ii); (cold storage) 7088, 7623; (creameries, N.W.T.) 7632 (iv); (dep. minister) 4357; (exhibitions) 4600; (experimental farms) 4551; (fumigating stations) 4434; (general statistics) 4430; (health act) 4440; (imperial institute) 4436; (Japan exhibition) 4631 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7646 (iv); (prof. Shutt's rep.) 4556; (San José scale) 4434; (St. Louis exhibition) 4600; (Tracadie lazaretto) 4439; (Treadgold exhibit) 4614; (Washington, Mr., Rep., &c.) 4430; (*Year Book*) 4429 (ii).

Canals, Generally (salaries and contingencies) 12933; (toll collectors) 12929; Chambly (tow paths) 12906; Rideau (Hog's Back, swing bridge) 12904 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Customs (contingencies) 332; (salaries) 323 (i); Geological Survey (salaries) 12592 (v); Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 235, 241; Interior (salaries) 271; Public Works (salaries) 333; Railways (salaries) 334 (i).

Customs (contingent expenses) 3783 (ii); (Dresden, port of entry) 3960; (inspectors, preventive service, &c.) 3950; (salaries, &c.) 3909; (Walpole office) 3961; (Yukon expenditure) 3968 (ii).

Dom. Lands (Long Lake & Saskatchewan ry. surveys) 6944; (Teulon road) 6927 (iii).

Immigration (on ques. of order) 6855 (iii).

Indians (St. Regis lock-up) 6415; (Walpole islands) 6412 (iii).

Justice—Ont. (Nipissing judgeship) 14258 (vi); Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3532; (Manitoba) 3534 (ii).

Labour Dept. (*Gazette*, printing, &c.) 7197 (iii).

Miscellaneous (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing, &c.) 14653 (vi); (arbitration, Dom. and

Clancy, Mr. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Miscellaneous—Con.

Provs.) 12590; (Micmac dictionary) 12592 (v); (naturalization act, expenses) 6953; (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6957 (iii).

N. W. T. Govt. (additional grant, &c.) 6947.

Ocean and River Service (St. Lawrence transportation) 4043 (ii).

Post Office (country postmasters) 6033; (Lambton postmaster, dismissal) 6166; (letter carriers, salaries) 6033; (mail bag repairs) 6148; (Ottawa Supply Co., &c.) 6148 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings, Dom. (architect's office) 961; (caretakers, &c.) 1018; (clerks of works) 964; **N.B.** (Richibucto) 412; (St. John, quarantine water service) 420; **N.W.T.** (Red Deer, court house) 960; **N.S.** (Halifax) 412; **Ont.** (Ft. William) 636; (renewals) 636; (Toronto Dom. buildings, renewals) 650; (Toronto post office) 957; (Toronto Junction post office) 650; (Wallaceburg) 505; **Ottawa** (astronomical observatory) 344; (Major's Hill Park) 1016; (Royal Mint) 351; (telephones) 1014; **Que.** (Grosse Isle) 426 (i).

Dredging (dredges, repairs) 2619 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (dredging plant) 2665; (ii); (repairs, &c.) 1185; **N.B.** (Shippegan harbour) 1183; (Negro Point breakwater) 1182 (i); **N.S.** (Big Harbour, wharf) 13143; (Breton Cove) 13151 (vi); (Janvrin's Island, wharf) 1102; **Ont.** (Amherstburg, dredging) 1185; (Bayfield pier) 1188; (Belle Rivière) 1191 (i); (Pembroke, wharf) 13248; (Point Edward, dredging) 13249; (Sydenham river) 13250 (vi); **Que.** (Chateauguay river) 3209; (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2644 (ii).

Miscellaneous (architect's office) 2747; (clerical assistance) 2753; (engineers, salaries) 2726 (ii); (Ottawa river surveys) 13342 (vi); (surveys, inspections, &c.) 2720; (temporary clerks) 2733 (ii).

Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 2690.

Telegraph Lines (Ashcroft-Dawson) 2993; (Magdalen islands) 2714 (ii).

Quarantine (cattle, &c.) 5507; (hog cholera) 5507 (iii).

Railways: I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 3699; (Levis accommodation) 3706 (ii); (North Sydney improvements) 12598; (power saw) 12607; (Rivière du Loup, engine houses) 12593; (St. John, increased accommodation) 12596 (v); Miscellaneous (litigation expenses) 12920 (vi).

Yukon (Middleton, T. W., defalcations, &c.) 6932 (iii).

Thunder Bay, Nepigon and St. Joe Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14401 (vi).

Timegami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14428 (vi).

Tobacco, Duty on foreign Leaf (Ques.) 446 (i).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14467 (vi).

Walpole Islands, Adoption of Boy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).

Waltham to Ferguson Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14448 (vi).

Winnipeg Beach to Icelandic River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).

Woodstock, N.B., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14322 (vi).

Yukon Post Office, Deficit (remarks) 14015 (vi).

Clare, Mr. G. A., *S. Waterloo.*

Ayr Postmaster, Dismissal of (Ques.) 1195 (i).

Berlin, Waterloo, Wellesley and Georgian Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 85) 1°*, 1023 (i).

British Cable News Service between Can. and G. B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10736 (iv).

Free List, Changes in Tariff, &c. (Ques.) 817 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10060 (iv).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. (Waterloo) 11641 (v).

Robson, Michael, Dismissal from Ayr Post Office (Ques.) 1195 (i).

SUPPLY:

Customs (salaries at ports, &c.) 3917 (ii).
Justice: Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3531 (ii).
Post office (country postmasters) 6056 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings, Dom. (coal contract 1066; Ottawa (astronomical observatory, 343; (census building) 991; (furniture, &c.) 984; (rentals, &c.) 989; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Amagandus wharf) 1071; (Church Point breakwater) 1078; (Drumhead breakwater) 1085; (Glace Bay) 1093 (i); Ont. (Port Arthur) 3353 (ii); Que. (Father Point, pier) 1513 (i); (St. Lawrence, ship channel) 3326 (ii).
Railways: I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 8271 (iv).

Tariff Changes, Free List, &c. (Ques.) 817 (i).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3505 (ii).

Clarke, Mr. E. F., *W. Toronto.*

Alaskan Boundary Commission, Publication of Cor., Objection (remarks) 14690 (vi).

——— Summary published, &c. (remarks) 10536 (v).

Alien (restriction) Labour Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 1°, 1296; on M. for 2°, 2388 (i).

American Exporters, Discriminating Freight Rates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13674, 13681 (vi).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5963 (iii).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7574 (iii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Mail Subsidies, &c., Miscellaneous, &c,'

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11166 (v).

Audit Act *re* Civil Servants, Extra Work (remarks) 13992 (vi).

Auditing Deptl. Finances, System, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6936 (iii).

Barr Colony, Mr. Haultain's Speech (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6354 (iii).

Bayfield and Can. Navy: *See* 'Navy.'

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7303, 7313 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order, 7307 (iii).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*

Binder Twine, Average Price for Sisal, &c. Ques.) 7566, 8085 (iv).

——— Quantity imported from U. S. (Ques.) 7566 (iv).
See Supply—Justice, Penitentiaries.

British Cable News Service between Can. and G. B. B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 8236 (iv), 10719 (v).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7412; on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7346 (iii).

Budget, The, 2206 (i).

Business of the House, &c. (remarks) 2301 (i).

Cable News from England: *See* 'British,' &c.

Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Canadian Associated Press: *See* 'British,' &c.

Can. Iron Foundry Strike, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res,, 4368, 4961, 5089, 5108 (ii); in Com. on B., 5597 (iii).

Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Co.'s B. 54 (Mr. *Osler*) 1°*, 707; in Com., 2303.

Can. and S. Africa SS. Service (remarks) in Com. on Can. and France Subsidy, 10820 (v).

Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Company's incorp. B. 189 (Mr. *Birkett*) in Com. (amt.) 7479; on M. for 3° (amt.) 7485; Neg. (Y. 9; N. 57) 7486 (iii).

Census Expenditure 1901, on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13708 (vi).

Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 55) 1°*, 707 (i).

Chambers of Commerce Delegates: *See* 'Delegates,' &c.

Cigarettes: *See* 'Criminal Code B. 215,' &c.

Citizens' Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 213) 1°*, 5679; in Com., 7478 (iii).

Civil Servants, Canvassing for Outside Business, &c. (remarks 13992 (vi).

——— and Guarantee Companies, &c. (Ques.) 3233 (ii).

——— Imperial Decorations: *See* 'Imperial,' &c.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12510, 12535 (v), 13822; on M. for 3°, 13946 (vi).

Coal imported in Ont. from June 1901 to March 1903, and June 1902 to March 1903 (Ques.) 669 (i).

Coleman, Mr. A. B., Tender *re* Toronto P. O., Mr. Gouinlock's Letter (read) 13096 (vi).

Collingwood Dry Dock, Remarks in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4685 (ii).

Commercial Travellers, Reduced Ry. Fares, &c., in Com. on Ry. Bill, 5680 (iii).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3263, 3274 (ii).

Corn Duties, Abolition by Imp. Parlt. (remarks) 1681 (i).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 5582; in Com., 6640, 7491 (iii); (cigarettes) 10750 (v).
Current Wages and P. O. Contracts: *See* P. O. 'Supplies.'
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 3045, 3088, 4012 (ii).
Customs and Excise, *per capita* Revenue from 1896 to 1903 (Ques.) 13935, 14284 (vi).
Debates, Translators, Rent of Building, &c. (Ques.) 2311 (i).
Delegates from Chambers of Commerce, Ill-treatment at Newport, Vt., Par. in Newspapers, &c. (read) 12495 (v).
Discriminating Freight Rates *re* Ocean Vessels (remarks) 13674, 13681 (vi).
Dom. Day, Adjnmt. (remarks) *re* Business for Thursday, 5589 (iii).
Dom. Notes Security B. 222 (Mr *Fielding*) in Com., 6914 (iii).
Dredges building at Sorel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13313 (vi).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3012, 4680 (ii).
Dundonald: *See* 'G. O. C.'
Electric Lighting of Chamber, Change of Lamps, &c. (Ques.) 816 (i).
Excise Taxation, Revenue 1896 and 1903 (Ques.) 13935, 14284 (vi).
Fast Atlantic Service: *See* 'Atlantic,' &c.
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6899 (iii).
France and Can. SS. Subsidy B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 10814; in Com. on B., 12295 (v).
Freight Rates Discrimination against Canadians. *See*: 'Discriminating,' &c.
Fuel Contracts, Interest on unpaid Accounts, &c. (Ques.) 5318 (iii).
G. O. C., Lord Dundonald's Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2417 (i).
German Surtax: *See* 'Customs,' &c.
Good Shepherd Reformatory, St. John, N.B., B. 199 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4840 (ii).
Govt. Contracts, Tenders *re*, Par. in Ottawa *Free Press* (remarks) 8405 (iv).
Grain Inspection, Cost per Car, &c. (Ques.) 4837.
Grain Inspection, Toronto Board of Trade, Res. *re* Grain Standards (remarks) 11177, 12535 (v).
G. T. Ry. Rates, Discrimination between Americans and Canadians, Tel. read, 10745 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5139 (iii), 7820, 7829, 7846 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10308, 10317; in Com. on B., 10453, 11192, 11294, 12076, 12143, 12241 (v).
G. T. P. Bill and Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections (amt.) 13272 (vi).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*
G. T. Pacific Ry., Surveys, Reps. *re* (remarks) 14765 (vi).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 677.
Hibernian SS., Wreck: *See* 'Shipping,' &c.
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 794 (i).
Immigration, Medical Inspection, Appnmts. by Govt. (Ques.) 2756 (ii).
Immigration Office in Ireland, Closing, &c. (Ques.) 1031 (i).
Imperial Service Orders to Civil Service (Ques.) 12715, 13669, 13936 (vi).
Incorporated Companies B. 94 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3257 (ii).
Insurance Rates *re* Ocean Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7597 (iv).
I.C.R., General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3677 (ii).
——— Official Guide, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3535 (ii).
——— Passes issued, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 9582.
——— Private Cars: *See* 'Official.'
——— Windsor Junction Accident, Evidence *re* (remarks) 3301, 3398 (ii).
See 'Windsor.'
Japan Trade *re* Customs Duties (Ques.) 8617 (iv).
——— *re* U.S. Products (Ques.) 9217 (iv).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 225 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 12301 (v).
——— B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10764, 10776 (v).
King's S. A. Medal, Pet. from N.C.Os., &c. (Ques.) 10491 (v).
Kingston Locomotive Works, Purchase of Engines for I.C.R.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7537 (iii).
Labour Day Adjournment (remarks) 10489 (v).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8197 (iv).
Leprosy at Tracadie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13039 (vi).
Letter Carriers, in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5672. *See* 'Supply—Postoffice,' &c.
Librarians of Parlt. B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 13833 (vi).
Lt.-Governor of Ontario and Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 663 (i).
See 'Mowat.'
Listowel Postoffice (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13124 (vi).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2504, 2518 (ii).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints *re* (remarks) 14222, 14542 (vi).
——— Special Trains, &c. (remarks) 14680, 14688.
Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5100 (ii).
Marconi Wireless Tel. System, P.E.I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13327 (vi).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*
Martineau Defalcations, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6936 (iii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 226 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6917 (iii).
Meteorological Service, Removal, &c. (Ques.) 6435 (iii).
Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) 5729 (iii).
Mowat, Sir Oliver, Lt.-Gov. of Ont., Decease of (remarks) 1579 (i).
See 'Lt.-Gov.'
Municipal Rights *re* Tramways, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Bill, 4700 (ii), 6081, 6112 (iii).
Murray, Immigration Agent, Scotland (cor. &c.) in Com. of Sup., 6827 (iii).
Naval Defence, Par. in Toronto *Globe*, 949 (i).
Navy Training Ships, Establishment, &c : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5295 (iii).
Nelson Postoffice, B. C., Racine Bros. Claim (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iii), 8126 (iv).
Newspaper Despatches from G.B : *See* 'British,' &c.
N. W. Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 242 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10742 (v).
Official. &c., Cars, Haulage paid, &c. (Ques.) 9682 (iv).
Owen Sound, Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup.. 13065 (vi).
Parliament Buildings, Ottawa, Lighting, &c. (Ques.) 816 (i).
See 'Supply—Public Works. Buildings,' &c.
Parliament Grounds, Dust Nuisance (remarks) 2104 (i).
Patent Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4220, 4675 (ii).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8262 (iv).
Petersen, Tate & Co.'s Deposit: *See* 'Supply—Miscellaneous.'
Pilotage Act Amt. B. (remarks) on M. to wthdr. Res., 12493 (v),
Pneumatic Tube Service *re* Postal Matters (remarks) 13999 (vi).
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 5658 ; in Com. 5659 (iii).
Post Office Clerks, Promotions, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13998 (vi).
P.O. Supplies and Current Wages, Declaration, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iii).
Preferential Tariff, Certificate of Origin (remarks) 3583 (ii).
Preston, W. T. R., Suit by Can. Employment Bureau (remarks) 12220 (v).
Printing Bureau and Typographical Union, &c. (Ques.) 4182, 4444 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys., 'Grafters,' 10517 (v).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*
Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) on M. for Com., 5972; in Com., 5979 (iii).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt B. 21 (Mr, *Blair*) in Com., 3988, 4697, 4728 (ii), 5326, 5680, 6080, 7300 (iii), 7610, 8126 (iv) ; (telephones) 5538 (iii), 8142 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* 2 cent fares, to M. for 3°, 8349 (iv) ; on Sen. Amts., 13836.
Railway Accidents, Duties of Public Officials (Ques.) 1032 (i).
Railway Accidents in Canada, Official Inquiry, &c. (Ques.) 9217 (iv).
See 'West Lorne,' &c., 'Windsor,' &c.
Ry. Accidents. Investigation, &c. (remarks) 1329.
——Loss of Life, &c. (Ques.) 873 (i).
Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2575 ; in Com., 2580 ; on M. for 3°, 3004, (ii).
Ry. Mail Clerks, in Com. on Post Office B. 208, 5659 (iii).
Railway Policy of Govt., on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to adjn. Hse., 7132 (iii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10899 ; 10958, 11125, 11431, 11503 ; (Kent) 11579 ; (Toronto) 11693, 11732 ; (York) 11665 ; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12459; on M. for 3°, 12438 (v).
Ronan, W., and Ottawa Supply Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).
Ross Rifle, Manufacture, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).
Rules of the House, on M. (Mr. *Demers*) to amend, 12216 (v).
St. Lawrence Navigation, Quotations from London Newspapers ; in Com. of Sup., 4133 (ii).
Salmon Canning Industry, B. C. (remarks) 10241 (v).
——Complaints *re* (remarks) 9978 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie, Labour Disturbances, Militia Transportation (remarks) 12940 (vi).
Scotch Iron Moulders and Toronto Strike (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iii).
Shipping Casualties Act Amt. B. 263 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 12994 (vi).
Sisal, Price per Pound for Binder Twine, &c. (Ques.) 8085 (iv).
See 'Binder Twine.'
Snow Storms in N.W.T., False Reports, &c. (remarks) 11827 (v).
S. Africa and Can. SS. Service (remarks) in Com. on France and Can. Subsidy, 10820 (v).
S. A. Contingents and Govt. Employees, &c. (remarks) 1027 (i).
South African Medals, Regulations *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8264 (iv) 10491 (v).
Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3291 (ii).
——B. 225 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6915 (iii).
——B. 237 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 1°, 12494 (v).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*

Stock Gambling, on Personal Explanation (Mr. *Bourassa*) 7204 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Poultry Farming) 7649 (iv.)

Canals: Galops (deepening, &c.) 8269 (iv).

Civil Govt.: Labour Dept. (Thompson, Mr. P., remuneration) 7152 (iii); Post Office (promotion, &c.) 13998 (vi).

Customs (contingent expenses, Toronto, &c.) 3901; (preferential tariff) 3926; (salaries, &c.) 3901 (ii).

Dom. Lands (Teulon, North road) 6930 (iii).

Excise (Fyfe, Mr., rep.) 5382 (iii).

Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5295, 5299; (Ottawa) exhibit) 5308 (iii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6669; (agents, old country, &c.) 6726; (exodus to U. S.) 6727, 6874; (Galicians) 6863; Glockling's Mr. Robert, cor., &c.) 6728; (Murray, agent, Scotland) 6827; (settlers' effects) 6727; (trachoma, &c.) 6696; (Ques. of Order *re* quoting Speeches) 6873 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7784 (iv); (Man. Grain Act) 13698 (vi).

Justice, Administration of: Exchequer Court (salaries) 3406 (ii); Miscellaneous (revision of statutes) 14643 (vi); Supreme Court (law books, purchase) 3405; (reps. binding, &c.) 3405; Yukon (Dugas, judge) 3413; judges' living allowance) 3413; (sheriffs' salaries, &c.) 3410; (living allowances, &c.) 3509; (telegraph operators) 3419, 3509; Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3516; (general expenses) 3511 (ii).

Labour Dept. (fair wage schedule) 7174; (Racine Bros. claim) 7174 (iii).

Legislation: H. of C. (sessional clerks) 14242 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (St. Lawrence, improvement) 4133; (St. Lawrence, lighting, &c.) 4133 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 13677 (vi); (Can. and G. B.) 5997, (iii) 7573; (Can. and S. Africa) 7747 (iv); (*Lord Strathcona*, str,) 6003 (iii), 13697; (Magdalen Islands) 13676; (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 13694; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 13696 (vi); (St. John and Digby) 7739 (iv); (St. John, N,B., and Glasgow) 13674 (vi); (St. John and London) 7739; (St. John and W. Indies) 7740 (iv); (Victoria and Vancouver) 13694 (vi); (wrecking plant) 6003 (iii), 13697 (vi).

Militia (grants to associations) 3773; (pay and allowance) 3590; (Toronto drill shed) 3614 (ii), 13086 (vi); (Valleyfield strike) 3590, 3754 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit 6966 (iii).

N. W. M. Police, (compensation for injuries) 5264; (pay of force) 5262; (Yukon, salaries) 5262 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (St. Lawrence transportation) 4044 (ii).

Post Office (affidavits *re* supplies) 6138; (automobiles, &c.) 6050; (boots, &c., purchased in Aurora) 6142 (iii); (cities, promotions, &c.) 14009; (inspectors' salaries) 14001 (vi); (letter box collections) 6139; (letter carriers, Toronto) 6005; (mail bag repairs, &c.) 6142; (mail service) 6065; (ry. transfer agents) 6136 (iii); (statutory increases) 14006 (vi); (superannuation, letter carriers) 6113 (iii).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works: Buildings, Dom. (architect's staff) 963; (caretakers) 1022; (Toronto armoury) 972 (i); **N.B.** (Campbellton P.O.) 13037; (St. John, drill hall) 13042; (St. John, immigrant shed) 13040; (quarantine station, water service) 13042; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 13039; (Woodstock, armoury) 13040; (Woodstock, P.O.) 13041; **N.S.** (Antigonish, post office) 13034; (Lawlor's Island, quarantine station) 13030; (Halifax custom house) 13031; (Halifax. immigration shed) 13033; (Sydney Mines) 13029; (Sydney, post office) 13035; **Ont.** (Belleville, armoury) 13083 (vi); (Bowmanville) 510; (Clinton P.O.) 534 (i); (Cobourg P.O.) 13118 (vi); (Dom. exhibition) 534 (i); (Guelph, armoury) 13083; (Kingston, barracks) 13119; (Kingston, military college) 13094 (vi); (Kingston, military stables) 639 (London, drill hall) 646 (i); (Peterborough, armoury) 13083; (St. Mary's, P.O.) 13109; (Sault Ste. Marie, P.O.) 13107 (vi); (Toronto, custom house) 648, 957; (Toronto, Dom. exhibition) 534; (Toronto, drill hall) 3614 (ii), 13086; (Toronto, examining warehouse) 13118; (Toronto, military buildings) 13086, 13115; (Toronto P.O., addition) 13096; (Toronto, postal station) 13112 (vi); (Toronto, renewals) 956, 957 (i); **Ottawa** (additional rooms) 13006; (coal sheds) 13115, 13116 (vi); (elevators) 1012; (grounds) 1015; (heating, &c.) 1008; (lighting, &c.) 975; (Major's Hill Park) 1015 (i); (post office, improvements) 13117 (vi); (rentals, &c.) 989; (Rideau Hall, light, &c.) 1005; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 996 (i); (steel shelving) 13089 (vi); (telephones) 1013 (i); **P.E.I.** (Charlottetown, armoury) 13035; (Charlottetown, Dom. buildings) 13036; **Que.**, (Levis, P.O.) 13053; (Longueuil, P.O.) 13070; (Magog, P.O.) 13081; (Montmagny, P O.) 13066; (Montreal, barracks) 13077; (Que. Citadel drill hall) 13053, 13057, 13078; (Que., military buildings) 13054; (St. John's, P.O.) 13060; (St. Hyacinthe, drill hall) 13067; (Three Rivers, heating, &c.) 13069 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, B.C. (Anderson Lake) 1451; (Columbia river) 1451 (i); (dredging, plant, &c.) 13311 (vi); (Mr. Sinclair's dismissal) 1451 (i); **Generally** (dredges, repairs) 2619; **Mar. Provs.** (dredging plant) 2668 (ii); (hydraulic dredge) 13312; **N.B.** (Campbellton wharf) 13006; (Dalhousie wharf) 13233; **N.S.** (Abbot's Harbour) 13141; (Abram's river, wharf) 13141; (Bayfield, wharf) 13142; (Big Harbour, wharf) 13145; (Breton's Cove, 13151, 13152 (vi); (Bridgewater, dredging) 1077 (i); (Noel, wharf) 13204; (Pembroke, breakwater) 13205; (Pleasant Bay) 13205; (Port Hood, pier) 13206 (vi); **Ont.** (Belle Rivière) 1191; (Bowmanville, pier) 1352; (Burk's Falls) 1359; (Depot Harbour) 1364; (general repairs) 1373 (i); (Goderich, breakwater) 13242 (vi) (Goderich harbour) 1365 (i); (Kaministiquia river, dredging) 13013; (Kingston graving dock) 13024; (Little Current) 13245; (Magann & Phinn, claims) 13255 (vi); (Midland Harbour) 1376; (Petewawa narrows) 1427 (i); (Port Arthur) 2636, 3350 (ii); (Point au Baril route) 1365; (St. Lawrence, dredging) 1442; (Sturgeon Falls, wharf) 1432 (i); (Toronto, Magann & Phinn claims) 13255; (Toronto, pier) 13254 (vi); (Wendover, wharf) 1441 (i); **P.E.I.** (dredging plant) 13313; (Skinner's Pond) 13309 (vi); **Que.** (Grande Vallee, pier) 1520 (i); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3320 (ii);

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Con.
Yukon (Lewes and Yukon river) 13307; Miscellaneous (Ottawa river, surveys, &c.) 13340.
Telegraph Lines, N.W.T. (Edmonton and Athabaska) 13335; (Edmonton agency) 13334; P.E.I. (Marconi system) 13327 (vi).
Quarantine (diseased immigrants) 5492; (smallpox) 5492 (iii).
Railways (Murray Harbour branch) 7537 (iii).
Yukon (Middleton, T. W., defalcations) 6933 (iii).
Surtax: *See* 'Customs,' &c.
Tariff and N.W.T. Immigration, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6861 (iii).
Telegraph Operators, Yukon, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3419, 3509 (ii).
Telephone Cos. in Mar. Provs., Names, &c. (Ques.) 2585 (ii).
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 4672 (ii), 5555 (iii); in Com., 9421 (iv).
——— on M. to resume adjnd. deb., 6198 (iii).
——— on M. to ref. back to Com., 7813 (iv).
——— (Remarks) 6102 (iii).
Toronto and Niagara Power Co., 6116 (iii).
Toronto Island, Damage by Storms, &c. (Ques.) 5589 (ii).
Toronto, Labour Council and Tel. *re* Mechanics from Eng. (Ques.) 1854 (i).
——— Military Stores Building, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 972 (i), 3614 (ii), 13055, 13086, 13115, (vi).
——— Post Office, A. B. Coleman's Tender, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).
——— Toronto St. Ry. (remarks) 4700 (ii), 6082 (iii).
——— Public Works Employees, Delay in Payment, &c. (Ques.) 5588 (iii).
Transportation Commission, Meetings, Business transacted, &c. (Ques.) 13027 (vi).
U. S. Immigration Officers at Newport, Treatment of English Delegates (remarks) 12495 (v).
Valleyfield Labour Strike, Payment of Militia (Ques.) 13371 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply—Militia.'
Valleyfield Post Office, Tenders *re* (remarks) 11187 (v).
West Lorne Investigation, Commissioners, &c. (Ques.) 6168 (iii).
——— Jury's Verdict, &c. (Ques.) 3231 (ii).
——— Rep. of Commissioner (remarks) on M. to adjn., 4726 (ii).
——— (remarks) 5088 (ii), 5242 (iii).
——— *See* 'Ry. Accidents.'
Windsor Junction Ry. Accident, Rep. of Commissioner, Inquiry for, 3496, 3712 (ii).
See 'I. C. R.'

Cochrane, Mr. E., *E. Northumberland, Ont.*
Allan SS. Co., Reductions of Sailings from St. John (remarks) 14077 (vi).
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4236 (ii).
Apples, Canadian Packing, Mr. Preston's Interview, &c. (remarks) 11184 (v).
Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11176 (v).
Business of the Hse., Delay in printing Bill (remarks) 485 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5059 (ii), 5424, 5072 (iii).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Campbellford Post Office, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13073 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply—Public Works,' &c.
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5103 (ii).
Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3227 (ii).
Cattle purchased in S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5483 (iii).
Chickens, Fattening of: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 13813 (vi).
Cobourg Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13084 (vi).
Country Postmasters: *See* 'Postmasters,' &c.
Cumberland Ry. & Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 14426 (vi).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3026 (ii).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 293, 625 (i).
Ferries: *See* 'Navigable.'
Grain Standards, Samples, &c. (remarks) 11180 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5167 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10440, 11190, 11362 (v).
G. T. P. Bill, Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13280 (vi).
Johnson, W. H., Purchase of House on Murray Canal (remarks) in Com of Sup., 14143, 14147 (vi).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10759 (v).
Le Journal, Canvassing for: *See* 'Pelletier,' 'Political,' &c.
Litigation Expenses, Fees, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12917 (vi).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks) 14551 (vi).
Milk Cans Bill: *See* 'Weights & Measures B. 20.'
Murray Canal, Supt.'s duties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14144 (vi).

Cochrane, Mr. E.—*Con.*

Navigable Waters Act (swing bridges) Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12780, 12987 (vi).

Owen Sound, Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13064 (vi).

Pelletier, Mr. H. L. and Canvassing for *Le Canada* (remarks) 13982 (vi).

Pilotage Act (Montreal and Quebec Districts) Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 13630 (vi).

Political Partisanship *re* Govt. Officials (remarks) 13991 (vi).

Postal Scales: *See* 'Weights & Measures B. 188.'

Postmasters in Rural Districts, Salaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14035 (vi).

Preston, Mr. and Can. Apples: *See* 'Apples,' &c.

Public Printing and Stationery B. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4212 (ii).

Public Works Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) in Com., 4222 (ii).

Public Works Dept., Transfer of Control, &c., B. 269 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14755 (vi).

Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) in Com., 5981.

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3833, 4706 (ii), 6210 (iii), 8130 (iv); (drainage) 4756 (ii).

Ry. Act (supplies to I.C.R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12962 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14464, 14506 (vi).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10979, 11139, 11468, 11625; (Toronto) 11720 (v).

Seeds Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7221 (iii).

Supplies for I. C. R.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 258.'

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (aids to societies) 4433; (census enumerators) 4817; (census, Haldimand) 4822 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7641 (iv).

Canals: Generally (toll collectors) 12931; (Johnson, W. H., purchase of house) 14143, 14147; (wire fencing) 14151 (vi); Welland (Dunnville dam) 7811 (iv).

Civil Govt.: Interior (Mines branch, salaries) 13769 (vi).

Customs (Campbellford collector) 3913; (salaries) 3913 (ii).

Dom. Lands (tree culture) 6780 (iii).

Fisheries (Hurley, J. M., fishery inspector) 5124; (steamers, B. C.) 5278 (iii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6699; (agents' expenses) 6887; (Cory, W. W., &c.) 6853; (White, W. J., agent) 6853 (iii).

Indians: Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6345; (medical attendance) 6345 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7768; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7768 (iv).

Legislation: House of Commons (*Montreal Herald*, printing) 5271; (printing, &c.) 5271 (voters' lists) 5275 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (*Bayfield*, str.) 5745 (iii); (Marconi stations) 13645 (vi).

C½

Cochrane, Mr. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 7581 (iii); (freight rates, &c.) 7586 (iv); (St. John, N.B., and Glasgow) 13675 (vi); (St. John and Halifax) 7742; (St. John and London) 7737 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (Govt steamers, supplies, &c.) 4086 (ii); (masters and mates examination) 13528 (vi).

Public Works: Buildings, N. B. (St. John, drill hall) 13044 (vi); Ont. (Campbellford) 504; Ottawa (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 1002 (i); Que. (hospital for trachoma) 14245; (military buildings) 13054 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Campbellton, wharf) 13230; (damages to schooner) 13231 (vi); **N.S.** (Amagandus wharf) 1069 (i); (Big Harbour, wharf) 13146 (vi); (Big Pond, wharf) 1073; (Cheverie breakwater) 1078; (Cow bay) 1079; (Economy wharf) 1087 (i); (Gabarouse breakwater) 13182; (Glace Bay, wharf) 13190 (vi); (Grand Etang bridge works) 1095; (Green Cove harbour) 1101; (Kingsport pier) 1104; (Larry's River) 1104; (Lingan Beach) 1105; (Meteghan Cove) 1133; (Necum Teuch wharf) 1139; **Ont.** (Bronte harbour) 1355; (Depot Harbour) 1362 (i); (Moira river, flooding) 13470 (vi); (Port Arthur) 3346 (ii); (Trenton, dredging) 1434; (Wendover wharf) 1436 (i); **Que.** (Cacouna wharf) 5898 (iii); (Chateauguay river) 3211 (ii); (Grand Vallee pier) 1515 (i); (Kamouraska pier) 13458; (Paspebiac landing pier) 13465; (Port Daniel wharf) 13468; (Rimouski pier, &c.) 13469; (Rivière Verte) 13470; (St. Andre de Kamouraska pier) 13492; (Ste. Anne de la Perade) 13488; (St. Jean des Chaillons) 13497 (vi); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3219, 3308, 3327 (ii); (Sabrevois wharf) 13485; (Sorel, deep water wharf) 12855 (vi).

Miscellaneous (engineers, salaries) 13340; (Ottawa river surveys) 13345 (vi); (surveys, inspections, &c.) 2715 (ii).

Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 2692 (ii).

Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2689 (ii).

Telegraph Lines (Magdalen islands) 2714; (Mar. Provs. cable lines) 2701 (ii).

Railways: I. C. R. (general vote) 12881; (Moncton, locomotives, &c.) 14093; (Pictou accommodation) 14089; (sidings, additional) 14057, 14082; P. E. I. (Hillsborough bridge) 14110, 14116; (Murray Harbour branch) 12832 (vi),

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7276 (iii).

Supreme Court Registrar's B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14301 (vi).

Treadgold Commission, par. in Dawson newspapers (remarks) 11082 (v).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2348 (i).

——— (postal scales) Amt. B. 188 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4188 (ii).

Copp, Mr. A. J. S., *Digby.*

County Court Judges, N. S., Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).

Dodd, Judge of County Court No. 7, N. S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).

Copp, Mr. A. J. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13505 (vi).
Fisheries (fish hatcheries) 13660 ; (sardine industry) 13653 (vi).
Justice, Administration of : N.S. (county court judges) 14259 (vi).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lurcher's shoal lightship) 4173 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 14251 (vi).
Ocean and River Service (masters and mates examination) 13528 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N. S. (Meteghan Cove) 1135 (i) ; (Victoria beach wharf) 13214 (vi).

Costigan, Hon. J., *Victoria, N.B.*
Civil Service (superannuation) Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 597 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9064 (iv).
Home Rule for Ireland (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 720 ; Agreed to (Y. 102, N. 41) 812 (i).
Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) on M. for Com. (objection) 5971 ; in Com., 5978, 6399 (iii).
Rocky Mountain Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 197) 1°*, 4262 (ii).
Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s incorp. (B. 26) 1°*, 367 ; on M. for 2°, 630 ; M. to ref. to Sel. Com. on Private Bills, 664 (i).

Cowan, Mr. M. K., *S. Essex.*
Detroit River, &c., International Waters, &c., U. S. Govt. Work (M. for. cor.*) 2778 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 894 ; in Com., 908 (i).
Drainage across Ry. Properties (B. 19) 1° m., 202. *See* 'Ry. Act. B. 21.'
Hamilton, Berlin and Collingwood Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 149) 1°*, 2396 (i).
Hamilton, Galt and Berlin Ry. Co.'s (B. 149) in Com., 4587 (ii).
Huron, Erie and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 123) 1°*, 1764 (i) ; in Com., 4588 (ii).
Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s (B. 120) 1°*, 1675 (i).
Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 154 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 4592 (ii).
Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 2718 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 254 (i) ; in Com., 4726 ; (drainage) Amt., 4729 (ii) ; 5325, 6178 ; (farm crossings) 5774 ; (screens, &c., 6072 ; (Toronto and Niagara Power Co.) 6115 (iii) ; (race horse *Henry R.*) 8191 (iv).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 102) 1°*, 1295 ; 2° m., 1812 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10883 ; in Com., 10993 (v).

Cowan, Mr. M. K.—*Con.*
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (exhibitions) 4624 (ii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (transfer Marine Dept.) 2947 (ii).
Toronto and Hamilton Ry., 6118 (iii).
Treadgold Commission, Pars. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11071 (v).
Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.'s B. 87 (Mr. *Macpherson*) in Com., 4588 (ii).

Culbert, Mr. J., *Brockville.*
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11485 (v).

Davis, Mr. T. O., *Saskatchewan.*
Aliens, Naturalization Act Amt. B. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5877 (iii).
Autonomy for N. W. T. Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13896 (vi).
Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6391 (iii).
Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 157) 1°*, 2582 (ii) ; (M.) to ref. back to Com. on Rys., 5238 ; 3° m., 5988 (iii).
Budget, The, 1715 (i).
Campaign Literature and Franking Privilege (Ques.) 14286 (vi.)
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 110) 1°*, 1462.
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4371, 5100 (ii) ; in Com. on B., 5611, 5650, 5799 (iii).
Canadian Yukon Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 159) 1°*, 2582 (ii).
Canals in Ont. and Que., Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 1594 (i).
Civil Servants and Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3179 (ii).
Dom. Election Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13567 (vi).
Edmonton Street Ry. Co.'s (B. 58) 1°*, 707 (i).
Grain Blockade : *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'
Grain Standards, Samples, &c. (remarks) 11181.
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5145 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10019 ; ('red headed boy') 10020, 10035 (iv) ; in Com. on B., 11250, 11989, 12048, 12231, 12268 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry., Alternative Policy of Mr. Borden, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 13028 (vi).
Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Sup., 6571, 6596 (iii).
Lumber Combine in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks) 1580 (i).
Mailing and Franking Privilege: *See* 'Campaign.'
Man. and N.W.T., Ry. Co.'s. Land Subsidies granted by Govt. (Ques.) 1197 (i).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7993 (iv)

Davis, Mr. T. O.—*Con.*
N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12321 (v).
Public Works, Generally, Amount expended in Provs. (Ques.) 1197 (i).
Qu'Appelle and Long Lake Ry., &c., on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters,' 10501, 10507 (v).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5682, 6274 (iii); (amt. *re* fire-guards) 8173 (iv).
Railway Policy of Mr. Borden, Pets. *re* received (Ques.) 13028 (vi).
Ry. Subsidies (money) paid by Govt. in Provs. (Ques.) 1197 (i).
See 'Man. & N.W.T.' &c.
Ry. Transportation from N.W.T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2455 (i).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11033, 11115, 11460, 11718; (Dauphin) 11757; (Macdonald) 11781; (Winnipeg) 11787; (York) 11688 (v).
Senate Representation in N. W. T., B. 253 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 12303 (v).
Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 471 (i).
Settlers' Claims *re* Rebellion of 1885 (remarks) on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).
Stewart River Development Co.'s incorp. (B. 160) 1°*, 2582 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6687 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (post offices) 532 (i).
Tariff Protection, Govt. Policy: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6691 (iii).
Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11086 (v).
——— Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4544 (ii).
Wheat Blockade in N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'

Delisle, Mr. M. S., *Portneuf.*
Pilotage Act (Montreal and Quebec) Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 3°, 13940 (vi).

Demers, Mr. L. P., *St. John and Iberville.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex's Speech (seconded) 18 (i).
C.P.R. car 001, Improvements to, &c. (Ques.) 14282 (vi).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 837 (i).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7505 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13571, 14410 (vi).
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. (B. 155) 1°m., 2501 (ii), 2°m, 8243; in Com., 8244, 8361 (iv).

Demers, Mr. L. P.—*Con.*
Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4784 (ii).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 928 (i).
Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Ry. Co.'s (B. 52) 1°*, 654 (i).
Private Bills, Notices, &c., Rep. of Com. *re* Revision of Rules (M.) 12216, 13547 (vi).
See 'Rules,' &c.
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (drainage) 4752 (ii); (fire indemnification) 6299 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to M. for 3°, 8349 (iv).
Ry. Act (fire damages) Amt. (B. 23) 1°m., 283 (i); 2°m., 2780 (ii).
Representation in the H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 1257 (i); in Com., 11034.
Rules of the Hse. (M.) to amend, 12216 (v), 13547 (vi).
Rules, Revision, &c. *re* Pets. for Private Bills (M.) for Sel. Com., 4441 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (experimental farms) 4548 (ii).
Supreme Court Act Amt. (B. 22) 1° m., 283; 2° m., 2351 (i).
Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4901 (ii).
Tarte, Hon. J. I., and C.P.R. Car 001, &c. (Ques.) 14282 (vi).

Desjardins, Mr. S., *Terrebonne.*
Doncaster Indian Reserve, Terrebonne (M. for cor.*) 288 (i).
Jesus River, Deepening, &c. (M. for cor.*) 289.
Terrebonne Post Office Buildings, &c. (M. for cor.*) 289 (i).

Douglas, Mr. J. M., *East Assiniboia.*
Agriculture and Colonization Com., 8th Rep. (M.) to conc., 13788 (vi).
——— 8th Rep. (binder twine) M. to conc., 14043, 14047 (vi).
Binder Twine Inspector's Rep., Distribution, &c. (M.) 13788 (vi).
——— Rep. of Com. on Ag., Distribution of Copies (M.) to conc., 14043 (vi).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5812 (iii).
C. P. Ry. and Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s Agreement (Ques.) 2306 (i).
Elevator Rates, Advance, &c. (remarks) 11062.
Great North-west Central and C. P. R. Co.'s Agreement (Ques.) 2306 (i).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7994 (iv); on Sen. Amts. (amt.) 13625.
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5785, 6233 (iii).
Ry. Transportation from N.W.T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2478 (i).

Dyment, Mr. A. E., *Algoma.*
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie incorp. (B. 104) 1°*, 1295 (i); in Com., 6655 (iii).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s (B. 98) 1°*, 1204 (i).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14436 (vi).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 97) 1°*, 1204 (i).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14399 (vi).
Nepigon Iron Range Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 170) Pet. (presented) 2396 (i); 1°*, 2675 (ii).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14399, 14436 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Duncan, Mr., inspector, Georgian Bay) 5134 (ii).
Quarantine (small-pox) 5015 (ii).
Thunder Bay, Nepigon and St. Joe Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14401 (vi).

Earle, Mr. T., *Victoria, B.C.*
B. C. Fisheries Commission, Rep. of Commissioner (remarks) 1199 (i).
Canning Industry in B. C. (remarks) 10103, 10241 (v).
See 'Salmon,' &c.
Esquimalt Naval Station, Removal of Flagship (remarks) 10957 (v).
False Creek Lease, Cor., &c., (M. for copies*) 2337 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 3129 (ii); 5513, 6354.
——— Lease to Kelly and Burnett (Ques.) 7565.
Flagship at Esquimalt Naval Station, Removal, &c. (remarks) 10957 (v).
Fraser River Canning Industry, &c. (remarks) 10103, 10241 (v).
Kelly & Burnett, Lease of False Creek, &c. (Ques.) 7565 (iv).
See 'False Creek.'
Labour Commission B.C., Rep. *re* (Ques.) 8116.
Port Moody, Military Reserve, &c. (Ques.) 446.
Quesnel Dam, B.C., Obstructions *re* (Ques.) 11557 (v).
Salmon Canning Industry in B. C. (remarks) 10103, 10241 (v).
Salmon Hatcheries, B.C., Increased Capacity, &c. (Ques.) 12073 (v).
Salmon Industry, Fraser River, Letter from Canners Ass'n. (read) 9968 (iv).
Salmon shipped to France, Tariff *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (exhibitions, Treadgold exhibit) 4614 (ii).
Fisheries (steamers, B.C.) 5278 (iii).
Indians—B.C. (agents, travelling expenses) 7262; (Clayoquot school) 7269; (fishing, &c., investigation *re*) 7264; (reserves, re-allotment, &c.) 7263; (reserves, sale of, &c.) 7268; (Songhees, removal, &c.) 7258 (iii).

Earle, Mr. T.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Ocean and River Service (Dom. steamers, supplies) 5050 (ii),
Post Office (Ottawa Supply Co.) 6151 (iii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Esquimalt graving dock) 5919; (Hardy Bay wharf) 5916; Que. (Cacouna wharf) 5899; Telegraph Lines, B. C (Alberni Clayoquot) 5918; (Quesnel Atlin branch) 5827 (iii).
Trade and Commerce (preferential tariff in France) 7799 (iv).

Emmerson, Mr. H. R., *Westmoreland.*
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12570 (v).
Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 1115 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. (compulsory voting), 14409 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5190 (iii), 7891 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8706, 8718 (iv); in Com. on B., 11389 (v); on M. for 3°, 12731 (vi).
Harvey and Salisbury Ry. Subsidy, Remarks, &c. 14471 (vi).
Immigrants for Mar. Provs. (Ques.) 1855 (i).
Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2375 (i).
I. C. R., General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3682 (ii).
International Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14321 (vi).
Pensions to S. A. Veterans, by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14599 (vi).
Pilotage Act Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12798 (vi).
Postmasters and Newspaper Agents (remarks) 14679 (vi).
P. E. I. Ferry Co.'s incorp. (B. 180) 1°*, 3391 (ii); in Com., 7771, 7914 (iv).
P. E. I. Winter Communication, on M. (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) for Cor., 1049 (i).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. (N.B.) 11818 (v).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14321 (vi).
St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14324 (vi).
St. John Valley, Fredericton to Woodstock Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).
Shediac and Coast Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14325 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Militia (Valleyfield strike) 3596 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, N.B. (Campbellton, P.O.) 13038; (St. John, drill hall) 13042; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 13039 (vi).
Railways: I. C. R. (Eel River, agent's house) 12600; (Metis station) 12605; (Moncton accommodation) 12599; (Truro accommodation) 12604 (v).

Emmerson, Mr. H. R.—*Con.*
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2370 (i).
Ties on Govt. Rys., Importations, &c. (Ques.) 1679 (i).
Winnipeg Beach to Icelandic River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).
Woodstock, N.B., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14322 (vi).

Erb, Mr. D. K., *S. Perth.*
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com,, 5441 (iii).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6216 (iii).

Ethier, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*
Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4777 (ii).
Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 264) 1°*, 12993 (vi).
Rivière du Nord Fish Ladders, &c. (M. for copies of reps., &c.) 2778 (ii).
Two Mountains Ry. Facilities, Ques. of Privilege, 7567 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance) *Shelburne and Queen's, N.S.*
Adjournment of Hse., Procedure *re* (remarks) 6637 (iii).
Alaskan Boundary Commission, on Notice of M. (Mr. *Borden*) 14765 (vi).
——— *See* 'Joint-High,' &c.
Alien (restriction) Labour Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 2388 (i).
Allan SS. Co., Reduction in Sailings from St. John (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13937, 14064.
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen, Tate & Co.'s Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6955 (iii).
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. for 2°, 1509 (i).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com., 1807 (i).
Audit Act Amt. (B. 251) 1°m., 11159 (v).
——— Govtl. Intention *re* (remarks) 13258 (vi).
Auditing Deptl. Finances (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6935 (iii).
Auditor General and Finance Dept. (remarks) 11423 (v).
Auditor General's Rep. (presented) 89 (i).
Auditor General and Treasury Board, Circulars, &c. (remarks) 11553 (v).
Auditor General and Treasury Board *re* Payment to Members (remarks) 10956 (v).
Auditor General, on Inquiry for Cor., 11427 (v).
Autonomy to N.W.T.: *See* 'N.W.T.'
Bankers' Association, Inspection Duties, &c. (Ans.) 819 (i).
Bankers, Private, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 285 (i).
Bank Failures since Confederation, &c. (Ans.) 6435 (iii).
Banks, Unclaimed Balances, Rep. (presented) 3804 (ii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Bass River, N.S., Marine Light (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
Beersville Coal Co.'s Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).
Belmont Disaster Victims, Compensation *re* Injuries (remarks) 14156 (vi).
See 'Crandall.'
Binder Twine Bounties (B. 233) prop. Res., 6436; in Com. on Res., 7300; 1°*, 7382; 2°*, 7382; in Com., 7383 (iii).
———on Ques. of Order, 7308 (iii).
———Inspection and Penalties collected, &c. (remarks) 14048 (vi).
Birkett, Mr. T., M.P., Lease of Lands, &c. (Ans.) 12217 (v).
Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation, &c. (remarks) 6522 (iii).
Boyd, Sir John, Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 5990 (iii).
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7400 (iii).
———on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7342 (iii).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14436 (vi).
Budget, The, Financial Statement, 1378 (i).
Condition of Country, 1378; Details of Revenue, comparison with 1900-1, 1379; Excise, 1379; Post Office Dept., 1381; I.C.R. Revenue and Expenditure, Consolidated Fund, 1382; Capital and Consolidated Fund, Expenditures, 1383; Revenue for 1902-3, Estimate of, 1385; Public Debt, 1897-1903, 1385; Public Debt, reduction of, 1387; Surpluses, 1387, 1390; Net Debt. per capita, 1388; Chartered Banks Deposits, 1389; Increase in paid up capital and note circulation, 1395; Total Trade, Tables, 1389; Public Accounts, 1391; Iron Bounties, 1391; Reasons for borrowing while Finances are prosperous, 1392; Redemption of Treasury Bills before maturity, 1392; Loans, maturing, 1392; New sources of revenue by sale of C.P.R. lands, 1394; Increase in circulation of Dominion notes, amts. to Currency Act, 1396; Tariff amts. and free list not practicable at present, 1398; Trade Relations with England, Preference should be reciprocal, 1400; Preferential trade, memo. of Mr. Gerald Balfour, 1402; memo of Can. Ministers at Colonial Conference, 1404; Colonial Conference, 1400-1406; U.S. relations, 1406; Cor. between Sir Wilfrid Laurier and U.S. Senator Fairbanks *re* Joint High Commission and Alaskan Boundary, 1407; Tariff Policy of Govt., 1409; German Surtax, 1412-1418; Cor. with Mr. Bopp, 1414; Steel Rail industry and Sault Ste. Marie works, bounties to, 1419; Lead Industry of B.C., 1419; Binder Twine, 1420; Foreign Built Ships, and registration in Can., coasting privileges, 1420; Beet Root Sugar Machinery, 1421; Alluvial Gold Mining Machinery, 1421; Transportation Problem, Canal tolls, 1422; Resolutions *re* Customs Tariff Amt., 1423 (i).
Budget, The (remarks) 410, 1114 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order, 1743 (i).
Business of the House (remarks) 871, 1110, 2395, 2501 (i), 3969, 5051 (ii), 5510, 5581, 5959, 6352, 7090, 7201 (iii), 7728, 7812 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Business of the House. Delay in printing Bills (remarks) 484 (i).
——— Late Sittings (remarks) 3207 (ii).
——— Misleading Statements (remarks) 4347 (ii).
——— *re* Suppl. Estimates (remarks) 4957 (ii).
——— *See* 'Govt. Business.'
Butter sold at Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 1593, 1857 (i).
Cable News Service between Can. and G. B. (B. 240) prop. Res., 8118; in Com. on Res., 8231; 1°* of Bill, 8243 (iv); 2° m., 10715; in Com., 10718 (v).
——— Brierly, Jas. S., Letter read, 10739 (v).
Canada Central Ry. and Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Amalgamation, Compensation to Municipalities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5613 (iii).
Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Co.'s B. 54 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 2304 (i).
C. P. R. to Brownsburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14458 (vi).
C. P. R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14497 (vi).
C. P. R. (Medicine Hat) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14504 (vi).
C. P. R. Steamers sailing from St. John (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14076 (vi).
C. P. R., Transcontinental Ry. Trains, Water Supply (remarks) 9457 (iv).
Canadian Press Despatches: *See* 'Cable,' &c.
Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5556, 5884 (iii).
Canals in Ont. and Que., Amount expended (Ans.) 1594 (i).
Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 375 (i).
——— Ret. *re* (papers laid on Table) 591 (i).
——— (remarks) 267 (i), 14054 (vi).
Cattle-Guard Commission, Rep. laid on Table, 14758 (vi).
——— Rep. *re* (remarks) 14686 (vi).
Census of 1901, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 203,286, 1593 (i).
——— (remarks) 204 (i).
——— Cost, on M, for Ret. (amt.) 289 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 479 (i).
——— *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'
Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 5960, 6199 (iii).
Chambers of Commerce, Delegates, Treatment by U. S. Immigration Officers at Newport (remarks) 12496 (v).
Chambly Canal, Collector, Superannuation (Ans,) 7203 (iii).
——— *See* 'Moreau.'
Chartered Banks, List of Shareholders (presented) 1575 (i).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Chevrier Family, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12499 (v).
Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c, (remarks) 4427 (ii).
Cigarette Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3288 (ii).
Civil Service Act (general increase) Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12494, 12538 (v).
——— (superannuation) Amt. (B. 49) prop. Res., 204; in Com. on Res., 593; 1°* of B,, 597; 2° m., 1116 (i).
Civil Service Employees, Classification, Salary, &c. (Ans,) 9682 (iv).
——— Temporary, &c, (remarks) in Com. on P. O, Bill, 5869 (iii).
Civil Service Examiners List (presented) 479 (i).
Clergue Steel Works at the Sault, Contract, &c. (Ans,) 13668 (vi).
——— *See* 'Steel.'
Cochrane, Hon. Senator, Tel. *re* (read) 3000 (ii).
Collingwood Dry Dock, remarks in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4681 (ii).
——— *See* 'Dry Docks Bill.'
Colonial Conference, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 853 (i).
——— *See* 'Alaskan.'
Congratulations to Prime Minister *re* Twenty-five years as Member, 11690 (v),
Consolidated Revenue: *See* 'Audit,' &c.
Consolidated Trust Corporation incorp. B. 121 (Mr. *McColl*) in Com., 3223 (ii).
Corry & Laverdure, Award, &c., *re* Trent Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iii).
Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).
Crandall, Brakeman on I. C. R., injured at Belmont (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13546 (vi).
——— *See* 'Belmont.'
Cumberland Ry. and Coal Co.'s (Parrsboro) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).
Cummings, Jas., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 9458 (iv).
Customs Act Amt, (The Tariff) Prop. Res., 1423 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3058; in Com. on B., 4038 (ii).
——— (B. 273)—(surtax) in Com., 14755 (vi).
Debates, Official, 6th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Champagne*) to conc., 9349 (iv).
Debert Coal Mines and I. C. Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14328 (vi).
Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 587.
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 914 (i); M. for Sel. Com., 3001 (ii); in Com., 13591 (vi).
——— Govtl. Intention *re* (remarks) 12720 (vi).
——— (M.) to add Name *re* Sel. Com., 6734 (iii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Clancy*) on M. for 2°, 704 (i).

Dom. Notes Security (B. 222) prop. Res., 6270; in Com. on Res., 6437; 1°* of B., 6448; in Com., 6913 (iii).

Drummondville Siding Accommodation (remarks) 14081 (vi).

Dry Docks Construction (B. 178) prop. Res., 2237 (i); in Com. on Res., 3004; 1°* of B., 3298; in Com., 4678 (ii), 5871 (iii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.' Subsidy, in Com. on Res,, 14341 (vi).

Election Law, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12218 (vi).

——— *See* 'Dom. Elections.'

Election Printing in *Advocate*, Prince Albert, in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).

Electoral Lists, Printing, &c. (Ans.) 288 (i).

Electric Lighting, Cardinal and Iroquois Canals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12901 (vi).

Estimates, The (presented) 90 (i).

——— Suppl., 1903 (presented) 707 (i), 4956 (ii).

——— Suppl., 1904 (presented) 12868 (vi).

——— Further Suppl. (presented) 14042, 14662 (vi).

——— (remarks) 5002, 5122 (ii).

Experimental Farms Report (presented) 1937 (i). *See* 'Butter, &c.'

Fast Atlantic Service: *See* 'Atlantic.'

Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. *Bell*) 14617 (vi).

Fisher, Chas. A. L., Inspector of Public Works, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 1592 (i).

Fishing Industry in N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13167 (vi).

France and Canada ss. Service (remarks) 4958 (ii).

Frank Disaster, N.W.T. (remarks) 2100 (i).

Fredericton to Woodstock Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).

Fruit Marks Act Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on M. for 2°, 2387 (i), 2789 (ii).

——— B. 130 (Mr. *Henderson*) on M. for 2°, 3285 (ii).

Galops Rapids, Deepening (M.) to conc., agreed to (Y. 36; N. 14) 8403 (iv).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4785 (ii).

German Surtax, in Com. on Ways and Means, 14755 (vi).

——— *See* 'Budget.'

——— Cor., &c., papers laid on Table, 1460 (i).

Govt. Business (remarks) 13547 (vi).

——— *See* 'Business of the House.'

Govt. Contracts, Tenders *re* (remarks) 8405 (iv).

Govt. Official Cars, Amounts paid for Haulage (Ans.) 9682 (iv).

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on Order for Com., 4132 (ii); in Com., 5147, 5236 (iii), 7901; on M. for 3°, 8328 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (B. 235) prop. Res., 7915; on. M. for 1°, 7725; on M. for Com. on Res., 8546 (iv); in Com. on Res., 10420; in Com. on B. 10588, 10614, 11191, 11302, 11838, 12076, 12168 (v); on M. for 3°, 12694 (vi).

G.T. Pacific Ry., Contracts *re* Short Sections (Ans.) 13027 (vi).

——— Parishes crossed, Levis to Temiscouata (Ans.) 8117 (iv).

——— Par. in Ottawa *Journal* (remarks) 5734 (iii).

——— Surveys, Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi).

——— Surveys, Reps., &c, (remarks) 8231 (iv).

——— Ways and Means *re* Surveys (M.) for Com., 14765 (vi).

G. T. Ry., and C. P. Ry. Fiscal Bookkeeping, Policy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12880 (vi).

G. T. Ry. Rates, Discrimination between Americans and Canadians (remarks) 10745 (v).

——— Loans by Govt. (Ans.) 2920 (ii).

——— and Two Cent Rate, *re* Original Charter (Ans.) 11556, 11828 (v).

Halifax Cotton Co., Loan of Rails, &c. (remarks) 14478 (vi).

——— Elevator, Land Purchase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12825 (vi).

——— Marine and Fishery Office, Removal, &c. (remarks) 14279 (vi).

——— Museum, Removal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13032 (vi).

——— P. O., Pet. *re* Salaries of Employees (remarks) on Conc., 14759 (vi).

Halifax and S. Western Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14330 (vi).

Hamilton, Galt and Berlin Ry. Co.'s B. 149 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 4587 (ii).

Hawkesbury to South Indian Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14344 (vi).

Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 676, 1057 (i).

Herald Printing Co., Montreal, Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 8330 (iv).

Imperial Co.'s incorp. B. 71 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) in Com., 3170 (ii).

Imperial Defence *re* Lord Rosebery's prop. Res. (remarks) 411 (i).

Indian River Ry. Co.'s (Megantic) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).

Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2373 (i).

Insurance Cos. of Canada, Abstract of Statements (presented) 1025 (i).

——— Rep. of Supt. (presented) 9350 (iv).

I.C.R., Pension System, &c. (Ans.) 9216 (iv.)

——— *See* 'Trackmen.'

——— Stations, Restaurants, &c., Fire Protection (Ans.) 14664 (vi).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
International Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 705 (i).
Inverness Ry. and Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).
Iron and Steel Bounties Act Amt. (B. 238) prop. Res., 6629 (iii); in Com. on Res., 7923; 1°*, of B., 7988 (iv); 2°m., and in Com., 10799 (v).
Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4278 (ii).
——— (remarks) 4040 (ii).
——— Bounty Payments (Ans.) 6435 (iii).
James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14443 (vi).
Japanese Tariff *re* U. S. Products (Ans.) 9217 (iv).
Joggins to Minudie, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14329 (vi).
Joint High Commission *re* Par. in Toronto *World* (remarks) 14054 (vi).
Judges' Retiring Allowance B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) wthdn., 634 (i).
Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s (Dawson) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14518; (Amt.) 14519 (vi).
Lachine Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Supply., 14140 (vi).
Lake Superior Ry. (Peninsula Harbour) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14505 (vi).
Lead Bounties (B. 239) prop. Res., 6169; in Com. on Res., 8195 (iv); in Com. on B., 10798 (v).
Librarians of Parlt. B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14300 (vi).
Lime Ridge, Megantic Co. Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).
Loan Companies, Extension of Power B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2350 (i).
Locomotive Contracts *re* I. C. R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14091 (vi).
Long Wharf, St. John, Lease by Govt. (Ans,) 11829 (v).
Lumber Combines, N.W.T., Investigation (Ans.) 6168 (iii).
——— (remarks) 1580 (i).
Lumber Trade in B. C. and U. S. Importations (remarks) 14766 (vi).
Mabou and Gulf Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14326 (vi).
Manufacturers' Delegation *re* Tariff (remarks) 266 (i).
Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5359 (iii).
Martineau Defalcations, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6934 (iii).
——— Rep. of Commission, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 90,707 (i), 4956 (ii), 12868, 14042, 14662 (vi).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Middleton and Victoria Beach Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14330 (vi).
Midland Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14488 (vi).
Militia Defalcation, Investigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6934 (iii).
Militia Estimates (remarks) 13369 (vi).
Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*) 5719 (iii).
Milk Can. Bill: *See* 'Weights.'
Ministerial Changes, Explanation, &c. (remarks) 90 (i).
——— on Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 164. (i).
Montfort and Gatineau Colonization Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14316 (vi).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan (B. 201) prop. Res., 4262; in Com. on Res., 4445 (ii); in Com., 5417; 3°m., 5657 (iii).
Montreal Locomotive Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
Moreau, H., Salary as Collector on Chambly Canal (Ans.) 8488 (iii), 12497 (v).
——— *See* 'Chambly.'
Napanee and Deseronto Ry. Co.'s Charter (Ques.) 8084 (iv).
Newspaper Despatches from England B.: *See* 'Cable.'
N. S. and Dom., Financial Terms, &c. (Ans.) 3001 (ii).
Nova Scotia and Eastern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14327 (vi).
N. W. T., Financial Aid (B. 256) prop. Res., 10102; in Com. on Res., 12306; 1°*, of B., 12330 (v); in Com., 12843 (vi).
——— Autonomy to N. W. T. Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13918 (vi).
——— *See* 'Provincial.'
North-west Bank of Canada incorp. B. 51 (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com., 2754 (ii).
Ottawa Experimental Farm: *See* 'Butter.'
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. (B. 223) prop. Res., 6269; in Com. on Res., 6449; 1°*, of B., 6456; in Com., 6806 (iii).
Ottawa, Northern and C. P. Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14319 (vi).
Ouelle River, I. C. R. Branch Line, Total Cost (Ans.) 10491 (vi).
Patent Act Amt., Legislation *re* (Ans.) 97 (i).
Patent Relief Bill (remarks) 2397 (i).
Penny Banks (B. 198) 1°m., 4175 (ii); in Com., 6456 (iii), 10793 (v).
Posters, Handbills, Exclusion, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Tariff B. 273, 14757 (vi).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 5240; in Com., 5662, 5869 (iii).
P. O. Savings Bank (B. 220) 1°m., 6353; in Com., 6814 (iii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
P. O. Savings Banks Deposits, Defalcations of Postmasters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14276, 14655 (vi).
Preferential Trade, Offer of Can. Govt. to G. B. (remarks) 3220 (ii).
Preferential Trade and Mr. Chamberlain's Proposals (remarks) 13936 (vi).
Press Gallery Representatives, Payment as Sessional Clerks (remarks) 14114 (vi).
Prince Albert *Advocate : See* 'Election Printing.'
P. E. I. Ry. Subsidies to Branch Lines (remarks) 14474 (vi).
Printing Bureau and Union Organizations (Ans.) 4180 (ii).
Private Cars : *See* 'Govt. Official,' &c.
Prorogation (remarks) 14763 (vi).
Provincial Autonomy, N. W. T., Imperfect Ret. (remarks) 6892 (iii).
——— *See* 'N.W.T.,' &c.
Public Accounts (presented) 89 (i).
Public Debts, Amount of Decrease (Ans.) 14665 (vi).
Public Works, Preservation of Health, Regulation, &c. (Ans.) 1858 (i).
Quebec Bridge Subsidies Agreement (B. 272) in Com. on Res., 14690 ; 1°* of B., 14734 : 2° m., 14734 (vi).
——— Papers laid on Table, 14521 (vi).
——— Application for Further Aid (Ans.) 10496.
——— Subsidy paid by Govt. (Ans.) 10496 (v).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14450 (vi).
Quesnel, Jules, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 7203 (iii).
Questions by Members, Answers *re* (remarks) 544 (i).
Railway Accidents in Canada, Official Inquiry, &c. (Ans.) 9218 (iv).
Ry. Act (consolidation) B. 21 (M.) for Com. to confer with Senate *re* Amts., 14520 (vi).
——— (M.) to appoint Managers to confer with Senate *re* Amts., 14690 (vi).
——— Rep. of Special Com. (presented) 14663.
——— (remarks) *re* Conference with Senate, 14740.
Ry. Act (fire guards) Amt. B. 16 (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for 2°, 871 (i).
Ry. Act (subsidies) Amt. B, 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1060 (i).
Railway Appropriations *re* Expenditure, Transfer to other Votes (remarks) 14055 (vi).
Ry. Commissioners Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8124 (iv).
Railways constructed without Govt. Aid, Man. and N.W.T. (Ans.) 8488 (iv).
Ry. Employees Safety B. 77 (Mr. *Smith*) on M. for 2°, 2387 (i).
Ry. Policy, Govt. Announcement (remarks) 6426.
Railway Subsidies (B. 270) prop. Res., 13549 ; M. for Com. on Res., 14053 ; in Com. on Res., 14314, 14428 ; (auditing Co.'s books, &c.) 14516 ; (location of rys.) 14514 ; (payment of subsidies,

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Railway Subsidies—*Con.*
&c.) 14511 ; (running powers, Govt. control, &c.) 14515 ; 1°* of B., 14519 ; 2°m. and in Com., 14735 ; (Amts.) 14740 (vi).
——— Cost of Bridges, Safeguard *re* (remarks) 14512 (vi).
——— granted to provs., Amounts to each, &c. (remarks) 14484, 14687 ; Stmnt. (presented) 14852 (vi).
——— Payments of, Safeguarding, &c. (remarks) 14513 (vi).
——— voted by Govt., 1900-1902 (Ans.) 13027, 13259 (vi).
——— in 1901-2-3, &c. (Ans.) 13934 (vi).
——— Amounts paid since 1900 to 1903 (Ans.) 12842, 13370 (vi).
——— voted for past ten Years, &c. (Ans. 13934.
Railway Act (Supplies to I.C.R.) Amt. (B. 258) prop. Res., 8332 (iv) ; 10715, 11189 ; in Com. on Res., 12574 ; 1°* of B., 12584 (v) ; in Com., 12944 (vi).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 1812 (i).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11032 ; (N. S.) 11800 ; on M. for 3°, 12482 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) to M. for 3°, 12445 (v).
——— (remarks) 408 (i).
Returns, on Inquiry for (remarks) 544 (i).
Revenue and Expenditure, Amounts collected, &c., for 1903 (Ans.) 12715, 13370 (vi).
Rideau Canal Employees, Delay in Paying (remarks) 13303 (vi).
Roberval to James Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).
Rosebery and Imperial Defence : *See* 'Imperial.'
St. Eustache to St. Placide Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).
St. John, Long Wharf : *See* 'Long.'
See 'Allan,' 'C.P.R.', &c.
St. John Valley Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14323 (vi).
St. Lawrence Islands, Improvements, in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).
St. Louis Exposition, Canadian Exhibits (Ans.) 3001 (ii).
St. Mary's River Ry. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4589 (ii).
St. Peter's and Louisburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).
Salmon Industry, Fraser River, &c. (remarks) 9970 (iv).
Shediac and Coast Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com, on Res., 14325 (vi).
Sinclair, James : *See* 'Patent.'
South African Medals, Regulations *re* (remarks) 8266 (iv).
S. A. War, Supplies purchased by Imp. Gov., on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) for O. Cs., &c., 2761.
See 'Hay,' &c.

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Steel Rails and Clergue Govt. contract, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

See 'Clergue,' &c.

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7028 (iii).

Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Supplies to I.C.R.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 258.'

Supply (M.) for Com., 89 (i).

Supply (B. 206) 1°*, 2°*, 3°*, 5243 (iii).

Supply (B. 218) prop. Res., 6003; conc. (M.) 6069; in Com., 6170 (iii).

Supply Bill (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5995 (iii).

——— (remarks) *re* one-fifth Vote, 6408 (iii).

——— (B. 241) 1°m., 8404 (iv).

——— (B. 271) prop. Res., 14767; 1°* of B., 14768.

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census) 4597, 4644, 4801; (census, N.B., religions) 4810; (gold exhibits) 4617; (Stuart, Capt. dismissal) 4353 (ii).

Canals—Chambly (electric station by-wash) 12906; (land damages) 12908; (landing wharfs) 12908; (macadamizing tow path) 14151; (tow paths) 12906 (vi); **Cornwall** (electric equipment) 14134; (enlargement) 12895; **Farran's Point** (acetylene gas plant) 14155 (vi); (enlargement) 7565 (iii); 12898, 14150; **Galops** (channel completion) 14644 (vi); (deepening, &c.) 8268; conc., 8374; (enlargement) 7804 (iv); 12899, 14141 (vi); (north channel) 7803 (iv); 14142 (vi); **Generally** (lockmen, &c., increased wages) 14157; (operating expenses) 12920; (salaries and contingencies) 12933; (surveys, &c.) 12900; (tolls, collectors) 12929; **Grenville** (guide pier) 12909; (investigation *re* supt.) 14157 (vi); **Lachine** (electrical appliances) 7806 (iv); 14142; (enlargement, &c.) 12903; (hydrographic surveys) 12904; (lock gate protection) 14142; (masonry walls) 12906; (Mill Street paving) 14153; (Lake St. Francis dam) 14152; **Miscellaneous** (engineers, &c., salaries) 12910; (general vote) 12910; (Heath, Geo., compensation) 14155; (litigation expenses) 12911; **Murray** (Johnson's purchase of house) 14145; (wire fencing) 14151 (vi); **North Channel** (dam construction) 7803; **Rideau** (Brasses' Point bridge) 7808 (iv); (Hog's Back, swing bridge) 12904; (swing bridge at Concession St., Ottawa) 14150; **St. Ours** Lock (stop logs) 12908 (vi); **Sault Ste. Marie** (construction) 7560 (iii); 12904; **Soulanges** (bank repairing) 14154 (vi); (construction) 7549 (iii); (Goodwin's claim) 14143; (O'Leary's claims) 14651 (vi); **Trent** (construction) 7551 (iii); 14645; (Corry & Laverdure claims) 14651; (Peterborough pier) 14645 (vi); **Welland** (deepening, &c.) 7804 (iv); (deepening long level) 14148; (drainage) 12905 (vi); (Dunnville dam) 7809 (iv); (electric lighting) 12900, 14148; (elevator foundations) 14149 (vi); (land damages) 7805 (iv); (land surveys) 12905 (vi); (mitre sills) 7804 (iv); 14148; (Port Colborne improvements) 12902; (Port Colborne, rock cut) 14148; (protection walls) 12905 (Ramy's Point obstruction) 12902; (summit level) 12903; (Townsend valve, lock gates) 12905; **Williamsburg** (gate lifter) 14149; (scow) 14154; (overseer's house) 14150 (vi).

Charges of Management (Dom. notes, printing, &c.) 5135 (ii), 14252 (vi); (Receiver General) 12584 (v).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt.: Aud. General (promotion) 14255, (vi); Customs (contingencies) 331; (salaries) 320; Finance (contingencies) 226; (salaries) 224 (i); (Insurance) 12586; Geological Survey (salaries) 12592 (v); Gov. Gen.'s Office (salaries, &c.) 207 (i); (High Commissioner's Office) 12586 (v); Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 239; Interior (salaries) 269 (i); Railways and Canals (2nd-class clerk) 14055 (vi); (salaries) 335; Sec. of State (printing, &c.) 223 (i); (2nd-class clerks) 14254 (vi); (salaries) 222 (i).

Culling Timber (salaries) 7798 (iv).

Customs (miscellaneous expenditure, &c.) 3967; (preferential tariff) 3940 (ii).

Fisheries (fishery officers) 5050; (inspectors' salaries) 5128 (ii); (lighthouses, &c.) 5312 (iii); (lobster hatcheries) 13661 (vi); (salaries) conc., 6070 (iii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6668; (exodus, &c.) 6729 (iii); (general expenses) 2299 (i); (repatriation, &c.) 6716 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7772; (Man. grain act) 7798 (iv).

Justice, Administration of (Henry, Justice, retiring allowance) 14662 (vi).

Legislation: Elections (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing) 14268 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 4173 (ii); (Halifax harbour buoys) 13638 (Marconi stations) 13647 (vi).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 14249 (vi).

Militia (annual drill) 5005 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Alaskan Boundary commission) 2299 (i); (arbitration, Dom. and Prov.) 12590 (Art Gallery) 12589 (v); (Barton, Sir Edmund, expenses, &c.) 6952 (iii); (classifying records) 12592 (v); (Martineau defalcations) 6991 (iii); (Micmac Dictionary, printing) 12592; (Mining Institute) 12591 (v); (naturalization act, expenses) 6952 (iii); (Paris agency) 12589 (v); Petersen, Tate & Co., deposit) 6953 (iii); (Prince Albert *Advocate*, printing) 14652 (vi); (Printing Bureau plant) 12587 (v); (St. Lawrence Islands, improvements) 14661 (vi); (S. African memorial association) 6992 (iii); (tobacco commission) 8267 (iv); (trade combinations investigation) 14654 (vi); (unforeseen expenses) 6951 (iii), 12588 (v); (Victoria Memorial, Can. contribution) 14655); Yukon (Canadian Bank of Commerce, compensation) 14274 (vi).

N. W. T. Govt. (general expenses) 6889 (iii); (salaries, &c.) 13787 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 4043; (St. Lawrence, transportation) 4044; (supplies) 5046 (ii).

Post Office: Outside Service (salaries) 5927 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings, N.S. (Halifax) 411 (i); (Halifax custom house) 13031; (Halifax, immigration shed) 13033 (vi); **Ont.** (rural mail delivery) 515 (i); **Ottawa** (buildings) 5007 (ii); (census building) 992 (i); (Rideau Hall grounds) 5006 (ii); (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 996; (Royal mint) 346 (i)

Docks (commission's rep.) 2982 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers, Generally (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2644 (ii); **N.B.** (St. John River, wharfs) 1180; **N.S.** (Amagandus, wharf) 1071 (i); (Breton's Cove) 13167 (vi); (Cow Bay) 1079; (Drumhead Breakwater) 1087 (i); (Frudes Point, wharf) 13180 (vi); (Glace Bay) 1088 (i); (Glace Bay, wharf) 13185 (vi); (Grand Etang, bridge works) 1096; (Green Cove, harbour) 1100; (Kingsport, pier) 1104; (Lunenburg, harbour)

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

1108; (Three Fathoms, harbour) 1149 (i); (Victoria Beach, wharf) 13125 (vi); (West Baccaro, channel) 1150; **Ont.** (Belle Rivière) 1191; **Que.** (Grande Vallee, pier) 1552 (i); conc., 6070 (iii); (Murray Bay, wharf) 2271 (i).

Miscellaneous (architect's office) 2747; (Dixon, F. A.) 2729; (temporary clerks) 2732 (ii).

Slides and Booms (repairs) 2980 (ii).

Telegraph Lines (Belle Isle) 2712; (Marconi system) 2712; (Mar. provs.) 2711; (telegraph lines, St. Lawrence) 5007 (ii).

Quarantine (small-pox) 5011 (ii).

Railways—G. T. Pacific (surveys) 14646; (G.T. R., rental) 12887 (vi); **I.C.R.** (air brakes, freight) 7527 (iii), 8281; (air signals) 8311 (iv); (Amqui accommodation) 12601 (v); (bridge strengthening) 8269 (iv); (Canso ferry service) 7525 (iii), 12602 (v), 14093; (car shops, machinery) 14106 (vi); ('Chapman' ball-bearing apparatus) 8283: (Chaudière junction, engine house) 8315 (iv), 12594 (v), 14106 (vi); ('Cleveland' cylinders) 8284 (iv); (Connolly's claim and interest) 14103; (double tracking, &c.) 14062 (vi); (draw bars) 7520 (ii), 8288 (iv); (Eastern Extension, award, &c.) 7529 (iii); (Eel River, agent's house) 12600 (v); (general vote) 12873; (Grand Narrows bridge protection) 14094 (vi); (Halifax accommodation) 7522 (iii), 8316 (iv), 12597 (v), 12824, 14080; (Halifax terminus) 14646 (vi); (Lévis, accommodation) 7520 (iii); (machinery for shops) 8290 (iv), 14106; (Metapedia station) 14096 (vi); (Metis station and road) 12604 (v), 12828 (vi); (Miramichi bridge) 8307 (iv); (Moncton accommodation) 12600; (Moncton, freight sheds) 14090 (vi); (Moncton workshops) 8312; (Muhlfeld's rep. *re* 'Cleveland' cylinder) 8284 (iv); (New Glasgow, freight shed) 14095 (vi); (North Sydney improvements) 12598 (v); (North Sydney, station) 14089 (vi); (operating expenses) 7811(iv); (Ouelle river branch) 7526 (iii), 12599 (v); (Pictou accommodation) 8317 (iv), 12827, 14088 (vi); (Pintsch gas equipment) 8291; (Point Tupper improvements) 8309 (iv); (power saw) 12607 (v); (Restigouche bridge) 8304 (iv); (Riviere du Loup engine house) 12593 (v); (Rivière du Loup, work shops) 8314; (Rivière du Loup, yards) 8309 (iv); (River Ouelle, spur line) 7526 (iii), 12599 (v); (rolling stock) 8292 (iv), 14100; (St. Flavie. accommodation) 12602 (v); (St. John, accommodation) 8315 (iv), 12596 (v), 12823, 14063; (*Scotia* Str., salvage) 14107 (vi); (steel rails) 5005 (ii); (Stellarton, increased accommodation) 8296 (iv); (sidings, additional) 14055, 14081, 14107 (vi); (Truro, accommodation) 12603 (v); (vestibule equipment) 7529 (iii), 12600 (v); (Windsor station) 14097 (vi)

Miscellaneous (gratuities) 14155; (ry. commission, salaries) 14155 (vi).

P.E.I. (Albany station) 14133; (Alberton station) 14132 (vi); (Blue Shank line, straightening) 7530 (iii), 14133; (Charlottetown station) 14131; (general vote) 12891; (Hillsborough bridge) 12829, 14115; (Kensington accommodation) 12840; (Kinkora accommodation) 12841; (Montague bridge) 14132 (vi); (Mount Stewart, freight house) 7530; (Murray Harbour branch and Hillsborough bridge) 7530 (iii), 7801 (iv), 12829, 14108; (Northam and Richmond stations) 12841 (vi); (steel rails) 7803 (iv); (Summerside, coal sheds) 12828; (water service) 12841 (vi).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Scientific Institutions (MacGregor, Capt., gratuity) 6994 (iii).

Superannuations (Casselman, W. J., lockmaster) 14272 (vi).

Trade and Commerce (iron and steel bounties, legal expenses) 7795; (preferential tariff in France) 7799 (iii).

Unprovided Items, 6993 (iii).

Supreme and Exchequer Court Act Amt, B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2369 (i).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4920, 4937 (ii).

Tariff Act Amt. B. 273 (surtax) in Com. on Ways and Means, 14755 (vi).

——— Revision, Inquiry for Cor., &c., 3003 (ii). *See* 'Budget,' &c., 'Customs,' &c.

Telephone Legislation (remarks), 409 (i).

Thunder Bay, Nepigon and St. Joe Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14401 (vi).

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314, 14380 (vi).

Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14428 (vi).

Tobacco Excise Duties, Par. in Toronto *Globe* (remarks), 5702 (iii).

Tobacco in Foreign Countries, &c., Amt. paid to Mr. Blaise Dugas *re* Trip (Ans.), 1035 (i).

Tobin Co. and Subsidy to Trois Pistoles Ry. (remarks) 14462 (vi).

Trackmen on Govt. Rys., Increase of Salaries (remarks), in Com. on B. 257, 12558 (v).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14086 (vi).

Transcontinental Ry., &c., on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*), 7727 (iv).

——— *See* 'G.T. Pacific.'

Transportation Commission, Formation, &c., (remarks), 9819 (iv).

Transportation Commission and Tariff Inquiry, *re* Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks), 854 (i).

Treadgold Commission, Tel. from W. A. Beddoe *re* Refusal of Commissioner to produce Files (remarks) 9818 (iv).

Trent Canal, Medical Officer (Ans.) 8117 (iv).

——— Payment to Thos. Dodds (Ans.), 8118 (iv).

——— Rep. of W. McLeod *re* Route, &c. (Ans.) 12716 (v).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).

Tyerman, P. D., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.), 286 (i).

United Empire Life Insurance Co,'s B. 163 (Mr. *Thompson*), in Com., 3796, 3983 (ii).

Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.'s B. 87 (Mr. *Macpherson*), in Com., 4587 (ii).

Veterinary Inspectors, Salaries, &c. (Ans.), 1591 (i).

Voters' Lists: *See* 'Electors,' &c.

Waltham to Ferguson Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14448 (vi).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Ways and Means (Res. for Com.), 89 (i).
——— The Tariff (M.), 1378 (i).
See 'Customs,' 'Budget,' &c.
Ways and Means re G.T.P. Surveys, in Com., 14765 (vi).
Weights and Measures Act (milk cans), Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2341 (i).
Welland Canal, Lock Tenders (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 12923 (vi).
Wheat Freight Rates for Export to Montreal, &c. (Ans.), 11188 (v), 11426 (v).
Wheat Freight Rates, Res. of Morden Board of Trade (Ans.), 12074 (v).
Williamsburg Canal, Supt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12928 (vi).
Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Mackinnon*) on M. for 2°, 631 (i).
Wood Alcohol manufactured, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 98 (i).
See 'Supply—Civil Govt., Inland Revenue.'
Yukon Supplies, Tenders, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4071 (ii).

Fisher, Hon. S. A. (Minister of Agriculture), *Brome.*
Agricultural Lecturers, Names, &c. (Ans.), 8615 (iv).
American Cattle purchased for British Govt. (remarks, 5415 (iii).
Anderson, Mr. J. G., Allegations *re* Inspection of Fruit (remarks), 13508 (vi).
——— Appnmt. as Fruit Inspector (Ans.) 13372 (vi).
Animals Contagious Diseases (B. 194), 1° *, 4003; 2° m., 4224; in Com., 4225, 4690 (ii).
Archives, Rep. (presented), 5417 (iii).
Art Gallery and Can. Artists, &c. (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 13515 (vi).
Binder Twine, Inspection and Penalties (remarks) 14050 (vi).
Burrard, B.C., Census, McCraney's Letter *re* Enumerators (remarks), in Com of Sup., 7079 (iii).
Business of the House, Misleading Statements (remarks), 4348 (ii).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention (B. 207) prop. Res., 4960; in Com. on Res., 5052; 1° m., 5240; in Com., 5419, 5846 (iii).
Butter and Cheese Weighing, Rep. *re* (Ans.), 5414 (iii).
Butter, Can., Mr. Preston's Interview, &c., (remarks), 10746 (v).
Canadian Exhibit at Imp. Institute, London (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 13509 (vi).
Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*), to Com. of Sup., 5467 (iii).
Census, Burrard: *See* 'Burrard.'
Census, Carleton, &c., N.B., Classification, &c. (Ans.), 4004 (ii).

Fisher, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*
Census Expenditure, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13707 (vi).
——— Grand Manan, N.B., Religious denominations, &c. (Ans.) 3801 (ii).
——— 1901, New Basis *re* Work of Staff (Ans.) 13936 (vi).
——— St. John, N.B., Religious Denominations, &c. (Ans.) 3801 (ii).
——— Schedules, Halton, Cardwell and Peel, for 1891 (Ans.) 6894 (iii).
——— *See* 'Halton,' &c.
——— Sunbury, &c., N.B., Religious Classification (Ans.) 4005 (ii).
——— *See* 'Supply—Agriculture,' 'Pub. Accts.' &c.
Fruit Inspector Anderson: *See* 'Anderson.'
Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on M. for 2°, 3810 (ii).
——— B. 130 (Mr. *Henderson*) on M. for 2°, 3826 (ii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9512 (iv); in Com. on B., 11296 (v).
Hagar, Miss, Emplymt. at Experimental Farm (Ans.) 5316 (iii).
Halton, Cardwell and Peel, Census Schedules (Ans.) 6436, 7092 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iii).
Herald Co., Ques. of Privilege, 5314 (iii).
Imperial Institute Exhibit: *See* 'Can. Exhibit.'
Kelly, Wm., Census Commissioner for N. Hastings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7080 (iii).
Orford Mountain Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14459 (vi).
Patent Act Amt. (B. 184) 1° m., 3622; in Com., 4213, 4674 (ii).
Preston, Mr., and Can. Butter: *See* 'Butter,' &c.
Privilege (Ques. of), Par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 5314 (iii).
Public Accounts Com., Production of Census Schedules, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7058 (iii).
Roach, Mr., Census Enumerator for N. Ontario (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7083 (iii).
St. Louis Exposition, Live Stock Exhibit (Ans.) 4837 (ii).
San José Scale, *re* Nursery Stock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13502 (vi).
Schell, J. T., M.P., Goods supplied to Govt. (Ans.) 4959 (ii).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale (B. 200) in Com. on Res., 5084; 1° m., 4442 (ii); in Com. on B., 6463, 7210 (iii); wthdn., 12493 (v).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (Acadian historical data) 13505 (vi); (aid to societies) 4432; (archives) 4429 (ii), 13503 (vi); (Canadian exhibit at Imperia Institute) 4435 (ii), 13509 (vi); (census) 4594 l (census, Côté circular) 4657; (census enumer; ators) 4646; (census, N.B.) 4801; (census

Fisher, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Agriculture—Con.
schedules) 4635 (ii), 7053 (census, total cost) 7053 (iii); (classification of patents) 4433 (ii); (cold storage) 7086 (iii), 7670; (creameries, N.W.T.) 7632 (iv); (criminal statistics) 4429; (dairying branch) 4671; (exhibitions) 4599; (experimental farms) 4548; (fumigating stations) 4434 (ii), 13502 (vi); (general statistics) 4429; (Health Act) 4440, 5007 (ii), 5490 (iii); (Japan Exhibition) 4626; (patent branch, salaries) 4350 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7641 (iv); (Prof. Shutt's report) 4556; (St. Louis exhibition) 4599; (San José scale) 4434; (Stuart, Capt., dismissal) 4354 (ii); (Toronto Industrial exhibition) 13501 (vi); (Tracadie lazaretto) 4439; (Treadgold exhibit) 4612 (ii); (tuberculosis, aid to Can. Association) 13517 (vi); (*Year Book*) 4429 (ii).
Immigration (exodus to U.S.) 6875; (repatriation, &c.) 6713 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (freight rates, &c.) 7583 (iv).
Public Works: Buildings, Que. (Magog P.O.) 13081 (vi).
Quarantine (cattle and vet. division) 5502; (diseased immigrants) 5492; (hog cholera) 5505 (iii); (public health) 4440 (ii), 5490 (iii); (public health, small-pox) 5007 (ii); (small-pox) 5491 (iii).
Supreme Court Registrar's B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14308 (vi).
Tuberculosis, Aid to Can. Association, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13517 (vi).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles (Minister of Justice), *Quebec County*.
Algonquin Lumber and Power Co.'s incorp. B. 165 (Mr. *Gould*) in Com., 5361 (iii).
Aliens, Naturalization Act Amt. B. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5875 (iii).
Anglo-American Cable Co. and P.E.I. and Mainland (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13332, 13338 (vi).
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. (remarks) in Com. on B. 155, 14771 (vi).
Binder Twine, Average Price, &c. (Ans.), 7566 (iv).
——— Average Price for Sisal, &c. (Ans.), 8085 (iv).
——— Circular *re* Sales, &c. (Ans.), 4182 (ii).
——— Cost, &c. (Ans.), 2311 (i).
——— Mr. Haycock's Powers under Act (remarks) 14047 (vi).
——— Residences of Purchasers, &c. (Ans.) 4183 (ii).
——— *See* 'Supply—Justice, Penitentiaries,' &c.
Brunet, Arthur, and Dom. Elections Act, on M. (Mr. *Casgrain*) for Pets., O. Cs., &c., 105 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan. B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5121 (ii).
Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3226 (ii).
C. P. Ry. Lands, School Taxation, &c. (Ans.) 4006 (ii).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5360, 5556 (iii).
Capital Cases, Commutations, &c. (remarks) 13303 (vi).
Carver *vs.* King, Commutation of, Reps. *re* (remarks) 13303 (vi).
Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B., in Com. on Res., 604 (i).
Columbia River Improvement Co.'s incorp. (B. 150) in Com., 5559 (iii).
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3281 (ii).
County Court Judges, Appnmt. from local Bars (remarks) 5582 (iii).
——— Appnmts., Retirements, &c. (Ans.), 4960 (ii).
——— *See* 'Judges'.
Criminal Code (immoral entertainments) Act Amt. (B. 12) 1° m., 95; in Com., 316; 3° m., 592 (i).
——— (cruelty to animals) B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 2779, 3242 (ii).
——— (general) Amt. (B. 215) 1° m., 5581; 2° m., 6638; in Com., 6639, 7490 (iii), 10746; (cigarettes), 10748 (v); Order dschgd., 14768 (vi).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 4023 (ii).
Desjardins Canal (B. 183) 1° m., 3393; in Com., 4213 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 906 (i); (compulsory voting), 13583, 14405 (vi).
——— Controverted Elections Act Am. (B. 13) 1° m. 95; 2° m., 635; in Com., 1115, 2239 (i).
——— Elections Act Amt., B. 15 (Mr. *Clancy*) on M. for 2°, 1061; in Com., 1062 (i); Amt., 3236 (ii).
Dorchester Penitentiary, Contracts *re* Fuel (Ans. 10101 (v).
Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co.'s (B. 109) 1°*, 1378 (i).
Election Bills: *See* 'Dom.' &c.
Empire Accident Surety Co.'s incorp. B. 107 (Mr. *Calvert*) in Com., 2755 (ii).
Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) in Com., 3226 (ii).
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Domers*) in Com., 8244, 8360 (iv).
Expropriation Act Amt. (B. 8) 1° m., 93; in Com., 291, 613, 634 (i).
Gagetown, N.B., Mail Contract, &c. (Ans.), 1676 (i).
Good Shepherd Reformatory N.B. (B. 199) 1° m., 4178; in Com., 4840 (ii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5216 (iii); 7817, 7824, 7845 (iv).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
G. T. Pacific Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9006 (iv); in Com. on B., 10424, 10568, 10619, 10649, 11190, 11210, 11319, 11833, 11864, 12063, 12074, 12164; (amt. to amt. *re* securities), 11963 (v).
——— Legal Opinions (read) 11335 (v).
——— Pets. *re* on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13269 (vi).
——— 2-cent a mile rate, 10465, 12225 (v).
——— Ques. of Order *re* Mr. Taylor, 10564 (v).
Haycock: *See* 'Binder Twine.'
Hêtu, R., Pardon, &c. (Ans.), 7915 (iv).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*), 788 (i).
Incorporated Companies B. 94 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3258 (ii).
Indian River Ry. Co.'s (Megantic) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).
Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2787 (ii).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 927 (i).
Judges appointed from Local Bars: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 208 (i).
Judges of the Superior Courts, Retiring Allowance (B. 7), 1° m., 93; prop. Res., 203 (i); (M.) to discharge Res., 2582 (ii).
Judges Retiring Allowance (B. 243) prop. Res., 3431, 4262 (ii), 5241 (iii); in Com. on Res., 8087, 8369; 1° * of B., 8372 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 14296 (vi).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. (B. 250), prop. Res., 10102; in Com. on Res., 10759; 1° *, 2° *, and in Com., 10792, 11406 (v).
Judges of Provincial Courts (Quebec) B. 255, in Com. on Res., 11821; 2° of Res. m., 11833; in Com. on B., 12301 (v).
Judges of N. W. T. Act Amt. (B. 259) 1° m., 12610; in Com., 13853, 14287 (vi).
Judges of Ont., Judges' Salaries, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 96 (i).
——— of County Courts, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 3628 (ii).
——— *See* 'County,' &c.
Justice, Deptl. Rep. (presented), 90 (i).
Juvenile Offenders Act Amt. (B. 10) 1° m., 94; in Com., 314 (i).
Kingston Penitentiary, Contracts *re* Groceries, &c. (Ans.), 10100 (v).
Law Library in England, Establishment, &c., on M. (Mr. *Casgrain*) for cor., 100 (i).
Librarians of Parlt. (B. 267) prop. Res., 13670; in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; in Com., 14299 (vi).
Lt.-Governor of Ont., Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 113, 661 (i).
Litigation Expenses, Fees, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vi).
Man. Judgeship, Delay in Appnmt., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).
See 'Myers.'

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5100 (ii).
Miller Bros., P.O. Saving Bank Deposits, Defalcations, in Com. of Sup., 14659 (vi).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4465 (ii).
Mowat, Sir Oliver, and Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 113, 661 (i).
Mutual Life Assurance Co. of Canada's B. 65 (Mr. *Bruce*) in Com., 2304 (i).
Myers, Appnmt. as Judge in Man. (Ans.) 285 (i).
See 'Man.,' &c.
New Canadian Co.'s incorp. B. 83 (Mr. *Lemieux*) M. to ref. back to Com., 2753 (ii).
Nicola, Kamloops & Similkameen Ry. Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6432 (iii).
N.W.T. Representation in Senate (B. 253) 1° m., 11691; in Com., 12302 (v).
Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com. 2717 (ii).
Pardons, Prerogatives, &c. of His Ex., on M. (Mr. *Casgrain*) for Ret., 567 (i).
———Number, Names, &c. (Ans.) 96 (i).
Penitentiary Act Amt. (B. 217) 1° m., 5763 (iii) 8261, 8373 (iv), 10824 (v).
Penitentiaries Deptl. Rep. (presented) 90 (i).
Public Printing and Stationery Act Amt. (B. 182) 1° m., 3392, 4203 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 5872 (iii).
Public Works Dept., Control and Transfer (B. 269) 1° m., 14281; in Com., 14741; (Amt.) 14755 (vi).
Quebec Bridge Co.'s B. 145 (Mr. *Power*) in Com., 4587 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14705 (vi).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14455 (vi).
Quebec Judges and Legal Business, &c. (Ans.) 14665 (vi).
See 'Judges' B. 255.'
Ry. Act (commission) Amt. B. 21, Salaries (prop. Res.) 8085; (M.) for Com. on Res., 8119 (iv).
Ry Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 2599, 3847, 3886, 4126, 4578 (ii) 5780, 7299, 7609, 8125 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* Two Cent Rate to M. for 3°, 8357 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 13834 (vi).
——— on Conference with Senate Managers *re* Amts., Report of Progress, 14740, 14761; Rep. (read) 14844; M. to conc., 14844 (vi).
Ry. Act (fire damages) Amt. B. 23 (Mr. *Demers*, Iberville) on M. for 2°, 2784 (i).
Ry. Debts Bill; *See* 'Exchequer,' &c.
Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14429, 14507; in Com. on B., 14736 (vi).
Reformatory Prisons (B. 221) 1° m., 6427 (iii); in Com., 8087 (iv).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles—*Con.*

Registrar of Supreme Court Salary (B. 268) in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; in Com. on B., 14300; (Amt.) 14403 (vi).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°, 719; on M. for 2°, 1230 (i); in Com., 10943, 10976, 11490; (Quebec) 11792; (Toronto) 11735; on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) to M. for 3°, 12435 (v).

Representation of P.E.I. and N.B. (Ans.) 5316 (iii).

———Papers *re* N.B. (remarks) 1110 (i).

———*Re* P. E. I. and N. B., Cor. respecting (remarks) 876 (i).

Revised Statutes; *See* 'Statutes,' 'Supply—Justice, Miscellaneous.'

St. James Division (Electoral) Vacancy (remarks) 409 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Acting Warden, &c. (Ans.) 10832 (iv).

———Hospital, &c. (Ans.) 13669 (vi).

———Investigation of 1898 (Ans.) 14285 (vi).

Schell, Mr., M.P., (M.) to ref. Stmnt. to Com. on Priv. and Elections, 5417 (iii).

Saunders, Mr. C. E., Appnmt. at Experimental Farm, &c. (Ans.) 1676 (i).

Scotia, Str. Salvage Claims, &c. (remarks) 7206 (iii) 14107 (vi).

Senate Representation of N.W.T.: *see* 'N.W.T.'

Seven Islands Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14456 (vi).

Shipping Casualties Act Amt. B. 263 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 13000 (vi).

South Shore Ry., Working, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 450 (i).

Statutes, Revised, Publication, Act Amt. (B. 11) 1° m., 94; in Com., 634 (i).

Statutes, Revision (B. 265) 1° m., 13667; in Com., 14297 (vi).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7034, 7047 (iii).

Sturgeon Falls Pulp and Lumber Co. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14429 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Canals: Soulanges (Goodwin's claim) 14143 (vi).

Charges of Management (public debt) 14253 (vi).

Civil Govt.: Customs (salaries) 321; Justice (appnmt. of Judges) 208 (i); (McGillivray, A. J.) 14255; (Morris, Thos.) 14255; (Messrs. Power and Fraser) 14255; (Miss Quain) 14255 (vi); (salaries) 207 (i).

Customs (inspectors, preventive service, &c.) 3951 (ii).

Indians (legal expenses) 6418; (Waby trial) 6418 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7776; (Man. grain act) 7798 (iv).

Justice, Administration of (Ad Hoc Judges) 3402; **B.C.** (judges' travelling allowances) 3400; **Exchequer Court** (Admiralty accommodation) 3409; (Admiralty, registrar) 3408; (reports) 3407; (registrar) 3407; (salaries) 3406; (travelling expenses) 3407; (execution

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Justice, Administration of—Con.

expenditure) 3401; **Man.** (judge's travelling expenses) 3399 (ii); **Miscellaneous** (Statutes, revision) 14643; **N.B.** (divorce court) 3401 (ii); **N. W. T.** (fees, &c.) 14257 (vi); (Prince Albert court, clerk) 3401; (prisoners in N.W.T.) 3398; (Regina jail, land purchase) 5135 (ii); (Supreme Court judge) 14257 (vi); **N. S.** (county court judge Dodd) 14259; **Ont.** (Nipissing judgeship) 14258 (vi); **Supreme Court** (contingencies) 3404; (law books) 3405; (library) 3403 (ii); (reports) 14257 (vi); (Reps., binding, &c.) 3405; (reporter) 3402 (ii); (Taschereau, E. R. A.) 14257 (vi); **Yukon** (clerk of court) 3411; (Dugas, judge) 3411; (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3410, 3414, 3507; (judges living allowances) 3411; (law library) 3506 (ii), 14267 (vi); (police magistrates) 3416; (Taylor, Geo. L.) 3416; (travelling allowances) 3409 (ii).

Dom. Police (salaries) 3511 (ii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3511; (general expenses) 3511; (Kingston) 3511; (Manitoba) 3534; (St. Vincent de Paul) 3534 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse supplies) 4171; (pilotage *re* St. Lawrence) 4144; (St. Lawrence, improvements) 4144 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 13696 (vi).

Militia (Valleyfield strike) 3589, 3600 (ii).

Miscellaneous (British American Bank Note Co.) 14279; (Perkins, Wm., Lisgar election pet.) 14251 (vi); (tobacco commission) 8268 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4068 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, Que. (Levis) 431 (i); Harbours and Rivers: Generally (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2433; Mar. Provs. (dredging plant) 2665 (ii); N. S. (Neil's Harbour) 1141; Que. (Batiscan channel) 2280 (i); (Chateau Richer) 13456 (vi); (Le Tableau wharf) 2254 (i); (Ste. Anne de la Perade, wharf) 13488; (Ste. Famille pier) 13489; (St. Jean des Chaillons) 13495; (St. Louis River, improvements) 13473; (Seven Islands wharf) 13480 (vi); Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2688 (ii); Telegraph Lines, Que. (Belle Isle system) 13332; (Bersimis to Godbout) 13332 (vi).

Rys. and Canals: Miscellaneous (Dixon, F. A. D.) 2729 (ii); (litigation expenses) 12911; (Stewart *vs.* King) 12913 (vi).

Trade and Commerce (iron bounties, legal expenses) 7797 (iv).

Supreme Court of Ontario, Judges' Salaries B., prop. Res., 10102 (iv).
See 'Judges' B. 250.'

Supreme Court Registrar (B. 268); in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; in Com., 14300 (Amt.) 14403 (vi).

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12305 (v).

Ticket-of-Leave System, Releases &c. (Ans.) 96.

Treadgold Concessions, on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2898 (ii).

——— Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4533 (ii).

Two-cent Ry. Rate: *See* 'G. T. P R.,' &c., 'Ry. B. 21.'

Valiquette, Mr. J. A., Appnmt. as Stenographer, Yukon (Ans.) 4005 (ii).

Yukon Ter. Act (summoning of jurors) Amt. (B. 9) 1°m., 94; in Com., 313 (i).

——— (Court of Appeal—quorum)—(B. 254) 1°m., 11692 (v).

Fowler, Mr. G. W., *King's (N.B.)*
Albert, N.B., Harbour Master, Capt. Bishop, Dismissal (Ques.) 6896 (iii).
Allan Line Steamships, Withdrawal from St. John (remarks) 13937 (vi).
——— Reduction of Sailings from St. John, N.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14064 (vi).
Aylesworth, Mr. A. B., Reported Interview *re* Alaskan Boundary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13957 (vi)
Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6384 (iii).
Bathurst, N.B., Fishery Overseer, Complaints *re* (remarks) 14686 (vi).
See 'Daly.'
Beersville Coal Co.'s Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14488 (vi).
Belmont Disaster Victims, Compensation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14156 (vi).
See 'Crandall.'
Bishop, Capt., Harbour Master at Albert, N.B., Dismissal (Ques.) 6896 (iii).
Bloomfield Postmaster, N.B., Charges against, &c. (Ques.) 818 (i).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14438 (vi).
C.P.R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14501 (vi).
C.P.R. (Medicine Hat) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14503 (vi).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4378 (ii).
Charbonneau, Miss Edna, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 12716 (vi).
Chevrier Family, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 12498, 12716, 13968 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12336, 12500; I. C. R. trackmen, 12561 (v); on M. for 3°, 13942 (vi).
Crandall, Brakeman on I. C. R., Inquiries at Belmont (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13546 (vi).
See 'Belmont.'
Cumberland Ry. and Coal Co.'s (Parrsboro') Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).
Daly, M. T., Bathurst, Harbour Master, N.B. (Ques.) 2919 (ii).
See 'Bathurst.'
Demurrage Regulations, I.C.R. (Ques.) 4672, 4952 (ii).
Digby Port Wharf, Extension, &c. (Ques.) 2101.
Discriminating Freight Rates *re* Ocean Vessels (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7604 (iii), 13687 (vi).
See 'Ry. Act B. 21.'
Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13570, 14405 (vi).
Elgin and Havelock Ry. Co.'s (B. 142) 1°*, 2237.
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8255, 8257 (iv).
Ferries on St. John River: in Com. of Sup., 13696 (vi).

Fowler, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*
Freight Rates on Ocean Vessels, Discrimination: *See* 'Discriminating.'
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5173 (iii); in Com., 7844, 7883; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 8055, 8067, 8321 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10243; in Com. on B., 10670, 11215, 11876, 12045 (v); on M. for 3°, 12744; (amt.) 12709 (vi).
Hatfield's Point, Lighthouse-keeper, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 6896 (iii).
House of Commons Officials, Salaries: *See* Civil Service B. 257.'
Indian Medical Attendant, Kings, N.B. (Ques.) 2502 (ii).
Indian River Ry. Co.'s (Megantic) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).
I. C. R. Demurrage of Cars, Amount collected, &c. (Ques.) 4672, 4959 (ii).
——— General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3675 (ii).
——— Private Cars: *See* 'Private.'
——— Supplies entered Duty Free (M. for ret.*) 916 (i).
See 'Trackmen.'
International, Dredge leased by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 12218 (v).
James Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).
Judges' Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8110 (iv).
Kars, Census Enumeration, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 3804 (ii).
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14490 (vi).
Lake Superior, &c., Ry. (Peninsula Harbour) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14505 (vi).
Long Wharf, St. John, Lease by Govt. (Ques.) 11828 (v).
Nicolet River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).
Nobles, Israel, Dismissal as Lighthouse-keeper (Ques.) 6896 (iii).
O'Reilly, Mr., Claim *re* Tobacco Factory (remarks) 13979 (vi).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8261, 8373 (iv).
Penny Banks B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6457 (iii).
Pneumatic Tube Service *re* Postal Service (remarks) 13999 (vi).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. 5659 (iii).
Post Office Revenue, Increase, &c. (remarks) 14019 (vi).
Post Office Savings Banks Defalcations, in Com. of Sup., 14658 (vi).
P.E.I. Ferry Co.'s incorp. B. 180 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 7914 (iv).

Fowler, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*
Private Cars, I.C.R., &c. (Ques.) 2309 (i).
Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14708, 14717 (vi).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5329, 5566 (iii).
Ry. Debts Bill: *See* 'Exchequer.'
Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 2924 (ii).
Ry. Mail Clerks, in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5630 (iii).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14438 (vi).
Ry. Wrecks, in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10953, (N.B.) 11809; on M. for 3°, 12490 (v).
St. Francis River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14509 (vi).
St. John, Long Wharf: *See* 'Long Wharf.'
——— Allan Line, &c., Withdrawal: *See* 'Allan.'
St. Mary's River Ry. (Galt Road) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).
Schell, J. T., M.P., Goods supplied to Govt. (Ques.) 4959 (ii).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale, B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6474 (iii).
Small-Pox Patients, Gloucester, N.B., Contribution by Govt. towards Expenses *re* (remarks) 14688.
Springhill Public Building, Explosion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice—N.W.T. (fees, &c.) 14257; N. S. (county court Judge Dodd) 14259; Ont. (Nipissing Judgeship) 14258; Supreme Court (salaries) 14257; Yukon (law library) 14267 (vi).
Agriculture (census, N.B., religions) 4801 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7647 (iv).
Canals—Chambly (landing wharfs) 12908; Grenville (Tucker, Henry, services *re* investigation) 14157 (vi); Lachine (electrical appliances) 7806 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen. (promotions) 14256; Public Works (architect's salary) 13499; (contingencies) 13500; (Hunter, J. B., salary) 13499 (vi).
Dom. Lands—(Banff bath house) 13956 (vi).
Excise (analysts, &c.) 5399 (iii); (inspectors salaries) 13974 (vi); (liquor inspection) 5399 (iii); (salary of private sec.) 13968 (vi).
Immigration (Barr colonists) 6696 (iii).
Indians—Mar. Provs. (schools) 6409 (iii).
Legislation—Elections (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing) 14269 (vi).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 7604 (iv); (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 14249; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 13696; (St. Stephen and Black Bay) 13695 (vi).
Militia (rifle associations) 3768 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Alaskan boundary commission) 13957; (Miller Bros., P. O. Savings Bank defalcations) 14658 (vi).
Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 13543; (life-saving awards) 13544; (masters and mates examination) 13524; (naval militia reserve and school of navigation) 13545; (wrecks, investigation, &c.) 13545 (vi).

Fowler, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Buildings, Dom. (architect's staff) 961; (dismissals, &c.) 1019; (furniture) 1006; Generally (armouries) 965; (clerks of works) 963; (experimental farms) 973; (Nappan farm) 973; (Sussex armoury) 965 (i); N. S. (Arichat) 5828 (iii); Ottawa (census building) 982; (furniture, &c.) 974, 979; (heating, &c.) 1010; (ventilation, &c.) 974 (i); Que. (trachoma hospital) 14245 (vi).
Docks (repairs, &c.) 2978 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Windsor, sheer dam) 14248 (vi); Que. (Grande Vallée pier) 1523; (Le Tableau wharf) 2250 (i); (Mont Louis wharf) 13461 (vi); (Murray Bay, wharf) 2267 (i); (Newport breakwater) 13462; (New Richmond breakwater) 13463; Notre Dame du Portage) 13463 (vi); (Rivière aux Renards) 2279 (i); (St. André de Kamouraska pier) 13492; (Ste. Anne de la Pérade) 13488; (Ste. Anne de Sorel) 13489; (St. Fulgence, wharf) 13491; (St. Gédéon Islands, wharf) 13491; (St. Godfroi de Nouvelle, breakwater) 13490; (St. Jean des Chaillons, wharf) 13495 (vi); (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2263 (i); (St. Maurice, dam) 13492; (St. Michel de Bellechasse, pier) 13494; (St. Simeon, wharf) 13493 (vi); (Valleyfield, dredging) 2298 (i).
Slides and Booms (Gagner, Mr., salary) 2976; (Gatineau River) 2977; (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2974 (ii).
Telegraph Lines (Marconi stations) 2991 (ii).
Railways—Generally (wrecks, investigations *re*) 14154; I.C.R. (Amqui accommodation) 12601 (vi); (bridge strengthening) 8269 (iv); (Eel river, agent's house) 12600; (Halifax accommodation) 12597; (Métis station) 12604; (v); (North Sydney improvements) 12598; (Pintsch gas equipment) 8292 (iv); (Rivière Ouelle, spur line) 12599 (v); (rolling stock) 8293 (iv); (St. John accommodation) 12597 (v); (St. John accommodation) 14063 (vi); (Stellarton accommodation) 8296 (iv); (Sussex accommodation) 12601 (v); P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 7539 (iii).
Sussex Armoury, Overseer's Qualifications *re* Constructions, &c. (Ques.) 8331 (iv).
——— Brigade Camp (Ques.) 3235 (ii).
——— I.C.R. Roundhouse, Gates, &c. (Ques.) 4672 (ii).
——— Station Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).
Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12304 (v).
Tiffin, Genl. Manager, I.C.R., and Private Cars (Ques.) 2309 (i).
Trackmen on I.C.R., &c.: *See* 'Civil Service B. 257.'
White, Albert S., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4673 (ii).

Fraser, Mr. D. C., *Guysborough.*
Alliance Bank of Canada Incorp. B. 212 (Mr *Russell*) in Com., 7477 (iii).
Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5969 (iii).
Beauharnois Electoral District, Rep. of Com. (presented) 7202 (iii).

Fraser Mr. D. C.—*Con.*
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7330 (iii).
Brockville, Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*), M. for Com., 7339 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7340 (iii).
Budget, The, 2131 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5079 (ii); in Com. on B., 5453 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry, Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5631, 5820 (iii).
Canadian Steel Co.'s (B. 185) 1°*, 3708 (ii).
Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 189 (Mr. *Birkett*) in Com., Ques. of Order, 7483 (iii).
Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5557 (iii).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7495 (iii); in Com. (cigarettes) 10749 (v).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1203 (i), 13579, 14407 (vi).
Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6443 (iii).
Erie, Ontario, Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3580 (ii).
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8254, 8361 (iv).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6908 (iii).
Fishing Industry N.S., Accommodation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13159 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5229 (iii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7829.
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10643, 12236 (v).
Loy, Geo. M., M.P., Beauharnois, Rep. of Com. (presented) 7202 (iii).
Nova Scotia and Eastern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy in Com. on Res., 14327 (vi).
Privileges and Elections Com., M. to employ stenographer, 7202 (iii).
Public Accounts Com. (M.) 367 (i).
Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) on M. for Com., 5977; in Com., 5983 (iii).
Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3731 (ii), 5776 (iii) 8128, 8170.
Ry. Debts. B.: *See* 'Exchequer.'
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14327.
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11115, 11501 (v).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7249 (iii).
Statutes, Revision B. 265 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. 14297 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.—Public Works (architects' salary) 13499 (vi).

Fraser, Mr. D. C.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Immigration (repatriation, &c.) 6718 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7788 (iv).
Justice—Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3517 (ii).
Legislation—House of Commons (printing, &c.) 5270 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings—N.S. (Guysborough) 5839 (iii); Ottawa (electric lighting) 988; Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Caraquet wharf) 1176 (i); N.S. (Big Harbour wharf) 13147; (Breton's Cove) 13159 (vi); (Bridgewater, dredging) 1076; (Cheverie breakwater) 1078; (Drumhead breakwater) 1083; (Larry's River) 1104; (New Harbour) 1145 (i); (Paspebiac, landing pier) 13467 (vi).
Yukon Govt. (hospital grants) 7293 (iii).
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9421 (iv).
Wilson, Stephen, Relief B. 228 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 9151 (iv).

Gallery, Mr. D., *Montreal, St. Anne.*
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 227 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 13825 (vi).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2507.
Macdougall, James Sinclair, Patent Relief (B. 169) Pet. presented, 2397 (i); 1°*, 2675 (ii).
Pilotage Act Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12783 (vi).
Postmasters Salaries, Increase of 10 per cent (remarks) 14025 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13506 (vi).
Canals—Generally (lockmen, &c., increased wages) 14157 (vi).
Excise (liquor analysis) 5393 (iii).
Militia (military properties) 3620 (ii).
Public Works—Docks (Montreal dry dock) 2987; Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Sorel, deep water wharf) 3376 (ii).

Galliher, Mr. W. A., *Yale and Cariboo.*
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7313, 7326 (iii).
Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 157, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to ref. back to Com., 5239; in Com., 5986 (iii).
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7143, 7403; 3° m., 7468 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7339 (iii).
Budget, The, 2062 (i).
Columbia River Improvement Co.'s Limited incorp. (B. 150) 1°*, 2396 (i); on Sen. Amts., 6847; (amt.) 6894 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 14415 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5228 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10464, 10690 (v).
Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8096 (iv).

Galliher, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14490 (vi).

Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8203 (iii).

Midway and Vernon Ry. Co.'s (B. 216) 1°*, 5679 (iii).

Midway to Vernon Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Mulloy, Trooper of S. A. Contingent, Pension by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14594 (vi).

Nelson Post Office, Claims of Racine Bros. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7170 (iii), 8126 (iv).

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal Co.'s B. (M.) to receive Pet., 5511; 1°*, 5512; 3°m., 6428, 6432 (iii).

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Ry. and Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14337 (vi).

Pacific Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 164) 1°*, 2582 (ii).

Postmasters in Quebec and Newspaper Agents (remarks) 14677 (vi).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5661, 5862 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5341, 5570, 5766 (iii), 8126 (iv).

Ry. Act (fire damages) Amt. B. 23 (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) on M. for 2°, 2784 (ii).

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2553 (ii).

Ry. Mail Clerks, in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5661 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14337, 14489 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.: Labour Dept. (Racine Bros. claim) 7170 (iii).

Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5290 (iii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6726; (on ques. of order) 6873 (iii).

Indians: B.C. (Agassiz reserve, &c.) 7266; Ont., (Dr. Secord) 6341; Ont. (medical attendance) 6341 (iii)

Miscellaneous (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6989 (iii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Columbia river) 1451; (Sinclair's dismissal) 1451 (i); Generally (dredging) 2650 (ii).

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11085 (v).

Ganong, Mr. G. W., *Charlotte.*

Cattle Guard Commission, Appnmt. of Mr. Geo. Robertson, &c. (Ques.) 668 (i).

Census, Grand Manan, N.B., Religion, &c. (Ques.) 3801 (ii).

——— St. John, N.B., Religious Denominations, &c. (Ques.) 3800 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9327 (iv).

Ganong, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Mail Subsidies and ss. Subventions (St. Stephen and Back Bay) 7759 (iv).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Arsenault, Capt., damages, &c.) 13231; (Black Brook) 13227; (Campobello, breakwater) 13228; (Campbellton, wharf) 13229; (Cocagne wharf) 13231; (Grand Manan, wharf) 13234; (Richibucto, pier) 13235 (vi).

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*

Gaspé & Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 166) 1°*, 2582 (ii).

I. C. R., Shops at Rivière du Loup, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 12497 (v).

Lighthouse Keepers, Pets. *re* Increase of Salaries (Ques.) 14665 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14467 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Rivière du Loup) 13477 (vi).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14467 (vi).

Geoffrion, Mr. V., *Chambly and Verchères.*

Grand Trunk Ry. Co. of Can. (B. 29) 1°*, 367 (i).

Montreal and Longueuil Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 156) 1°*, 2582 (ii); in Com., 5558 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Chateauguay River) 3216 (ii); (Sorel, deep water wharf) 12856 (vi); Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2970 (ii).

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 452.

South Shore Ry., Complaint *re* Safety (remarks) 205 (i).

German, Mr. W. M., *Welland.*

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5807 (iii).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. (B. 176) 1°*, 3126 (ii); in Com., 5360, 5555, 5584, 5883 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7500 (iii).

Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 134) 1°*, 2100; in Com., 3226, 3578, 3751 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9708 (iv,)

Hamilton, Lake Erie Power Co.'s (B. 162) 1°*. 2582 (ii).

Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s (B. 57) 1°*, 707 (i).

Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 154) 1°*, 2501 (ii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3574, 4577 (ii), 5259, 5778, 6071, 6243 (iii).

Ry. Act (fire compensation) Amt. (B. 181) 1° m., 3291 (ii)

German, Mr. W. M.—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (coaling vessels) 7561 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers Generally (dredges, repairs) 2619 ; Ont. (Port Colborne) 3371 (ii).

Gibson, Mr. A., Jr., *York, N.B.*

Ry. Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14342, 14488 (vi).

St. John Valley Ry., Fredericton to Woodstock Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14343 (vi).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (St. John river wharfs) 1180 (i).

York and Carleton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., on Res., 14488 (vi).

Gilmour, Mr. J., *E. Middlesex.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4226 (ii).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5421, 5432 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10758 (v).

Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on M. for 2°, 3822, 3827 (ii).

Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8097 (iv),

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12311 (v).

Permanent Force, Increase of Pay (Ques.) 13371.

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4573 (ii).

Representation in H. of C. B. '66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10879; in Com., 10975, 11585 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to M. for 3°, 12467 (v).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6478, 7213 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (creameries) 7635 (iv).

Public Works : Buildings, Ont. (London, magazine) 13115 (vi).

Quarantine (cattle and vet. division) 5502 (iii).

Girard, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9992 (iii).

Quebec, Saguenay and Gulf St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s (B. 56) 1° *, 707 (i).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6487 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Public Works : Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Lake St. John) 2245 (i).

Gould, Mr. I. J., *W. Ontario.*

Algonquin Lumber and Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 165) 1° *, 2582 (ii), in Com., 5361 (iii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10896 (v).

Gourley, Mr. S. E., *Colchester.*

Accommodation for Members in H. of C. (remarks) 14577 (vi).

Alaskan Boundary Commission Award, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*), 14824 (vi).

——— Reported Interview of Mr. Aylesworth (remarks), 13961 (vi).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Delay, &c., by Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 14204 (vi).

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6369 (iii).

Bass River, N.S., Marine Light (remarks) in Com, of Sup., 14248 (vi).

Bernier, Capt., Govt. Aid to North Pole Expedition (remarks), 12816 (vi).

Brookfield Station Enlargement (remarks)in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).

Budget, The, 1657 (i).

Campaign Literature : *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B., in Com. on Res., 4975 (ii).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*), to Com. of Sup., 5469 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), in Com., 10747 ; (cigarettes) 10749 (v).

Cumberland Ry. and Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).

Customs Tariff Act (surtax) Amt. B. 273 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 14756 (vi).

Debert Coal Mine Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14328 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*), in Com., 13615 (vi).

Door-keeper of H. of C., Salary, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14115 (vi).

Election Pamphlets : *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 308 (i).

Govt. Officials canvassing for newspapers : *See* 'Political,' &c.

G.T. Pacific Ry, Co.'s incorp, B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5164 (iii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com on Res., 10353 ; in Com. on B., 10674, 11234, 11385, 11977 ; 'Shadow of Cox,' &c., 11859, 12056, 12146 (v).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13282 (vi).

——— on M. to adjn. debate (remarks) 8807 (iv). *See* 'Ry. Policy.'

Halifax and S. Western Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14335 (vi).

House of Commons, Door-keeper's Salary : *See* 'Door-keeper.'

I.C.R. Pension System, &c. (Ques.), 9216 (iv).

——— (remarks) 14727 (vi).

——— Trackmen and Labourers, Increased Wages, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).

Gourley, Mr. S. E.—*Con.*
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7944, 7972 (iv).
James Bay Ry Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi).
Joliette and Lake Manan Ry. Subsidy, in Com on Res., 14317 (vi).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10759, 10769; in Com. on B., 11416 (v).
Judges' Retiring Allowance B. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8100 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 14294 (vi).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks) 14542, 14577 (vi),
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) on Sen. Amts., 13626 (vi).
Maps, Printing and Publishing for Geological Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*, Haldimand), 5717 (iii).
North Pole Expedition: *See* 'Bernier, Capt.'
N. W. T. Act Amt B. 259 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14288 (vi).
Nova Scotia and Eastern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14327 (vi)
Parrsboro to Truro, Ry. Subsidy: *See* 'Ry. Subsidies.'
Political Partisanship *re* Govt. Officials canvassing, &c. (remarks) 13983 (vi).
Post Office Revenue, on Statement of P.M.G. (remarks), 14022 vi).
P. O. Savings Banks, Defalcations of Postmaster (remark) in Com. of Sup., 14274 (vi).
Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14708, 14726 (vi).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5779, 6308 (iii), 8178 (iv).
Ry. Policy of Govt., on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7135 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14317, 14491 (vi).
——— General Policy, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14377 (vi).
——— for N. S., Colchester County (remarks) 14491 (vi).
Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11618 (v).
Roberval to James' Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).
Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 473 (i).
Statutes, Revision B. 265 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14297 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice: N.S. (county court judges) 14265 (vi).
Canals: Lachine (electrical appliances) 7806 (iv); Soulanges (Goodwin's claim) 14143 (vi).
Dom. Lands (maps, printing) 14272 (vi).

Gourley, Mr. S. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Fisheries (dog-fish pest) 13656; hatcheries 13661; (steamers, new) 13569 (vi).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7787; (Man. grain act) 7798 (iv).
Legislation: Elections (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing) 14268; H. of C. (door-keeper's salary) 14115 (vi).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Marconi stations) 13642 (vi).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and London) 7736; (St. John and Halifax) 7743 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Alaskan boundary commission) 13961 (vi).
Public Works: Buildings, generally (immigrant buildings) 14247 (vi); Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 490 (i); Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Five Islands, wharf) 13180; (Georgeville, wharf) 13198; (Melbourne, wharf) 13203; (Port au Pique, wharf) 13210; (Port Hood, pier) 13209; (Swim's Point, wharf) 13212; Ont. (Burlington channel, piers) 13237; (Goderich, breakwater) 13241; Que. (Mont Louis, wharf) 13461; (Newport breakwater) 13463; (Paspebiac landing pier) 13464; (Perce pier) 13467; (River du Loup) 13477; (Saguenay dredging) 13473; (Seven Islands wharf) 13480; Miscellaneous (Ottawa river surveys) 13355 (vi).
Railways: I. C. R. (siding facilities) 14083 (vi); (Stellarton accommodation) 8298 (iv); (Truro accommodation) 12603 (v).
Trade and Commerce (iron and steel bounties, legal expenses) 7796 (iv).
Supreme Court Registrar's B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14301 (vi).
Tariff (N. S. steel industry) Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4919 (ii).
Tatamagouche Postmaster, Letter *re* Insurance Fund (remarks) 14660 (vi).
Truro to Parrsboro Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 14492 (vi).

Grant, Mr. G. D., *N. Ontario.*
Budget, The, 2109 (i).
Eureka, str., Loaned by Govt. (Ques.) 14285 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry., Contracts *re* Short Sections, &c. (Ques.) 13027 (vi).
Judges in Quebec as Bank Directors, &c. (Ques.) 14665 (vi).
Mara, Rama, &c., Flooding of Lands (M. for copies of reps., &c.) 2762 (ii).
Quebec Judges and Legal Business, &c. (Ques.) 14665 (vi).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10993 (v).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Investigation, 1898 (Ques.) 14284 (vi).
Toronto Public Works, Amount expended since 1890 (M. for stmnt.*) 1203 (i).
Transcontinental Ry., Contracts *re* Short Sections (Ques.) 13027 (vi).

Guthrie, Mr., H., *S. Wellington.*
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3277 (ii).
Crown Bank of Canada (B. 129) 1**, 1936 (i).

Guthrie, Mr. H.—*Con.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9082 (iv).

Guelph and Georgian Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 125) 1°*, 1764 (i).

Insolvency B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 3251 (ii).

Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8113 (iv).

Niagara Welland Power Co.'s Limited, Change of Name (B. 90) 1°*, 1193 (i).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 7610, 8145, (amt.) 8153 (iv).

——— (employees) Amt. (B. 74) 2°m., 3247 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Guelph, armoury) 13083 (vi).

Hackett, Mr. E., *W. Prince, (P.E.I.)*

Alberton Ry. Station, P.E.I. (Ques.) 2503 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).

Anglo-American Tel. Co., P.E.I. and the Mainland (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vi).

Annandale Pier, P.E.I., Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 2921 (ii).

——— Range Lights, Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 2921 (ii).

Archives and Mr. Casey: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Art Gallery and Can. Artists (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13517 (vi).

Ballot Boxes in P.E.I.: *See* 'Latour.'

Bonded Warehouses, P.E.I., Rental, Closing, &c. (Ques.) 12073 (v).

Brecken, Mr., P.O. Inspector, P.E.I. (remarks) 14001 (vi).

Brennan, Mr. J. P., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 13994 (vi).

British Cable News Service between Can. and G.B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10725 (v).

Budget, The, 2017 (i).

Buote, Mr. J., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 14010 (vi).

Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 405 (i).

Charlottetown, P.E.I., Free Mail Delivery (remarks) 13806, 14010 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12535 (v); in Com. on B., 13824; on M. for 3°, 13947 (vi).

Conroy, Mr., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 13993 (vi).

Currie, Mr. James, P.E.I., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 13992 (vi).

DesRoches, John M., Alleged Fraud *re* Fishing Bounties (Ques.) 10955 (v).

Dominion Elections Act, Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 901 (i); in Com., (compulsory voting) 13569 (vi).

Fishery Guardian, John M. DesRoches, Alleged Fraud, &c. (Ques.) 10955 (v).

Hackett, Mr. E.—*Con.*

Frozen Fish, &c., Compensation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13520 (vi).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7880; (amt.) 7909; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 8326 (iv).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9459 (iv); in Com., 10637 (v); on M. for 3°, 12740 (vi).

G.T.P. Bill, Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13270 (vi).

Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I., Agreement, &c., Amt. paid (Ques.) 2758 (ii).

——— Preparation of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 4444 (ii).

See 'Supply—Railways.'

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 731 (i).

——— (remarks) 13894 (vi).

House of Commons, Official's Salaries: *See* 'Civil Service B.'

Keith, Mr., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 14010 (vi).

Larkin, Capt. W. S., Complaints against (Ques.) 2922 (ii).

Latour, Mr., Absence from Dept. to canvas for *Le Canada* (remarks) 14006 (vi).

Mutch, Mr. H. W., P.E.I., Increase of Salaries (remarks) 13824 (vi).

North Pole Expedition, Govt. Aid to Polar Expedition (remarks) 12822 (vi).

O'Leary Station, P.E.I., Branch Line (Ques.) 6168 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).

O'Reilly, Mr., Claim *re* Tobacco Factory, P.E.I. (remarks) 13978 (vi).

Pneumatic Tube Service *re* Postal Service (remarks) 13999 (vi).

Portage, P.E.I., Opening of Post Office (remarks) 14008 (vi).

Press Despatches from England: *See* 'British,' &c.

P.E.I. Coal Fields, &c. (Ques.) 2503 (ii).

Prince Edward Island Ferry Co.'s incorp. B. 180 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 7771 (iv).

P.E.I., Fishing Industry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13177 (vi).

P.E.I. and Mainland Winter Communication (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13520 (vi).

See 'Winter,' &c. 'Supply—Ocean and River Service,' &c.

P.E.I. Ry., Sale of Tickets, &c. (Ques.) 2503 (ii).

P.E.I. Telegraph System, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii); 13333 (vi).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Roche*, Hfx.) *re* Fishermen of N.S., 'Outskirts of Civilization,' 13375 (vi).

Queens, West, P. E. I., Representation in Parlt. (remarks) 13378 (vi).

Hackett, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10900; in Com., 11030; (amt.) 12432 (v).
Representation in the Cabinet from P.E.I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 282 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery, P.E.I., par. in Charlottetown *Patriot*, 13806 (vi).
See 'Charlottetown.'
St. Patrick's Day, Public Holiday (Ques.) 1858 (i).
Semaphore Lights, P.E.I. Ry., Discontinuance, &c. (Ques.) 4443 (ii).
Skinner's Pond, P.E.I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 13445 (vi).
Station Agents, P.E.I. Ry., Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 4361 (ii).
Telegraph Communication, P.E.I. and Mainland (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii), 13333 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13505; (archives) 13504 (vi); (Census, Cote's circular 4657; (census, P.E.I. 4656 (ii).
Civil Govt., Indian Affairs (salaries) 282 (i).
Customs (Curry, Mr., superannuation, &c.) 3918; (salaries, &c.), 3918 (ii).
Excise (salaries, P.E.I.) 13918 (vi).
Fisheries (Provincial claim) 5311 (iii).
Immigration (agents, P.E.I.) 6884 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 6001; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 6001 (iii); (P.E.I. and Newfoundland) 13676 (vi).
Militia (pay and allowance) 13442 (vi).
Ocean and River Service (masters and mates examination) 13534; (Govt. Strs., repairs, &c.) 13519 (vi); (Govt. steamers, service, &c.) 4059; (Govt. steamers, supplies) 4081 (ii).
Post Office (letter carriers, P.E.I.) 6058; (mail service) 6066; (P.E.I. winter service) 5944 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings, P.E.I., (Charlottetown, armoury) 13035 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (hydraulic dredge) 13312 (vi); **N.S.** (Big Pond wharf) 1072 (i); (Breton Cove) 13152; (Broad Cove) 13200; (Duncan's Cove, wharf) 13179; (Fort Lawrence, pier) 13181; (Gabarouse, breakwater) 13184 (vi); (Grand Etang, bridge) 1095; (Green Cove Harbour) 1101 (i); (Kingsport, pier) 13202; (L'Ardoise, breakwater) 13201; (Livingstone Cove) 13201; (Margaretsville, breakwater) 13202; (Middle river, dam) 13202; (Ogden's Pond) 13204; (Oyster Pond) 13204; (Pleasant Bay) 13205; (St. Ann's, wharf) 13204 (vi); (West Baccaro channel) 1151; **P. E. I.** (Aitkin's wharf) 1159 (i); (Beach Point) 13218 (vi); (Belfast Pier) 1153 (i); (Canoe Cove) 13218; (Carleton Point) 13220 (vi); (Cascumpec Harbour) 1153; (Cove Head Harbour) 1155; (creosoted timber, &c.) 1155 (i); (dredging, &c.) 13310; (dredging plant) 13313 (vi); (Gaspereaux Harbour) 1155; (Higgin's shore pier) 1159 (i), 13222 (vi); (New London) 1160; (piers, repairs) 1161 (i); (Richmond Bay) 13223; (Skinner's Pond) 13308; (Summerside breakwater) 13226 (vi); (Tignish breakwater) 1162 (i); **Que.** (Bonaventure East, breakwater) 13448; (Caplin breakwater) 13448 (vi); (Father Point pier) 1513; (Grand Vallee pier) 1515 (i); (Mont Louis wharf) 13462; (Newport breakwater) 13463; (New Richmond breakwater) 13463); (Paspebiac landing pier) 13464; **Yukon** (Lewes and Yukon river) 13306 (vi).

Hackett, Mr. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Con.
Miscellaneous (Ottawa River surveys) 13341.
Roads and Bridges (Bryson, approaches) 13321 (vi).
Telegraph Lines—P.E.I. (Marconi system) 13326 (vi); (P.E.I. tel. lines) 2707 (ii); (P.E.I. and mainland) 5917 (iii); Que. (Marconi, Murray Bay, &c.) 13326 (vi).
Quarantine (Pethick, Dr., expenses) 5505; (veterinary division) 5504 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 8275 (iv); (Canso ferry service) 12603; (Metis, station) 12604 (v); **P. E. I.** (general vote) 12891; (Hillsborough bridge) 12833; (Kinkora, accommodation) 12841 (vi); (Murray Harbour branch) 7534 (iii), 12833; (Northam and Richmond stations) 12841 (vi); (O'Leary's station) 7538 (iii).
Winter Communication with P.E.I., on M. (Mr. *Hughes*) for Cor., 1040 (i).
——— *See* 'Supply,' &c.
Winter Navigation, P.E.I., Construction of Str. (Ques.) 6895 (iii).

Haggart, Hon. John, *South Lanark.*
Alaskan Boundry Commission Award, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 14778 (vi).
——— (remarks) 14287 (vi).
Aliens, Naturalization Act Amt. B. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5873 (iii).
Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5962 (iii).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 7392 (iii).
——— Res., on Ques. of Order, 7308 (iii).
Bonding Privileges with U.S. (remarks) in Com. on G.T.P. Ry. Bill, 12751 (vi).
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on Ques. of Order, 7342, 7352 (iii).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14436 (vi).
Budget, The, Rep. in Toronto *Globe* (remarks) 410 (i).
Business of the House, on M. to take in Mondays, 3711 (ii).
——— (remarks) 7812 (iv).
——— *See* 'Govt.'
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5846 (iii).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4962, 4993, 5090 (ii), 5590, 5786 (iii).
Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr *Oliver*) in Com., 3226, 3982 (ii).
Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 408 (i).
Chapman Double Ball-Bearing Co., &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7524 (iii).
Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4424 (ii).
Chinese Restriction Act Amt. B. 82 (Sir *Wilfrid*

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*
Laurier) in Com. on Res., 610; in Com. on B. 2241 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12337 (v); in Com. on B., 13810 (vi).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Remarks in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4680 (ii).
Corry & Laverdure, Contracts *re* Trent Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iii).
Criminal Code Amt. (immoral entertainments) B. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 316 (i), 7514 (iii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 3065, 4024 (ii).
Dom. Coal Co. and Glace Bay Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13192 (vi).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1202 (i), 13561, 14406 (vi).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3024; in Com. on B., 4680 (ii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8250, 8360 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 14770 (vi).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 291, 618 (i).
France and Can. SS. Subsidy B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 12295 (v).
Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 166 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) in Com., 5890 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal. *See* 'Ottawa,' &c.
Govt Business, Precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 940 (i).
——— *See* Business.
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5159 (iii), 7816, 7845, 7867 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*), 7827 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8680; on M. for 1°, 7717 (iv); in Com. on B., 12096, 12289 (v); on M. for 3°, 12676, 12757 (vi).
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry., Par. in Toronto *Globe re* Scheme, 5892 (iii).
——— Surveys, Information, &c. (remarks), 8230 (iv).
——— Transcontinental Ry., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for cor., 448 (i).
——— *See* 'Transcontinental'.
Halifax and S. Western Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14331 (vi).
Hawkesbury to South Indian Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14344 (vi).
I. C. R., Book-keeping: *See* 'Supply—Rys.'
——— Freight Cars on connecting Lines, &c. (M. for ret. *) 3805 (ii).
——— General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3657 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*
——— Inquiry for Papers, 3537 (ii).
I.C.R., Mr. Pottinger's Rep. (M. for copy) 3806(ii).
——— Supplies Bill: *See* 'Ry. B. 258.'
——— Ties issued, purchased, used, &c. (M. for ret.*), 3805 (ii).
International Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).
Inverness Ry. and Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7926 (iv).
Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14392 (vi).
James Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).
James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi).
Joggins to Minudie, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14329 (vi).
Joliette and Lake Manan Ry. Subsidy, in Com on Res., 14317 (vi).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt, B. 255 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (Quebec) 12301 (v).
Judges' Retiring Allowance B. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Sen. Amts., 14289 (vi).
Juvenile Offenders Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 315 (i).
Lt.-Governor of Ontario, Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks), 658 (i).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks), 2523 (ii).
Loy, Geo. M., Independence of Parlt., &c., on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elections, 8041 (iv).
Lumber Combine in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks), 1590 (i).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks), 14543 (vi).
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) on Sen. Amts., 13626 (vi).
Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 78 (Mr. *Borden*, Kings) in Com., 1117, 2240 (i).
Mounted Police Pension Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Scott*) on M. to introduce, Ques. of Order, 14281 (vi).
Mowat, Sir Oliver: *See* 'Lt.-Gov.'
National Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G.T.P.Ry.'
New Canadian Co.'s B. 83 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com. 3221 (ii).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. of Res., 14337 (vi).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Ry. Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6433 (iii).
N.W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12313 (v).
——— Sen. Representation B.: *See* 'Senate.'
Nova Scotia and Eastern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res,, 14327 (vi).
Orford Mountain Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14460 (vi).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineers, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for Copies, 1311 (i).

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6809 (iii).

Ottawa, Northern and C. P. Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).

——— *See* 'Waltham.'

Paspebiac to Gaspé Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14461 (vi).

Patent Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3623 (ii).

Perth Public Building, &c. (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 13075 (vi).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 5240, 5661; on M. for 2°, 5658; in Com., 5854 (iii).

Procedure, Ques. of, 5892 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*), in Com. on Res., 14691 (vi).

Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14419 (vi).

Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) on M. for Com., 5972; in Com., 5984 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt B 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 250 (i); in Com., 2597, 3542, 3720, 3830, 3885, 3975, 3985, 4124, 4573, 4696 (ii), 5256, 5681, 6197 (iii), 8125, 8133 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 13836 (vi).

——— Commissioners' Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8120 (iv).

——— *See* Ry. Act (consolidation).

——— Debts Bill: *See* 'Exchequer.'

——— Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2577 (ii).

——— (subsidies) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 546; in Com., 550, 1059; on M. for 3°, 1199 (i).

——— Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14314, 14428 (vi).

——— (supplies for Govt. rys.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12944 (vi).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 5892 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°, 720; on M. for 2°, 1259 (i); on M. for Com., 10885; in Com., 10975, 12294; (Kent) 11577; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12404, 12427; neg. (Y. 28; N. 65) 12431 (v).

——— (remarks) 408 (i).

Roberval to James' Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

Ross Rifle, Manufacture, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).

St. Eustache to St. Placide Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

St. John Valley Ry. Fredericton to Woodstock, Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14343 (vi).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

Sault Ste. Marie Labour Disturbances and Militia (remarks) 12940 (vi).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6469 (iii).

Senate Representation in N.W.Ter., B. 253 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 12303 (v).

South-eastern Valley and United Counties Ry. Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 454, 458 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 225 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 6542 (iii).

Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Supplies to I.C.R.: *See* 'Ry. B. 258.'

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census enumerators) 4656 (ii).

Canals—Galops (deepening) 8268; conc., 8374; (enlargement) 7803; Lachine (electrical appliances) 7806; North channel (dam) 7803; Rideau (Brasses' Point bridge) 7808 (iv); Sault Ste. Marie (coaling vessels) 7563; (construction) 7560; Soulanges (construction) 7550; Trent (construction) 7557; (Corry & Laverdure, contract) 7557 (iii); Welland (deepening, &c.) 7804; (Dunnville bridge) 7809; (land damages) 7805; (mitre sills) 7804 (iv).

Charges of Management (public debt) 14253 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Aud. General (promotions) 14255 (vi); Customs (contingencies) 331; (salaries) 322; Interior (salaries) 270 (i); Justice (salaries) 14255 (vi); Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 342; (salaries) 341 (i); Public Works (contingencies) 5824 (iii); Railways (salaries) 334 (i); Sec. of State (2nd class clerks) 14254 (vi).

Culling Timber (salaries) 7799 (iv).

Dom. Lands (surveys, &c.) 6762 (iii).

Excise (Perth, salaries) 13969 (vi).

Inspection of Staples (Man. Grain Act) 7798.

Justice, Administration of: N.S. (county court judges) 14261; Ont. (Nipissing judgeship) 14258 (vi); Yukon (Dugas, Judge) 3430; (sheriffs' salaries) 3410 (ii).

Legislation: H. of C. (debates, amamuenses) 14243; (sessional clerks) 14242 (vi).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Australia) 5880 (iii), 13693 (vi); (Can. and G. B.) 5998; (Can. and S. Africa) 5878 (iii); (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 14249; (St. Catharine's Bay and Tadousac) 13696 (vi).

Miscellaneous (Perkins, Wm., Lisgar election pet.) 14252 (vi); (tobacco commission) 8268.

Public Works: Buildings—N.B. (Richibucto) 412; (St. John, immigration) 413; (St. John, quarantine water service) 415 (i); **N.S.** (Halifax) 411 (i); **Ont.** (Guelph armoury) 13084 (vi); **Ottawa** (Royal mint) 349 (i); (steel shelving) 13094 (vi); (Victoria museum) 366 (i), 14243 (vi); **Que.** (citadel, drill shed) 13057; (Longueuil P.O.) 13075 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (St. Andrew's wharf) 5894, (St. John tributaries) 5895 (iii); **N.S.** (Glace Bay wharf) 13192 (vi); (Necum Teuch wharf) 1137; (Neil's Harbour) 1141; **Que.** (Isle aux Coudres) 2242; (Lake St. John wharf) 2243; (Laprairie ice piers) 2249; (Le Tableau wharf) 2249; (L'Ile d'Alma) 2257; (repairs, improvements) 2242 (i); (rivière du Nord) 5908; (St. Laurent wharf) 5906 (iii); (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2257 (i); (St. Lawrence

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Con.
ship channel) 3307 (ii); (St. Maurice river) 5904 (iii); (Sorel, deep water wharf) 12848 (vi); (Valleyfield, dredging) 5906 (iii).
Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2678; (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2974 (ii).
Railways—I. C. R. (air brakes to freight cars) 7528 (iii); 8281; (air signals) 8311 (iv); (book keeping) 12876 (vi); (bridge strengthening) 8269 (iv); (Canso ferry service) 7525 (iii); (Chaudière junction, engine house) 8314; ('Cleveland' cylinders) 8285; (draw bars, exchange) 8289 (iv); (Eastern Extension, award, &c.) 7528 (iii); (G. T. R. rental) 12887 (vi); (Halifax, accommodation) 8316 (iv); (Lévis, accommodation) 7522 (iii); (machinery for shops) 8291; (Miramichi bridge) 8307; (Moncton workshops) 8312; (operating expenses) 7811 (iv); (Ouelle River branch) 7526 (iii); (Pictou, accommodation) 8317; (Pintsch gas equipment) 8291; (Restigouche bridge) 8304; (Rivière du Loup, work shops) 8314; (Rivière du Loup, yards) 8309; (rolling stock) 8293; (St. John, accommodation) 8315; (Stellarton accommodation) 8296 (iv).
P. E. I. (Murray Harbour branch) 7530 (iii) 7801; (steel rails) 7802 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (iron and steel bounties, legal expenses) 7796 (iv).
Supreme Court Registrar's B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14301, 14403 (vi).
Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12304 (v).
Tilsonburg, Lake Erie, &c., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314, 14382 (vi).
Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14428 (vi).
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 4672 (ii).
Transcontinental Ry. and Sir William Mulock's Speech (remarks) 367 (i).
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M, for Com. of Sup., 3444 (ii).
——— (remarks) *re* Sorel Wharf, 12854 (vi).
——— *re* Speech from the Throne (remarks) 6404 (iii).
Treadgold Concessions, Appnmt. of Special Com. on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4536 (ii).
United Empire Life Ins. Co.'s B. 163 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 3796, 3983 (ii).
Waltham to Ferguson, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14448 (vi).
Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 26 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. to refer to Com., 664 (i).
Woodstock, N.B., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14322 (vi).
Yamaska to Lotbinière Ry. Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 14318 (vi).

Hale, Mr. F. H., *Carleton (N.B.)*
Census, Carleton, &c., N.B., Religious Classification, &c. (Ques.) 4004 (ii).

Hale, Mr. F. H.—*Con.*
Drill Shed, Woodstock, N.B., Purchase of Site, &c. (M. for cor.*) 3236 (ii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5191 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 3°, 12733 (vi).
Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3734 (ii); (telephones) 5534 (iii).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7230 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2684 (ii).
Woodstock, N.B., Post Office, Repairs, &c. (Ques,) 672 (i).
——— Retaining Wall, &c. (M. for ret.*) 705 (i).

Harty, Mr. Wm., *Kingston.*
Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s (B. 46) 1°*, 591 (i).
Queen's College of Kingston (B. 190) 1°*, 3864 (ii),
SUPPLY:
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse supplies) 4169 (ii).

Henderson, Mr. D., *Halton.*
Alliance Bank of Can. incorp. B. 212 (Mr. *Russell*) on M. for 2°, 5585; in Com., 7470 (iii) (amt.) 7477 (iii).
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4224 (ii).
Atlantic, Quebec & Western Ry. Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com., 1806 (i).
Auditor General and Treasury Board, Circular from Aud. Gen. (remarks) 11553 (v).
Bank Act Amt. (B. 234) 1° m., 7565 (iv).
Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6404 (iii).
Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14436 (vi).
Bernier, Capt., Govt. Aid to North Pole Expedition (remarks) 12813 (vi).
Binder Twine Inspector, Authority as to Penalties, &c. (remarks) 14048 (vi).
Brandon, Saskatchewan & Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 157, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to ref. back to Com., 5239; in Com., 5985; on M. for 3° (amt.) 5988 (iii).
British Cable News Service between Can. and G. B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10721 (v).
Brockville & Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7464; on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7345 (iii).
Bruce Mines & Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14439 (vi).
Budget, The, 2076 (i).
Burrard, B.C., Census, Letter of Mr. McCraney *re* Enumerators (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7077 (iii).
Business of the House *re* Printing of Bills (remarks) 2394 (i).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5062 (ii); in Com. on B., 5422, 5452, 5850 (iii).

Butter, Can., Mr. Preston's Interview, &c. (remarks) 10712, 10745 (v).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5626 (iii).

C.P.R to Brownsburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14458 (vi).

Can. Associated Press Despatches B.: *See* 'British.'

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5584 (iii).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5468 (iii).

Census Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13730 (vi).

See 'Burrard,' &c., 'Supply—Agriculture,' &c.

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 5969, 6199 (iii).

Citizen's Bank of Canada incorp. B. 214 (Mr. *Clarke*) 7478; (amt.) 7479 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12359 (v).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3261 (ii).

Country Postmasters, in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5676 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 5582, 6654, 7503 (iii); (cigarettes) 10756 (v).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3050; in Com. on B., 4036 (ii).

See 'German,'

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. 1062 (i); (compulsory voting) 13575, 14423 (vi).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6438 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3009 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act Amt. (B. 130) 1°*, 1936 (i); 2° m., 3285 (ii).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Léonard*) 4782 (ii).

German Surtax, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Tariff B. 273, 14757 (vi).

See 'Customs.'

Govt. Railways Act (supplies to I.C.R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12582 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7820, 7856 (iv).

G.T. Pacific Ry Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9942 (iv); in Com. on B., 10687, 11911, 11934 (v); on M. for 3° (amt.) 12770 (vi).

——Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13271 (vi).

Imports for 1903, Duty collected and Preferential Tariff, &c. (Ques.) 13935 (vi).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Inspection Act (textile fabrics) Amt. B. 137 (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for 2°, Ques. of Order, 3297 (ii).

I.C.R. Supplies B.: *See* 'Govt.,' &c.

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7974 (iv).

Iron and Steel Bounties paid 1890-1903 (Ques.) 11556 (v).

Judges' Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8111 (iv).

Lac Bouchette Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14456 (vi).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 8007 (iv).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14400 (vi).

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5359 (iii).

Milk Cans Bill: *See* 'Weights.'

Niagara, Queenston & St. Catharines Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 154 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 4592 (ii).

Nicola, Kamloops & Similkameen Ry. Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6431 (iii).

North-West Bank of Canada incorp. B. 51 (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com., 2753 (ii).

N.W.T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12327 (v).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 4871 (ii).

Penny Banks B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6457 (iii).

Pilotage Act (Montreal and Quebec Districts) Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 13631 (vi).

Postmasters and Newspaper Agents (remarks) 14680 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5676, 5859 (iii).

Preferential Tariff Imports: *See* 'Imports.'

Press Despatches from England: *See* 'British,' &c.

P. E. I. Ferry Co.'s incorp. B. 180 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 7771 (iv).

Public Works Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) in Com., 4223 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14711, 14731; on M. for 2°, 14734 (vi).

Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14454 (vi).

Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi).

Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3737 (ii), 6102, 6119, 6173, 6323; (telephones) 5553 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14315, 14428, 14736 (vi).

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14347 (vi).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Red Deer Valley Ry. & Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 1812 (i).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10851; in Com., 11541, 11584, 12294; (Brant) 11111, 11152; (Toronto) 11747; (Waterloo) 11643, 11652 (v).

Seeds Inspection and Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5085 (ii); in Com. on B., 6470 (iii).

——— (remarks) 5845 (iii).

Seven Islands Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14457 (vi).

Statutes, Revised, Publication Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 634 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3292 (ii).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron,' &c.

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7040 (iii).

Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14315 (vi).

Sturgeon Falls Pulp and Lumber Co. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14428 (vi).

Sugar entered for Home Consumption, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 14285 (vi).

Supplies for I. C. R.: *See* 'Govt. Rys. B. 258.'

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13507 (vi); (census schedules) 7076 (iii); (deputy minister) 4356; (experimental farms) 4557 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7653 (iv); (Shutt's, prof., report) 4557 (ii).

Civil Govt.: Public Works (contingencies) 5824.

Excise (liquor inspection) 5402 (iii).

Fisheries (bait freezers) 13655 (vi).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6707 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7763; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7765 (iv).

Justice, Administration of: Yukon (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3415; Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3525 (ii).

Legislation (voters' lists) 5276 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Bronte lighthouse) 5755 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 7754 (iv).

Miscellaneous (arbitration, Dom. and Provs.) 12590; (Printing Bureau plant) 12587; (unforseen expenses) 12588 (v).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4088; (meteorological service) 4119; (tidal surveys) 4116 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Man. (immigration building) 5844 (iii); N. B. (Campbellton, P.O.) 13037 (vi); N. S. (Arichat) 5833; Ont. (Clinton, P. O.) 519 (i), 5834 (iii); (Guelph) 638; (London drill hall) 642 (i); Ottawa (electric lighting, transformers) 5843; Que. (Montmagny) 5841 (iii).

Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bronte harbour) 1355 (i); (Burlington channel piers) 13238 (vi); (general repairs) 1374 (i); (Kaministiquia river) 5825 (iii); (Oakville pier) 1376 (i); P. E. I. (Summerside, breakwater) 13227 (vi).

Miscellaneous (Ottawa river) surveys) 13357; (transportation commission) 13363 (vi).

Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 2691 (ii).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways: I.C.R. (Canso ferry service) 12603 (v).

Tariff and Taxation *re* N. W. Immigration: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6866 (iii).

Tariff Policy of Govt., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6707 (iii).

———*See* 'Customs,' &c.

Textile Fabrics B.: *See* 'Inspection.'

Thunder Bay, Nepigon and St. Joe Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14401 (vi).

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Subsidy (remarks) in Com. on B. 270, 14737; (amt.) 14739 (vi).

Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14428 (vi).

Tobacco Duties collected, 1902 (Ques.) 2103 (i).

——— 1903 (Ques.) 12217 (v).

Tobacco Excise Duties, Par. in *Globe* (remarks) 5701 (iii).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) Inquiry *re* resuming adjnd. deb., 5882 (iii).

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13363 (vi).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14465 (vi).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2341 (i).

Halliday, Mr. J., *N. Bruce.*

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10952 (v).

Heyd, Mr. C. B., *S. Brant.*

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com, on Res., 7319, 7361, 7391 (iii).

Binder Twine, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2311 (i).

Budget, The, 1764 (i),

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5073, 5082 (ii).

Census Expenditure, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. on Sup., 13724 (vi).

——— New Basis *re* Work of Staff (Ques.) 13935 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 838 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 3°, 8323 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9505 (iv); in Com. on B., 10556, 10669, 11909, 12032, 12242 (v).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elections, 13286 (vi).

——— *See* 'Ry. Policy.'

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7975 (iv).

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4338 (ii).

Loan Companies, Extension of Powers B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2350 (i).

Heyd, Mr. C. B.—*Con.*
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2523 (i).
Loy, Geo. M., Independence of Parlt., &c., on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com., 8055 (iv).
National Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G. T. P. R.'
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Ry. Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6433 (iii).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6452 (iii).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4746 (ii), 5554, 6127, 6274 (iii), 8168 (iv), 12964 (vi); on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* 2 cent fares, to M. for 3°, 8346 (iv).
Railway Policy of Govt., &c., on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7126 (iii).
Railway Subsidies for past ten Years, voted by Parlt. (Ques.) 13934 (vi).
Rathbun Co.'s (B. 122) 1°*, 1675 (i).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10893, 10922, 11088, 11657 (v).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5087 (ii); in Com. on B., 7219 (iii).
Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.: Railways (salaries) 338 (i).
Customs (contingent expenses) 3794 (ii).
Indians: Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6334; (medical attendance) 6334 (iii).
Inland Revenue (wood alcohol) 239 (i); (Keilty, Mr., appnmt.) 5370 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7768, 7773 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 7603 (iv).
Post Office (letter carriers, salaries) 6022 (iii).
Railways: I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 8276 (iv).
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9427 (iv).
Two cent Ry. Passenger Fares: *See* 'Ry. B. 21.'

Holmes, Mr. R., *W. Huron.*
British Cable News Service B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8239 (iv).
Budget, The, 1953 (i),
Can. Associated Press Despatches Bill: *See* 'British,' &c.
Census Expenditure, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13733 (vi).
Chickens, Fattening of: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 824 (i).
See 'Criminal,' &c.
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3266 (ii).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes), 10752 (v).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13570 (vi).

Holmes, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3014 (i).
Fattening of Chickens: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'
Fire Protection of Parliament Buildings: *See* 'Ottawa.'
Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Smith*, Wentworth) on M. for 2°, 3819 (ii).
Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*), to Com. of Sup., 4771 (ii).
Grain Shipments from Port Arthur and Ft. William (Ques.) 542 (i).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10049 (iv).
——— Member (Mr. *Taylor*) asked to keep to Clause under Discussion, 10565 (v).
——— Ques. of Order *re* Mr. Kemp, 11987 (v).
Huron Judgeship, Appnmt. of Mr. Holt (remarks), 220 (i).
Newspaper Despatches from G.B.: *See* 'British.'
North Pole Expedition, Govt. Aid to Polar Expedition (remarks), 12814 (vi).
Ottawa Govt. Buildings, Rep. *re* Martineau Investigation and Security from Fire (Ques.) 4673 (ii).
Press Despatches from G.B.: *See* 'British,' &c.
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (under-crossings, &c.), 6202 (iii).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. (Huron), 11003 (v).
Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7038 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (*Poultry Farming*) 7644 (iv),
Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 220 (i).
Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.), 5288 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7778 (iv).
Legislation—House of Commons (printing, &c.) 5272 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Clinton, P.O.) 520 (i); N.S. (Breton's Cove), 13164 (vi); Ont. (Goderich, breakwater), 13241 (vi).
Vegetable Duties: *See* 'Garden,' &c,

Hughes, Mr. J. J., *King's* (*P.E.I.*).
British Cable News Service between Can. and G.B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10731 (v).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*), on M. for 3°, 13944 (vi).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. (compulsory voting) 13590 (vi).
Elmira Branch Line on P.E.I. Ry. (marks), in Com. of Sup., 12836 (vi).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*), in Com., 6903 (iii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*), on M. for 3°, 8329 (iv).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), on M. for Com. on Res., 9183 (iv).

Hughes, Mr. J. J.—*Con.*
Post Office Revenue, on Postmaster General's Statement (remarks), 14021 (vi).
P.E.I. Ry., Total Cost, Misrepresentation, &c. (remarks), 1679 (i).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), on M. for 3°, 12451 (v).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale, B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7235 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Post Office—Outside Service (P.E.I. winter service) 5948 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Summerside breakwater) 13227 (vi); Telegraph Lines (P.E.I. cables), 2710 (ii).
Railways—P.E.I. (Elmira Line), 12836; (Murray Harbour branch), 12832 (vi).
Winter Communication with P.E.I., Cor. with Govt. (M. for copies), 1036, 1051 (i).

Hughes, Mr. S., *N. Victoria (O.).*
Alaskan Boundary Commission Award, &c., on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*), 14786 (vi).
Art Gallery, Expenditure on Paintings, &c. (Ques.), 12717 (vi).
See 'Supply—Miscellaneous.'
Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*), in Com., 5970 (iii).
Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11165 (v).
Bedford Basin, I.C.R., Land acquired (remarks), 14062 (vi).
Belmont Disaster, Widows' Gratuities (remarks), 14157 (vi).
Binder Twine, Inspection and Penalties collected (remarks), 14048 (vi).
Bracebridge, Post Office Building (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 13071 (vi),
Bridges over Canals, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
British Cable News Service between Can. and G.B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 10716 (v).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Canadian Artists and King Edward's Portrait, &c. (Ques.), 13026 (vi).
Canadian Beef supplied to British Troops (remarks), 483 (i).
Canadian Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14510 (vi).
Can. Central and O. & B. Ry. Amalgamation, Compensation, &c. (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
Can Foundry Co.'s strike: *See* 'Scotch,' &c.
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4378 (ii); 5648 (iii).
C.P.R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14501 (vi).
C.P.R. (Medicine Hat) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14504 (vi).
C.P.R. to Brownsburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14458 (vi).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Can. Press Despatches Bill: *See* 'British.'
Can. S.A. Constabulary, Attestation, Discharge, &c. (Ques.), 14287 (vi).
Canal Locks, Opening, &c. (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 14158 (vi).
Cartoons in *Military Gazette*, &c. (Ques.), 2103 (i).
Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 400 (i).
Chateauguay and Northern Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14511 (vi).
Civil Service B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res. (M.) that Com. rise, 12562 (v).
Coldstream Guards Band, Arrangements *re*, &c. (Ques.) 9683 (iv).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Remarks in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4687 (ii).
Clergue Steel Works, Labour Disturbance (remarks) 12610 (vi).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6640, 7501 (iii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3065 (ii).
Debert Coal Mines Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14329 (vi).
Dixon, Capt., Rep. *re* Canadians in S.A. (Ques.) 7914 (iv).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3, on M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Sel. Com., 3002 (ii); in Com., 14422 (vi).
Dom. Lands, Sale, Locations, Purchasers, &c. (Ques.) 670 (i).
Drill Sheds established, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13068 (vi).
Dry Docks Construction B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4687 (ii).
Dundonald, Lord: *See* 'G.O.C.'
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).
Election Pamphlets: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Election Printing in Prince Albert *Advocate*, in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).
Elevator Accident, &c. (remarks) 5417 (iii).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 615 (i).
False Creek, B.C., Agreement, &c. (remarks) 2758 (ii).
Ferries Regulation B.: *See* 'Navigable.'
Franking of Election Pamphlets: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Freight Rates, Discrimination: *See* 'Supply—Mail Subsidies.'
Furniture Trade with Australia, 13679 (vi).
G.O.C., Rep., &c., Publishing of (Ques.) 669 (i).
——— Lord Dundonald's Speech at Hamilton *re* Defence Scheme, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2406 (i).
——— *See* 'Supply—Militia.'
Good Shepherd Reformatory, N.B., B. 199 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4841 (ii).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Gordon Highlanders' Trophy (remarks) 7253 (iii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5152 (ii), 5171 (iii), 7816, 7880; on M. for 3° (amt.) 8065 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order *re* Mr. Wilmot's Amendment, 8067 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) 7826 (iv).
Grand Trunk Pacific Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8874 (iv); in Com. on B., 10421, 10586, 11238, 11887, 11346, 11887, 11901, 11950 (v); on M. for 3°, 12736, 12762 (vi).
G.T.P. Ry., Mr. Hays' Statement *re* Plans for Completion, &c., 14648 (vi).
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Privs. and Elections Com., 13272 (vi).
——— Surveys, Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi).
Hawkesbury to South Indian, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14344 (vi).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt. for S.A. War, Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 677 (i).
Hides, Trade with Australia. *See* 'Supply—Mail Subsidies.'
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 769 (i).
——— (personal explanation) 871 (i),
House of Commons Elevator: *See* 'Elevator.'
Hutton, Maj.-Gen., Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 206 (i).
Iroudale, Bancroft and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14392 (vi).
James Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14447 (vi).
James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi).
Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s (Dawson) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14497 (vi).
Leprosy at Tracadie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
Librarians of Parlt. B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14300 (vi).
Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s (B. 146) 1°*, 2396 (i).
Lindsay Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13082 (vi).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2530 (ii).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints *re* (remarks) 14239 (vi).
——— (remarks) 14540 (vi).
Mara, Rama, &c., Flooding of Lands, on M. (Mr. *Grant*) for Copies of Reps., &c., 2764 (ii).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7992 (iv).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14399 (vi).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Military Gazette Cartoons: *See* 'Cartoons.'
Militia Bill, Date of Introduction (Ques.) 669 (i).
——— Estimates (remarks) 13368 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply—Militia,' &c., 'Personal,'&c.
Navigable Waters Act Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 12985 (vi).
Nepigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14395 (vi).
Newspaper Despatches from G.B.: *See* 'British.'
Nicola, Kamloops and Similakameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14337 (vi).
Nicolet River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).
N.W.M. Police Act Amt. B. 242 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10741 (v).
——— Appnmts, Promotions, &c. (Ques.) 2921 (ii).
Ninety-fourth Regiment, Senior and Junior Majors, &c. (Ques.) 9080 (iv).
Orford Mountain Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14459 (vi).
Painting of King: *See* 'Portrait.'
Paspebiac to Gaspé Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14461 (vi).
Patent Act. Amt. B. 184 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4674 (ii).
Patent Relief Bills (remarks) 2397 (i).
Pensions to S.A. Soldiers by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14597 (vi).
——— *See* 'S. A.,' &c.
Personal Explanation, *re* Misprint in Speech on Militia Service, 14850 (vi).
Portrait of His Majesty, King Edward VII and Canadian Artists (Ques.) 13026 (vi).
Post Office Savings Banks Defalcations, in Com. of Sup., 14660 (vi).
Press Despatches from G. B.: *See* 'British.'
Press Gallery Representatives, Payment as Sessional Clerks (remarks) 14114, 14242 (vi).
Prince Albert *Advocate*, Printing, &c.: *See* 'Election.'
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14449 (vi).
'Ragging' in the British Army (remarks) 3134, 3136 (ii).
Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3728, 3750, 4124, 4703, 4728 (drainage) 4752 (ii); 5354 (iii).
Ry. Rates, Control by Govt., &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14502 (vi).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).
——— Ques. of Order, Ruling asked for, 14360 (vi).
Ry. Wrecks Investigation: *See* 'Supply—Rys.'
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10892; in Com., 10951, 10957, 11439, 11505; on M. for 3°, 12478 (v).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Roach, Mr., Census Enumerator for N. Ontario (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7083 (iii).

St. James Electoral Division, Vacancy (remarks) 6997 (iii).

St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14323 (vi).

St. John Valley Ry., Fredericton to Woodstock Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14343 (vi).

St. Mary's River Ry. (Galt Road) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Saturday Sittings, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13265 (vi).

Sault Ste. Marie Disturbances, Par. in Newspapers (remarks) 12610 (vi).

Scotch Labourers, &c., Return to Old Country (remarks) 7206 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7238 (iii).

Snow Storms in N.W.T., False Reps., &c. (remarks) 11823 (v).

S. A. Contingents and Govt. Employees, reinstated, &c. (Ques.) 1026 (i).

——— Hay: *See* 'Hay and Oats.'

——— Pensions to Canadians (Ques.) 2920 (ii).

——— *See* 'Pensions.'

Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3292 (ii).

——— B. 225 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6916 (iii).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7038 (iii).

Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14316 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (census enumerators) 7083 (iii); (census, N. Ont.) 4826; (imperial institute) 4437; (patent branch, salaries) 4350 (ii).

Canals—Chambly (macadamizing tow path) 14152; Cornwall (electric lighting) 14139; Farran's Point (acetylene gas plant) 14155; Grenville (Tucker, Henry, investigation services) 14157; Lachine (Guilbault, Mr., gratuity) 14157; Lake St. Francis (dam) 14152; Murray (purchase of Supt.'s house) 14146; (wire fencing) 14151; St. Ours (landing wharfs) 14154 (vi); Sault Ste. Marie (coaling vessels) 7560; Trent (construction) 7553 (iii); 14645; (Peterborough pier) 14645; Williamsburg (overseer's house) 14150 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Finance (Insurance) 12586; Geological Survey (salaries) 12592 (v); Gov. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 207 (i); High Commissioner's Office, 12585 (v); Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 241 (i).

Dom. Lands (fire regulations) 6775; (half-breed schools, salaries) 6772 (iii); (homestead entries) 13966 (vi); (roads, &c.) 6772; (surveys) 6768; (tree culture) 6775; (Winnipeg office) 6767 (iii).

Electric Light (inspections) 5407, 5412 (iii).

Excise (Fyfe, Mr., rep., &c.) 5387; (grain weighing machine) 5387; (liquor inspection) 5401; (methylated spirits, &c.) 5373; (wood alcohol) 5375 (iii).

Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5278, 5288; (U. S. licenses, &c.) 5309 (iii).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6677; (creed lines) 6698; (mechanics, &c.) 6832; (Ritchie, U.S. agent) 6849; (tents, &c.)6849; (N.W.T. expenditure, &c.) 6882; (on ques. of order) 6871 (iii).

Inland Revenue (Bourassa, Mr., shortage) 5406; (retirements, &c.) 5404 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7774 (iv).

Interior (Amos Barnes) 6925; (Liard River miners) 6926; (meteorological observatory) 6793; (squatters' claims) 6925 (iii).

Justice Administration of: Miscellaneous (prisoners. N.W.T.) 3398 (ii).

Labour Dept. (*Gazette*, printing, &c.) 7198 (iii).

Legislation—House of Commons (messengers, &c.) 5267 (iii) 14243; (sessional clerks) 14242 (vi); (voters' lists) 5275 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Australia) 13678 (vi); (Can. and G.B.) 5998 (iii), 7582; (Can. and S. Africa) 7746; (freight rates, &c.) 7582 (iii); (wrecking plant) 13698 (vi).

Militia (defence scheme) 3763 (ii); (Dom. arsenal) 7089 (iii); (G.O.C.) 3779; (pay and allowance) 3755 (ii), 13434 (vi); (rifle associations) 3767; (target practice) 3772; (Valleyfield strike) 3754 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Academy of Arts) 12589 (iv); (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing, &c.) 14652 (vi); (Art gallery) 12589 (v); (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6984 (iii); (Paris agency) 12589; (printing bureau plant) 12588 (v); (S. A. memorial association) 6992.

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4078 (ii).

Post Office (letter boxes) 6153; (letter carriers) 6037; (locked boxes, H. of C.) 6026; (Mallon, A. D., retirement, &c.) 6037; (ry. mail clerks) 6026 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings, Man. (Winnipeg, immigration stations) 13126; **N B.** (Campbellton, P.O.) 13037, 13040; (military buildings) 13041; (quarantine station, water service) 13042; (St. John drill hall) 13042 (vi); (St. John immigration) 414 (i); (St. John immigration shed) 13040 (vi); (St. John, quarantine water service) 415 (i), 13042; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 13038; **N.W.T** (Strathcona Horse barracks) 13130; (Moosejaw, P.O.) 13130; (Prince Albert court-house) 13129; **Ont.** (Belleville, armoury) 13082 (vi); (Bowmanville) 510; (Guelph, armoury) 13084; (Kingston, barracks) 13118; (Military college, Kingston) 13094; (Peterborough, armoury) 13083 (vi); (Toronto Junction post office) 651 (i); (Wingham, P.O.) 13120; (Woodstock armoury) 13125; **Ottawa** (additional (bath rooms, H. of C.) 13006 (vi); (ventilation of Chamber) 13011; (ventilation, lighting, &c. of H. of C.) 13087; (Victoria museum) 14244; **P. E. I.** (Charlottetown, armoury) 13035; **Que.** (Levis, P. O.) 13053; (Longueuil, P. O.) 13072; (Magog, P. O.) 13081; (military buildings, arsenals, &c.) 13054; (Montreal, barracks) 13076; (Quebec drill hall addition) 13077; (St. Hyacinthe, drill hall) 13067; (St. John's, P. O.) 13059; (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 13079 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Columbia river) 1457 (i); (Victoria harbour, dredging) 13306; **Man.** (dredging plant) 13311 (vi); (snag boat) 2673 (ii); (White Mud, dredging) 1450 (i); **Mar. Prov.** (dredging plant) 2665 (ii); **N.W.T.** (repairs, &c.) 1450 (i); **N.S.** (Abbott's Harbour) 13141;

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Con.
(Big Harbour, wharf) 13145; **Ont.** (Amherstburg, dredging) 13235; (Blind river, wharf) 13235 (vi); (Bowmanville pier) 1354 (i); (Bracebridge, wharf) 13236 (vi); (Bronte harbour) 1357 (i); (Burlington channel, piers) 13237; (Couchiching, Lake Simcoe) 13252; (Cumberland, wharf) 13239; (Goderich, breakwater) 13240; (Parry Sound) 13248 (vi); (Port Arthur) 3342 (ii); (Port Perry) 13249; (Rosedale, wharf) 13249; (Thessalon, breakwater) 13254; **P.E.I.** (dredging plant) 13314 (vi); **Que.** (Father Point, pier) 1514; (Grande Vallee pier) 1516, 1521 (i); (Quebec harbour improvements) 3341; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3306; (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2657 (ii).
Roads and Bridges (Bryson, approaches) 13321; (Edmonton, flooring) 13323; (Moisie Post Road) 13322; (Peace River, pack trail) 13323 (vi).
Telegraph Lines, Que. (Anticosti, Fox River) 13325; Yukon (working expenses) 14041 (vi).
Railways: G. T. Pacific (surveys) 14646 (vi); I. C. R. (air brakes, freight cars) 7527; (Canso ferry service) 12602; (Chaudière Junction, engine house) 12594; (Rivière du Loup, engine houses) 12593; (Halifax accommodation) 12597 (v); (investigation *re* wrecks) 14154 (vi); (Metis station) 12604 (v); (miscellaneous, gratuities) 14155 (vi); (Ouelle River, spur line) 12599 (v); (Pictou accommodation) 14088 (vi); (power saw) 12608 (v); (rolling stock) 14100 (vi); (St. Flavie accommodation) 12602 (v); (sidings, additional) 14058 (vi); (vestibules) 12600 (v); P.E.I. (Hillsborough bridge) 14119 (vi).
Scientific Institutions (MacGregor, Capt., gratuity) 6994 (iii).
Yukon (Middleton, T. W., defalcations, &c.) 6932 (iii).
Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4889 (ii).
Thunder Bay, Nepigon and St. Joe Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14401 (vi).
Tilsonburg and Lake Erie Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14381, 14388 (vi).
Trent Canal, Medical Officer, &c. (Ques.) 8117 (iv).
——— Payment to Thos. Dodds (Ques.) 8118 (iv).
——— Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2324 (i).
Toronto Armouries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13085 (vi).
Toronto, Lindsay, &c., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3456 (ii).
Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).
Waltham to Ferguson Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14148 (vi).
Wellington and Union Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14491 (vi).
Winnipeg Beach to Icelandic River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Yamaska to Lotbinière Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14319 (vi).
Yukon Ry. through Can. Ter. (remarks) 14497 (vi).
Hyman, Mr. C. S., *London.*
Bills withdrawn (M.) 7203 (iii).
Cardiff Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4591 (ii).
Committees, Sel. Standing (M.), Meeting concurrently with Sittings of the Hse., 8405 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 64) M. to ref. back to Com. on Rys., &c., 4441 (ii).
Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Ry Co.'s incorp. B. 154 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 4592 (ii).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10860; in Com., 10942, 10958, 11584, 12293; (Brant) 11098; (Toronto) 11698; (Waterloo) 11642; (York) 11682; on M. for 3°, 12408, 12416, 12463 (v).
——— Rep. of Tel. Com. (presented) 7293 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (London drill hall) 641 (i).
Ingram, Mr. A. B., *E. Elgin.*
Alien Labour Act, Prosecutions, &c. (Ques.) 3971 (ii).
Alien (restriction) Labour Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 2387 (i).
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4248 (ii).
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. for 2°, 1510 (i).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6976 (iii).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on M. for Com., 1804; in Com., 1808 (i).
Bankers Association, Inspection Duties, &c. (Ques.) 819 (i).
Brockville and Sault St. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7340 (iii).
C. P. R. (Kirkella to Elkorn) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14499 (vi).
——— (Medicine Hat) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14504 (vi).
Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 401 (i).
Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B. in Com. on Res., 611 (i).
Cigarette Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3288 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12494, 12517 (v).
Civil Servants and Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3183 (ii).
——— (Ques. of Order) 3107 (ii).
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) on M. for 1°, 1193 (i); in Com., 3260 (ii).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7519 (iii).
Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 3243 (ii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3103; in Com. on B., 4011 (ii).
Dom. Election Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 896; in Com., 905 (i); on M. for Sel. Com., 3003 (ii).
——— B. 15 (Mr. *Clancy*) in Com., 1062 (i).
Dom. Notes Security B. 222 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6914 (iii).
Dorchester Penitentiary, Tenders for Fuel (Ques). 10101 (v).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3009 (ii).
Elgin County, Redistribution, &c., Par. in Toronto *Globe* (remarks) 6540 (iii).
Fast Atlantic: *See* 'Atlantic.'
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6905 (iii).
German Surtax: *See* 'Customs.'
Gerrymander Bill: *See* 'Representation B. 66.'
Glace Bay, N.S., Wharf, Letter of Mr. Shields (read) 13185 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7819, 7843, 784 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10425, 10613, 10671, 11297, 12240 (v).
——— on M. to adjn. Debate (remarks) 8807 (iv).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 68 (i).
Hog Cholera, Outbreak in Yarmouth, Ont. (M. for ret.*) 1058 (i).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 809 (i).
Imperial Building, Ottawa, Govt. Occupation, &c. (Ques.) 3803 (ii).
Imperial Co.'s incorp. B. 71 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) in Com., 5172 (ii).
Interior, Deptl. Rep., Illustrations, &c. (Ques.) 3972 (ii).
Judges appointed from Local Bar, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2516, 2532 (i).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints, *re* (remarks) 14224 (vi).
Manufacturers' Delegation *re* Tariff (remarks) 265 (i).
Martineau, Arthur, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3802 (ii).
Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*) 5725 (iii).
New Canadian Co.'s incorp. B. 83 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 1512 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s B. 57 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 1811 (i).
Order, Questions of, on Mr. Speaker's Rulings (remarks) 10537 (v).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6810 (iii).
Patent Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3624; in Com., 4217 (ii).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*, in Com., 82 3 (iv).
Penny Banks B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 4177 (ii).
Post office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5869 (iii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* Visitors in Corridors, 11563 (v).
——— (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys. 'Grafters,' 10521 (v).
Public Printing and Stationery B. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4212 (ii).
Railway Accidents, Investigation into (remarks) 1334 (i).
Ry. Commissioners Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8122 (iv).
Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 250 (i); in Com., 3839, 3891, 4128 (ii), 5765, 6133, 6217, 6259, 6324 (iii).
Ry. Employees Safety B. 77 (Mr. *Smith*) on M. for 2°, 2387 (i).
Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2 60; in Com., 2581, 2924 (ii).
Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14499 (vi).
Ry. Transportation from N.W.T., Blockade, &c., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2492.
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 1813 (i).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10879; in Com., 10940, 10981, 11014, 11140, 11456, 11496, 11157, 11 87, 11 24, 11637, 11662; (Brant) 11099, 11110; (Toronto) 11713; (Waterloo) 11662; on Amt. (Mr. *Lennox*) to M. for 3°, 12489 (v).
Rural and Free Mail Delivery (remarks) 516 (i).
St. James Electoral Division, Issue of Writ (remarks) 13378 (vi).
St. Thomas, Armoury Grounds (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13109 (vi).
Schooley, Wm. Francis, Relief B. 128 (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com., 3224 (ii).
S. A. Constabulary, Information *re* Grievances, &c. (Ques.), 1027 (i).
Springhill Boiler Explosion (remarks) 13258 (vi).
Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7052 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (patent branch, salaries), 4350 (ii).
Canals—Welland (Dunnville dam) 7810; (land damages) 7805 (iv).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 272; Justice (salaries) 211; Militia (salaries) 222; Privy Council Office (salaries) 207 (i).

Culling Timber (salaries) 7798 (iv).

Customs (contingent expenses) 3785; (salaries, &c.) 3907 (ii).

Dom. Lands (Banff hot springs) 6789 (iii).

Geological Survey (geologist, international boundary survey) 6825; (new building) 6824 (iii).

Immigration (exodus to U. S.) 6880; (general expenditure) 6880; (on ques. of order) 6862; (Ques. of order, quoting speeches) 6871; (U.S. agents) 6849 (iii).

Labour Dept. (B.C. labour commissioners) 7198 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse supplies) 4172; (lightkeepers, salaries, &c.) 4166; (St. Lawrence navigation) 4150 (ii).

Militia (defence scheme) 3765; (G.O.C.) 3782; (grants to associations) 3770 (ii); (pay and allowance) 13396 (vi); (transport and freight) 3752, 3767 (ii).

Miscellaneous (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6985; (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6976 (iii).

N. W. T. Govt. (general expenses) 6858 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies) 4084 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (electric power) 1068; (furniture) 1006; (heating, &c.) 1066; (postmasters) 1020 (i); **Mar. Provs.** (renewals, &c.) 422 (i); **Ont.** (Alexandria, P. O.) 506; (architects) 524; (Clinton P.O.) 522 (i); (Oshawa P.O.) 13111; (St. Mary's P.O.) 13109 (vi); (Toronto Junction post office) 651 (i); **Ottawa** (heating) 1009; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 1003; (telephones) 1013 (i).

Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Columbia river) 1455 (i); **N.B.** (Campbellton wharf) 1164; (Caraquet wharf) 1174; (Great Salmon river) 1177; (Negro Point, breakwater) 1181; (Richibucto, pier) 1177; (Shippegan, harbour) 1184 (i); **N.S.** (Amagandus, wharf) 1069); (Cow Bay) 1081; (Drumhead, breakwater) 1083 (i); (Glace Bay, wharf) 13185 (vi); (Grand Etang, bridge works) 1037 (i); (Indian harbour, wharf) 13199 (vi); (Janvrin's Island, wharf) 1102; (Kingsport, pier) 1103; (Larry's River) 1104; (Lingan Beach) 1105; (Margaree, wharf) 1133; (Meteghan Cove) 1134; (Neil's Harbour) 1140; (New Harbour) 1144; (Port Hawkesbury) 1148 (i); (Port Hood, pier) 13209 (vi); (West Baccaro channel) 1151 (i); **Ont.** (Amherstburg, dredging) 1185; (Bayfield pier) 1188; (Belle Rivière) 1192 (i); (Burlington channel, piers) 13237 (vi); (Depot Harbour) 1361; (general repairs) 1369; (Goderich harbour) 1368 (i), 13240; (Kingsville) 13244; (Little Bear Creek) 13245; (Port Stanley) 13249 (vi); (Sarnia, dredging) 2638 (ii); (Wendover wharf) 1439 (i); **P.E.I.** (Anderson's Hollow) 1164; (Cove head, harbour) 1155; (creosoted timber) 1155; (New London, wharf) 1160; (piers, repairs, &c.) 1161 (i); **Que.** (Chateauguay River) 3211 (ii); (Cross Point, pier) 1513 (i); (dredging plant) 2674 (ii); (Esquimaux Point) 2278; (Father Point, pier) 1513; (Grande Vallée, pier) 1515; (Murray Bay, wharf 2269; (St. Alexis Bay) 2289; (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2258 (i); (St-

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Lawrence ship channel) 3218, 3306 (ii); (St. Maurice River) 2286; (Sorel, wharf) 2295 (i); (Temiscamingue Lake, dredging) 2246 (i); (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2639 (ii).

Miscellaneous (art gallery) 2725; (salaries, engineers, &c.) 2731; (temporary clerks, &c.) 2731 (ii).

Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 2700; (Portage du Fort) 2696 (ii).

Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2689 (ii).

Tel. Lines (Belle Isle) 2712; (B.C.) 2992; (Magdalen islands) 2714; (Mar. Provs.) 2709 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (air brakes, freight cars) 8282 (iv); (bridge strengthening) 3700 (ii); 8270, 8273; ('Cleveland' cylinders) 8284; (draw bars, exchange) 8289 (iv); (Levis accommodation) 3704 (ii); (steel rails) 7803; (Sydney accommodation) 3698 (ii).

Scientific Institutions (MacGregor, Capt., gratuity) 6993 (iii).

Surtax: *See* 'Customs.'

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Subsidy (remarks) in Com. on B. 270, 14738 (vi).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9422 (iv).

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspaper (remarks) 11081 (v).

Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Mackinnon*) on M. for 2°, 631 (i).

Johnston, Mr. A., *Cape Breton.*

Alliance Bank of Canada incorp. B. 212 (Mr. *Russell*) in Com., 7476 (iii).

Glace Bay Wharf, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13185 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11348 (v); on M. for 3°, 12700 (vi).

——— Ques. of Order, Member reading Speech, 10249 (v).

I.C.R. Extension from N. Sydney Junction to North Sydney (M. for cor.*) 447 (i).

Ry. Act (supplies for I.C.R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12972 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11028, 11534; (N.S.) 11798; on M. for 3°, 12484 (v).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Arichat) 5836 (iii); (Sydney Mines) 13030; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Big Harbour, wharf) 13144; (Glace Bay, wharf) 13185 (vi).

Railways—I. C. R. (North Sydney improvements) 12598 (v); (Sydney accommodation) 3697 (ii).

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12304 (v).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4921 (ii).

Johnston, Mr. R., *Cardwell.*
Alton and Caledon Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14019 (vi).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7318, 7367 (iii).
Boyd, Chief Justice, Relatives in Govt. Employ (Ques.) 4185 (ii).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5080 (ii); in Com., 5436 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10640, 12109, 12252.
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13285 (vi).
Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) 5732 (iii).
Montreal Northern Ry. and St. Agathe Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 564 (i).
——— (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4711 (ii); 6135, 6217 (iii).
Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14483 (vi).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11746; on M. for 3°, 12428.
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (census enumerators) 4825 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c. 4114 (ii).
Postoffice (country postmasters) 6037 (iii), 14019.
Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4943 (ii).
Trois Pistoles Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14483 (iii).

Johnston, Mr. T. G., *Lambton, W.*
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10096 (v).

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E., *Lunenburg.*
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5435 (iii).
Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4426 (ii).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res., (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 839 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 3°, 13945 (vi).
Cornwall Road and Mahone Bay Postal Service (remarks) 14038 (vi).
Country Postmasters: *See* 'Postmasters.'
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10755 (v).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3099 (ii).
Dog Fish: *See* 'Supply—Fisheries.'
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 14423 (vi).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6897 (iv).

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E.—*Con.*
Fishing Industry, N.S., Accommodation to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13167 (vi).
Glass Factory, Pictou, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6723 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7892; on M. for 3°, 8323 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12062, 12254 (v).
Halifax and S. Western Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14332 (vi).
Judge's Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8102 (iv).
Lunenburg Marine School, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13534 (vi).
Markland, Schr., Seizure, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5992 (iii).
Penny Banks B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 4176 (ii).
Postmasters in Country Postoffices, in Com. on Postoffice Bill, 5662 (iii).
——— Increase of Salary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14038 (vi).
Post Office Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. (country postmasters), 5662, 5864 (iii).
Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14699 (vi).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14332 (vi).
Safety of Ships Act Amt. B. 179 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6919 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (experimental farms) 4555 (ii).
Fisheries (*Acadia*, sale of) 13658; (Behring Sea arbitration) 13658; (dog fish pest) 13651; (hatcheries, Lunenburg) 13660 (vi).
Geological Survey (explorations, &c.) 6817 (iii).
Immigration (repatriation, N.S.) 6722 (iii).
Indians: Mar. Provs. (schools) 6415 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Halifax harbour lightship) 4165 (ii); (Marconi stations) 13646; (Nfld., aids to Navigation) 13647 (vi).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 7751 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Micmac dictionary, printing) 12592 (v).
Ocean and River Service (masters and mates examination) 13532; (naval reserve, school of navigation) 13546 (vi).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—**N.S.** (Breton's Cove) 13167 (vi); (Larry's river) 1104; (Lunenburg harbour) 1106 (i); (Port Hood, pier) 13206; (Tancock breakwater) 13217; (Victoria, beach wharf) 13214 (vi); (West Baccaro channel) 1152 (i); (Yarmouth bar) 13218 (vi); **Ont.** (Port Arthur) 3350 (ii).
Railways: I. C. R. (North Sydney improvements) 12598 (v).

Kemp, Mr. A. E., *E. Toronto.*
Budget, The, 2050 (i).
Canadian Freight Classification, Approval, &c. (Ques.) 3537 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5595 (iii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3046; in Com. on B., 4035.

Kemp, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*
Freight Classification (Canadian) O.C., &c. (remarks) 3302 (ii).
See 'Can. freight, &c.' Supply—Mail Subsidies,' 'Ry. Bill 21.'
German Discrimination and Bond-Hay Treaty, Inquiry for Papers, 1324 (i).
German Tariff, Cor., &c., laid on Table (remarks) 1460 (i).
Grain Standards, Samples *re* &c. (remarks) 11179.
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5211 (iii); on M. for 3° (amt.) 8066 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9152 (iv); in Com. on B., 10450, 10478, 10538, 10569, 11280, 11310, 11360, 11973, 11984 (v), 12102, 12180, 12274; on M. for 3°, 12729 (vi).
——— Ques. of Order *re* 'Grafter,' 10190 (v).
See 'Privilege.'
G. T. Pacific Subsidy, Par. in Ottawa *Journal*, 5733 (iii).
See 'Ry. Policy.'
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 766 (i).
Insurance Rates on Steamers *re* St. Lawrence Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7592 (iv).
I. C. R. & G. T. R., Traffic Arrangements (Ques.) 2759 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7928, 7956 (iv).
Militia Force, Condition, &c. (remarks), 5733 (v).
Milk Can Bill: *See* 'Weights and Measures.'
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys., 10509 (v).
Railway Accidents, Investigation into (remarks), 1334 (i).
Ry. Commission B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*), on M. for Com., 2589; in Com. (express rates), 2596, 3539 (ii); (freight rates) 5685, 6285 (iii); 8125 (iv).
Railway Policy of Govt., on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to adjn. Hse., 7127 (iii).
Railway Sidings for Private Corporations, &c. (remarks), 14061 (vi).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), in Com., 11051; (Toronto) 11695; (Winnipeg) 11791; (York) 11667; on Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to M. for 3°, 12467 (v).
——— Printing of Amendments, &c. (remarks), 11424 (v).
Sorel Deep Water Wharf, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12851 (vi).
Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'
SUPPLY:
Customs (contingencies, &c.) 3903; (preferential tariff) 3921; (salaries, &c.) 3911 (ii).
Justice—Penitentiaries (binder twine), 3518 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.), 7574; (freight rates, &c.) 7588 (iv).
Militia (Valleyfield strike, pay), 3602 (ii).
Postoffice (letter carriers, &c.), 6009 (iii).

Kemp, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Buildings (Toronto custom house), 647.
Harbours and Rivers—**Man.** (St. Andrew's Rapids), 3355, 3364 (ii); **Ont.** (Depot Harbour), 1361; (Goderich harbour) 1366; (Toronto, harbour) 1433; (Wendover wharf) **Que.** (Quebec harbour improvements) 1439; 3338; (Sorel, deep water wharf), 3374 (ii); 12851 (vi).
Railways—I.C.R. (Eastern Extension, fees), 7529 (iii); (sidings, additional) 14061 (vi).
Trade Commissioner in London, Eng. (remarks), 3497 (ii).
Transportation Commission, &c., Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks), 865 (i).
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3470, 3486 (ii); 12851 (vi).
United Counties Ry., Letter of E. D. Lafleur (read) in Com. of Sup., 12852 (vi).
Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*), on M. for 2°, 2340 (i); on M. to refer to Special Com., 3247 (ii).
Wheat, Export Freight Rate to Montreal, &c. (Ques.), 11188, 11425 (v).

Kendall, Mr. A. S., *Cape Breton.*
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*), in Com., 6900 (iii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), in Com., 11298, 12052 (v).
Insurance Rates *re* Ocean Steamers (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 7598 (iv).
I.C.R., Coal Rates, &c. (Ques.), 6167 (iii).
——— Trackmen, Wages, &c. (Ques.), 1297 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*), in Com. on Res., 7972 (iv).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax), 4288 (ii).
Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8102 (iv).
Labour Commission, 1886, Names, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.), 8083 (iv).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks), 2525 (ii).
Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*), in Com., 3744 (ii), 5340 (iii), 8143, 8165 (iv); (telephones) 5521 (iii).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), in Com. (N.S.), 11794 (v).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice, N.S. (county court judges), 14267 (vi).
Fisheries (dog-fish pest), 13653 (vi).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Marconi stations), 13646 (vi).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.), 7598 (iv); (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 14250 (vi).
Ocean and River Service (masters and mates examination), 13528 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, **N.S.** (Cow Bay), 1082 (i); (Gabarouse breakwater) 13182 (vi); (Glace Bay) 1090 (i); (Glace Bay, wharf) 13196 (vi); (St. Ann's, wharf) 13204 (vi).
Quarantine (small-pox), 5021 (ii).

Kidd, Mr. E., *Carleton, (O.).*

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Montreal harbour), 3367 (ii).

Lancaster, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln and Niagara.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4231 (ii).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5887 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5816 (iii).

Cattle Guards : *See* 'Ry. B.'

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 13813 (vi).

Civil Servants, Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup. 3158 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7516 (iii).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3063, 3114 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 908 (i), 13577 (vi).

Drainage across Rys. : *See* 'Ry. B. 21.'

Dry Docks Construction B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4681 (ii).

Fishing Rights, James and Hudson's Bays, &c. (Ques.) 1194 (i).

Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on M. for 2°, 3815 (ii).

Grand River, Dredging at Dunnville (Ques.) 12497 (v), 13027 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., on Ques. of Order, 7827 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9909 (iv) ; in Com. on B., 10627 (v) ; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12720 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13293 (vi).

Hamilton Electric Light & Power Co., Rental, &c. (Ques.) 3803 (ii).

Hamilton and Grimsby Electric Line (remarks) 6084 (iii).

James and Hudson's Bays, Fishing Rights, &c. (Ques.) 1194 (i).

——— (M. for cor.*) 3806 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 6893 (iii).

Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8112 (iv).

Lt.-Governor of Ontario, Appnmt of Administrator (remarks) 112 (i).

Macnee Fishing License, Inquiry for Ret., 4727 (ii).

McDermid, Ellen, Relief (B. 229) in Com., 9148 (iv).

Mowat, Lt.-Gov. : *See* 'Lt.-Gov.'

Post Offices, Opening and Closing Hours (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5931 (iii).

Lancaster, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. (B. 6) 1° m., 93 ; 2° m., 552 (i).

Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. 2591, 3571, 3717, 3881, 3883, 3888, 3974, 4001, 4121, 4565, 4691, 4748 (ii), 5323, 5539, 5563, 5766, 6071, 6084, 6204, 6305 (iii), 8128 (iv) ; (cattle guards) 5774, 6204—6250 (iii) ; (drainage) 4748 (ii) ; (telephones) 5539 (ii) ; on Sen. Amts., 13845 (vi).

Representation in the H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 1250 (i) ; in Com., 11157 11435 (v).

Seeds Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7232 (iii).

Statutes, Revised, Publication Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 635 (i).

SUPPLY :

Canals : Chambly (By-wash station) 12906 ; (tow path) 12907 ; Generally (operating expenses) 12920 ; Miscellaneous (litigation expenses) 12912 (vi) ; Welland (deepening, &c.) 7804 (iv) ; (drainage improvement) 12905 ; (electric light) 12900 ; (land surveys) 12905 ; (Port Colborne improvements) 12903 ; (protection walls) 12904 ; (Ramy's Point obstruction) 12902 ; (Townsend valve, lock gates) 12905 (vi).

Civil Govt. : Public Works (architect's salary) 13499 (vi).

Customs (inspection, preventive service, &c.) 3953 (ii).

Excise (analysis, food, &c.) 5402 (iii).

Interior (Liard River miners, relief) 6926 (iii).

Justice, Administration of : Yukon (law library) 14268 (vi).

Militia (annual drill) 3604 ; (Valleyfield strike) 3599 (ii).

Post Office (Ottawa Supply Co.) 6151 ; (inspectors' salaries) 5931 ; (ry. mail service) 5956 ; (salaries) 5925 (iii).

Public Works : Buildings, **N.S.** (Arichat) 5829 (iii) ; **Ont.** (Cayuga P.O.) 502 ; (Clinton P.O.) 526 ; (Cobourg armoury) 639 ; (London drill hall) 641 ; **Que.** (L'Assomption) 428 (i). Harbours and Rivers, **N.B.** (Campbellton wharf) 1164 ; (Caraquet wharf) 1173 (i) ; **N.S.** (Big Harbour, wharf) 13146 (vi) ; **P.E.I.** (New London 1160 (i) ; **Que.** (Rimouski pier, &c.) 13469 ; (Rivière du Loup) 13476 ; (Rivière Verte) 13470 ; (Ste. Famille, pier) 13489 ; (Ste. Fidèle, wharf) 13493 ; (St. Fulgence, wharf) 13491 ; (St. Gedeon Islands, wharf) 13491 ; (St. Godfroi de Nouvelle, breakwater) 13489 ; (St. Jean des Chaillons, wharf) 13495 ; (St. Louis river) 13473 ; (St. Maurice, dam) 13491 ; (Sabrevois, wharf) 13488 ; (Sacre-Cœur, wharf) 13478 ; (Seven Islands, wharf) 13482 ; (Shegawake, harbour) 13479. Miscellaneous (arbitrations and awards) 13339 (vi).

Steamboat Inspection (boiler inspectors) 13649.

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11080 (v).

Welland Canal Lock Tenders, Increase of Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12921 (vi).

——— Water Power, O. C.'s *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1859 (i).

——— rep. of Board of Trade of St. Catharines, &c. (Ques.) 668 (i).

Lang, Mr. John, *East Peterborough*.
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11013; (Peterborough) 11625.

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C., *Provencher*.
Assiniboine and Red River Nav. Rep. of Winnipeg Board of Trade (Ques.) 1859 (i).
Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5558, 5887, 5960 (iii).
Business of the House, *re* Private Bills Procedure (remarks) 5137 (iii).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5852 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5790 (iii).
Country Postmasters, Salary, &c., in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5677 (iii).
See 'P. O. Bill,' 'Memorial,' &c.
Criminal Code (immoral entertainments) Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 319 (i).
Customs Warehouse at Winnipeg, &c. (Ques.) 6268 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 14406 (vi).
Emerson Mail Service, &c. (Ques.) 5321 (iii).
German Surtax, Purchases previous to (Ques.) 3394 (ii).
Half Breed Claims, Commissions, Applications for Scrip, &c. (M. for ret.*) 110 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 2016 (i), 3397 (ii).
Imperial Co.'s incorp. B. 71 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) in Com., 3170 (ii).
Interior Dept., Permanent Officials, &c., Date of Appnmt. (M. for list*) 2338 (i).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10791.
Judges' Salaries, County Courts, Pets., &c. (Ques.) 3628 (ii).
——— Increases (remarks) 5242 (iii).
Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Privs. and Elections Com., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print evidence, 7919 (iv).
Lumber Combine in N. W. T and Man. (remarks) 1585 (i).
Man. and N. W. T. Postmasters' Association Memorial *re* Remuneration (Ques.) 13259 (vi).
Memorial of Man. Postmasters' Association (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13994, 14020 (vi).
Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s Change of Name (B. 88) 1°*, 1193 (i).
Naturalization Act, Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 2015 (i).
Paradis, Amable, Claim against Pub. Works (M. for cor.*) 2337 (i).
Penny Banks Establishment B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10794 (v).
Postmasters' Association, Memorial from Man. and N. W. T. (Ques.) 125 (i), 13259 (vi).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5677, 5865 (iii).
Private Bills, Order of Procedure (remarks) 5137.

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C.—*Con.*
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11034; (Dauphin) 11770; (Portage LaPrairie) 11782 (v).
Roseau River Reserve, Sale of Lots, &c. (Ques.) 5319 (iii).
St. Boniface Money Order Branch, Closing, &c. (Ques.) 5321 (iii).
——— Postal Facilities, &c. (Ques.) 1858 (i).
Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 469 (i).
Settlers' Claims *re* Rebellion of 1885, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 13949 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.: Postoffice (junior 2nd-class clerks) 13996 (vi).
Dom. Lands (Banff, bath house) 13956 (vi).
Post Office (salaries *re* transfers) 13994; (Winnipeg, dead letter branch) 13995 (vi).
Winnipeg P. O.: *See* 'P.O. Bill 208,' 'Supply—'Post Office.'

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G. (Prime Minister), *E. Quebec*.
Address, on The, 40 (i).
Adjournment of Hse., Procedure *re* (remarks) 6635 (iii).
Agriculture and Colonization Sel. Com. (M.) to add name, 5679 (iii).
Alaskan Boundary Commission *re* Lord Alverstone (remarks) 13963 (vi).
——— Aylesworth, Mr., Alleged Interviews (remarks) 13668, 13957 (vi).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13957 (vi).
——— Award, Govt. Responsibility, &c., Reply to Mr. Borden, Halifax, 14810 (vi).
——— Official Information (remarks) 14523, 14529 (vi).
——— Award, &c. (remarks) 14280, 14287 (vi).
——— Bond-Hay Treaty, &c., on Inquiry for Papers, 878, 1324 (i).
——— Convention respecting Treaty (remarks) 481 (i).
——— Cor. *re*, Papers laid on Table, 14688 (vi).
——— on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to review Case, 14764 (vi).
——— Refusal of Can. Commissioners to sign Award (remarks) 14403, 14689 (vi).
——— Summary published, &c. (remarks) 10536 (v).
——— Tel. from Lord Alverstone (read) 13806 (vi).
——— Tel. from Mr. Sifton (read) 14529 (vi).
Aliens, Naturalization Act Amt. B. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°*, 5136; in Com., 5872, 5874 (iii); 3°m., 5991 (iii).
Alverstone, Lord: *See* 'Alaska Boundary.'
Ascension Day Adjournment (M.) 3127 (ii).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Contract with Allan Co. (Ans.) 7092 (iii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Delay by Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com of Sup., 14171 (vi).
Lavish expenditure criticised by opposition, 14171; not satisfactory service, 14172; efforts by former Govts., 14173; Mr. Foster's scheme in 1888, 14173; no tenders received—offer by Allans, 14174; conditions, 14174; Petersen, Tate & Co., Tender, 14175; obvious reasons for doing nothing 1899 to 1902, 14176; negotiations in Eng. with different firms 1902, 14176; invitations for tenders in March, 1902, 14176; Toronto speech, 14177 (vi).
——— (remarks) notice of M., 13948 (vi).
——— Tenders, &c. (remarks) 4120 (ii).
Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11165 (v); wthdn., 13444 (vi).
Aylesworth, &c.: *See* 'Alaska Boundary.'
Banff Coal Reserve, Mining Leases, &c. (Ans.) 13026 (vi).
Bass River, N. S., Marine Light (remarks) 14249 (vi).
Binder Twine Bounties, on Ques. of Order, 7307 (iii).
Binder Twine, Prices for current Year (Ans.) 203 (i).
Beauharnois District, Independence of Parlt. Act, on M. to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 7106 (iii).
Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation, &c. (announcement) 6540 (iii).
——— (explanation) 6735, 6754 (iii).
Blankets, Web cloth, &c., purchased by Govt. (Ans.) 10101, 10410, 10714 (v).
Bonding Privileges with U.S.: *See* 'Coasting.'
Bopp, Mr.: *See* 'Can. & German,' &c.
Boyd, Chief Justice, Relatives in Govt. Employ (Ans.) 4185 (ii).
B. C. Legislation, Disallowance, on Inquiry for Ret., 2016 (i).
British Journalists and Members, Visit to Can. (remarks) 7489 (iii).
——— Visit to Mar. Provs. (remarks) 2105 (i).
Business of the Hse. (M.) 3127 (ii).
——— Delay in printing Bills (remarks) 482 (i).
——— Misleading Statements (remarks) 4349 (ii).
——— Procedure on Order Paper (remarks) 2302.
——— (remarks) 1204 (i).
——— *See* 'Govt. Business.'
Cabinet Changes: *See* 'Ministerial Changes.'
Calgary and Edmonton Mortgage Deed, Regulations *re* Deposit, &c. (Ans.) 13026 (vi).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Can. and German Fiscal Policy, Cor. with Dom. Govt. and Herr Bopp (remarks) 12220 (v).
Canadian Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, &c. *re* St. Francis River Bridge, in Com. on Res., 14509 (vi).
Canadian Mails via New York, Tons, &c. (Ans.) 10713 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B., 209, in Com. on Res., 4963, 5000 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
C. P. R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14500 (vi).
Canals Tonnage Dues, Abolition (Ans.) 874 (i).
Cargill, Henry, late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 12937 (vi).
Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 388 (i).
Cattle Guard Commission, on Inquiry for Rep. (remarks) 3396 (ii).
Census Schedules, Questions in Peel, Halton, &c. (Ans.) 11425 (vi).
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. Joseph, Speech *re* Canadian Tariff 13376 (vi).
Chamber of Commerce at Paris, &c. (Ans.) 1297 (i).
Charbonneau, Miss Edna, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12716 (vi).
Chateauguay and Northern Ry. Co.'s Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14486, 14510 (vi).
Chevrier Family, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12499 (v), 12716 (vi).
Chinese Restriction Immigration Act Amt. (B. 82) prop. res., 265; in Com. on Res., 597; 1°*, 945; in Com., 2241, 2399 (i); on Sen. Amts, 5872 (iii).
Cigarettes Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 1°, 2014 (i).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 845 (i).
Civil Servants and Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3198 (ii).
Civil Servants and Guarantee Companies (Ans.) 3234 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 257) prop. res., 10410 (v); on Sen. Amts. 14845 (vi).
Civil Service List (presented) 125 (i).
Clergue Steel Works, Labour Disturbances (remarks) 12611 (v).
——— *See* 'Sault.'
Coasting Laws, U. S. Privileges, &c. (remarks) 12714, 12758 (vi).
——— *See* 'U. S.'
Cold Storage and Fruit: *See* 'Fruit.'
Coldstream Guards Band, Arrangements *re* Visit to Can. (Ans.) 9683 (iv).
Colonial Conference, Report, &c. (remarks) 3633 (ii).
——— *See* 'Imperial.'
Committee, Joint Printing, List (presented) 244 (i).
Committees, Sel. Standing, to prepare Lists (M.) 5 (i).
——— Lists presented, 197 (i).
——— Meeting concurrently with sitting of (Hse.) (remarks) 8333 (iv).
Corn Duties, Abolition by Imp. Parlt. (remarks) 1681 (i).
Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) Act Amt. B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 1324 (i).
———(immoral entertainments) Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 319 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Coal Lands, Application *re* (Ans.) 12217 (v).
Debates, Official, Sel. Com. (M.) 5 (i).
———6th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Champagne*) to conc., 7922 (iv).
Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 573 (i).
Dom. Day, Adjnmt. (M.) 5589 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1200 (i); 13583, 14407; M. to place on Govt. Orders, 13373; Order dschgd., 14769 (vi).
Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 945 (i).
Dundonald, Lord: *See* 'G.O.C.'
Easter Adjournment (M.) 1115 (i).
Electoral Lists, N.S., Changes since Printing (Ans.) 8331 (iv).
Esquimalt Naval Station, Removal of Flagship (remarks) 10957 (v).
Estimates, Suppl., on Inquiry for (remarks) 10832 (v).
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) (M.) to place on Govt. Orders, 8115; 2° m., 8243 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 14770 (vi).
False Creek, Lease, &c. (Ans.) 2919 (ii).
Farquharson, Mr., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 5512 (iii).
Ferries Bill: *See* 'Navigable.'
France and Canada SS. Service B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 10802, 11422 (v).
Frank Disaster, N.W.T., Tel. from Board of Trade, &c. (read) 2106 (i).
———Tel. to Dep. Min. of Int. (read) 2238 (i).
See 'Supply—Miscellaneous.'
Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Smith*, Wentworth) on M. for 2°, 3257 (ii).
Fruit Shipments in Cold Storage, Value, &c. (Ans.) 3233 (ii).
General Inspection Act (weigh-masters) Amt. B. (prop. res.) 13264 (vi.)
See 'Inspection.'
G.O.C., Lord Dundonald's Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2420 (i).
German Discrimination and Bond-Hay Treaty, on Inquiry for Papers, 1324 (i).
Germans in Canada, Recruiting for Naval Service (remarks) 8717 (iv).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Monday (M.) 3708 (ii).
———Precedence on Thursdays (M.) 940 (i).
———Precedence on Wednesdays (M.) 1114 (i).
———Redistribution Bill (remarks) 204 (i).
———Stmnt. *re* further Business (remarks) 13559 (vi).
Gov. Gen's Speech at Banquet of Chambers of Commerce (Ans.) 10101 (v).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Grain Inspection *re* Standard Samples (remarks) 11179 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5158, 5218 (iii), 7847; on M. for 3°, 8060 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Maclean*) 7815 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7828 (iv).
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 235) M. for Com. on Res., 8406; 1° m., 7658; ('mountains of information') 7679 (iv); in Com. on Res., 10411; 2°* of B. and in Com., 10412; in Com. on B., 10540, 11191, 11247, 11273, 11312, 11969, 12015, 12055; (two-cent rate) 12233 (v); 3° m., 12612, 12644, 12730, 12758; on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) 12743; on Amt. (Mr. *Barker*) to M. for 3°, 12770 (vi).
———Alternative Policy of Mr. Borden, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 13028 (vi).
——— Distribution of Bill among Members (remarks) 8918 (iv).
———Govt's. Intention *re* Quebec to Moncton Scheme, 10537 (v).
———Govt. Policy, &c. (Ans.) 2308 (i).
———Delay, &c. (remarks) 6806, 6922, 7299, 7399, 7488 (iii).
———Papers laid on Table, 11302 (v).
———Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to refer to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13267, 13560 (vi).
———Plans by E. A. Hoare (presented) 8082 (iv).
———Sir William Mulock's Speech, Par. in 'Citizen' (remarks) 368 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. to adjn. Deb., 8806 (iv).
——— (remarks) 8086 (iv).
See 'Ry. Policy.'
Haanel, Dr., Duties as Supt. of Mines (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13764 (vi).
Hawkesbury to South Indian, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14344 (vi).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid, &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 679 (i).
Herchmer, L. W., Pension, &c. (Ans.) 5322 (iii).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 778 (i).
——— Address to His Maj. (M.) 1193 (i).
Imperial Conference Cor., Can. Govt.'s Refusal to publish, &c. (remarks) 3633 (ii), 7923, 8230, 9458 (iv).
——— Cor. laid on Table, 9582 (iv).
Imperial Service Orders to Civil Servants, &c. (Ans.) 12715 (vi).
——— Names of Officials, &c. (Ans.) 13669, 13936 (vi).
I.C.R., Shops at Rivière du Loup, Construction (Ans.) 12497 (v).
——— Lévis Accommodation: *See* 'Lévis.'
——— Windsor Junction Accident, Evidence *re* (remarks) 3398 (ii).
Internal Economy Com. (M.) 91 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 4297 (ii).
Insolvency B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2787, 3248 (ii).
Insolvenèy Act, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 818 (i).
Inspection General Act (weigh masters) Amt. B. 266 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) prop. Res., 13264; in Com. on B., 14311 (vi).
James Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).
Japanese Immigration (remarks) 3713 (ii).
Jonquières to Ha Ha Bay, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14316 (vi).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 11408 (v).
Judges of Provincial Courts, Superior Court, Que. (prop. res.) 11426; Res. 2° m., 11833 (v).
Judges Retiring Allowances on Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 4262 (ii); in Com. on Res., 8090 (iv); (M.) to conc. in Sen. Amts., 14289 (vi).
—— Increase of, &c. (remarks) 14307 (vi).
Judgeship offered by Mr. Dansereau to Conservative (remarks) 13805 (vi).
Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s B., on M. to receive Pet., 2779 (ii).
Labour Day Adjournment (M.) 10742 (v).
—— (remarks) 10489, 10712 (v).
Lac Bouchette Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14456 (vi).
Lake St. John Ry. and La Tuque, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).
Le Canada, Mr. Latour's Canvass: *See* 'Postmasters.'
Lévis, Land purchased for I.C.R., on M. for O. Cs. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3806 (ii).
Librarians of Parlt. B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14299 (vi).
Library of Parlt. Com. (M.) 244 (i).
Lt. Governor of Ont. and Appnmt. of Administrator, on M. for Com. of Sup., 119 (i).
—— (remarks) 111, 656, 1206 (i).
—— *See* 'Mowat.'
Loan Companies Extension Act Amt. B. 35 (Mr. *Thompson*) on Sen. Amts., 14763 (vi).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal, Settlement, &c. (remarks) 2504, 2517, 2677 (ii).
Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Priv. and Elections Com., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7918 (iv).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to adjn., 14571 (vi).
—— Refund of Express Charges (remarks) 14684 (vi.)
—— Use of certain Rooms, &c., 14534 (vi).
Man. Grain Act (1900) Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 13623 (vi).
Man. and N.W.T., Increased Representation in the Senate (Ans.) 1297 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Man. School Lands, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 6169 (iii).
Maps for Geological Survey, Printing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 14272 (vi).
Martineau, Mr. P. R., M.P., Decease of (remarks) 10242 (v).
Matane and Gaspé Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14484 (vi).
Members of H. of C. Appnmts. to Govt. Positions (Ans.) 3632 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 1204 (i).
Mills, Hon. Mr. Justice, Decease of (remarks) 2794 (ii).
Mining Cos. Incorporation (remarks) 14850 (vi).
Ministerial Changes, Explanations, &c. (remarks) 6, 110, 130, 159 (i); 6735 (iii).
Ministers, Reduction of Number, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 274 (i).
Minto, Earl of: *See* 'Gov. Gen.'
Montreal and Atlantic and South Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14486 (vi).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4470 (ii); in Com. on B., 5419 (iii).
Montreal *Star*, Par. *re* Judgeship: *See* 'Judgeship.'
Morning Sittings (M.) 8333 (iv).
Mortimer & Co.'s Fire, Govt. property destroyed (Ans.) 4836 (ii).
Mowat, Sir Oliver, Lt. Governor of Ontario, Decease (remarks) 1575 (i).
See 'Lt.-Gov.'
Mulloy, Trooper of S. A. Contingent, Pension by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14596 (vi).
National Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G.T.P.Ry.'
Naturalization of Aliens Act Amt. (B. 204) 1° *, 5136 (iii).
—— *See* 'Aliens.'
Naval Defence, Par. in Toronto *Globe*, 945 (i).
Navigable Waters Act Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 12992; Order dschgd., 14768 (vi).
New Canadian Co.'s B. 83 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on M. for 2°, 1328 (i).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Ry. Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6429 (iii).
Nicolet River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).
North Atlantic Transportation Co., on Inquiry (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) for Papers, 13667, 13933 (vi).
—— Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 13372 (vi).
N. W. Mounted Police Act Amt. (B. 242) 1°m., 8321 (iv); 2°m., and in Com., 10741 (v).
—— Mounted Police Pension Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Scott*) M. to introduce, 14281 (vi).
North West Mounted Police, Deptl. Rep. (presented 92 (i).
—— Promotions, &c. (Ans.) 2921 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12321 (v).
North West Provincial Autonomy, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 1296 (i).
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°** *pro forma*, 4 (i).
Order in the House (remarks) 12723 (vi).
Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineers, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for copies, 1303 (i).
Ottawa Valley Fire Sufferers, Govtl. Assistance (remarks) 3134 (ii).
Pacific Cable, & Eastern Tel. Co.'s Concessions, &c. (remarks) 2676 (ii).
Paris Chamber of Commerce: *See* 'Chamber.'
Parliament Grounds, Mutilation of Lawn (remarks) 242 (i).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) M. to dschg. Order, 13444 (vi)
Pensions to S. A. Soldiers by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14596 (vi).
Pilotage Act Amt. B. 138 (M.) to dschg. Order for 2°, 11302 (v).
Post office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 5241 (iii).
Postmasters in Quebec and Newspaper Agents (remarks) 14671 (vi).
Preferential Trade, Offer of Can. Govt. to G. B. (remarks) 3221 (ii).
——— *See* 'Chamberlain,' &c., 'South Africa,' &c.
Preston, W. T. R., Suit by Can. Employment Bureau (remarks) 12221 (v).
Printing and Stationery, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1192 (i).
Printing Bureau and Indebtedness of Members (Ans.) 4180 (ii).
Printing Bureau and Union Employees (Ans.) 4182 (ii).
Private Bills, on M. to extend Time, 10490 (v).
——— (remarks) 2396 (i); 4959 (ii).
——— Order of Procedure (remarks) 5137 (iii).
——— *See* 'Rules,' &c.
Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Par. in *La Patrie*, 6803 (iii).
——— (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* Visitors to Corridors (remarks) 11563 (v).
——— (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters,' &c., Western Rys., 10515 (v).
Provincial Autonomy to N. W. T., Papers laid on Table, 5512 (iii).
——— N. W. T. Imperfect Ret. (remarks) 6893 (iii).
——— *See* 'N. W. T. B. 256.'
Provincial Subsidies Increase, &c. (Ans.) 5764 (iii).
Public Documents, Distribution to Boards of Trade (remarks) 1378 (i).
Pulp Wood, Duty by U. S. (remarks) 4363 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Public Works Dept., Transfer of Duties, B. 269 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14748 (vi).
Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).
Quebec Bridge Agreement, &c. (prop. res.) 14523 (vi).
——— (remarks) 14280 (vi).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14449 (vi).
Queens, P.E.I., Representation in Parlt. (remarks) 13378 (vi).
'Ragging' in the British Army (remarks) 3134 (ii).
Ry. Act B. 21, Salaries of Commissioners, in Com. on Res., 8119 (iv).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (telephone, &c.) 5531 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to M. for 3°, 8350 (iv).
——— Ry. Conference with Senate (remarks) *re* Procedure, 14760 (vi).
Ry. Debts Bill: *See* 'Exchequer.'
Railway Policy of Govt., Delay in bringing down, on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to adjn. Hse., 7115 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 551 (i).
Railway Subsidies (B. 270) in Com. on Res., 14314, 14329; (running powers, Govt. control, &c.) 14516 (vi).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. *Monk*) 10956 (v), 12805 (vi).
Representation in the House of Commons (B. 66) 1°m., 708; 2°m., 1207, 1218, Agreed to (Y. 72, N. 37) 1292 (i); M. for Com., 10832, 10848; in Com., 10912, 10953, 10957, 11114, 11508, 11621, 12293; (Kent) 11567; (Norfolk) 11427; 3°m., 12372; on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) to M. for 3°, 12432 (v).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1284 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order *re* Mr. *Tisdale*, 11474 (v).
——— Evidence *re*, &c. (remarks) 11423 (iv).
——— Schedules, Maps, &c. (remarks) 877 (i).
——— Stmnt. of Hon. Mr. Pugsley *re* N. B., 943 (i).
Returns ordered, Complaint (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) 13140 (vi).
River du Loup Ry. Shops: *See* 'I. C. R.'
Roberval to James Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).
Ross Rifles, Examination, Approval, &c. (Ans.) 2759 (ii).
Rules of the House, on M. (Mr. *Demers*) to amend, 12216 (v).
St. Francis River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).
St. James Electoral Division, Issue of Writ (remarks) 13376 (vi).
——— Vacancy, &c. (remarks) 6998 (iii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
St. John Valley Ry., Fredericton to Woodstock, Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14343 (vi).
St. Patrick's Day, Public Holiday (Ans.) 1858 (i).
Salmon Canning Industry in B.C. (remarks) 10102 (v).
Saturday Sittings (M.) 13264 (vi).
Sault Ste. Marie, Labour Disturbances, Govt. Proposals (remarks) 12718 (vi).
——— Labour Troubles, Wages, &c. (remarks) 12941 (vi).
See 'Clergue.'
Sec. of State Deptl. Rep. (presented) 125 (i).
Senate Representation of N.W.T.: *See* 'Man. and N.W.T.'
Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meeting, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 465 (i).
Settlers' Claims *re* Rebellion of 1885 (remarks) on M. for Sup., 13952 (vi).
Slater Shoe Co. and Alien Labour, Res. *re* (remarks) 14669 (vi).
Small-pox Patients in Gloucester, N.B. (remarks) 14688 (vi).
Snow Storms in N.W.T., False Reports, &c. (remarks) 11826 (v).
Sorel, Deep Water Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12845, 12850 (vi).
S. Africa and Can. SS. Service (remarks) in Com. on France and Can. SS. B., 10821 (v).
S. African Colonies and Preferential Tariff, Res. of Winnipeg Board of Trade (Ans.) 1679 (i).
——— Hay: *See* 'Hay and Oats.'
South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 456 (i).
Speech from the Throne (M.) 5 (i).
Steel Industry: *See* 'Iron and Steel.'
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.—High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 13772.
Indian Affairs (contingencies) 13760 (vi); (salaries) 274 (i).
Interior (clerical assistance) 13769; (salaries) 13761; (Mines branch, salaries) 13762 (vi).
Geological Survey (A. P. Low, salary) 13770; (salaries) 13769, 13966; (technical officer, salary) 13772 (vi).
N. W. Mounted Police (Drake, E. F., salary) 13761; (salaries) 224 (i), 13760 (vi).
Privy Council Office (salaries) 207 (i).
Dom. Lands (Banff, bath house) 13955; homestead entries) 13966; (maps, printing, &c.) 14272, (salaries, outside service) 13773, 13966; (surveys, printing, &c.) 13777; (tree culture) 13775, 14272 (vi).
Geological Survey (maps, lithographing, &c.) 13778; (metallurgical, salaries) 13778 (vi).
Govt. of N. W. T. (registrars, &c.) 13787 (vi).
Indians—B. C. (Hazelton hospital) 13787; (medical attendance) 13785; (salaries) 13785; (schools) 13786; (steam launch) 13787 (vi).
Man. and N.W.T. (agricultural implements) 13782; (industrial schools) 13784; (medical attendance, Dr. West) 13784; (surveys, &c.) 13784; (triennial clothing) 13783 (vi).
N. B. (fire damages) 13782; (salaries) 13782.
N.S. (land purchase) 13781 (vi).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Indians—Con.
Ont. and Que. (Doncaster reserve, roads) 13779; (Rama reserve, roads, &c.) 13781; (roads, repairs) 13779 (vi).
Justice, Administration of—Miscellaneous (N. W. T., expenditure) 3398 (ii); Ont. (Nipissing judgeship) 14258 (vi); Yukon (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3423 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Alaskan boundary commission) 13957; (Assay Office, B.C.) 13965; (Canadian Mining Institute) 13965; (Turtle Mountain, land slide) 13965 (vi).
N. W. Mounted Police (compensation for injuries) 5264; (pay of force) 5262 (iii); (Yukon) 5003 (ii); (Yukon, salaries) 5262 (iii).
Pensions (Lady Lafontaine) 14252 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (trachoma hospital) 14246 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Kamouraska pier) 13458; (Sorel, deep water wharf) 12845 (vi).
Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2932 (ii).
Tariff Policy of Gov., Ques. of Order *re* Quotations, 4843 (ii).
——— (remarks) 4263 (ii).
Tarte, Mr., Resignation: *See* 'Ministerial.'
Telephone Legislation (remarks) 291 (i).
Thanksgiving Day Adjournment (M.) 13790 (vi).
——— (remarks) 13379 (vi),
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. to refer back to Com., 7813 (iv).
Trans-Canada Ry., Sale to G.T. Pacific (remarks) 7567 (iv).
Transcontinental Ry. (B. 235) 1° m., 7658 (iv).
See 'G.T. Pacific.'
——— Govt. Policy (remarks) 5765 (iii).
Translation of Parliamentary Documents (remarks) 545 (i).
Transportation Commission, Appnmt of Commissioners (notification) 5137 (iii).
——— Appnmt. of Chairman (remarks) 9582 (iv).
——— Appnmt. of Sir Wm. VanHorne (remarks) 7297 (iii).
——— (Ans.) 8330 (iv).
——— Further Arrangements, &c. (remarks) 9458 (iv).
——— O.C., Cor. *re* Appnmts. (M. for copies) 1324 (i).
——— Names of Commissioners (remarks) 4727.
——— Personnel, &c. (remarks) 7206 (iii).
——— Rep. *re* Commission (remarks) 1199 (i), 3129 (ii), 12850 (vi).
Transportation and Treadgold Commissions (remarks) 4840, 4960 (ii).
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3438 (ii), 12850 (vi).
Treadgold Commissioners, Appnmt. of (notification) 5136 (iii).
——— Appnmt., &c. (remarks) 3713 (ii).
——— Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4541 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Treadgold Commissioners, on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2880 (ii).
——— Appnmt. of Commission (remarks) 2424, (i), 3298, 3397, 3870 (ii).
——— and Dawson Board of Trade (remark) 1025 (i).
——— Instructions to Commissioners (remarks) 4120, 4564 (ii).
——— Names of Commissioners (remarks) 4727.
——— Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11065 (v).
——— Personnel, &c. (remarks) 6638 (iii).
——— Tel. read from Dawson Board of Trade *re* Scope (Ans.) 1196 (i).
——— (remarks) 8086 (iv).
——— Terms of Commission (remarks) 4120, 4564 (ii).
——— and Transportation Commission (remarks) 4840, 4960 (ii).
——— (remarks) 13792 (vi).
Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).
Turnpike Trust, Montreal, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Stmnt., 676 (i).
U.S. Coasting Laws, &c., Regulations *re* (remarks) 13138 (vi).
See 'Coasting.'
Voters' Lists: *See* 'Electoral.'
Wiallard, Paul, Emplymnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 11188 (v).
Woodmen of the World B. 31 (Mr. *Calvert*) in Com., 1854 (i).
Yamaska and Lotbiniére Ry. Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 14318 (vi).
Yukon Ry. through Can. Ter. (remarks) 14497 (vi).
Yukon Regulations *re* Dom. Lands, in Com. on Res., 13791 (vi).

Lavell, Mr. J. R., *Leeds & Grenville.*
Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in in Com. on Res., 3054 (ii).
G.T.Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. No. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9431 (iv); in Com. on B., 10648, 11401, 12186 (v).
'Ragging' in the British Army (remarks) 3140.
SUPPLY:
Justice, Administration of: Yukon (living allowances) 3419 (ii).
Quarantine (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5500 (iii).

Lavergne, Mr. L., *Drummond & Arthabaska.*
Drummondville Ry. Sidings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14081 (vi).
Mathurin, Jos. A., Death Sentence, Judge's Rep., &c. (M. for copies*) 3236 (ii).
Standard Car Truck Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 105) 1°*, 1295 (i).
SUPPLY:
Railways and Canals: I. C. R. (Drummondville sidings) 14055 (vi).

Law, Mr. B. B., *Yarmouth.*
Can. Temperance Act Amt. (B. 14) 1°*, 113 (i).
SUPPLY:
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4101 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers (dredges, repairs) 2629 (ii).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A., *E. Prince (P.E.I.)*
Alliance Bank of Canada incorp. B. 212) Mr. *Russell*) in Com., 7476 (iii).
Anglo-American Tel. Co. and P. E. I. Monopoly (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7380 (iii).
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7351 (iii).
Cape Tormentine Ry. Subsidy (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14472 (vi).
Charlottetown, Ry. Station, P.E.I., Rebuilding, &c. (Ques.) 4442 (ii).
——— Wharf and Dock Accommodation (remarks) 14132 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12537 (v).
Dom. Coal Co., and Glace Bay Harbour (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13189 (vi).
Elmira Branch Line on P. E. I. Ry., Res. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12835 (vi).
Frozen Fish, &c., P.E.I., Claims for Damages *re* (Ques.) 13373 (vi).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13522 (vi).
——— Losses, &c., Pet. *re* (Ques.) 3394 (ii).
Georgetown, P.E.I. Ry. Warehouse Accommodation (remarks) 14088 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9529 (iv); in Com. on B., 10601 (iv).
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13275 (vi).
Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I., Contractor's Name, &c. (Ques.) 2584 (ii).
See 'Supply—Rys.'
Kensington, Increased Accommodation, P.E.I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12840 (vi).
Kinkora Station, P.E.I. Ry. (remarks) in Com., of Sup., 14133 (vi).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8209, 8223 (iv).
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, P E.I. Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14108, 14126 (vi).
Oyster Fishing, P. E. I., Pet., &c. (Ques.) 2920.
P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13522 (vi).
See 'Winter.'
P. E. I. Ry., Southport and Murray Harbour Ry., Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 2584 (ii).
P. E. I. Ry. Subsidies to Branch Lines, &c. (remarks) 14472 (vi).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

P. E. I., Winter Communication by Str. *Stanley* (Ques.) 4006 (ii).

——— Winter Communication (M.) for Copies of Pets., &c., 2765 (ii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14472 (vi).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 1269 (i); on M. for 3°, 12432, 12446; (amt.) to M. for 3°, 12454 (v).

Representation in the H. of C. for P. E. I. and N. B. (Ques.) 5316 (iii).

Richmond and Northam Station, P.E.I.Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).

Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 472 (i).

Shippers of P. E. I., Claims for Damages (Ques.) 13373 (vi).

See 'Frozen Fish.'

Southport and Murray Harbour Ry., P. E. I., Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 2584 (ii).

Summerside Breakwater, P.E.I, Completion of, &c. (Ques.) 3234 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5300 (iii).
Geological Survey (explorations) 6824 (iii).
Immigration (repatriation, &c.) 6725 (iii),
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse construction) 5762 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (P.E.I. and G. B.) 7744 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 4049 (ii); (masters' and mates' examination) 13529 (vi); (*Stanley*, repairs, &c.) 4049 (ii).
Post Office (Kelley's Cross P. O.) 6064; (P.E.I. letter carriers) 6063; (P.E.I. winter service) 5937 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings, Ottawa (coal sheds) 13116; P.E.I. (Charlottetown, Dom. building) 13036 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Cape Tormentine) 13228 (vi); N.S. (Glace Bay, wharf) 13189; P.E.I. (Canoe Cove) 13218; (Cape Traverse, survey) 13219; (Carleton Point) 13219; (North Cardigan) 13223; (Summerside breakwater) 13223 (vi); (Summerside harbour) 3367 (ii).
Telegraph Lines (P. E. I. and mainland) 2988; (P. E. I. cables) 2702 (ii).
Quarantine (cattle and vet. division) 5505; (Pethick, Dr., allowance) 5505 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 8271 (Canso ferry service) 7525 (iii), 14094; (Halifax accommodation) 12827; (locomotives, &c.) 14093 (vi); (Moncton accommodation) 12600; (North Sydney station) 12597 (v); 14090; (St. John accommodation) 12823 (vi).
P.E.I. (Alberton station) 14132; (Charlottetown, accommodation) 14131; (Elmira line) 12835; (Hillsborough bridge) 12829, 14108, 14111, 14126; (Kensington accommodation) 12840 (vi); (Kinkora accommodation) 12841; (Montague bridge) 14132 (vi); (Murray Harbour branch) 7535 (iii); (Summerside coal sheds) 12828 (vi).

Trackmen on Govt. Rys., Increase of Salaries (remarks) in Com. on B. 257, 12558 (v).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14472 (vi).

Winter Communication with P. E. I., Memorial from Emerald, &c. (M. for copies of pets., &c. 2765 (ii).

Lemieux, Mr. R., *Gaspé.*

Agricultural Lecturers, Que., Names, Counties, &c. (Ques.) 8615 (iv).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6962 (iii).

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 28) 1°*, 367; M. for Com., 1804; in Com., 1806 (i).

Aylesworth, Mr. A. B., Reported Interview *re* Alaskan Commission (remarks) 13960 (vi).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 157 (Mr. *Davis*) on M. to ref. back to Com. on Rys., 5238 (iii).

Budget, The, 2167 (i).

Canadian (New) Company Limited incorp. (B. 83) 2°m., 1328 (i).

——— *See* 'New.'

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4977 (ii).

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J., and Pref. Trade: *See* 'Preferential.'

Cigarette Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3288 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 3°, 13945 (vi).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6645 (iii).

Dom. Subsidies to Provinces, Increase, &c. (M. for cor.) 691 (i).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 1°, 6539 (iii).

Fishermen in Gulf of St. Lawrence, Pet. (Ques.) 2917 (ii).

Floating Lighthouses, Applications from Captains, &c. (Ques.) 665 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8776 (iv).

Lecturers on Agriculture, Names, &c. (Ques.) 8615 (iv).

Lighthouses, Floating, Applications, &c. from Captains (Ques.) 665 (i).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2505 (i).

Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7919 (iv).

New Canadian Co.'s incorp. (B. 83) 1°*, 1023; 2°m., 1328 (i); in Com., 3221 (ii).

Ottawa and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 6625 (iii).

Paspebiac to Gaspé Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14460 (vi).

Pilots on River St. Lawrence, &c. (Ques.) 2915 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 5658 (iii).

Lemieux, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Preferential Trade, Mr. Chamberlain's Colonial Scheme, Mr. Fielding's Remarks *re*, Par. in Montreal *Star*, 13936 (vi).

Provincial Subsidies, Increase, &c. (M. for cor.) 691 (i).

——— (Ques.) 5764 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6301 (iii).

——— (fire damages) Amt. B. 23 (Mr. *Demers*, *Iberville*) on M. for 2°, 2783 (ii).

——— Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14460 (vi).

St. James Electoral Division, Vacancy (remarks) 7000 (iii).

St. Lawrence Gulf Fishermen, Pet., &c. (Ques.) 2917 (ii).

St. Lawrence River Pilots, &c. (Ques.) 2915 (ii).

St. Louis International Exhibition, Can. Exhibits (Ques.) 3001 (ii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary Hospital, &c. (Ques.) 13669 (vi).

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., *re*, on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 456 (i).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7032, 7045 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6674; (Fabre, Mr., salary) 6674 (iii).

Legislation: House of Commons (debates, &c.) 5265 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6956 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, &c.) 4058 (ii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Lake St. John, wharf) 2244; (Lake Temiscamingue, dredging) 2248; (Magdalen island) 2265; (Murray Bay, wharf) 2269; (Rivière aux Renards) 2279; (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2258 (i); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3309 (ii); (Seven Islands, wharf) 13480 (vi); (Sorel, wharf) 2291 (i).
Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2950 (ii).

Railways: I. C. R. (Ouelle River branch) 7526 (iii).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2370 (i).

U. S. Indemnity to Fishermen, Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 3236 (ii).

Lennox, Mr. H., *S. Simcoe.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen's Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6966 (iii).

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6358 (iii).

Barrie Wharf, Govt. Grant (remarks) in Com. of Sup, 13452 (vi).

Brockville & Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7402 (iii).

Business of the Hse., Govt. Legislation, &c. (remarks) 1348 (i).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5449 (iii).

Canadian Construction Co. and Farran's Point Contract (M. for ret.*) 1323 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4368, 4973, 5116 (ii); in Com. on B., 5632 (iii).

Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 189 (Mr. *Birkett*) in Com., 7482 (iii).

Cattle Guards Commission, Appnmt. of Mr. Holt and Retirement of Mr. Robertson, &c. (M. for Cor.*) 1059 (i).

———Names, &c. (Ques.) 874 (i).

———Rep., &c. (Ques.) 669 (i).

———Withdrawal of Mr. Robertson, &c. (Ques.) 1034 (i).

———Inquiry for Papers, 3396 (ii).
See 'Ry. Bill.'

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5484 (iii).

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 6200 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 831 (i).

Correspondence Clerk, Ry. Dept., Name, &c. (Ques.) 5318 (iii).

Corridors of Hse., and Visitors, Ques. of Priv., 11558 (v).

County Court Judges, Appnmt. from local Bars (remarks) 5582 (iii).

———Appnmts., Retirements, &c. (Ques.) 4960 (ii).

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 3240 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6646, 7514 (iii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 4027 (ii).

Dixon, F. A., Chief Clerk in Ry. Dept., &c. (Ques.) 5318 (iii).

———Promotion as Chief Clerk, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 1058 (i).

Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 580 (i).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 312 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7888 (iv).

G.T. Pacific Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8808 (iv); in Com. on B., 10488, 10583, 10698, 11341, 11394, 11839, 11867, 12006 (vi).

Hawkestone Wharf, Govt. Aid to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13453 (vi).

Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Govt., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 681 (i).

Insolvency B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 3251 (ii).

Insolvency Act, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 818 (i).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 927 (i).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7966 (iv).

Judges of Provincial Courts Salaries B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8114; in Com. on B., 11421 (iv).

Judges appointed from Local Bar, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 210 (i).

Labour Gazette Correspondents, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 7203 (iii).

Lt. Governor of Ontario and Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 661 (i).

Loy, Geo. M., Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act, on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections, 8069 (iv).

Metropolitan Ry. Co., running on highway (remarks) 6099 (iii).

Mowat, Sir Oliver: *See* 'Lt. Gov.'

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 4869 (ii).

Privilege (Ques. of) *re* Visitors in Corridors, 11557 (v).

Public Accounts Com., producing Census Schedules (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7060 (iii).

Public Works, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) 13451 (vi).

Railway Accidents, Investigation into (remarks) 1341 (i).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4121, 4573, 4712, 4738 (ii), 5251, 5332, 5524, 5560, 5680, 5698, 6080, 6189, 6219, 6298, 7201, 7299 (iii), 8160 (iv); (cattle guards) 6244, 6253; (drainage) 4738 (ii); (telephones, &c.) 5524 (iii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11427; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12488 (v).

———Ques. of Order *re* Mr. Campbell, 11710 (v).

Robertson, Geo. *re* Cattle Guard Commission (Ques.) 874 (i).

———Withdrawal from Cattle Guard Commission (Ques.) 1034 (i).

See 'Cattle Guards,' &c.

Saskatchewan Land Company, Inquiry for Ret., 7108 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5086 (ii); in Com. on B., 7225 (iii).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census schedules) 7060 (iii); (general statistics) 4431 (ii).

Civil Govt.: Justice (appnmt. of Judges) 210; Railways (salaries) 334 (i).

Dom. Lands (homesteads) 6771; (inspector's expenses) 6766; Long Lake, &c. (Saskatchewan Ry. survey) 6942 (iii).

Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5290 (iii); (Hurley, J. M., fishery inspector) 5126 (ii), 5283 (iii).

Indians: Man. and N.W.T (medical attendance) 6350; Ont. (medical attendance) 6327 (iii).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Justice, Administration of: Exchequer Court (reports) 3408; Penitentiaries (Kingston, binder twine) 3518; (Regina jail, Land Purchase) 5135; Sup. Court (reps., binding, &c.) 3405; Yukon (judges' living allowances) 3412; (sheriffs' salaries) 3411; (telegraph operators) 3421 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (printing, binding, &c.) 5267; (Room 56, furniture) 5266 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6966 (iii).

Postoffice (Barrie branch) 6062; (rural mails) 6137 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings, **Dom.** (electric power) 1068; **Ont.** (Alliston) 495; (Clinton P. O.) 521; Ottawa (census building) 992; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 1003; (Royal Mint) 358; **Que.** (Levis) 432; (quarantine, Grosse Isle) 425; (renewals, &c.) 424; (St. Hyacinthe) 439 (i).

Harbours and Rivers, **Man.** (St. Andrews Rapids) 3364 (ii); **Mar. Provs.** (dredging plant) 2669 (ii); **N.B.** (Anderson's Hollow) 1163; (Campbellton wharf) 1165; (St. John river wharf) 1178, 1186; **N.S.** (Amagandus wharf) 1069; (Big Pond, wharf) 1072, 1074; (Bridgewater, dredging) 1074; (Cow Bay) 1079; (Meteghan Cove) 1133; (Neil's Harbour) 1142; **Ont.** (Barrie wharf) 1186; (Petewawa narrows) 1426; (Port Hope, pier) 1425 (i); (Sault Ste. Marie, improvements) 13252 (vi); (Southampton, harbour) 1429; (Sturgeon Falls, wharf) 1432; (Wendover, wharf) 1434; **P.E.I.** (Cascumpec harbour) 1154; (Gaspereaux, harbour) 1156; (Souris Knight's Point) 1162 (i); **Que.** (Caplan, breakwater) 13451 (vi); (Father Point, pier) 1514; (Grande Vallée, pier) 1515 (i).

Miscellaneous (transportation commission) 13364 (vi).

Railways: I.C.R. (Sydney accommodation) 3698 (ii).

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7276; (roads and bridges) 7285 (iii).

Telegraph Operators, Yukon: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3421 (ii).

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13364 (vi).

Wharf Building by Public Works Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13451 (vi).

Leonard, Mr. J. E. E., *Laval.*

Binder Twine, Circular issued *re* Sales, &c (Ques.) 4180 (ii).

——— Residence of Purchasers, &c. (Ques.) 4182 (ii).

Civil Service Employees, Classification, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 9681 (iv).

Criminal Code (immoral entertainments) Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 3° (amt.) 592 (i).

Duchesneau, Dr., Warden of St. Vincent de Paul, Resignation, &c. (Ques.) 286 (i).

Electoral Lists, Printing, &c. (Ques.) 288 (i).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4766; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 100 4799 (ii).

Leonard, Mr. J. E. E.—*Con.*
G. T. P. Ry. B. 235, French Translation (remarks) 8118 (iv).
Latour, L. J., Circular issued *re* *Le Canada*, &c. (Ques.) 1032 (i).
Le Canada, Circular issued to Postmasters, &c. (Ques.) 1032 (i).
Market Gardeners: *See* 'Garden Products,' &c.
Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 59 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 6531 (iii).
Postal Facilities to Parishes near Montreal, Pets., &c. (Ques.) 12498 (v).
Public Works Employees, Dismissals, Promotions, &c. (M. for ret.) 1058 (i).
St. James Electoral Division, Vacancy (remarks) 7001 (iii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Acting Warden, &c. (Ques.) 10831 (v).
——— Resignation of (Ques.) 286 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Rivière Jesus, dredging) 13470 (vi).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2361 (i).

Logan, Mr. H. J., *Cumberland.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Delay by Govt., &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 14203 (vi).
Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5475 (iii).
Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4404 (ii).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 833 (i).
——— *See* 'Criminal,' &c.
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12559 (v).
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3279 (ii).
Country Postmasters, Salary, &c., in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5677 (iii).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10753 (v).
Cumberland Coal & Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).
France and Can. SS. Subsidy (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 10813 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5184 (iii); on M. for 3°, 8324 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9238 (iv); in Com. on B., 12043, 12116 (v).
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13290 (vi).
Joggins to Minudie, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14329 (vi).
Judgeship, Offer by C. A. Dansereau to Conservative, Par. in Montreal *Star* (remarks) 13805.
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10789 (v).

Logan, Mr. H. J.—*Con.*
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2526 (ii).
Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 141) 1° *, 2237 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act. Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6455 (iii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5677 (iii).
Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 135) 1° *, 2100 (i); M. for Com., 5971; in Com., 5978; (amt.) in Com., 6399 (iii).
Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2581; in Com., 2923 (ii).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 3°, 12450 (v).
Restigouche Boom and Log Driving Co.'s (B. 116) 1° *, 1575 (i).
St. Joseph's Transportation Co.'s incorp. (B. 151) 1° *, 2396 (i).
Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 152) 1° *, 2396 (i).
Springhill, N.S., Boiler Explosion in Dom. Building (remarks) 13257 (vi).
Steel Co. of Can., Loan of Rails, &c. (remarks) 14482 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Geological Survey (exploration, information, &c.) 6823 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 7602 (iv).
Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (Victoria museum) 365; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Bridgewater, dredging) 1074 (i); (Fort Lawrence, pier) 13181; (Victoria beach, wharf) 13214 (vi).
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. (M.) to receive Pet., 4261 (ii).
Trackmen on I.C.R., Salaries, &c., 12559 (vi).
Truro to Parrsboro Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 14494 (vi).

Loy, Mr. G. M., *Beauharnois.*
Beauharnois Canal, Damages *re* Floods (remarks, in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).
Beauharnois Electoral District, Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act, Statement (read) 7102 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Lake St. Francis (dam *re* flooding) 14153 (vi).
Militia (Valleyfield strike) 3594 (ii).

Mackie, Mr. T., *N. Renfrew.*
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5426 (iii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9414 (iv).
Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8107 (iv).
Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineers, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for Copies, 1321 (i).

Mackie, Mr. T.—*Con.*
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11157 (v).

Mackinnon, Mr. D. A., *E. Queen's, P.E.I.*
P.E.I. Ferry Co.'s incorp. B. 180 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 7771 (iv).

SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 7615 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4083, 4105 (ii).
Post Office: Outside Service (P.E.I. winter service) 5940 (iii).
Railways: P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 7539 (iii).

Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s (B. 26) 2° m., 630 (i).

MacLaren, Mr. A. F., *N. Perth.*
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5075 (ii); in Com. on B., 5426 (iii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9898 (iv).
Listowel Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13123 (vi).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr *Blair*) in Com. (telephones) 5542 (iii).

SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Goderich, breakwater) 1366 (i); 13242 (vi).

Maclaren, Mr. W. S., *Huntingdon.*
Budget, The, 1937 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5434 (iii).
Customs Act Amt. B 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3086 (ii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10139 (v).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6187, 6307 (iii); (drainage) 4758 (ii).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7226 (iii).

Maclean, Mr. W. F., *E. York (O.)*
Algonquin Lumber and Power Co.'s incorp. B. 165 (Mr. *Gould*) in Com., 5361 (iii).
Bell Telephone Agreement: *See* 'Telephone,' 'Ry. B. 21.'
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7304 (iii).
Business of the Hse., Delay in printing Bills (remarks 482 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5431 (iii).
Cabinet Changes: *See* 'Ministerial.'
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4369, 4379 (ii).
Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5360, 5555 (iii).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 381 (i).
Criminal Code (immoral entertainments) Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 318 (i).
Crisis in Ont.: *See* 'Lt. Governor.'
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3045; in Com. on B., 4038 (ii).
Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6438 (iii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 308 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7814, 7821; on M. for 3°, 8056 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 7825 (iv).
——— (M.) that Com. rise in order to get Speaker's decision *re* Ques. of Order, 7831, 7832 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10429; (two-cent rate) 10462, 12221 (v).
G. T. R. Transcontinental Ry., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 448 (i).
G. T. Ry. Two-Cent Fare, Repeal of Clause in Original Charter (Ques.) 11556, 11828 (v).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid, &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 677 (i).
Hudson's Bay Change of Name (B. 173) 1°m., 2794 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts Salaries B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 11416 (v).
Lt. Governor of Ont., Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 110, 655, 1204 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 114 (i).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7991 (iv).
Ministerial Changes, Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 166 (i).
Montreal-Longueuil Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 156 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) in Com., 5558 (iii).
Mowat, Lt. Gov. of Ont.: *See* 'Lt. Governor.'
Municipal Rights *re* Tramways, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Bill, 6082 (iii).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6430 (iii).
N. W. T., Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12309 (v).
——— Representation in Senate B. 253 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 12302 (v).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6453 (iii).
Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 2597, 3538 (ii), 5344, 5352, 5561, 6082, 6173, 6253, 6271 (iii), 7609, 8126 (iv); (telephones, &c.) 5513 (iii); on M. for 3°, 8334; (amt.) *re* two-cent rate, 6271 (iii); 8334; Neg. (Y. 34; N. 45) 8359 (iv).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Ry. Commissioners Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8121 (iv).
Railway Subsidies (B. 270) in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).
Roberval to James' Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).
St. James Electoral Division, Vacancy (remarks) 410 (i).
St. John Valley Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14323 (vi).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6485 (iii).
Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 478 (i).
South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 455 (i).
Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7042 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Excise (liquor analysis) 5395 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 7581 (iv).
Militia (pay and allowance) 3592; (Valleyfield strike) 3597 (ii).
Post Office (rural mails) 6137 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (mail delivery) 506; (amt.) 511; Ottawa (additional land) 353; Que. (Montreal renewals) 437; (Valleyfield P. O.) 444 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Port Arthur) 3352; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3305 (ii).
Telephone, Bell, Agreement with C. P. R., &c., in Com. on Ry. Bill, 5513 (iii).
Telephone Co.'s (B. 4) 1°*, 92; 2°m., 700 (i).
—— (B. 5.) 1°m., 92; 2°m., 701 (i).
Telephone Legislation (remarks) 291, 409 (i).
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. (remarks) 6091 (iii).
Toronto, Lindsay, &c., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).
Two-cent Ry. Fare: *See* 'G. T. P. Ry. B. 235,' 'Ry. B. 21.'
Winnipeg Beach to Icelandic River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).

Macpherson, Mr. R. G., *Burrard.*
Alaskan Boundary Award, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 14789 (vi).
Aliens, Naturalization Act Amt. B. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5876 (iii).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7353 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com on Res., 4398 (iii).
Cattle purchased in S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5487 (iii).
Chinese Immigration: *See* 'Aliens,' 'G. T. P. B. 235.'
Dom. Election Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13575, 13593 (vi).
Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6447 (iii).
Dry Docks Construction B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. Res., 3014; in Com. on B., 4683 (ii).

Macpherson, Mr. R. G.—*Con.*
Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup.. 4798 (ii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9218 (iv); in Com. on B., 12046, 12205 (v).
Labour Troubles in B.C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 949 (i).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8209 (iv).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature (remarks) 14232 (vi).
Salmon Industry, B.C., Complaints *re* (remarks) 9976 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.: Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 237 (i).
Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6685 (iii).
Vancouver and Coast Kootenay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 87) 1°*, 1111 (i).
Vancouver Land Acquisition (B. 76) 1°*, 872 (i).
Yukon Coast Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 35) 1°*, 446 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. L. G., *N. Simcoe.*
Barrie Wharf, Govt. Aid to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13453 (vi).
Canada Industrial Corporation Limited incorp. (B. 112) 1°*, 1462 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5625 (iii).
Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3226 (ii).
Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5584.
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3265 (ii).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10753 (v).
Depew, Geo. M., Patent Relief (B. 127) 1°*, 1853 (i).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3015 (ii).
General Inspection Act (hides) Amt. (B. 48) 1°m., 592 (i), 2°m., 2786 (ii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 64) 1°*, 707 (i), Order for Com., 4132; in Com., 4871 (ii), 5138 (iii), 7814-7913; 3°m., 8055, 8321 (iv).
—— on Amt. (Mr. *Wilmot*) Ques. of Order, 8067 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11358 (v).
Hawkestone Wharf, Govt. Aid (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13453 (vi).
Judges of Provincial Courts Salaries B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8108 (iv), 10772, 10777; in Com. on B., 11410 (v).
Lt. Governor of Ontario, Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 113 (i).
Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s (B. 62) 1°*, 707 (i); in Com., 2716 (ii).
Parliament Grounds, Mutilation of Lawn (remarks) 2422 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. L. G.—*Con.*
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6237, 6305 (iii); (drainage) 4741 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. (B. 136) 1°*, 2100 (i), 2°m., 3288 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Post Office (Barrie, branch P.O.) 6062 (iii).
Winnipeg Western Land Corporation Limited Co.'s (B. 61) 1°*, 707 (i).

McColl, Mr. J. B., *W. Northumberland (O.)*
Alnwick, Mississaga Indians, Claims, &c. (Ques.) 6895 (iii).
Consolidated Trust Corporation incorp. (B. 121) in Com., 3223 (ii).

McCool, Mr. C. A., *Nipissing.*
James Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14446 (vi).
Nipissing and James Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 114) 1°*, 1462 (i).
Nipissing and Pontiac Ry. Co.'s (B. 47) 1°*, 591 (i).
Nipissing Surveys on Ottawa River (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vi).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14430 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Miscellaneous (Ottawa river survey) 13350 (vi).
Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14430 (vi).
Waltham to Ferguson, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14448 (vi).

McCormick, Mr. G., *Muskoka and Parry Sound.*
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Wendover, wharf) 1441 (i); Slides and Booms (Gatineau River) 2977; (salaries) 2974; (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2974 (ii).
Yukon Govt. (roads and bridges) 7289 (iii).

McCreary, Mr. W. F., *Selkirk.*
Allen, Wm., Relief (B. 196) 1° m., 4179 (ii).
Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5888, 5961 (iii).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7361 (iii).
Binder Twine, Prices fixed (Ques.) 1595 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5846 (iii).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Canada Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 99) 1°*, 1294 (i).
Canada Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4388, 5117 (ii); in Com. on B., 5806 (iii).
Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3982 (ii).
C.P.R. Expenditure for Rolling Stock in 1902-3 (Ques.) 2311 (i).
Civil Servants, Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3132 (ii).

McCreary, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Country Postmasters: *See* 'Postmasters.'
Fyfe, Mr.: *See* 'Weights B. 188.'
Grain Weighing in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks) in Com. on B. 188, 4198 (ii).
G.T.Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5151, 5227 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10417 (v); on M. for 3°, 12684 (vi).
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13279 (vi).
Great North-western Ry. Co.'s (B. 38) 1°*, 541.
Immigrants, Accommodation for Settlers (remarks) 1123 (i).
Labour Day Adjournment (remarks) 10742 (v).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2523.
Lumber Combine in N.W.T. (remarks) 1585 (i).
Magness, Mr.: *See* 'Weights B. 188.'
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints, &c. (remarks) 14221 (vi).
Man. School Lands, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 6169 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4481 (ii).
Northern Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 51) in Com., 2753 (ii).
Osler, Mr.: *See* 'Privilege.'
Parliament, Delay in Convening (remarks) 14856 (vi).
Père Marquette International Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 132) 1°*, 2014 (i).
Postmasters, Country, Salary Increases (remarks) 14011 (vi).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys., 'Grafter,' 10523, 10529 (v).
Ry. Act. (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 251 (i); in Com., 3539 (ii), 6275 (iii).
Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14338, 14494 (vi).
Ry. Subsidies for Man. Rys., &c. (remarks) 14494 (vi).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11041; (Dauphin) 11774; (Portage La Prairie) 11782; (Toronto) 11743; Winnipeg) 11789 (v.)
Revenue contributed by Man., &c. (remarks) 14495 (vi).
St. Andrews Rapids, Bridge Construction (Ques.) 14284 (vi).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7217 (iii).
S. African Colonies and Preferential Tariff, Res. of Winnipeg Board of Trade (Ques.) 1678 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3292 (ii).
Steele, James Reid, Relief (B. 195) 1°*, 4178 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Customs (stationery, &c.) 3966 (ii).
Dom. Lands (homestead entries) 13966 (vi).

McCreary, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works: Buildings—**Man.** (Winnipeg, immigrant shed) 13126 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers—Generally (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2645 (ii); **Man.** (Dauphin Lake) 1448 (i); (St. Andrew's Rapids) 3356; (snag boat) 2673 (ii); (White Mud, dredging) 1450 (i); **Ont.** (Port Arthur) 3345 (ii).
Quarantine (public health) 5016 (ii).
Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11071 (v).
Weights and Measures Act (scales) Amt. B. 188 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4009, 4198 (ii).
Winnipeg Beach to Icelandic River, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14388 (vi).

McEwen, Mr. G., *S. Huron.*
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7362 (iii).
Census Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13753 (vi).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10755 (v).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7998 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (St. Joseph wharf) 3382 (ii).

McGowan, Mr. J., *C. Wellington.*
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4226 (ii).
Bankers, Private, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 285 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5442 (iii).
Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 396 (i).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 930 (i).
Private Bankers: *See* 'Bankers.'
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11027 (v).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6470 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Customs (linseed oil, seizure) 3935 (ii).
Post Office (postal mail service) 6053 (iii).
Public Works: Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2685 (ii).

McGugan, Mr. M., *S. Middlesex.*
London Loan Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 101) 1°*, 1295 (i).
London and Port Stanley Ry. Co.'s (B. 63) 1°*, 707 (i).

McIntosh, Mr. J., *Sherbrooke.*
Eastern Township's Bank (B. 25) 1°*, 367 (i).

McIsaac, Mr. C. F., *Antigonish.*
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 64) M. to ref. back to Com., 4586 (ii).
Keller Heating Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 231) M. to rec. Pet., 7091; 1°*, 7294 (iii).

McIsaac, Mr. C. F.—*Con.*
Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s (B. 177) M. to rec. Pet., 2778; 1°*, 3219 (ii).
Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co.'s incorp. (B. 131) 1°*, 2014 (i); in Com., 5093 (ii), 5359 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, **N.S.** (Bayfield, wharf) 13141; (Benoit's Cove) 13143 (vi); **Que.** (Grande Vallée, pier) 1544 (i).

McLennan, Mr. A., *Inverness.*
Euxine, Scuttling of Schr. (M. for cor.) 699 (i).
SUPPLY:
Postoffice: Outside Service (ry. mail service, N.S.) 5949; (postal service, Inverness) 6051 (iii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers Generally (dredges, repairs) 2628 (ii); **N.S.** (Broad Cove) 13199 (vi); (Grand Etang bridge works) 1095; (Margaree, wharf) 1133 (i); (Pleasant Bay) 13205 (vi); (Port Hawkesbury) 1146 (i); (Port Hood, pier) 13206 (vi).

Madore, Mr. J. A. C., *Hochelaga.*
Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com. (presented) 1461 (i).
Sugar imported into Canada, 1902 (M. for stmnt.*) 3236 (ii).

Malouin, Mr. A., *Centre Quebec.*
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9882 (iv).

Marcil, Mr. C., *Bonaventure.*
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. for 2°, 1506; (amt.) 664 (i); on M. to ref. back to Com., 6621 (iii).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on M. for Com., 1804; in Com., 1806 (i).
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co., and Sen. Amts. to Exchequer Court Amt. B. 155 (remarks) 14770 (vi).
——— *See* 'Exchequer B. 155.'
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Subsidy, Claims' &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3299 (ii).
Baie de Chaleur Ry.: *See* 'Atlantic,' &c.
British Cable News Service B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8241 (iv).
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on Ques. of Order, 7342 (iii).
Campaign Literature and Improper Use of Mail Bags, Complaint, &c. (remarks) 14219 (vi).
C. P. R. to Brownsburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 11459 (vi).
Can. Associated Press Despatches: *See* 'British.'
Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6447 (iii).
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8259 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 14770 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9351 (iv).

Marcil, Mr. C.—*Con.*

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 751 (i).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2507 (ii).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaint *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 14219 (vi).

New Canadian Co.'s incorp. B. 83 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 1512 (i).

Newspaper Despatches from England: *See* 'British.'

Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 59 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 1327, 1511 (i); on M. to ref. back to Com., 6530, 6621 (iii).

Press Despatches from England: *See* 'British.'

Public Works Dept., Control of, &c.: *See* 'Supply—Public Works.'

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13507 (vi).

Justice, Administration of: Supreme Court (library) 3404 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 7756 (iv).

Militia (Valleyfield strike) 3754 (ii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Bonaventure East, breakwater) 13446; (Caplan breakwater) 13449 (vi); (Cross Point pier) 1513; (Grande Vallée pier) 1515 (i); (Maguasha pier) 13461 (vi); (Maria pier) 2265 (i); (Newport breakwater) 13463; (New Richmond breakwater) 13463; (Paspebiac landing pier) 13464; (St. Godfroi de Nouvelle breakwater) 13490; (Shegawake harbour) 13479 (vi); (transfer of works to Marine Dept.) 2649 (ii).

Railways: I. C. R. (Restigouche bridge) 8304 (iv).

Marcil, Mr. J. E., *Bagot.*

G. T. P. Ry. B., Pets. from Bagot (ques. of privilege) 12941 (vi).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6502 (iii).

Matheson, Mr. J., *Richmond (N.S.)*

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6911 (iii).

Fishing Industry in N.S., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13172 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11029; (N.S.) 11797 (v).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Buildings, N.S. (Arichat) 5828 (iii); Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Breton's Cove) 13172 (vi); (Janvrin's Island wharf) 1102 (i).

Meigs, Mr. D. B., *Missisquoi.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10472 (v).

Monet, Mr. D., *Laprairie and Napierville.*

Pensions to S. A. Contingent by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14598 (vi).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3895 (ii).

Monet, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6506 (iii).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7035, 7043 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6687; (creed lines) 6698; (repatriation agents) 6700 (iii).

Militia (military properties) 3620; (properties) 3613 (ii).

Transportation Commission, &c., Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks) 861 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*

Address, on The, 55 (ii).

Alaskan Boundary: *See* 'Colonial,' &c.

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s (B. 36) 2°m., 664 (i).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen, Tate & Co.'s Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6963 (iii).

Beauharnois Electoral District Representation, and Independence of Parliament Act (M. to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com.) 7095 (iii).

Boards of Trade and Distribution of Public Documents (remarks) 1378 (i).

Bonaventure Station, Terminal Facilities, Amounts paid by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 706 (i).

——— (Ques.) 666 (i).

British Cable News Service between Can. and G. B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 10715; in Com., 10718 (v).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on M. for 3°, 7468 (iii).

Business of the Hse, Delay in printing Bills (remarks) 482 (i).

——— Govt. Legislation, &c. (remarks) 1343 (i).

——— (remarks) 5051 (ii); 11062 (v).

Butter and Cheese Weighing, Rep. *re*, &c. (Ques.) 5414 (iii).

Butter sold at Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 1593, 1857 (i).

Cabinet Changes: *See* 'Ministerial.'

Canadian Chamber of Commerce at Paris, &c. (Ques.) 1297 (i).

Can. Press Despatches: *See* 'British,' &c.

Cartierville Workmen, Treatment by Govt. Contractors (remarks) in Com. on B. 235, 11288 (v).

See 'Racine,' &c 'Nelson,' &c.

Census Commissioners for Prov. of Que., Travelling Expenses, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 1058 (i).

Census Expenditure, Notice of M., 13368 (vi).

Census 1901, Cost to Date, &c. (Ques.) 1593 (i).

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. Joseph, Speech *re* Canadian Tariff (remarks) 13375 (vi).

Chambly Canal, Collector, &c., Superannuation (Ques.) 7203 (iii).

Cigarette Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Rickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3288 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B., on M. (Sir *William Mulock*) to wthdrw., 11301 (v).

Colonial Conference, Bond-Hay Treaty and Alaska, Inquiry for Ret., 853 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Committees meeting concurrently with Sittings of the Hse. (remarks) 8333 (iv).
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3261 (ii).
Consolidated Trust Corporation incorp. B. 121 (Mr. *McColl*) in Com., 3223 (ii).
Country Postmasters, Salary, &c., in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5677 (iii).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6640, 7498 (iii).
Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 1326 (i), 3241 (ii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3100; in Com. on B., 4010 (ii).
Customs Employes, Transfers, &c. (Ques.) 5318 (iii).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3606 (ii).
Dugas, Mr. Blaise, Amount paid *re* Trip in Foreign Countries (Ques.) 1034 (i).
Dundonald, Earl: *See* 'G.O.C.'
Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3582 (ii).
Estimates, Suppl., Inquiry for, 10832 (v).
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8360 (iv).
Fair Wage Clause in Govt. Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7156 (iii).
——— *See* 'Nelson,' &c.
Fisher, Chas. A. L., Inspector of Public Works, Salary, Qualifications, &c. (Ques.) 1592 (i).
France and Canada SS. Subsidy (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 10804 (v).
Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4772 (ii).
G. O. C., Lord Dundonald's Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2413 (i).
G. T. P. Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7821, 7858; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 8324 (iv).
G. T. P. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8526 (iv); 10411; in Com. on B., 10412, 10574, 10650, 11287, 11302 (v).
——— on M. for Com. on Res., Notice of Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) 10315 (v).
——— Order, Ques. of, Ruling asked *re* reporting debates of Com., 10633; Ruling of Chairman (Mr. *Belcourt*) sustained (Y. 52; N. 30) 10634 (v).
——— Govt's Intention *re* Quebec to Moncton scheme, 10537 (v).
——— Govt. Policy (remarks) 5765, 7487 (iii).
——— Subsidy from Govt., &c. (Ques.) 671, 1031 (i).
——— Surveys, Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 14647 (vi).
——— *See* 'Transcontinental.'

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
G. T. Ry., Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, &c. (M. for ret.*) 706 (i).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid, &c. (M. for ret.) 676, 688; Neg. (Y. 35; N. 66) 690 (i).
Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, &c., on M. for Sup., 6612 (iii).
Incorporated Companies B. 94 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3258 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 186 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4008 (ii).
Insolvency Act Amt. (B. 53) 1° m., 654 (i); 2° m., 2373 (i), 2787, 3248; Neg. (Y. 42; N. 74) 3256 (ii).
Insurance Rates on Steamers *re* St. Lawrence Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7591 (iv).
I. C. R. and G. T. Ry., Terminal Facilities at Bonaventure, &c. (Ques.) 666 (i).
——— *See* 'Bonaventure,' 'G.T.R.'
I. C. R., River Ouelle, Branch Line, Total Cost (Ques.) 10490 (v).
Interpretation Act Amt. (B. 18) 1° m., 125; 2. m., 566, 705, 916 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7953 (iv); in Com. on B., 10799 (v).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10759, 10768 (v).
Labour Day Adjournment (remarks) 10712, 10743 (v).
L'Assomption Post Office, Site, &c. (Ques.) 3230 (ii).
——— Letters, Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 3236 (ii).
——— Receipts, Cheques, &c. (M. for copies*) 3236 (ii).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10799 (v).
Lévis, Land purchased for I.C.R., on M. for O. Cs. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 3806 (ii).
Lt. Governor of Ont., Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 659 (i).
Litigation Expenses, Fees, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vi).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal, Govtl. Action (remarks) 2504 (ii).
——— *See* 'Montreal.'
Loy, Geo. M., M.P., Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act (remarks) 7095 (iii).
——— on M. to conc. in Rep. of Priv. and Elections Com. (amt.) 8008 (iv).
——— (M.) to print Evidence, 7917 (iv).
Martineau, Mr., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 10242 (v).
Mayrand, Denis, Petition *re* Dismissal (Ques.) 9082 (iv).
Ménard, Denis, Charges against, &c. (Ques.) 3536 (ii).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Milk Can Bill: *See* 'Weights and Measures.'

Ministerial Changes, on Explanation, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 90, 179 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4448, 4482 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 8084 (iv).

Montreal Longshoremen's Strike, Payment of Militia (Ques.) 4006 (ii).

——— *See* 'Longshoremen.'

Montreal Post Office Buildings, Enlargement, &c. (Ques.) 666 (i).

——— Investigation *re*, &c. (Ques.) 3972 (ii).

——— *See* 'Post Office.'

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness, &c. (M. for stmnt.) 672 (i).

Mowat, Sir Oliver: *See* 'Lt.-Gov.'

Murray Bay and St. Denis Wharf SS. Service, Amount paid by Govt. (Ques.) 10496 (v).

Nelson P.O., B.C., Labourers, Claims *re* Contractors (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7157 (iii).

——— Agreements between Employees and Contractors (read) 7162 (iii).

——— Letters read from Labour Dept., &c., 7164 (iii).

See 'Cartierville,' &c., 'Racine.'

New Canadian Company, Limited, B. 83 (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2° m., 1328 (i).

Newspapers in United Kingdom, France and U.S., Amounts paid by Govt. (M. for stmnt.*) 706 (i).

See 'British.'

North Halfway Point, Lightkeeper, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3536 (ii).

N. W. Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 242 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10741 (v).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Be'court*) on M. for 3°, 4869 (ii).

Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 59) 1°*, 707; 2°m., 1327 (i); (M.) to ref. back to Com., 6523; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 87) 6537 (iii).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 10825 (v).

Penny Banks Establishment B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10794 (v).

Petersen-Tate: *See* 'Atlantic.'

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 138, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to wthdrw. B., 11302 (v).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5677 (iii).

Post Office Buildings, Montreal, Enlargement, &c. (Ques.) 666 (i).

See 'Montreal.'

Post Office Employees, Holidays, &c. (Ques.) 4005 (ii).

Post Office Savings Banks B. 220 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6815 (iii).

Post Office Savings Banks Deposits, Defalcations, &c., in Com. of Sup., 14660 (vi).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Preferential Tariff, Speech of Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain (remarks) 13375 (vi).

Préfontaine, Mr., and Speech *re* 'Transcontinental Ry.': *See* 'Transportation,' &c.

Printing of Bills: *See* 'Business,' &c.

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys., 'Grafters,' 10531 (v).

——— (ques. of order) 10505 (v).

Public Accounts Com. producing Census Schedules (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7059 (iii).

Public Documents, Distribution to Board of Trade (remarks) 1378 (i).

Public Works Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. *Sutherland*) on M. for 1°, 3970 (ii).

Public Works Dept., Transfer of Control, &c., B. 269 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14746 (vi)

Public Works, Preservation of Health, Regulations *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1857 (i).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14697, 14700 (vi).

Quebec Bridge, Application for Further Aid (Ques.) 10496 (v).

Quesnel, Jules, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 7203 (iii).

Racette, V., Purchase of Land, &c. (Ques.) 3231 (ii).

Racine Bros., Claims against Contractors *re* Nelson Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7157 (iii).

See 'Cartierville,' 'Nelson,' &c.

Ry. Commissioners, Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8123 (iv).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3549, 3832, 4728 (ii), 5694 (iii), 8134, 8170 (iv).

——— (fire damages) Amt. B. 23 (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) on M. for 2°, 2782 (ii).

——— (fire guards) Amt. B. 16 (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for 2°, 871 (i).

Ry. Debts Bill: *See* 'Exchequer.'

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2564 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 546; in Com., 550; (M.) to ref. to Com. on Rys., 551 (i).

Railway Subsidies, Inquiry for, 10955 (v).

Ry. Transportation from N. W. T., Grain Blockade, on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. to Sup., 2472 (i).

Richelieu River Inundations, &c. (Ques.) 10496.

Reports, Deptl., French Translation, Delay in Issuing (remarks) 479 (i).

Representations in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10832; in Com., 10958, 11028, 11114 (v).

St. James (Montreal) Electoral Division, Issue of Writ (M.) 707, 940 (i).

——— (remarks) 40.) (i), 6995 (iii), 13376 (vi).

St. Mary's Current Wharf, Contract with Poupore & Malone (M. for copy of contract*) 706 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. (M.) that Com. rise, 6496 (iii).

Session of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 475 (i).

Slater Shoe Co. and Alien Labour, Res. of Shoemakers Union (read) 14666 (vi).

S. African Contingent, Saddles and Bridles, &c. (Ques.) 1675 (i).

S. A. War, Supplies purchased by Imp. Govt., on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) for O. Cs., 2761 (ii).

See 'Hay,' &c.

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 457 (i).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron,' &c.

Steel Rails, Contract, Price, &c. (Ques.) 285 (i).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7036 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (archives) 4429; (criminal statistics) 4429 (ii); (Drolet, census schedules) 7055 (iii); (experimental farms) 4548; (general statistics) 4432; (imperial institute) 4435 (ii).

Canals: Chambly (land damages) 12908; (landing wharfs) 12909; Generally (salaries and contingencies) 12933; (toll collectors) 12929 (vi).

Civil Govt.: Labour Dept. ('Gazette' correspondents, Montreal) 7155 (iii).

Customs (inspectors, preventive, &c.) 3949; (preferential tariff) 3943; (stationery, printing, &c.) 3963 (ii).

Geological Survey (Dr. Bell's appnmt.) 6816; (explorations, &c.) 6816; (instruments purchased) 6820 (iii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6660; (expenditure) 6615; (Fabre, Dr., medical inspector) 6662, 6850; (Hungarians, &c.) 6694; (medical inspection) 6852; (trachoma, inspection) 6668; (U. S. agents) 6850 (iii).

Indians: Yukon Ter. (relief, medical attendance, &c.) 7271; (travelling expenses) 7272 (iii).

Interior (assay office, Vancouver) 6799; (Genelle *vs.* The King) 6795; (Keewatin govt., expenses) 6798; (litigation expenses) 6795; (maps, engraving, &c.) 6800 (iii).

Justice: Miscellaneous (Statutes, Revision) 14644 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Anticosti lightship) 5737; (*Bayfield*, str., reps. *re*) 5748; (light houses construction) 5737; (St. Lawrence route) 5758 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Montreal ports) 7591 (iv).

Militia (annual drill) 3607 (ii); (Cole *vs.* Cooke, costs) 6950 (iii); (Cottee, Herbert, salary, &c.) 3610; (pay and allowance) 3586; (properties) 3612; (stores branch) 3609; (Valleyfield strike) 3586 (ii).

Miscellaneous (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6986; (naturalization act, expenses) 6953; (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6962 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Dom. steamers, repairs) 5033; (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 4041; (Govt. steamers, supplies) 4047; (St. Lawrence, obstruction, &c.) 4041 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Mar. Provs. (renewals, &c.) 422 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

N.B., St. John (quarantine, water service) 415, 486 (i); (St. John water service) 486.

N.S. (Halifax) 411 (i).

Que. (Lévis) 431; (Montreal examining warehouse) 433; (Montreal, renewals) 436; (renewals, &c.) 422; (St. Hyacinthe) 441; (Valleyfield P. O.) 443 (i).

Docks (commissioner's reps.) 2984 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's Rapids) 3354 (ii).

Ont. (Port Arthur) 3348 (ii).

Que. (Montreal harbour, 3365; (Quebec harbour improvements) 3336; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3304; (Sorel deep water wharf) 3376 (ii).

Miscellaneous (arbitration and awards) 13339 (vi); (general expenditure) 2925 (ii); (Ottawa river surveys) 13341 (vi); (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2925 (ii); (transportation commission) 13365 (vi).

Slides and Booms (repairs, &c.) 2979 (ii).

Telegraph Lines: N.W.T. (Wood Mountain, &c.) 13336 (vi).

Railways: I.C.R. (Ouelle River branch) 7526 (iii); Miscellaneous (litigation expenses) 12913 (vi); P.E.I. Ry. (Murray Harbour branch) 7534 (iii).

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7275; (govtl. expenses) 6802 (iii).

Tarte, Mr., Resignation: *See* 'Ministerial.'

Telegraphic System, N.W.T. and C.P.R. Connection (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vi).

Tobacco (Canadian) in Foreign Countries, Sale, &c., Amounts paid to Mr. Blaise Dugas, &c. (Ques.) 1034 (i).

Tobacco Combine, Rep. (Ques). 1297 (i).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co., Application for Subsidy, &c. (Ques.) 1026 (i).

Trans-Canada Ry., Sale to G.T. Pacific Co., Par. in Toronto *News*, 7566 (iv).

Transcontinental Ry., Govt. Policy (remarks 5765 (iii).

———Proposals to Govt. (Ques.) 874 (i).

See 'G.T.P.R.'

Translation of Deptl. Reports: *See* 'Reports.'

Transportation Commission and Tariff Inquiry, Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks) 853 (i).

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13365 (vi).

Treadgold Concessions, Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. on Sup., 4505 (ii).

———(remarks) 3876 (ii).

———Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11064 (v).

Trent Canal Surveys, &c. on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2330 (i).

Turnpike Trust, Montreal, Indebtedness, &c. (M. for stmnt.) 672 (i).

Two Mountains Ry. Facilities, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Ethier*) 7569 (iv).

Valleyfield P.O., Erection, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ques.) 98 (i).

Veterinary Chief Inspectors, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1591 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Victoria Bridge, Montreal, Amounts paid by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 706 (i).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 3245; on M. to ref. to Special Com., 3247 (ii).

Wiallard, Paul, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 11188 (v).

Yukon District Newspapers, Amounts paid by Govt. (M. for stmnt.*) 706 (i).

Morin, J. B., *Dorchester.*

Budget, The, 2034 (i).

Chabot, Mr. F.X., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2015 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12553 (v).

Employees in H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14115 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7903 (iv.)

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12053 (v); on M. for 3° (amt.) 12774 (vi).

———Parishes crossed, Lévis to Temiscouata (Ques.) 8117 (iv).

——— on Pets. presented (remarks) 12942 (vi).

———Surveys, in Com. of Sup., 14647 (vi).

House of Commons, Employees: *See* 'Employees.'

Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) 5726 (iii).

Military Riding School, St. John d'Iberville, &c. (Ques.) 8616 (iv).

Moreau, Dr., Appnmt. at Chambly Canal (Ques.) 8331, 8488 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Subsidy paid, &c. (Ques.) 10496 (v).

Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14449 (vi).

Railway Accidents, Investigation into (remarks) 1337 (i).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14449 (vi).

Red Deer Valley Ry. & Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 1815 (i).

Ross Rifle, Examination, Approval, &c. (Ques.) 2758 (ii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6517 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Immigration (U.S. agents) 6857 (iii).
Legislation: H. of C. (tradesmen, &c.) 14115 (vi)
Post Office (country postmasters) 6060 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings—**N.W.T.** (Yorkton court-house) 961; **Que.** (L'Assomption) 429; (Levis) 432 (i); (Levis, P.O.) 13055; (Montmagny, P.O.) 13066; (St. John's, P.O.) 13060 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers—**Que.** (Anse aux Gris Fonds) 13445; (Bonaventure East, breakwater) 13446 (vi); (Cacouna, wharf) 5897 (iii); (Caplan, breakwater) 13451 (vi); (Chateauguay River) 3209 (ii); (Chateau Richer) 13455 (vi); (Crane Island, wharf) 1513 (i); (Desjardins, Allumette, wharf) 13457; (Grand Rivière, wharf) 13457 (vi); (Grande Vallee, pier) 1514 (i); (Grosbois Isle) 5902; (Hull, wharf) 5902 (iii); (Kamouraska, pier) 13458; (Mistook, wharf) 13461; (Mont Louis, wharf) 13461 (vi); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3305 (ii); (St. Laurent, wharf) 5907; (St. Jerome, wharf) 5909; (St. Maurice River) 5905; (St. Nicholas, pier) 5905 (iii); (Sorel, deep water wharf) 3374 (ii); (Valleyfield, dredging) 5905 (iii)

Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2678, 2689.

Telegraph Lines (Petite Rivière, St. Agnes) 13334 (vi).

Quarantine (small-pox) 5025 (ii).
Railways—I. C. R. (Chaudière, engine-house) 14106 (vi); Ouelle River Branch) 7527 (iii).
Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7280 (iii).

Trottier, Louis M., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 8488 (iv).

Valleyfield Strike, 1900 (Ques.) 2759 (ii).

Morrison, Mr. A., *New Westminster.*

British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 50) 1°*, 654 (i).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s (B. 45) 1°*, 591.

Century Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 175) 1°*, 3126.

Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B., in Com. on Res., 611 (i), 5555, 5583, 6199 (iii).

Dominion Institute of Amalgamated Engineering (B. 32) 1°*, 367 (i).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6901 (iii).

Grand Trunk Pacific Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8859 (iv).

Japanese Immigration (remarks) 3713 (ii).

Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 33) 1°*, 367 (i).

Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 41) 1°*, 591 (i).

Man. and North-western Ry. Co. of Can. (B. 44) 1°*, 591 (i).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8261 (iv).

Private Bills (M.) to extend Time, 10489 (v).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14491 (vi).

Salmon Industry, B.C., Complaints, &c. (remarks) 9970 (iv).

Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.'s B. 87 (Mr. *Macpherson*) in Com., 4588 (ii).

Wellington and Union Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14491 (vi).

Westminster Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 249) 1°*, 10744; (M.) to receive Pet., 10744 (v).

Yukon Telegraph Line, Management, &c., Par. in *Post Intelligencer*, 7003 (iii).

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm., K.C.M.G. (Postmaster General) *North York, O.*

Alliance Bank of Canada's incorp. B. 212 (Mr. *Russell*) in Com., 7471 (iii).

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.—*Con.*

Alien Labour Act, Prosecutions, &c. (Ans.) 3971.
See 'Naturalization.'

Alien Restriction Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 3285 (ii).

Ashcroft-Barkerville Mail Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1595 (i).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6958, 6966 (iii).
See 'Supply—Mail Subsidies,' &c.

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11171 (v).

Auditor General and Civil Service Bill (remarks) in Com., 13809 (vi).

Balaclava and Owen Sound Mail Contract (Ans.) 13263 (vi).

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6383 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7367 (iii).

Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation, &c. (remarks) 6758 (iii).

Bloomfield Postmaster, Charges against, &c. (Ans.) 819 (i).

Brecken, Mr., P.O. Inspector, P.E.I. (remarks) 14002 (vi).

B. C. Labour Troubles, Commissioners' Appnmt. (Ans.) 1596 (i), 8116 (iv).
See 'Labour.'

Brockvillle and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7445 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7339 (iii).

Business of the Hse., Govt. Legislation, &c, (remarks) 1346 (i).

——— (remarks) 3794 (ii), 7487 (iii).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5064 (ii).

Campaign Literature and Franking Privilege (Ans.) 14286 (vi).

——— and Mail Bags, Complaints, &c. (remarks) 14222 (vi).

——— Govt. Ownership (Ans.) 14286 (vi).
See 'Mail Bags.'

C.A.R. Section-Men's Strike (remarks) 2303 (i).

Canada Foundry Co'.s Strike (remarks) 7205 (iii).
See 'Scotch,'

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5105 (ii).

C.P.R. Lands in Man. Exempt from Taxation, &c. (Ans.) 667 (i).
See 'Lands.'

Cane Bros., Timber License, &c. (Ans.) 2757 (ii).

Cartierville Workmen, Treatment by Govt. Contractors (remarks) in Com. on B. 235, 11288 (v).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5480 (iii).

Charlottetown, P.E.I., Free Delivery, &c. (remarks) 14010 (vi).

Chevrier Family, Number in Govt. (Ans.) 12499 (v).

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.—*Con.*

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 245) 1°m., 9079 (iv), wthdn., 11301 (v).

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 257) Res. prop., 11829; in Com. on Res., 12330, 12493, 12500, 12574 (v), 13809, 13833 (vi); 3°m, 13942 (vi).

Civil Servants and Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3176, 3185 (ii).

Civil Servants and Guarantee Companies (Ans.) 3233 (ii).

Collingwood Dry Dock: *See* 'Dry Docks Bill.'

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) on M. for 2°, 3259 (ii).

Conciliation Boards, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3629 (ii).

Country Postmasters: *See* 'Postmasters,' &c.

Cutler and Gore Bay Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iii).

——— (Ans.) 2308 (i).

Cutler, Spanish Mills, &c., Tender (Ans.) 2308.

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3098 (ii).

Dom. Lands, Man. and N.W.T. Sale, Prices paid, &c. (Ans.) 671, 816 (i).

Doukhobors, Homestead Entries, &c. (Ans.) 542.

——— Pilgrimage, Expenses, Losses, &c. Ans.) 542 (i).

——— Govt. Action, &c. (Ans.) 1031 (i).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3021; in Com. on B., 4682 (ii).

Enterprise Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 14008 (vi).

Ernestown Station, Postmaster, Change, &c. (Ans.) 1034 (i).

Fair Wage Schedule on Govt. Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7156 (iii).
See 'Labour,' &c,

False Creek Lease to Burnett & Kelly (Ans.) 2758 (ii).

Fast Atlantic Service: *See* 'Atlantic,' &c.

Govt. Business: *See* 'Business.'

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 64 (Mr. *McIsaac*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 4586 (ii); in Com., 7836, 7877 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9751 (iv); in Com. on B., 10564, 10624, 11190, 11288, 11348 (v).
See 'Transportation,' &c.

Half-Breeds Claims Commission, on Inquiry for Ret., 3397 (ii).

Haanel, Dr., Duties as Supt. of Mines (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13767 (vi).

Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 685.

House of Commons, Ventilation: *See* 'Ventilation.'

Immigration, Accommodation for Settlers (remarks) 1127 (i).

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.—*Con.*

Immigration into Can. Nationality, &c. (Ans.) 2310 (i).

——— Number refused admittance, &c. (Ans.). 2310 (i), 2502 (ii).

Immigration into Man., Houses and Fuel (Ans.) 542 (i).

——— Medical Inspection, Appnmts. by Govt. (Ans.) 2757 (ii).

Immigration Office for Ireland, Closing, &c. (Ans.) 1032 (i).

Immigration for Ont., Govtl. Action (Ans.) 1593 (i).

Immigration, Provision for Settlers on C.P.R. Trains, &c. (remarks) 868 (i).

——— Total Number, Origin, Expenditure, &c. (Ans. 1035 (i).

Imperial Agency incorp. B. No. 71 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) in Com., 3170 (ii).

Indian Agents, Guardians, &c. (Ans.) 819 (i).

Indian Medical Attendant, Kings, N.B. (Ans.) 2502 (ii).

Insurance Rates on Ocean Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7597 (iv).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 705 (i).

Interier, Deptl. Rep., Illustrations, &c. (Ans.) 3972 (ii).

Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14391 (vi).

Jonasson, Mr. S., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1198 (i).

Labour Commission, B.C., Rep. *re* (Ans.) 1596 (i), 8116 (iv).

Labour Commission of 1886, Names, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 8083 (iv).

Labour Council, Toronto: *See* 'Toronto.'

Labour Disputes, Settlement, &c. (Ans.) 4003 (ii). *See* 'Ry. Labour Disputes,' 'Fair Wage.'

Labour Gazette Correspondents, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 7204 (iii).

Labour Troubles in B.C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 951 (i).

——— (Ans.) 1596 (i).

Lambton Postmistress, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 6166 (ii), 14278, 14651, 14661 (vi).

Lands (Govt.) available for Settlers, in B.C., &c. (Ans.) 4836 (ii).

——— Grants to Rys., Areas, &c. (Ans.) 2102 (i).

——— Sales, Winnipeg, Purchasers, &c. (Ans.) 1858 (i).

——— Subsidies to Rys. unearned (Ans.) 3797 (ii). *See* 'C.P.R.,' &c., 'Rys,' &c.

Latour, Mr., Absence from Dept. to canvass for *Le Canada* (remarks) 14002 (vi).

——— *See* 'Postmasters in Que.'

Letter Carriers, in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5672 (iii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Post Office.'

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.—*Con.*

Lime Rock, N.S., Postmaster's Salary, &c. (Ans.) 1297 (i).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2515 (ii).

Macleod, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 8083 (iv).

McNulty: *See* 'Lambton.'

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints, &c. (remarks) 14222 (vi).

——— Statement *re* Special Trains, 14681 (vi).

——— Statement *re* Threats to Express Cos., 14851 (vi).

——— (remarks) 14540 (vi).

——— *See* 'Campaign.'

Mails carried by Rys., &c. (Ans.) 6268 (iii).

Mails carried *via* New York (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7728 (iv).

Mail Cars, N.W.T., Insufficient Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6049 (iii).

Mail Clerks: *See* 'P.O. B. 208.'

Maps, Printing and Publishing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14273 (vi).

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5099 (ii).

Miller Bros. and P.O. Bank Deposits, Defalcation of Postmaster, 14274, 14655 (vi).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4483 (ii).

Montreal Post Office, Enlargement of Building, &c. (Ans.) 666 (i).

——— Investigation *re* (Ans.) 3973 (ii).

Naturalization Act, Regulations, &c. Ans.) 2015 (i).

——— *See* 'Aliens,' &c.

Nelson Post Office, B.C., Claims of Labourers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7157 (iii). *See* 'Cartierville.'

Nepigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14396 (vi).

Nesbitt P.O., Man., Postmaster Watson, as Lib. Candidate (Ans.) 1196 (i).

Newmarket Office Specialty Co. (personal explanation) 13256 (vi).

N.W.T., Postal Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14040 (vi). *See* 'Mail Cars, &c.'

Orleans Island Mail Service, &c. (Ans.) 670 (i).

Ottawa Supply Co. *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6146 (iii).

Parkhill Mail Contract, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 1594 (i).

Personal Explanation *re* Newmarket Specialty Co., 13256 (vi).

Petersen-Tate Deposit: *See* 'Atlantic.'

Picton Mail Service, Irregular Delivery, &c. (remarks) 13135 (vi).

Pneumatic Tube Service *re* Postal Service (remarks) 13993 (vi).

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.—*Con.*

Portage, P.E.I., Opening of Post Office (remarks) 14008 (vi).

Postal Facilities *re* Parishes near Montreal (Ans.) 12498 (v).

Postal Newspaper Boxes, Manufacture, &c. (Ans.) 14283 (vi).

Postal Service N.W.T. : *See* 'N.W.T.'

Postmasters' Association, Memorial *re* Salaries (Ans.) 129 (i), 13263 ; (remarks) 14016 (vi).

Postmasters' Bonds and Insurance Fund (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14655 (vi).

Postmasters, Country, Increases in Salaries (remarks) 6038 (iii) ; 14012 (vi).

Postmaster General's Rep. (presented) 89 (i).
——— (remarks) 879 (i).

Postmasters in Man. and N.W.T., Pet. *re* Salaries (Ans.) 129 (i) ; 13263 (vi).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14016 (vi).

Postmasters in Quebec and Newspaper Agents (remarks) 14672 (vi).
——— *See* 'Latour.'

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. (B. 208) 2° m., 5657 ; in Com., 5659 (iii).

Post Office, Deptl. Rep., Distribution, &c. (presented) 89 ; (remarks) 879 (i).

Post Office Employees, Holidays granted, &c. (Ans.) 4006 (ii).

Post Offices in Cities, Revenue and Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 667 (i).

Post Office Insurance Fund, Rep. *re* (remarks) 14661 (vi).

Post Office Savings Banks Defalcations, in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).
——— Statement *re* Progress, in Com. of Sup., 14012 (vi).

Préfontaine, Mr., Speech *re* G. T. P. Ry. : *See* 'Transportation.'

P.E.I. Coal Fields, &c. (Ans.) 2504 (ii).
——— *See* 'Winter Communication.'

Protective Tariff, Govt. Policy, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6689 (iii).

Public Works, Contracts awarded, &c. (Ans.) 9080 (iv).

Racine Bros. : *See* 'Nelson,' &c.

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 7609, 8125 (iv).

Ry. Labour Disputes (B. 17) 2° m., 2535 ; in Com., 2580, 2923 ; 3° m., 3004, 3298 (ii) ; on Sen. Amts., 5654 (iii).

Ry. Land Subsidies in Man. N.W.T., reserved, &c. (Ans,) 2307 (i).
——— Unpatented (Ans.) 2583 (ii).
——— Subsidies voted, &c., Govtl. Action *re* Selection (Ans.) 4832 (ii).
See 'Saskatchewan,' 'Lands,' &c.

Ry. Mail Clerks, in Com. on Post Office Amt. B. 208, 5659 (iii).
——— *See* 'P.O. Bill 208.' 'Supply,' &c.

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.—*Con.*

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14349 (vi).

Railway Subsidies, General Policy (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14349 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies granted to Provs. (remarks) 14485 (vi).

Ry. Transportation Policy : *See* 'Transportation.'

Rainy River Mail Service (remarks) 6890 (iii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10881 ; in Com., 10924 ; (Norfolk) 11117 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to M. for 3°, 12470 (v).

Robson, Michael, Dismissal from Ayr Post Office (Ans.) 1195 (i).

Ronan, Mr., and Ottawa Supply Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).

Rural Mail Delivery (Ans.) 13259 (vi).
——— P.E.I. (remarks) 13806 (vi).
——— *See* Supply—'Post Office,' &c.

St. Boniface, Postal Facilities, &c. (Ans.) 1859 (i).

St. Chrysostôme Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. *Brown*) in Com., 7772 (iv).

Saskatchewan Land Co., Sales, &c. (Ans.) 2502 (ii).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co.'s Property (Ans.) 2306 (i).

Scotch Iron Moulders and Toronto Strike (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7192 (iii).
See 'Can. Foundry.'

Scotia, Str., Salvage Claims (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7151 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Agriculture (exhibitions) 4624 (ii).
Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 272 (i).
Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 234 (i).
Interior (salaries) 267 (i).
Labour Dept. (*Gazette* cors., Montreal) 7154, 7155 ; (salaries) 7151 ; (Thompson, Mr. P., remuneration) 7152 (iii).
See 'Labour Dept.'
Post Office (junior 2nd-class clerks) 13995 ; (mail clerks) 13997 ; (Smith, F. H., salary) 14000 (vi).
Dom. Lands (maps, printing, &c.) 14273 (vi).
Fisheries (Hurley, J. M., inspector) 5125 (ii).
Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6689 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7772 ; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7784 (iv).
Justice, Administration of, Ont. (Nipissing judgeship) 14259 (vi).
Labour Dept. (B. C. Commissioners) 7198 ; (*Gazette*, printing, &c.) 7197 (iii).
See 'Civil Govt.,' 'Labour.'
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 7597 ; (G. B. and Can.) 7728 (iv).
Miscellaneous (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6984 ; (Martineau defalcations) 6991 (iii) ; (Post office, Miller's claims *re* Savings Bank) 14274, 14655 (vi) ; (Petersen, Tate and Co.'s deposit) 6958, 6966 (iii).
Post Office (automobiles, &c.) 6050 ; (Barrie branch) 6063 ; (box rents) 6139 (iii) ; (cities, promotions) 14009 (vi) ; (country postmasters) 6038 ; (Dawson and Eagle City) 5923 ; (Halifax, salaries) 6004 (iii) ; (inspectors' salaries) 14001 (vi) ; (jubilee stamps) 6061 ; (letter carriers, increases) 6004 ; (letter carriers,

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office—Con.

P.E.I.) 6058; (letter carriers, Toronto) 6005; (letter carriers, Winnipeg) 6006; (mail bag repairs) 6139; (mail marking machines) 6159; (mail service) 6065 (iii); (outside service, additional salaries) 14010 (vi); (outside service, Ottawa Supply Co.) 5936; (outside service, salaries, &c.) 5925 (iii); (pneumatic tube service) 13998 (vi); (postal service, Inverness) 6051; (postmasters, arrears of salaries) 5921; (P.E.I. winter service) 5943; (ry. mail clerks) 5928, 6026 (iii); (ry. mail clerks, Man. and N.W.T.) 14041 (vi); (ry. mail transfer agents) 6136; (rural mail delivery) 6137 (iii); (statutory increases) 14006 (vi); (superannuation, letter carriers) 6013 (iii); (temporary employees, promotion) 14001; (Vancouver, inspector) 14000; (Winnipeg, dead letter branch) 13995; (Winnipeg, inspector's office) 14001 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings, Dom. (furniture, &c.) 1007; (Orillia caretaker) 1017; (Ottawa, furniture, &c.) 978; (Rideau Hall, light, &c.) 1005; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 993 (i).

Harbours and Rivers, **Ont.** (Port Arthur, dredging) 13021 (vi); **P.E.I.** (Gaspereaux harbour) 1156; **Que.** (Murray Bay wharf) 2270 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (Ouelle River branch) 7527 (iii).

Tariff: *See* 'Customs,' 'Protective,' &c.

Tarte, Mr., Reference to in Toronto *Star* (explanation) 6758 (iii).

Tatamagouche Post office, Insurance Fund, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14660 (vi).

Telephone Co.'s B. 4 (Mr. *Maclean*) on M. for 2°, 700 (i).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 5555 (iii); in Com., 9424 (iv).

——— (remarks) 5883 (iii).

Toronto and James Bay Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 14358 (vi).

Toronto Labour Council, Tel. *re* Mechanics from Eng. (Ans.) 1855 (i).

See 'Labour,' 'Can. Foundry,' &c.

Transportation Commission, &c., Par in Montreal *Herald re* Mr. Prefontaine (remarks) 858 (i).

Transportation Policy, *re* Speech from Throne (remarks) 6405 (iii).

Treadgold Concessions, Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4499.

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2826 (ii).

——— Appnmt. *re* (remarks) 3303 (ii).

——— Sec. 14, &c. (remarks) 4593 (ii).

Valleyfield Strike, 1900 (Ans.) 2760 (ii).

Ventilation of Chamber, &c. (remarks) 6406 (iii).

Watson, Postmaster, and Man. Elections: *See* 'Nesbitt.'

Whitney Pier, N.S., Dismissal of Postmaster Carlin (Ans.) 130 (i).

——— Salary of Postmaster, &c. (Ans.) 668 (i).

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.—*Con.*

Winter Communication with P.E.I., on M. for Cor., 1045 (i).

Wood Alcohol, Contract with Standard Chemical Co., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 234 (i).

Wright, A. W., Amounts paid to (Ans.) 8116 (iv).

Murray, Mr. T., *Pontiac.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1011 (i); in Com. on B., 10552 (v).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 767 (i).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10792 (v).

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineer, &c. (M. for copies) 1299 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Miscellaneous (Ottawa river surveys) 13362; (transportation commission) 13367 (vi).

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13367 (vi).

Northrup, Mr. W. B., *E. Hastings.*

Banff Coal Reserve, Lease for Mining, &c. (Ques.) 13026 (vi).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3269 (ii).

Grain Standards, Samples, &c. (remarks) 11182.

G. T. Pacific Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9039 (iv); in Com. on B., 10419, 10658, 11191, 11353, 11856, 12198, 12261 (v); on M. for 3° (amt.) 12711 (vi).

Hetu, Rudolph, Pardon, &c. (Ques.) 7915 (iv).

I.C.R., General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3680 (ii).

Judges of Provincial Courts B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 11407 (v).

Lt.-Governor of Ont., Appnmt. of Administrator, on M. for Com. of Sup., 123 (i).

Ministerial Changes, Explanation, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 183 (i).

Mowat, Sir Oliver: *See* 'Lt.-Gov.'

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters.' Western Rys., 10522, 10534 (v).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 1219 (i); in Com., 10987, 11542; (Brant) 11107 (v).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (post offices) 517 (i).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4951 (ii).

Treadgold Concessions, Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4525 (ii).

——— (remarks) 3879 (ii).

Oliver, Mr. F., *Alberta.*

Advocate, Prince Albert: *See* 'Supply.'

Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 119) 1°*, 1675 (i).

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°*, 11176 (v).

Oliver, Mr. F.—*Con.*

Autonomy for N. W. T. Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 13883 (vi).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7374 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order, 7309 (iii).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7437 (iii).

Budget, The, 1799, 1816 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4391, 4996 (ii); in Com. on B., 5803 (iii).

Canadian North-West Irrigation Co.'s (B. 143) 1°*, 2300 (i); in Com., 3226 (ii).

C.P.R. Lands and School Taxation (Ques.) 4006.

Cardiff Ry. Co.'s incorp, (B. 140) 1°*, 2236 (i); in Com., 4591 (ii).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5488 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13586, 13593, 14427 (vi).

Edmonton and Peace River Ry. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°*, 446 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 111) 1°*, 1462 (i).

——— Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).

Frank, Disaster, N.W.T. (remarks) 2106. 2238 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5162 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8805 (iv); in Com. on B., 11352, 11946, 12145 (v).

Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, &c., on M. for Sup., 6562 (iii).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7961 (iv).

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4336 (ii).

Labour Day Adjournment (remarks) 10742 (v).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8219 (iv).

Lumber Combine in N.W.T. and Man., Cor. read, &c., 1580 (i).

Lumber Combine Investigation, &c. (remarks) *re* B.C. Lumber Trade, 14767 (vi).

Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*, Haldimand) 5727 (iii).

Mulloy, Trooper in S. A. Contingent, Pension by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14592 (vi).

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12316 (v).

Prince Albert *Advocate*, Printing: *See* 'Supply,' &c.

Provincial Autonomy: *See* 'Autonomy.'

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., (fire-guards) 8187 (iv); (telephones, &c.) 5522 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).

Oliver, Mr. F.—*Con.*

Red Deer Valley Ry. & Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 1813 (i).

St. Mary's River Ry. Co.'s (B. 139) 1°*, 2236 (i); in Com., 4588 (ii).

Snow Storms in N.W.T., False Reports, &c. (remarks) 11825 (v).

S.A. War, Cattle for S.A.: *See* 'Cattle.'

———Medals, Regulations *re* (remarks) 8266 (iv).

———Pensions to disabled Soldiers (remarks) 14592 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Dom. Lands (fire regulations) 6776; (tree culture) 6776 (iii).

Legislation: Elections (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing) 14268 (vi).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3479 (ii).

Osler, Mr. E. B., *W. Toronto.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen, Tate & Co.'s Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6972 (iii).

Campbell, D. J., Postmaster at Macleod, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 8082 (iv).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4378 (ii).

Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Corporation Co.'s (B. 54) in Com., 2303 (i).

Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4417 (ii).

Civil Service Act (superannuation) Amt. B. 49, in Com. on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 595 (i).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6649, 7492 (iii).

Defalcations in Deptl. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iii).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 623 (i).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 1°, 6539 (iii).

Fishing Industry, N.S., Accommodation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13163 (vi).

France and Can. SS. Subsidy B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 12300 (v).

Goods imported direct into Can., Value of Duty, &c. (Ques.) 12716 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9281 (iv); in Com. on B., 10600, 10650, 11279, 11320, 11972, 12038, 12062, 12161, 12286 (v); on M. for 3°, 12691; (amt.) 12693; Neg. (Y. 39; N. 78) 12703 (vi).

———Customs Duties *re* Clause 17, Legal Opinions (read) in Com. on B., 11320 (v). *See* 'Ry. Policy.'

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4293 (ii).

Judges' Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8094 (iv).

Letters signed by Minister, stamped, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6936 (iii).

Osler, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2527 (ii).

Loy, Geo. M., Independence of Parlt., &c., on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com., 8054 (iv).

Macleod, N. W. T., Dismissal of Postmaster (Ques.) 8082 (iv).

Martineau, Defalcation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iii).

Ministerial Changes, on Explanation, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 195 (i).

Moosonee Diocese Trust Funds (B. 148) 1°*, 2396 (i).

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12310 (v).

Privilege, Ques. of, Mr. Scott's Attack *re* Western Rys., 10497 (v).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry. Co., Memo of Mr. Kingsmill *re* Bonds, &c. (read), 14588 (vi).

——Ques. of Privilege, *re* 'Grafters,' 10497 (v).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6321 (iii).

——Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2559 (ii).

Railway Policy of Govt., on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to adjn. Hse., 7125 (iii).
See 'Transportation.'

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. (Toronto) 11701; (York) 11671; on Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to M. for 3°, 12462; on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) to M. for 3°, 12437 (v).

Scotia, Str., Salvage Claims (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7156 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7220 (iii).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7024 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Canals: Sault Ste. Marie (wharfs, &c.) 7564 (iii).

Civil Govt.: Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 240; Justice (salaries) 212 (i); Labour Dept. (Thompson, P., remuneration) 7154 (iii).

Dom. Lands (Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. surveys) 6940; (surveys) 6939 (iii).

Indians: Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6326; (medical attendance) 6409; Ont. and Que. (medical attendance) 6326; (schools) 6409; Que. (medical attendance) 6408 (iii)

Legislation (voters' list) 5275 (iii).

Militia (Cooke *vs* Cole, costs) 6950; (Winnipeg barracks, paving streets) 6949 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Petersen, Tate & Co's deposit) 6956 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Dom. steamers, supplies) 5043 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Ont. (Cobourg, armoury) 640; (London, drill hall) 641; (Toronto Junction, post office) 651 (i).
Harbours and Rivers: N.S. (Big Harbour, wharf) 13144; (Breton's Cove) 13163 (vi).
Miscellaneous (Ottawa river, surveys) 13342.
Telegraph Lines: (Ashcroft-Dawson) 2993; (Marconi stations) 2991; (Yukon) 2993 (ii).

Osler, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Yukon (Middleton, T. W., defalcations) 6933 (iii).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4929 (ii).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3490 (ii).
See 'Ry. Policy.'

Treadgold Concessions, on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2912 (ii).

Parmelee, Mr. C. H., *Shefford.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10157 (v).

Printing Com., 3rd Rep. (M.) to conc., 5314 (iii).

——— 4th Rep. (M.) to conc., 5581 (iii).

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 460 (i).

SUPPLY:

Legislation: House of Commons (printing, &c.) 5268 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (electric lighting) 988 (i).

Paterson, Hon. William (Minister of Customs) *N. Wentworth and Brant.*

Agricultural Implements, Rebates for 1901-2 (Ans.) 3803 (ii).

Aluminum, Oxide of, imported into Can., Ports of Entry, &c. (Ans.) 1035 (i).

Audit Act and C. S. Employees, 13990 (vi).

Bananas imported into Dom., Value, &c. (Ans.) 1198 (i).

Bauxite, Tons imported into Canada, 1902 (Ans.) 1678 (i).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 7385 (iii).

Binder Twine, Quantity imported from U. S. (Ans.) 7566 (iv).

Bonded Warehouses, Rental, Closing, &c. (Ans.) 12074 (v).

Bonding Privileges with U. S.: *See* 'Coasting.'

Bourgeois, M. E., Sub-collector of Customs at Tracadie, N.B., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 543 (i).

Budget, The, 2176 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5061 (ii).

Chevrier, F. L., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12716 (vi).

Civil Servants and Guarantee Cos. (Ans.) 3233.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12507 (v); in Com. on B., 13826 (vi).

Coal imported in Ontario from June, 1901, to March, 1902, and June, 1902, to March, 1903 (Ans.) 669 (i).

Coasting Laws, U. S., and Bonding Privileges, &c. (remarks) 13135 (vi).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. (B. 174) Prop. Res., 2922; in Com. on Res., 3044; in Com. on B., 4010; 3°m., 4187 (ii).

Customs Employees, Transfers, &c. (Ans.) 5318.

Paterson, Hon. William—*Con.*

Customs and Excise, *per capita* Revenue from 1896 to 1903 (Ans.) 13935 (vi).

Euxine, Scuttling of Sch., on M. (Mr. *McLennan*) for Cor., 699 (i).

German Surtax, Purchases previous to (Ans.) 3395 (ii).

See 'Preferential,' &c.

Goods imported direct into Can., Value, &c. (Ans.) 12716 (vi).

Grain Receipts through Western Lake Ports (Ans.) 97 (i).

Grain Shipments from Port Arthur and Fort William (Ans.) 543 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10275; in Com. on B., 10549, 11360, 12025, 12170 (v); on M. for 3°, 12698, 12755 (vi).

Grant, J. G., Sureties *re* defaulting Customs Collections (Ans.) 5991 (iii).

Imports for 1903, Duty collected and Preferential Tariff, &c. (Ans.) 13935 (vi).

See 'Preferential,' &c.

Insurance Rates on Steamers *re* St. Lawrence Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7592 (iv).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7959, 7979 (iv).

'Jesse James' Stories, Importation Free of Duty, &c. (Ans.) 11426 (v).

King's Warehouse at Winnipeg (Ans.) 6268 (iii)

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8217 (iv).

Le Canada Newspaper: *See* 'Pelletier,' &c.

Markland, Schr., Seizure, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5994 (iii).

Montreal Customs Dept., Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 8115 (iv).

Nova Scotia Bank, Customs Duty *re* Safe, &c. (remarks) 13988 (vi).

Pelletier, Mr. H. L., and canvassing for *Le Canada* (remarks) 13980 (vi).

Preferential Tariff, Certificate of Origin (remarks) 3584 (ii).

Preference Tariff *re* German Goods (Ans.) 5322 (iii).

——— *See* 'Goods.'

Questions put by Members, Answer *re* (remarks) 544 (i).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14375 (vi).

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14375 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10918, 11489; (Brant) 11098, 11149; on Amt. (Mr. *Lennox*) to M. for 3°, 12488 (v).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'

Sugar for Home Consumption, Quantity entered (Ans.) 14285 (vi).

Paterson, Hon. William—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Canals: Sault Ste. Marie (coaling vessels) 7563 (iii); Welland (Dunnville dam) 7810 (iv).

Civil Govt.: Customs (contingencies) 331; (salaries) 319 (i).

Customs (contingent expenses) 3782, 3897; (Dauphin port) 3898; (Gananoque port) 3897; (inspectors, preventive service, &c.) 3949 (ii); (Kilroy, Mr., payment for services) 13993 (vi); (linseed oil fraud) 3935; (locks, printing, &c.) 3962; (Montreal contingencies) 3785; (preferential tariff) 3921; (printing, &c.) 3962; (salaries, &c.) 3897 (ii); (salaries, overtime) 13980 (vi); (Yukon expenditure) 3968 (ii)

Electric Light (inspectors) 5409 (iii).

Immigration (repatriation, &c.) 6710 (iii).

Indians: Ont. (medical attendance) 6345 (iii).

Justice, Administration of: Yukon (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3427 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 7592 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4098 (ii).

Post Office: Outside service (ry. mail service) 5956; (salaries) 5927 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings, N.S. (Arichat) 5832.

Surtax Bill: *See* 'Customs.'

Tariff Charges, Free List, &c. (Ans.) 817 (i).

Tobacco Duties collected for 1903 (Ans.) 12217.

Trade and Navigation Deptl. Rep. (presented) 90 (i).

Trade Commissioner in London, Appnmt., &c., (remarks) 3497 (ii).

U.S. Coasting Laws, &c., Regulations *re* (read) 13135 (vi).

Windsor Junction Accident, I.C.Ry., on Inquiry for Papers, 3496 (ii).

Wheat Shipments from Port Arthur and Fort William (Ans.) 284 (i).

Pope, Mr. R. H., *Compton.*

Alaskan Boundary Commission, Mr. Aylesworth, reported Interview (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13963 (vi).

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4229 (ii).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5419, 5431 (iii).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 5464; (Neg. Y. 48; N. 78) 5489 (iii).

Chickens, 'Wringing Chickens' Necks': *See* 'Supply—Agriculture'

Immigrants, Provision for Settlers (remarks) 868.

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. to Sup., 4341 (ii).

Latour, Mr., Leave of Absence and canvassing for *Le Canada* (remarks) 13980, 14002 (vi).

Le Canada and Mr. Pelletier's Canvassing, &c. (remarks) 13980 (vi).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8198 (iv).

Mail Clerks, Promotions, Salaries, &c. (remarks) 13997 (vi).

Pope, Mr. R. H.—*Con.*

Ministerial Changes, on Explanations, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 191 (i).

Pelletier, Mr. H. E., and canvassing for *Le Canada* (remarks) 13980, 14002 (vi).

Postal Service in N. W. T. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14039 (vi).

Poultry Fattening: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Pulp Wood, Duty by U.S. (remarks) 4362 (ii).

Ry. Transportation from N.W.T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) for Com. of Sup., 2484 (i).

Sorel Wharf, Cor., Reps., &c., Inquiry for Papers, 2302 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (*Poultry Farming*) 7644.

Civil Govt.: Post Office (mail clerks, salaries) 13997 (vi).

Customs (salaries for overtime) 13980 (vi).

Dom. Lands (Bennett, Mr., salary increase) 13967 (vi).

Excise (travelling expenses, &c.) 5373 (iii).

Fisheries (close season, investigation, &c.) 13650; (dog-fish pest) 13651 (vi).

Immigration (agents' salaries) 6734 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (wireless stations) 13640 (vi).

Miscellaneous (Alaskan boundary commission) 13963 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 4064 (ii).

Post Office (dead letter branch, Winnipeg) 13995; (pneumatic tube service) 13998; (statutory increases) 14007; (Vancouver inspector) 14000; (Winnipeg, inspector's office) 14001 (vi).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Batiscan channel) 2280; (Chateauguay river) 2280; (Grande Vallee, pier) 1538; (Lake Temiscamingue, dredging) 2246; (Laprairie, ice piers) 2248; (Magdalen islands) 2265; (Maria, pier) 2265; (Murray Bay, wharf) 2266; (Orleans, wharf) 2290; (Rivière aux Renards) 2280; (St. Alexis Bay) 2289; (St. Francis, ice pier) 2282; (St. Jerome, wharf) 2291; (St. Lawrence, lower) 2257; (Sorel, wharf) 2291; (Three Rivers, wharfs) 2298; (Touladie river) 2286 (i).

Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2961 (ii).

Slides and Booms (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2974; (salaries) 2974 (ii).

Telegraph Lines (Yukon working expenditure) 14042 (vi).

Quarantine: (diseased immigrants) 5492 (iii).

Porter, Mr. E. G., *W. Hastings.*

Ashley, Harford Relief (B. 236) 1°*, 8115 (iv).

Belleville Harbour Boundaries, &c. (Ques.) 5588.

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9597.

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 775 (i).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8092 (iv), 10786 (v).

Loy, Geo. M., Violation of Independence of Parlt., on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections, 8078 (iv).

Napanee and Deseronto Ry. Co.'s Charter, &c. (Ques.) 8084 (iv).

Porter, Mr. E. G.—*Con.*

Quinté Bay Buoys, Payments for Services, &c. (Ques.) 5587 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5342 (iii).

Rathbun Co.'s Ry. Charter, &c. (Ques.) 8084 (iv).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11548 (v).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings, Generally (Belleville armoury) 969 (i).

Treadgold Concessions, on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) Com. of Sup., 2873 (ii).

Trent Valley Canal, Rep. of W. McLeod, &c. (Ques.) 12716 (vi).

——— Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2334 (i).

Préfontaine, Hon. Raymond (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) *Maisonneuve.*

Alaska, Str., Purchase by Govt. (Ans.) 6629 (iii).

Annandale Range Lights, Amount expended (Ans.) 2922 (ii).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. for 2°, 631 (i).

Bathurst Harbour Buoys (Ans.) 3630 (ii).

Bayfield, Str., Sale, &c. (Ans.) 5586 (iii).

——— Reps. of Mr. Evans and others (read) in Com. of Sup., 5740 (iii).

Belleville Harbour Boundaries (Ans.) 5588 (iii).

Bernier, Capt., Govt. Aid to Polar Expedition (remarks) 12820 (vi).

Bishop, Capt., Harbour Master, Albert, N B. (Ans.) 6896 (iii).

B. C. Fisheries, Rep. of Commissioners (remarks) 1199 (i).

C. P. R. to Brownsburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14458 (vi).

Coal Oil as Fuel on Steamers: *See* 'Steamboat Inspection Bill.'

Daly, M. T., Harbour Master at Bathurst, N.B. (Ans.) 2919, 3630 (ii).

Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8259, 8360 (iv).

False Creek, Kelly & Burnett's Lease (Ans.) 7565 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3129 (ii), 5515, 6354 (iii).

Fisheries Act Amt. (B. 224) 1°m., 6538; in Com., 6896 (iii).

Fisheries Deptl. Rep. (presented) 90 (i).

Fisheries Protection Service, Officers Mess, Regulations *re* (Ans.) 9820 (iv).

Fishery Rights between Dom. and Provs. (M.) for Memorandum, 7923 (iv).
See 'Supply—Fisheries.'

Fishing Rights, James and Hudson's Bay (Ans.) 1194 (i).
See 'James.'

Fishing within Three Mile Limit, N.B. (remarks) 4179 (ii).

Préfontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*

France and Can. SS. Subsidy (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 10813 (v).

Frozen Fish, Goods, &c., Claims for Damages (Ans.) 13373 (vi).

——— Losses, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 3394 (ii).

Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 166 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) in Com., 5890 (iii).

Govt. Fishery Steamers, Names of Commanders, &c. (Ans.) 446 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 3°, 8325 (iv).

G. T. R. Transcontinental Line, Speech in Montreal *Herald* :*See* 'Transportation.'

Harrison, Capt., Reimbursement to *re* Costs, &c. (remarks) 10240 (v).

Hatchey, Nazaire, Appnmt. as Harbour Master (Ans.) 3630 (ii).

James Bay Fishing Rights, on Inquiry for Ret., 6893 (iii).

See 'Fishing.'

Joliette and Lake Manan Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

Kelly & Burnett: *See* 'False Creek.'

Latour, L. J., Leave of Absence, &c. (Ans.) 6895 (iii).

Lighthouse Keepers, Pet. *re* Salaries (Ans.) 14666 (vi).

Macnee Fishing Licenses, on Inquiry for Ret., 4728 (ii).

See 'Fishing.'

Marine Deptl. Rep. (presented) 244 (i).

Masters and Mates Certificate B. 226 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) prop. Res., 6271; in Com. on Res., 6544; in Com. on B., 6917 (iii).

Mayrand, Denis, Petition *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 9082 (iv).

Mehan, Dr., Meteorological Service, Removal, &c. (Ans.) 3630 (ii).

Ménard, Denis, Lightkeeper, Charges against (Ans.) 3537 (ii).

Meteorological Service, Removal to Ottawa, &c. (Ans.) 6435 (iii).

Midland Water Front (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).

See 'Pratt.'

Minto, Govt. Steamer, Passengers carried (Ans.) 3632 (ii).

Miscou Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3631 (ii).

Monterey, Str., Wreck, Par. in Montreal *Star*, 6803 (iii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4474 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 8084 (iv).

Montreal Northern Ry. and Ste. Agathe Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).

Moreau, Dr., Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 8331 (iv).

Préfontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*

Naval Reserve (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5296 (iii); 13545 (vi).

Navigable Waters Act (swing bridges) Amt. (B. 260) in Com. on Res., 12779; in Com. on B., 12984 (vi).

Navy Training Ships, Establishment, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5296 (iii), 13545 (vi).

Nicolet River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).

Nobles, Israel, Dismissal as Lighthouse-keeper (Ans.) 6896 (iii).

North Pole Expedition, Govt. Aid to, &c. (remarks) 12820 (vi).

Oromocto Shoals, N.B., Dismissal of Miles McMonagle (Ans.) 1195 (i).

Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 59 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 6533 (iii).

Oyster Fishing, P.E.I., Pet. *re* (Ans.) 2920 (ii).

Pilotage Act Amt. (B. 138) 1°*, 2100 (i).

——— Montreal and Quebec Districts Amt. (B. 261) in Com. on Res., 12781; in Com., 13627; 3° m., 13937 (vi).

——— Prop. Res. wthdn., 12493 (v).

Pratt & Co., Water Frontage, Lease, Midland: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5294 (iii).

See 'Midland.'

P. E. I. Winter Communication, *re* Str. *Stanley* (Ans.) 4007 (ii).

See 'Winter,' 'Supply,' &c.

Quesnel Dam, B.C., Obstructions, &c. (Ans.) 11557 (v).

Quinté Bay Buoys, Payments for Service, &c. (Ans.) 5587 (iii).

Ry. Debts Bill: *See* 'Exchequer.'

Ry. Policy of Govt.: *See* 'Transportation.'

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14317, 14508 (vi).

St. Francis River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14509 (vi).

St. Lawrence Gulf Fishermen, Pet., &c. (Ans.) 2917 (ii).

St. Lawrence Navigation, Rep. of Lloyds, &c. (read) 4138 (ii).

See 'Supply,' 'Lighthouses,' &c.

St. Lawrence River Pilots, &c. (Ans.) 2916 (ii).

See 'Pilotage Bill.'

Safety of Ships Act Amt. (B. 179) 1°m., 3298 (ii); in Com., 6918 (iii).

Salmon Canning Industry, B. C (remarks) 10241 (v).

——— Rep. (M.) 7109 (iii).

——— Complaints, &c. (remarks) 9974 (iv).

——— Hatcheries, B.C., Increased Capacity, &c. (Ans.) 12073 (v).

Savard, Mr. P. V., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6895 (iii).

Shipping Casualties Act Amt. (B. 263) in Com. on Res., 12801, 12894; 3°m, 13560 (vi).

Préfontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*

Stanley and *Lansdowne*, Str., Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13518 (vi).

Stanley, *Minto*, Strs. in the Ice, Telegram read, 6 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3291 (ii).

——— (B. 225) prop. Res., 6270; in Com. on Res., 6541; in Com. on B., 6915 (iii).

——— Amt. (B. 237) 1°m., 12494 (v); in Com., 12777 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.: Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 5033 (ii); (salaries) 13663 (vi).

Fisheries (*Acadia*, sale of) 13658 (vi); (Bance, Mr. promotion) 5277; (*Bayfield*, str.) 5278 (iii); (Behring sea arbitratin) 13658 (vi); (Canadian fishery exhibit) 4175 (ii); (close season, investigation, &c.) 13650 (vi); (fish-breeding establishments) 4175; (fish-ways) 4174; (hatcheries) 4174 (ii); 13660 (vi); (Hurley, J. M., inspector, &c.) 5123 (ii); 5283, 5306; (intelligence bureau reps.) 5277 (iii); (lobster factories inspection) 5123 (iii); (Ottawa exhibit) 5308 (iii); (protection service, B.C.) 4174 (ii); (provincial claims) 5311; (steamers, construction) 5278; (U.S. licenses, expenses) 5309 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agency, Montreal) 13632 (vi); (aids to navigation) 5736; (*Bayfield*, reps. *re*) 5740; (Bronté lighthouse) 5756 (iii); (Canadian coast lighting 4164 (ii); (gas lights) 13633; (Halifax harbour buoy service) 13638 (vi); (lightkeepers' salaries) 4132; (lighthouse supplies) 4168; (Lurcher's shoal lightship) 4173 (ii); (Marconi stations) 13640 (vi); (Montreal pilot commissioners) 4173 (ii); (St. Lawrence lights) 13632 (vi); (St. Lawrence, navigation, &c.) 4135 (ii); (sweeping boats) 13636; (telephone service, Port Atkinson and Vancouver) 13638; (wireless stations) 13639.

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 4116 (ii), 13543; (Couillard, Alfred, gratuity, 13546 (vi); (Dom. steamers, repairs) 5034; (Govt. steamers, repairs) 4041 (ii); 13518 (vi); (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4048 (ii); (life saving awards) 13543; (marine biological station) 13543; (master and mates examination) 13524; (vi); (meteorological service) 4118 (ii); (naval militia and school of navigation) 13545 (vi); (St. Lawrence, lighting, &c.) 4042; (steamboat inspection) 4119; (tidal surveys) 4114 (ii); (wrecks, investigation, &c.) 13545 (vi); (wrecks, investigation) 4116 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Que. (Longueuil, P.O.) 13072; (St. Louis de Mile End, P.O.) 13080 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Sorel, deep water wharf) 12848 (vi); (Murray Bay, wharf) 2267 (i).

Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept., 2939 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection (boiler inspectors) 13648.

Scientific Institutions (MacGregor, Capt., gratuity) 6993; (time ball, Halifax) 6993 (iii).

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. (B. 262) in Com. on Res., 12304 (v); 12800; in Com. on B., 12993 (vi).

—— Prop. Res. withdn., 12492 (v).

Swinehammer, Geo., Retirement, &c. (Ans.) 2312.

Préfontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*

Transportation Commission, &c., Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks) 855 (i).

Venoit, P. I., Absence from Duty, &c. (Ans.) 3629 (ii).

Yamaska to Lotbiniere, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 14319 (vi).

Winter Communication, P.E.I., Construction of Str. (Ans.) 6896 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. *Hughes*, *P.E.I.*) for Cor., 1055.

Pringle, Mr. R. A., *Cornwall and Stormont.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4230 (ii).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7145, 7400 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5808 (iii).

Cattle Guard Commission, Inquiry for Rep., 14686 (vi).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) 14136 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for Com. (M.) to refer back to Com. on Rys., &c., 4871; Neg. (Y. 55, N. 102) 4874 (ii); in Com., 5208 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10118 (v).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13281 (vi).

See 'Transportation,' &c.

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4309 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14699, 14725 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Cornwall (electric lighting) 14136 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 487. Que. (L'Assomption) 428 (i).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3493 (ii).

Treadgold Concessions, on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2842 (ii).

Puttee, Mr. A. W., *Winnipeg.*

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s (B. 192) in Com., 5588, 5960 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7324 (iii).

B. C. Labour Troubles, Appnmt. of Commission (Ques.) 1595 (i).

Budget, The, 2149 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5447 (iii).

Canada Foundry Co., Toronto, Strike, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7194 (iii).

See 'Immigration, Inadequate Inspection.'

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5108 (ii).

C.P.R. Lands in Man., Exemption from Taxes, &c. (Ques.) 667 (i).

Puttee, Mr. A. W.—*Con.*

Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B., in Com. on Res., 610 (i).

Civil Servants and Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3181 (ii).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. (B. 95) 1°m., 1193 (i); 2°m., 2790, 3259; in Com., 3260 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6643 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. (compulsory voting), 13572 (vi).

Fair Wage Schedule on Govt. Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7159 (iii).

Grain Blockade in N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9120 (iv); in Com. on B., 11281 (v).

Immigration, Accommodation for Settlers, 1126 (i).

——— Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Sup., 6567 (iii).

——— Provision for Settlers on Trains, &c. (remarks) 866 (i).

Labour: *See* 'B. C.', 'Can. Foundry,' 'Conciliation,' 'Fair Wage,' 'Ry. Labour B., 'Supply, —Civil Govt.', 'Workmen,' &c.

Labour Troubles in B.C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 950 (i).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2509.

North Pole Expedition, Aid to Capt. Bernier, &c. (remarks) 12819 (vi).

Post Offices in Cities, Stmnt. of Revenue and Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 666 (i).

Preston, Mr., and Interference in Can. Labour Affairs: *See* 'Immigration, Inadequate Inspection.'

Public Printing and Stationery B. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4207 (ii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6263 (iii), 8136 (iv).

——— Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2549 (ii).

——— Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14380 (vi).

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14380 (vi).

Ry. Transportation from N.W.T., Car Shortage, &c., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2468 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 65 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10900; (Dauphin) 11748; (Winnipeg) 11784 (v).

St. Andrews' Locks Contract, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 287 (i).

St. Andrews Rapids, Expiration of Contract (Ques.) 10490 (v).
See 'Supply.'

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 456 (i).

Puttee, Mr. A. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.—Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 242 (i); Labour Department (*Gazette*) 7154 (iii).

Post Office (letter carriers, Winnipeg) 6006 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, military stores) 13126; (Winnipeg, P. O.) 438 (i), 13127 (vi); Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrews Rapids) 3354; (snag boat) 2672 (ii).

Quarantine (diseased immigrants) 5496 (iii).

Winnipeg and Assiniboine Water Power Co.'s (B. 192) 1°*, 3970 (ii).

Winnipeg P. O., Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 667 (i).

Workmen on G. T. P.Ry., Construction, Protection to, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 235, 11281 (v).

Reid, Mr. J. D., *S. Grenville.*

Alert, Str., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).

Alexandria Wood Export Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12924 (vi).

Bank Failures since Confederation, &c. (Ques.) 6435 (iii).

Bonding Privileges with U.S., 12761 (vi).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5060 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5112 (ii).

Cardinal Canal, Toll Collector (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12929 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12336, 12546 (v).

Clergue Co., Reorganization and Govt. Interference (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14098 (vi).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).

——— Supt's Duties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12896 (vi).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 4019 (ii).

Damages to Vessels at Govt. Wharfs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

Electric Lighting, St. Lawrence Canals at Iroquois (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12901 (vi).

Fiddler's Elbow, Channel, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5919 (iii).

France and Can. SS. Subsidy (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 10821 (v).

Galops Rapids, Deepening, &c., Contract, &c., Cor. (read) on conc., 8375 (iv).

Galops Rapids, Dam. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12608 (v).

Gananoque and Brockville Channel, Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13320 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12262 (v); on M. for 3°, 12699, 12743, 12761 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13277 (vi).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 787 (i).

Reid, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

I. C. R., Locomotive Contract: *See* 'Locomotives.'

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10759 (v).

Kingston and Brockville Channel, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5919 (iii).

Kingston Locomotive Works and Tenders for I. C. R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14091 (vi).

Lachine Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14140 (vi).

Litigation Expenditure, Fees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12916 (vi).

Locomotive Contracts *re* I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14091 (vi).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 5419 (iii).

Montreal Locomotive Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).

Morrison, Mrs., Claim *re* Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14104 (vi).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 10825 (v).

Public Works Dept. and Transfer to Mr. Prefontaine, 2645 (ii).

Public Works let by Tender, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14095 (vi).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6208, 6296 (iii).

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 2924 (ii).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11487, 12295 (v).

Schell, Mr.: *See* 'Alexandria,' &c.

Stewart, Mr., Supt. of Murray Canal, 12927, 14146 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census enumerators) 4820 (ii).

Canals—**Chambly** (land damages) 12908; (landing wharfs) 12908; (tow paths) 12906; **Cornwall** (electrical equipment) 14134; (enlargement) 12896; **Farran's Point** (enlargement) 12898; **Galops** (dam) 12608 (vi); (deepening) conc., 8374 (iv); (enlargement) 12899, 14141; (north channel) 12899, 14142; **Generally** (operating expenses) 12924: (repairs. &c.) 12924; (salaries) 12934; (surveys, dredging, &c.) 12900: (toll collectors) 12929; **Grenville** (guide pier) 12909; **Lachine** (electrical equipment) 14142; (enlargement, &c.) 12903; (masonry walls) 12906: **Lake St. Francis** (dam) 14152; **Lake St. Louis** (hydrographic survey) 12904; **Miscellaneous** (engineers, &c., salaries) 12910; (litigation expenses) 12911; **Rapide Plat** (enlargement) 12898; **Sault Ste Marie** (construction) 12904; **Welland** (Port Colborne, entrance) 12902; **Williamsburg** (gatelifter) 14149; (overseer's house) 14150; (scow) 14154 (vi).

Customs (salaries for overtime) 13984 (vi).

Dom. Lands (Banff, bath house) 13956 (vi).

Excise (salaries *re* C. S. Act) 13967; (salaries, Prescott) 13968 (vi).

Fisheries (Hurley, J. M., inspector) 5129 (ii), 5281; (intelligence bureau reps.) 5277; (steamers, B.C.) 5278 (iii).

Reid, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Indians: Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6332; (medical attendance) 6332 (iii).

Inland Revenue (excise inspections) 5364; (Keilty, Mr., Appnmt.) 5365, 5378 (iii).

Legislation (voter's lists) 5276 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 4047, 4091, 5042 (ii).

Post Office (Doyle, Mr.) 5928; (Ottawa Supply Co.) 5936, 6153; (postmasters' arrears of salaries) 5923; (salaries) 5927 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings—Ont. (post office), 530 (i).

Docks (Montreal dry dock) 2988 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers—Generally (dredges, repairs) 2626 (ii); **B.C.** (Columbia river) 1455; **Man.** (Dauphin lake) 1448 (i); **N.B.** (Arsenault, Capt., damages to schooner) 13231; **Ont.** (Depot harbour, breakwater) 13239 (vi); (dredging plant) 2671 (ii); (Petawawa narrows) 1442 (i); (Prescott, dredging) 5916 (iii); (transfer to Marine dept.) 2645 (ii); (Wolfe Island, dredging) 1442 (i), 13252; **P.E.I.** (dredging plant) 13319 (vi); **Que.** (Hull wharf) 5901 (iii); (Sabrevois wharf) 13485; (Sacré-Cœur wharf) 13479 (vi); (St. Louis river) 13475 (vi); (Valleyfield dredging) 5905 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Ottawa river surveys) 13344, 13347; (transportation commission) 13364 (vi).

Roads and Bridges (Ottawa, Dufferin, &c.) 13321 (vi).

Slides and Booms (Gatineau river) 2977; (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2975 (ii).

Telegraph Lines—**Mar. Provs.** (Deer Island and Eastport) 13325 (vi); **Que.** (Marconi, Chateau Bay) 13326 (vi); (Marconi stations) 2991 (ii).

Quarantine (diseased immigrants) 5492; (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5497 (iii); (small-pox) 5012 (ii); (trachoma epidemic) 5493 (iii).

Railways: I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 3702 (ii); (Canso ferry service) 14094; (Connolly's claim, &c.) 14103; (general vote) 12874; (Grand Narrows bridge protection) 14095 (vi); (Levis accommodation) 3703 (ii); (New Glasgow, freight shed) 14096; (rolling stock) 14100; (*Scotia*, salvage) 14107; (steel rails) 14099; (Windsor station) 14097; P. E. I. (Hillsborough, bridge) 12839, 14108; (Murray Harbour branch) 12833, 14123 (vi).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4884 (ii).

Telephone Service in the H. of C. (remarks) 5088 (ii).

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13364 (vi).

Williamsburg Canal, Electric Light, &c. (remarks) 14136 (vi).

——— Collector's Salary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12934 (vi).

——— Supt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).

Richardson, Mr. M. K., *S. Grey.*

Art Gallery, Can. Collection of Paintings, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13513, 13517 (vi).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7378 (iii).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7465 (iii).

Richardson, Mr. M. K.—*Con.*

Budget, The, 1946 (i).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7504 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. (compulsory voting), 14415 (vi).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3012 (ii).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 632 (i).

Flesherton Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10040 (iv); in Com. on B., 10625 (v); on M. for 3°, 12701 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs, and Elections, 13274 (vi).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 761 (i).

Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6573 (iii).

Lands available for Settlers in B. C., &c. (Ques.) 4836 (ii).

Mint Building, Progress, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14244 (vi).

Railway Accidents, Investigation into (remarks) 1339 (i).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14343 (vi).

——— General Policy, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14345 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11000, 11525 (v).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6472 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Can. Exhibit, Imp. Institute) 13509 (vi); (exhibitions) 4602; (Japan exhibition) 4635; (St. Louis exhibition) 4602 (ii).

Civil Govt.: Justice (salaries) 212 (i).

Dom. Lands (buffalo herd, &c.) 6790 (iii).

Fisheries (close season, investigation, &c.) 13649 (vi).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7776, 7778 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Marconi stations) 13640 (vi).

Militia (pay and allowance) 13428 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies) 4087 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, **Ont.** (Clinton P. O.) 521; (Durham) 506; (Ottawa, Rideau Hall), drainage) 647 (i); (Wingham, P. O.) 13122 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, **N. B.** (Caraquet, wharf) 1173; **N. S.** (Drumhead, breakwater) 1086; (Lunenburg, harbour) 1107 (i); **Que.** (Chateauguay river) 3210 (ii); (Grande Vallée, pier) 1534 (i); (Seven Islands, wharf) 13479 (vi).

Miscellaneous (Ottawa river surveys), 13350 (vi).

Robinson, Mr. Jabel, *W. Elgin.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4226 (ii).

Bananas imported into Can., Value, &c. (Ques.) 1198 (i).

Budget, The, 1825 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5064 (ii); in Com. on B., 5426 (iii).

Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 384 (i).

Cattle Guard Commission Rep., Publishing, &c. (remarks) 14758 (vi).

——— *See* 'Ry. Act.'

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6645 (iii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3085 (ii).

Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 573 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 902 (i); in Com. (compulsory voting) 13582, 14415 (vi).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6439 (iii).

Elgin County Centenary Celebration (remarks) 3129 (ii).

Fishing Industry in N.S., 13164 (vi).

Gates over Ry. Crossings, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Bill, 5775 (iii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9228 (iv); in Com. on B., 12233 (v).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 740 (i).

Immigrants for Ont., &c. (remarks), 1131 (i).

Immigrants for Ont., Govtl. Action (Ques.) 1593 (i).

I.C.R., General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3694 (ii).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7985 (iv).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10781 (v).

——— Retiring Allowance B. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8069, 8372 (iv).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8198 (iv).

McCraney, Mr. W., Letter *re* Legislation (read) 5362 (iii).

Mail Delivery, Free, Establishment, &c. (remarks) 14011 (vi).

——— *See* 'Rural.'

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6452 (iii).

Parliament, Delay in Convening (remarks) 14855 (vi).

See 'Sessions.'

Penny Banks Establishment B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 4176 (ii); in Com., 6459 (iii).

Robinson, Mr. Jabel.—*Con.*

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5867 (iii).

Printing Bureau and Indebtedness of Members (Ques.) 4180 (ii).

Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Attendance in House (remarks) 2015 (i).

Ry. Act (cattle guard) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 562 (i).

——— (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 258 (i); in Com., 4567 (ii), 5767, 6184, 6241, 6307 (iii), 8188 (iv); (telephones, &c.) 5519 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* Passenger Rates, to M. for 3°, 8346 (iv).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14431 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11523 (v).

Rural Mail Delivery, Establishment of (Ques.) 285 (i).

——— *See* 'Supply—Post Office.'

——— *See* 'Mail.'

Seeds Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7224 (iii).

Session of the House, Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 473 (i).

——— *See* 'Parliament.'

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7035 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Can. exhibit at Imp. Institute) 13511 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 239 (i).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7763 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (gas lights) 13636 (vi).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 7584; (Can. and S. Africa) 7752 (iv).

Post Office (free mail delivery) 14011 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Campbellton wharf) 1165 (i); N.S. (Breton's Cove) 13164 (vi).

Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14431 (vi).

Robinson, Mr. James, *Northumberland, N.B.*

Aluminum, Oxide of, Imports into Can. Ports, &c. (Ques.) 1035 (i).

Bauxite, Tons, Imports into Can. for 1902 (Ques.) 1678 (i).

Roche, Mr. W., *Halifax.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Contract with Allans, &c. (Ques.) 7091 (iii).

——— Delay by Govt., &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 14185 (vi).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6964 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7312 (iii).

Budget, The, 1891 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12358 (v); on M. for 3°, 13945 (vi).

Roche, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Civil Servants and Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche*, Marquette) to Com. of Sup., 3197 (ii).

Fishing Industry in N.S., Accommodation, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13157 (vi).

——— *See* 'Privilege.'

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5194 (iii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9553 (iv).

Immigration, Inspection, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 6557 (iii).

Inverness Ry. and Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7952 (iv).

Privilege, Ques. of, *re* N.S. Fishermen on 'Outskirt of Civilization,' &c., 13373 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.: Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 13666 (vi).

Fisheries (dog-fish pest) 13650 (vi).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6667; (agents, &c.) 6835; (trachoma, inspection, &c.) 6667 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Sable Island, Marconi service) 13648 (vi).

Militia (pay and allowance) 13394 (vi).

Miscellaneous (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6958 (iii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—**Mar. Provs.** (dredging plant) 13319; **N.S.** (Breton's Cove) 13157; (Chezzetcook, breakwater) 13217 (vi).

Quarantine (small-pox), 5020 (ii).

Roche, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.*

Agricultural Implements, Rebate for 1901-2 (Ques.) 3803 (ii).

Automatic Grain Weighers in N.W.T., Rep. of Inspector, &c. on M. (Mr. *Stewart*) for Ret., 850 (i).

Autonomy to N.W.T. Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 13905 (vi).

——— *See* 'N.W.T. B. 253.'

Budget, The, 1876 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4996, 5109 (ii).

Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 402 (i),

Civil Servants, Interference in Man. Elections (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 3141; Neg. (N. 71; Y. 22) 3206 (ii); (notice of motion) 3126 (ii).

Crow's Nest Pass Coal Lands, Applications, &c. (Ques.) 12217 (v).

Dom. Lands, Man. and N.W.T., Sale, Prices paid, &c. (Ques.) 816 (i).

Ewart, Mr., and Adress to Judge Perdue, 11071, (v).

Govt. Appnmts. of Members, &c. (Ques.) 3632 (ii).

Roche, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

Grain Weighing Machines: *See* 'Automatic.'

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7844, 7875 (iv).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9727 (iv); in Com. on B., 10444, 12267 (v); on M. for 3°, (amt.) 12706; Neg. (Y. 34; N. 74) 12709; on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) 12734 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections 13278 (vi).

Immigrants, Accommodation for Settlers, Par. in Winnipeg *Telegram*, 1121 (i).

Jerome, Martin, M.P.P., and Man. Elections, &c. (Ques.) 5321 (iii).

Jonasson, Mr. S., Emplymt. by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 1198 (i).

Land Sales, Winnipeg, Purchasers, &c. (Ques.) 1858 (i).

——— *See* 'Dom.', 'N.W.T. Grazing,' &c., 'Saskatchewan.'

McDonnell, Geo., Lease of, Grazing Lands, &c. (Ques.) 8330 (iv).

Man. and N.W.T. School Land, Sale, Amounts paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 706 (i).

Man. Judgeship, Delay in Appnmt.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 214 (i).

Members appointed to Govt. Positions (M. for ret.*) 3805 (ii).

Members appointed to Offices, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 9582 (iv).

——— (Ques.) 3632 (ii).

Myers, Appnmt. as Judge in Man. (Ques.) 285 (i).

Nesbitt, Man., Postmaster Watson as Lib. Candidate (Ques.) 1196 (i).

N.W.T. Grazing Lands, Lease to Geo. McDonnell (Ques.) 8330 (iv).

N.W.T., Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12323 (v).

——— Senate Representation: *See* 'Senate.'

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry. Co., Land Grants, &c. (M. for O.Cs., &c.*) 2338 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 4363 (ii).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11032, 11743; (Dauphin) 11748; (Macdonald) 11781; (amt.) to M. for 3°, 12476 (v).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Property, &c. (Ques.) 2306 (i).

See 'Qu'Appelle.'

Senate Representation of N.W.T., B. 253 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 12303 (v).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (St. Louis exhibition) 4611; (Treadgold exhibits) 4621 (ii).

Civil Govt.: Justice (salaries) 214 (i).

Customs (Dauphin port) 3898 (ii).

Fisheries (inspectors, Man.) 5127 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, immigration shed) 13127; Harbours and Rivers—Man. (dredging plant) 13311; (Mossy river, dredging) 13312 (vi).

Roche, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11071 (v).

Watson, John, Lib. Candidate in Man. (Ans.), 1196 (i).

Roddick, Mr. T. G., *Montreal, St. Antoine.*

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 832 (i).

Rosamond, Mr. B., *N. Lanark.*

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4998 (ii).

City and County Bank of Can. incorp. (B. 172) 1°*, 2675 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10752 (v).

Electric Lighting, Public Buildings, Ottawa, Contract Price, &c. (Ques.) 3235 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com, 5234 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11927, 12089 (v).

Herald Printing Co., Montreal, Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 8329 (iv).

Lobster Packing Factory in N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11490, 11650; (Brant) 11106; (Toronto) 11723; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12492 (v).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N. S. (Big Harbour, wharf) 13146; (Breton Cove) 13152 (vi); **Que.** (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3320; Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2684 (ii).

Ross, Mr. J. H., *Yukon Territory.*

Hydraulic Leases, Yukon, O. C's., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1323 (i).

Ross, Hon. Wm., *Victoria (N.S.)*

Allan SS. Service, Reduction in Sailings from St. John (remarks) 14080 (vi).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen's Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6983 (iii).

See 'Supply—Mail Subsidies.'

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7327 (iii).

British Members of Parlt., Visit to Mar. Provs. (remarks) 2105 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5080 (ii); in Com. on B., 5435 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B., in Com. on Res., 4991 (ii).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 396 (i).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res., (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 841 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock* in Com. on Res., 12504 (v); in Com. on B., 13825 (vi).

Ross, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*

Civil Service Act (superannuation) Amt. B. 49, (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 594 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3065 ; in Com. on B., 4015 (ii).
Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) to Com. of Sup., 575 (i).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 309 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com,, 6897 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5198 (iii), 7884 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9583 (iv).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 772 (i).
Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Sup., 6576 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7942 (iv).
Judges' Retiring Allowance B. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8371 (iv).
Labour Troubles in B. C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 955 (i).
Letter Carriers, &c., in Com. on Post Office B., 5660 (iii).
Markland, Schr., Seizure, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5994 (iii).
Masters and Mates Certificate B. 226 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 6545 (iii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5660 (iii).
Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) in Com., 5982 (iii).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3736 (ii), 5351, 5573, 5778, 6311 ; (telephones) 5553 (iii) ; on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* Passenger Rates, to M. for 3°, 8358 (iv).
Ry. Commissioners Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8123 (iv),
Schooley, Wm. Francis, Relief B. 128 (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com., 3225 (ii).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7221 (iii).
Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meeting, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 469 (i).
Steel Bounties : *See* 'Iron,' &c.

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (*Poultry Farming*) 7656 (iv).
Civil Govt. : Customs (salaries) 325 (i).
Customs (contingent expenses) 3787 (iii).
Geological Survey (explorations, &c.) 6817 (iii).
Inland Revenue (Inspectors, N.S.) 5409 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7783 (iv),
Justice : Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3521 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Australia) 5881 (iii), 13679 (vi) ; (Can. and G. B.) 7595 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6983 (iii).

Ross, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Ocean and River Service (Dom. steamers, supplies) 4081, 5043 ; (*Stanley*, repairs, &c.) 4055 (ii).
Post Office : Outside Service (P.E.I., winter service) 5945 (iii).
Public Works : Buildings—Ont. (rural mail delivery) 514 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, Generally (hydraulic dredge) 2621, 2625 (ii) ; N.S. (Bridgewater dredging) 1075 ; (Campbellton wharf) 1143; (Green Cove harbour) 1100 ; (Neil's harbour) 1139 ; (Washabuck wharf) 1150 (i) ; Que. (Le Tableau wharf) 2255 (i) ; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3314 (ii).
Miscellaneous (architect's office) 2751 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 8273; (Stellarton, accommodation) 8301 (iii).
Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4926 (ii).

Ross, Mr. W., *S. Ontario.*

Budget, The, 2036 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5433 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4369 (ii).
Clergue Steel Works, Sault Ste. Marie, Contract with Govt., &c. (Ques,) 13668 (vi).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6646, 7503 (iii).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10754 (v).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. (compulsory voting) 14420 (vi).
Huron and Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 60) 1°*, 707 (i).
Immigration Statistics, Total Number, Origin, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1035 (i).
Inspection, General Act (weighmasters) Amt. B. 266 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 14312 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Co.'s Subsidv B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9927 (iv).
North-west Bank of Canada incorp. B. 51 (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com., 2754 (ii).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 2609 (ii), 5349, 5771 (iii).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6468, 7228 (iii).
Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 477 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 7613 (iv) ; (experimental farms) 4551 ; (Shutt's, Prof., report) 4559 (ii).
Excise (analysts, food, &c.) 5395 (iii).
Justice, Administration of—Yukon (living allowances) 3417 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Oshawa P.O.) 13111 (vi).

Russell, Mr. B., *Hants.*

Alliance Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 212) M. to receive Pet., &c,, 4958 (ii) ; 1°*, 5512 ; 2° m., 5585 ; in Com., 7470 (iii).

Russell, Mr. B.—*Con.*

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4385 (ii).

Cattle Guards: *See* 'Ry. Bill 21.'

Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B., in Com. on Res., 608 (i).

Church Missionary Society of Canada incorp. (B. 202) 1°*, 4727 (ii).

Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8255 (iv).

Fire Guards on Ry. Lands: *See* 'Ry. Bill 21.'

Good Shepherd Reformatory B. 199 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4841 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7869 (iv).

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8907, 8919 (iv).

Harrison, Capt. of Str. *Grecian*, Reimbursement *re* Costs, &c. (remarks) 10239 (v).

Home Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 191) 1°*, 3970

Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2383 (i).

Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Privs. and Elections Com. *re* Beauharnois P. O. Site, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7920 (iv).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 72 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 4869 (ii).

Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (tolls) 5576; (cattle guards) 6249; (2-cent rate) 6278; (fire guards) 6315 (iii).

Ry. Debts: *See* 'Exchequer.'

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9423 (iv).

Schell, Mr. J. T., *Glengarry.*

Alexandria Wood Export Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12926 (vi).
See 'Privilege.'

Bell Telephone: *See* 'Dundonald, Earl.'

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7321 (iii).

Budget, The, 2025 (i).

C. A. R. Section-Men's Strike (remarks) 2303 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4401 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 14419 (vi).

Dundonald, Earl, Telephone Mess. *re* Scottish Demonstration (remarks) 10536, 10744 (v).

Glengarry Scottish Demonstration re Tel. Message to Lord Dundonald (remarks) 10536 (v).

Privilege (ques. of) *re* Govt. Purchases, 5416 (iii).
——— *See* 'Alexandria.'
——— *re* Mr. Stewart's Appointment, 14599 (vi).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (drainage) 4754 (ii).

Stewart, Mr., Appnmt. as Supt. of Williamsburg Canal, Ques. of Priv., 14599 (vi).

Schell, Mr. J. T.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:
Canals—Generally (operating, &c., expenses) 12926 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 488; Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Grande Vallée pier) 1518 (i).

Scott, Mr. W., *W. Assiniboia.*

Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 42) 1°*, 591 (i).

Automatic Grain Weighers in N.W.T., on M. (Mr. *Stewart*) for Ret., 880 (i).

Autonomy for N.W.T. Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 13914 (vi).
——— Correction in Press (remarks) 14855 (vi).
——— *See* 'N.W.T. B. 259.'

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6371 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7329, 7357 (iii).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Mortgage Deed, Deposit, &c. (Ques.) 13024 (vi).
——— *See* 'Qu'Appelle,' &c.

Campaign Literature and Mail Bags, Complaint, &c. (remarks) 14220 (vi).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4387, 5102 (ii); in Com. on B., 5786 (iii).

C. P. R. and Car Shortage in N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation,' &c.

C. P. R. (Kirkella and Elkhorn) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14497 (amt.) 14501 (vi).

C. P. R. (Medicine Hat) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. Res., 14504 (vi).

Century Life Ins. Co., B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 5583, 6201; (amt.) 5360 (iii).

Civil Servants, Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3164 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3056 (ii).

Dime Novels: *See* 'Weekly Publications.'

Engineers, Marine, Certificates to: *See* 'Masters and Mates.'

Fire Guards along Rys.: *See* 'Ry. Bills.'

Frank Disaster, N.W.T. (remarks) 2100 (i).

Freight Rates, Govt. Control: *See* 'Ry. Rates.'

Fyfe, Mr.: *See* 'Grain Weighing, &c., 'Supply—Excise.'

German Goods, 'Teapot,' Importation, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) 3056 (ii).
——— (Ques.) 5322 (iii).

Grain Blockade in the N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation,' &c.

Grain Weighing Scales in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks) in Com. on B. 188, 4202 (ii).
——— *See* 'Automatic.'

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10173; Grafters,' 10189; in Com. on B., 10710, 12276 (v).

Scott, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Graves, Florence D., Relief (B. 214) 1° *, 5581 (iii).

Herchmer, Lt.-Col., Pension, &c. (Ques.) 5321 (iii).

Inspection Act (textile fabrics) Amt. (B. 137) 1° m., 2101 (i); 2° m., 3294 (ii).

Land Grants to Rys., Areas, &c. (Ques.) 2101 (i); 3797 (ii).

——— *See* 'Rys.', &c.

Land Titles Amts. to N.W.T. Bill: *See* 'N.W.T. B. 259.'

Lumber Combines, N.W.T., Investigation, &c. (Ques.) 6168 (iii).

——— (remarks) 1579, 1589 (i).

MacLeod, Cardston and Montana Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 70) 1° *, 814 (i).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints, &c. (remarks) 14220 (vi).

Mail Cars, overcrowding, &c. (remarks) in Com. on P.O. Bill, 5870 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).
See 'Supply—Post Office.'

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7994 (iv).

Man. and N.W. Volunteers, Land Scrip., &c. (Ques.) 820 (i).

Masters and Mates Certificates B. 226 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 6545 (iii).

Mounted Police Act (pensions) Amt. Bill, M. to introduce, 14280 (vi).

Northern Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 51) 1° *, 654 (i).

Northwest Coal and Coke Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 69) 1° *, 813 (i).

N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 259 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com. (amts.) 13853, 14287 (vi).

N. W. T. Snow Storms, False Reps., &c. (remarks) 11822 (v).

Novels, Dime: *See* 'Weekly Publications.'

Osler, Mr. E. B., Attack *re* Qu'Appelle Ry. Bonds, &c., Ques. of Priv., 14583 (vi).

——— *See* 'Qu'Appelle,' &c., 'Privilege,' &c.

Parliament, Date of Convening (remarks) 14855 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. 5863, 5870 (iii).

Preference Tariff *re* German Goods (Ques.) 5322 (iii).

——— *See* 'German,' &c.

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys., 10530, 10533 (v).

——— *See* 'Qu'Appelle.'

——— *re* 'Lowering Tone of Debates,' &c., 14583.

Provincial Autonomy to N.W.T.: *See* 'Autonomy.'

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Co.'s Contract, 'Grafters,' &c. (remarks) on G.T. Pacific Bill, 10189 (vi).

Scott, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, &c., Mortgage, Regulations *re* Deposit, &c. (Ques.) 13024 (vi).

——— on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Osler*) 10500 (v).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (fire-guards) 5782; (cattle-guards) 6242, 6321 (iii), 7610 (iv).

Ry. Act (fire guards) Amt. (B. 16) 2° m., 871 (i).

Rys. Land Grants in Man. and N.W.T. and rest of Can., Mileage, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1677 (i).

——— Man. and N.W.T., Area reserved and patented, &c. (Ques.) 2307 (i).

——— Area unpatented, &c. (Ques.) 2583 (ii).

——— Govtl. Action *re* Selection, &c. (Ques.) 4831 (ii).
See 'Lands,' &c. 'Railway Subsidies in Land,' &c.

Ry. Rates, Govt. Control (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14503 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14497 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies in Land and Money in N.W.T. and Man. (Ques.) 1677 (i).

——— paid by Govt. since Confederation, &c. (Ques.) 1198 (i).

Ry. Transportation, N.W.T., Congestion (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2424 (i).

Regina & Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 43) 1°*, 591 (i).

Scrip to Volunteers: *See* 'Man. and N.W.T.' &c.

Snow Storms in N. W. T., False Reports, &c. (remarks) 11822 (v).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census, &c.) 4643 (ii).
Dom. Lands (surveys, printing, &c.) 13777 (vi); (tree culture) 6781 (iii).
Excise (Fyfe, Mr., salary, &c.) 5381; (grain weighing machine) 5381; (inspectors' salaries) 5381 (iii).
Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6673: (agents, &c.) 6836; (Barr Colony) 6870; (diseased immigrants) 6858; (exodus to U.S.) 6876; (expenditure, &c.) 6867; (ques. of order) 6854; (Galicians) 6863, 6878; (U. S. agents, &c.) 6858 (iii).
Indians: Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6343 (iii).
Post Office (Moosejaw postmaster) 6048; (postmasters, salaries) 6048; (ry. mail service, N.W.T.) 5835, 6048 (iii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (St. Joseph wharf) 3384 (ii).
Tel. Lines (N.W.T.) 2715 (ii).

Tariff and Immigration into N.W.T.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6861 (iii).

Textile Fabrics: *See* 'Inspection Act.'

Trant, Mr. (remarks) 3060, 3167 (ii).

Volunteers of Man. and N.W.T., Land Scrip, &c. (Ques.) 820 (i).

Weekly Publications, 'Jesse James Series', Customs Duty (Ques.) 11426 (v).

Weights and Measure Act (scales) Amt. B. 188 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4202 (iv).

Scott, Mr, W.—*Con.*

Wright, A. W., Amounts paid to (Ques.) 8116 (iv).

Sherritt, Mr. J., *N. Middlesex.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4246 (ii).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5463 (iii).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 393 (i).

Census Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13737 (vi).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 787 (i).

Parkhill Mail Contract, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 1594 (i).

SUPPLY :

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Goderich, breakwater) 13242 ; (Grand Bend, pier) 13239 (vi) ; (Port Colborne) 3373 ; (St. Joseph's wharf) 3387 (ii).

Quarantine (hog cholera) 5506 (iii).

Railways: I. C. R. (Toronto stockyards) 8317 (iv).

Sifton, Hon. Clifford (Minister of the Interior) *Brandon.*

Alnwick Band, Mississaga Indians, Claims, &. (Ans.) 6895 (iii).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5965 (iii).

Autonomy to N.W.T. : *See* 'Provincial.'

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6355, 6375 (iii).

See 'Supply—Immigration,' &c.

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5606, 5793 (iii).

Dokis Indian Reserves, Complaints *re* trespassing (Ans.) 7915 (iv).

Dom. Lands Act. B. (M.) dropped, 13444 (vi).

Doukhobors, Loan to by Govt. (Ans.) 5587 (iii).

Estimates, Suppl. (remarks) *re* one-fifth Vote, 6408 (iii).

Fire Guards : *See* 'Ry. B. 21.'

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8617 (iv).

Immigration Expenditure for 1902-3 (Ans.) 6269 (iii).

——— Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Sup., 6603 (iii).

Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 89 (i).

Indian Boy, Sand : *See* 'Sand.'

Interior, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 89 (i).

International Congress of Geology, Visit to Can. (Ans.) 8117 (iv).

McDonnell, Geo., Lease of Grazing Lands, &c. (Ans.) 8339 (iv).

Man. Grain Act (1900) Amt. (B. 232) 1° m., 7294 ; 2° m., 7988 ; in Com., 7991 (iii) ; 9350 (iv).

Man. School Lands, on Inquiry for Ret., 6893 (iii).

Sifton, Hon. Clifford—*Con.*

Moose Deer Point Island, Sale, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6411 (iii).

Pigeon Lake Island, Sale, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).

Provincial Autonomy, N.W.T., Further Cor., &c. (remarks) 7295 (iii).

——— Ret. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6947 (iii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Co., Ret. laid on Table, 7297 (iii).

See 'Supply—Dom. Lands.'

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5784 (iii).

Saskatchewan Land Co., on Inquiry for Ret., 7108 (iii).

Sand, Indian Boy, adopted by Mr. Johnstone (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iii).

Scotch Labourers, Return to Old Country (remarks) 7206 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Dom. Lands (Banff, roads and bridges) 6788 ; (boundary delimitations) 6790 ; (buffalo herd) 6790 ; (commissioner's salary) 6765 ; (half-breed schools, salaries) 6773 ; (homestead inspectors) 6766 ; (homestead lands) 6787 ; (inspector's expenses) 6766 ; (irrigation, &c.) 6764 ; (military asylum pensions) 6788 ; (roads, &c.) 6772 ; (Long Lake and Saskatchewan ry. surveys) 6940 ; (surveys, &c.) 6758, 6939 ; (swamp land expenditure) 6927 ; (Teulon road) 6927; (tree culture) 6774; (Winnipeg office) 6767 ; (Yoho Park roads, &c.) 6790 (iii).

Geological Survey (Bell, Dr., appnmt.) 6816 ; (coal, Sudbury) 6824 ; (geologist, international boundary survey) 6825 ; (instruments purchased) 6820 ; (plans, plottings, &c.) 6826 ; (surveys, exploration, &c.) 6815 (iii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6658 ; (Barr colonists) 6696 ; (Cory, W. W., &c.) 6854 ; (Devlin, Mr., successor) 6732 ; (Ellis, Dr., inspector) 6702 ; (expenditure) 6615 ; (general expenses) 6827 ; (homestead entries) 6704 ; (Lake St. John Col. Co.) 6888 ; (mechanics, &c.) 6833 ; (medical inspection) 6695, 6851 ; (Murray, agent, Scotland, cor., &c.) 6827 ; (Ritchie, U.S. agent) 6849 ; (tents, &c.) 6849 ; (trachoma) 6695 ; (U. S. agents) 6848 ; (White, Mr. W. J., expenses) 6735, 6853 (iii).

Indians: B. C. (Clayoquot school) 7269 ; (fishing, &c., investigation *re*) 7265 ; (reserves, sale of, &c.) 7267 ; (salaries) 7257 ; schools, &c.) 7254, 7260 ; (Songhees, removal, &c.) 7258 ; (travelling expenses) 7262 (iii).

Generally (agency inspectors) 6425 ; (chiefs' salaries) 6410 ; (general vote) 6425 ; (land fund) 6415 ; (legal expenses) 6416 ; (medical attendance) 6421 ; (Robinson treaty payments) 6410 ; (Stewart, E., extra expenses) 6416 ; (survey reserves) 6411 (iii.)

Man., &c. (agricultural implements, &c.) 6422 ; (medical attendance) 6329, 6350 (iii).

See 'N.W.T.' &c.

Mar. Provs. (schools) 6409 (iii).

N. B. (St. John river, pet., &c.) 6352 (iii).

N. S. (seed grain relief) 6417 (iii).

N.W.T. (Elkhorn school) 6348 ; (supplies, &c.) 6422 (iii).

Sifton, Hon. Clifford—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Indians—Con.

Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6326, 6344; (medical attendance) 6409 (iii).

Ont. and Que. (blankets, clothing, &c.) 6409; (medical attendance) 6326; (schools) 6409 (iii).

Que. (medical attendance) 6408; (St. Regis lockup) 6415 (iii).

Yukon Ter. (relief, medical attendance, &c.) 7270 (iii).

Interior (Alaskan boundary commission) 6931; (Amos Barnes, claim) 6922; (assay office, Vancouver) 6799; (astronomical observatory) 6791; (astronomical work) 6790; (Banff museum) 6927; (Bow River, bridge) 6925; (Casca Transportation Co.) 6926; (Howie, F. W., legal expenses) 6795: (Keewatin, govt.) 6797; (Keewatin, lunatics) 6798; (Liard river, miners) 6926; (litigation expenses) 6794; (maps, engraving, &c., N.W.T.) 6800 (iii).

N. W. T. Govt. (additional grant, &c.) 6946; (general expenses) 6888 (iii).

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher, expenditure) 6949, 7275; (govtl. expenses) 6802; (hospital grant) 7291; (Lithgow, Mr., controller) 7287; (Middleton, T. W., defalcations, &c.) 6931; (roads and bridges) 7283 (iii).

Treadgold Concessions, Corrected Answer, 6803 (iii).

——— Free Representations, &c. (Ans.) 5990 (iii).

——— Personnel of Commission *re* (remarks) 7297 (iii).

——— Telegram *re* Free Representations, 6427 (iii).

Smith, Mr. E. D., *S. Wentworth.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4227 (ii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7364 (iii).

British Journalists and Members, Visit to Can. (remarks) 7488 (iii).

Butter, Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5430 (iii).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5477 (iii).

Cold Storage: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 4035 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. (B. 86) 1°*, 1023; 2° m., 2387 (i), 2788; on M. for 2°, 3807 (ii).

——— B. 130 (Mr. *Henderson*) 2° m., 3823 (ii).

Fruit Shipments in Cold Storage to Europe, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 3805 (ii).

——— Value, &c. (Ques.) 3232 (ii).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Léonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4770 (ii).

Govt. Business, on M. to take in Mondays, 3708 (ii).

Permanent Corps, Qualification of Officers, &c. (Ques.) 4443 (ii), 6434 (iii).

See 'Royal.'

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5857 (iii).

Smith, Mr. E. D.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3550, 3714, 3850 (ii), 6208; (telephones) 5553 (iii).

Ry. Transportation from N. W. T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2469 (i).

Royal Canadian Regiment, Strength, &c. (Ques. 3801 (ii).

See 'Permanent.'

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7236 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (cold storage, &c.) 7086 (iii), 7610, 7655; (creameries, &c.) 7633 (iv); (fumigating stations) 4434 (ii).

See 'Mail Subsidies.'

Customs (receipts, &c.) 3923; (salaries, &c.) 3923 (ii).

Dom. Lands (Banff springs) 6789; (boundary delimitations) 6791; (irrigation, surveys, &c.) 6764; (tree culture) 6774 (iii).

Interior (assay office, Vancouver) 6799; (astronomical observatory) 6774 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Australia) 5880 (iii); (Can. and G. B.) 7573 7590 (iv).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (St. John river) 5896; Ont. (Midland, dredging) 5911 (iii); (Port Colborne) 3373 (ii); Que. (Cacouna, wharf) 5900; (Hull, wharf) 5902 (iii).

Quarantine (small-pox) 5032 (ii).

Smith, Mr. R., *Vancouver.*

Alien Restriction Labour Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 2390 (i).

Canada Foundry Co.'s Strike, Representations to Dept. of Labour (remarks) 7205 (iii).

Labour Troubles in B.C., on M. for Com. of Sup (remarks) 945 (i).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2512 (ii).

Ry. Employees Safety (B. 77) 1°m., 872; 2°m. 2386, 2387 (i).

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock* on M. for 2°, 2539 (ii).

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. L. P. Brodeur) *Rouville.*

Address, The, Reply from His Ex. (read) 1204 (i).

Alien Restriction Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) Members remarks checked, 3282 (ii).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2° (ruling) 665 (i).

Bills, Royal Assent Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 5315, 5427, 6353 (iii), 8642 (iv), 14844 (vi).

Bills withdrawn, on M. (Mr. *Hyman*) 7203 (iii).

Binder Twine Inspector's Rep., on M. to suspend Rule (remarks) 13789 (vi).

Brandon, Saskatchewan, &c., B. 157 (Mr. *Stewart*) on Amt. (Mr. *Henderson*) ruling, 5989 (iii).

British Journalists and Members, Visit to Can. (remarks) 7488 (iii).

Brunet: *See* 'Order,' 'St. James,' &c.

Budget, The, Irrelevancy of Debate (ruling) 1735, 1742 (i).

Butter Adulteration Act (remarks) 4960 (ii).

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*

Brockville and North-west Ry. Co. s incorp. B. 89 (Mr. *Calvert*) on M. for 1°, 1193 (i).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7339 ; (ruling) 7339 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order *re* Appeal to Speaker (ruling) 7342 (iii).

——— Translation of Bill (remarks) 7468 ; (ruling) 7469 (iii).

Butter, Can., Mr. Preston's Interview, Members remarks checked, 10746 (v).

Campaign Literature and Sessional Messengers (Ans.) 14286 (vi).

——— *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Canadian Apples, Packing, &c., Members called to Order, 11185 (v).

Cattle Guard Commission, Members remarks checked, 3396 (ii).

Cigarette Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2° (ruling) 3286 (ii).

Clerk of the House (notification of appnmt.) 1 (i).

Columbia River Improvement B. 150 (Mr. *Gallihier*) on Sen. Amts. (ruling) 6847 (iii).

Door-keeper of H. of C., Salary, &c. (remarks) 14115 (vi).

Dundonald, Lord, Telephone Message from Alexandria (ruling) 10536 (v).

Election Petitions, Judge's Reports (notification) 2 (i).

Elevator Accident in House (remarks) 5417 (iii).

Garden Products, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Léonard*) Members remarks checked, 4768, 4779 (ii).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 941 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 4586 (ii).

——— on M. for 3°, Ques. of Order, 8058 (iv).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) and M. (Mr. *Maclean*) that Com. rise (ruling) 7832 (iv).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Wilmot*) Ruling, 8067 (iv).

G. T. Pacific B. 235, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Monk*) that Committee not properly constituted (ruling) 10634 (v).

——— on M. for 3°, Order, Ques. of, Ref. to previous Debate, 12742 (vi).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) *re* Irregularity of Proceeding, 7727 (iv) ; (ruling) 12774 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) *re* Irregularity of Proceeding, 13266 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, Member called to Order, 13271 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) *re* Affidavits being read (ruling) 14847 (vi).

——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Marcil*) 12941 (vi).

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*

G. T Pacific B. 235, onQues. of Order, Member reading Speech (ruling) 10250 (v).

——— Ruling, on M. to receive Pets., &c., 12715 (vi).

——— *re* Vote of Mr. Cargill (remarks) 10538 (v).

Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (ruling) on M. for 2°, 2787 (ii).

——— Members remarks checked, 3248 (ii).

Inspection Act (textile fabrics) Amt. B. 137, on M. for 2° (ruling) 3297 (ii).

Laval Electoral District, Judge's Certificates (notification) 1 (i).

Library of Parlt., Rep. (presented) 6 (i).

Lt. Governor of Ont., Appnmt. of Administrator, &c. (ruling) 110 (i).

Loy, Geo. M. and Election Com., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence (ruling) 7918 (iv).

McCraney, Mr. W., Letter *re* Legislation (ruling) 5363 (iii).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Member (Mr. *Taylor*) called to Order for ref. to past Debate, 14553 (vi).

——— Use of Rooms in H. of C. (stmnt.) 14565 (vi).

——— Ques. of Order, on Mr. Taylor asking Question, 14684 (vi).

See 'Campaign.'

Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) on Sen. Amts., 13624 (vi).

Members, New, Certificates of Election (notification) 3 (i).

Members rights to speak, &c. (ruling) 10536 (v).

Mess. from His Ex. (read) 4, 90, 707, 1204 (i), 4957 (ii), 14042, 14662 (vi).

Messengers of House and Mail Bags : *See* 'Campaign.'

Mounted Police Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for 1°, 14281 (vi).

Mount Royal Savings Bank B. 153 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. to withdraw Bill, 10831 (v).

Mowat, Sir Oliver : *See* 'Lt. Gov.'

Ontario Electoral District, Certificate : Notification, 367 (i).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3° (ruling) 4871 (ii).

Order of the House, &c., Remarks of Mr. Borden *re*, 12724 (vi).

Order, Ques. of *re* Brunet, Arthur, and Dom. Election (ruling) 108 (i).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Bennett*) Irrelevancy of Deb. *re* Mr. Oliver (ruling) 11564 (v).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Monk*) on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Osler*) ruling, 10505 (v).

Order, Questions of (Mr. *Ingram*) on ruling (remarks) 10537 (v).

See 'Privilege,' &c.

Parliament Grounds, Mutilation, &c., Members remarks checked, 2398 (i).

Petitions presented, Rules, &c. (remarks) 6 (i).

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*

Petitions received *re* G. T. P. Ry. (ruling) 12715 (vi).

Petitions *re* Subsidies, Rejected, 654 (i).

See 'Subsidies.'

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 1° (ruling) 5241 (iii).

Post Office, Deptl. Rep., Distribution, &c. (remarks) 880 (i).

Press Gallery Representatives, Sessional Allowance (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14114, 14243 (iv).

Preston, Mr., and Can. Butter : *See* 'Butter.'

Private Bills, Notice, on M. (Mr. *Demers*) to revise Rules, 12216 (v), 13549 (vi).

——— Rules *re* presenting (remarks) 482 (i).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) Statement of member must be accepted, 10503 (v).

——— (Mr. *Clancy*) *re* member reading a letter from Hugh Sutherland, Ruling, 10530 (v).

——— (Mr. *Roche*, *Halifax*) 'Outskirts of Civilization,' on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 13374 (vi).

See 'Order,' &c.

Procedure, Ques. of, 5892 (iii).

Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 14844 (vi).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to M. for 3°, (ruling) 8351 (iv).

——— Mess. from Senate *re* Conference on Amts., 14734 (vi).

——— on Conference with Senate *re* its Amts., Names of Managers (read) 14740 ; M. to suspend Sittings of Hse., 14740 (vi).

——— Procedure, Bourinot quoted, &c. 14760 (vi).

Railway Policy of Govt., Member (Mr. *Sproule*) must not refer to previous Debate, 7121 (iii).

Ry. Subsidies Act Amt. B. 2 (ruling) 548 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66, on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) Ruling, 12432, 12435 (v).

Royal Assent to Bills, Com. from His Ex. (read) 5315 (iii).

See 'Bills,' &c.

Rules of the House, on M. (Mr. *Demers*) to amend, 12216 (v), 13549 (vi).

Russell Electoral Division, Notification of Vacancy, 1023 (i).

St. James Division, Montreal, Judge's Certificates (notification) 1 (i).

——— Judgment of Supreme Court, (notification) 91 (i).

——— Vacancy (remarks) 410, 1023 (i).

Stock Exchange Speculations, Members remarks checked, 7044 (iii).

Subsidies for Public Highways, Pets., &c. (ruling) 591 (i).

See 'Petitions.'

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

Legislation : House of Commons (debates, &c.) 5265 (iii) ; (debates, amanuenses) 14243 (vi) ; (messengers) 5265 ; (printing, &c.) 5267 (iii) ; (salaries, increases) 14112 ; (sessional clerks) 14113, 14242 ; (sessional messengers) 14243 (vi) ; (voters' lists) 5274 ; Library of Parlt., 5267 ; Senate (contingencies) 5264 (iii).

Telephone Service in H. of C. (remarks) 5088 (ii).

Terrebonne Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 7 (i).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 5555 (iii).

Transcontinental Ry. B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) Ruling reserved, 7727 (iv).

——— *See* 'G. T. P. Ry.'

Two Mountains Ry. Facilities, Ques. of Order (ruling) 7571 (iv).

Vacancies, Notification, 2 (i).

Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s B. 26 (remarks) 630-1 (i).

——— on M. to ref. to Private Bills Com. (ruling) 664 (i).

Yukon Telegraph Line, Members remarks checked, 7005 (iii).

Speaker, Mr. Deputy (Mr. P. Macdonald) *E. Huron.*

Anglo-American Cable Co., Irrelevancy of Debate, 13338 (vi).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) on Amt. (Mr. *LaRivière*) ruling, 5559 (iii).

——— (ruling) *re* Notice of Amt., 5970 (iii).

Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co. (ruling) 852 (i).

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com., 1808 (i).

Binder Twine Bounties, Ques. of Order, Remarks checked, 7305 (iii).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) read, 7400 ; (ruling) 7401 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) Irregularity of Deb. in Com., 5616 (iii).

——— Members' remarks checked, 4991 (ii).

Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Co.'s B. 54 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 2303 (i).

Century Life Ins. Co.'s B. 175, on Amt. (Mr. *Scott*) ruling, 5360 (iii).

——— on Amt. of Mr. Morrison (ruling) 6199 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 843 (i).

Civil Servants, Interference in Elections, on Ques. of Order, 3167 (ii).

Civil Service B. 257, on Com. on Res., Members' remarks checked, 12338, 12561 (v).

Conciliation Act Amt. B. 95, Irrelevancy of Debate, 3262 (ii).

Speaker, Mr. Deputy—*Con.*

Customs Act Amt., Irrelevancy of Deb. (ruling) 3058 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3, in Com. (ruling) 910 (i).
——— (remarks) 13569 (vi).
——— Amt. (Mr. *Campbell*) ruled out of order, 14424 (vi).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Clancy*) (remarks) 1062 (i).
Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3578 (ii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 64, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 5170 (iii).
——— in Com., Members' remarks checked, 7825; (ruling) 7814, 7826 (iv).
——— on Remarks *re* Par. in *Globe* (Mr. *Haggart*), Irrelevancy of Deb. (ruling) 5894 (iii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) Members' remarks checked, 10622, 10640, 11292, 11980, 11987, 12231, 12250 (v).
——— (amt.) read, 11834 (v).
——— Two-cent rate (ruling) 12235 (v).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., Ques. of Order, ref. to past Debate, 8212; (ruling) 8214 (iv).
Mess. from His Ex. (estimates, suppl.) 12869 (vi).
New Canadian Co.'s B. 83 (Mr *Lemieux*) 2° m., 1328 (i).
N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256, Members' remarks checked, 12326 (v).
Order, Ques. of, (Mr. *Maclean*) in Com. on Criminal Code Amt., 318 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208, Irrelevancy of Debate, 5868 (iii).
Ry. Act B. 21 (ruling) on Amts., 6220, 6272, 6311 (iii) 8143 (iv).
——— Com. from Senate insisting on its Amts., 14519 (vi).
——— Discussion *re* Private Bill (ruling) 6106 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* Telephones (ruling) 5548 (iii).
——— Members' remarks checked, 5767 (iii).
Ry. Act (govt. supplies) B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., Members' remarks checked 12982 (vi).
Ry. Subsidies B. 2 (ruling) 551 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12293 (v).
——— Irrelevancy of Debate, 10966 (v).
——— Members' remarks checked, 11617 (v).
——— Ques. of Order, 11470, 11474 (v).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Lennox*) 11710 (v).
St. Chrysostôme Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. *Brown*) in Com. (remarks) 7771 (iv).
Seeds, Inspection B. 200, Members' remarks checked, 6478 (iii).
——— (remarks) 7215, 7218 (iii).
Skinner's Pond (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi)

Speaker, Mr. Deputy—*Con.*

SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.—Justice (ruling) 209 (i); Public Works (remarks) 5824 (iii).
Fisheries: Members' remarks checked, 5294, 5296 (iii).
Immigration (observance of rules) 6862; (quoting from speeches) Ruling, 6870-6874; Remarks *re* Discussion, 6708, 6724, 6854 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) Members' Remarks checked, 7778 (iv).
Interior (Liard River miners) remarks, 6926 (iii).
Militia (stores branch) Amt., 3609 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (members' remarks checked) 4043 (ii).
Post Office (irrelevancy of debate) 5954 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings—Generally (ruling) 516 (i). N.B. (Campbellton) Members' Remarks checked, 13043, 13052; Ont. (ventilation of Chamber) 13010; (Wingham, P.O.) 13120 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers: Generally (irrelevancy of debate) 2638, 2669 (ii). N. S. Members' Remarks checked, 13171 (vi). Ont. (Bayfield, pier) 1189 (i). Que. (irrelevancy of debate) 2270 (i). Members' Remarks checked, 3367 (ii).
Railways: P.E.I. Ry. (M.) to reduce Vote, 7539 (iii).
Sydney Harbour Commission B., in Com. on Res. (ruling) 12306 (v).
Telegraphic Systems, P.E.I., in Com. of Sup., Members' Remarks checked, 13330 (vi).
Toronto and James Bay Ry., on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Hughes*, Victoria) (ruling) 14360 (vi).
Transportation Facilities, Irregularity of Debate (ruling) 3470 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S., *E. Grey.*

Adjournment of Hse., Procedure *re* (remarks) 6630 (iii).
Alaskan Boundary Commission, Refusal of Can. Commissioners to sign the award (remarks) 14402 (vi).
Alien (restriction) Labour Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 2388 (i).
Allan Line Steamers, Rate of Speed (remarks) 13672 (vi).
Alliance Bank of Canada incorp. B. 212 (Mr. *Russell*) in Com., 7473 (iii).
Anthrax in Cattle, Par. in Newspapers (remarks) 10102 (v).
Assiniboine River and Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 6846 (iii).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Delay of Govt., &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 14178 (vi).
See 'Supply—Mail Subsidies.'
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. for 2°, 664, 1509 (i).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com., 1806 (i).
Auditor General and Treasury Board, &c. (remarks) 11553 (v).
Automatic Grain Weighers in N.W.T. (remarks) 885 (i).
Autonomy to N.W.T.: *See* 'N.W.T.'

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6394, 6400 (iii).

Bass River (N.S.) Light (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14249 (vi).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7314, 7384 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties, &c., on Ques. of Order, 7307 (iii).

Binder Twine Inspector's Rep. (M.) for Distribution, 13789 (vi).

Binder Twine, 8th Rep. of Com. on Ag., on M. to conc., 14043 (vi).

——— Opinion of Min. of Jus. *re* Mr. Haycock's Powers, 14047 (vi).

See 'Supply—Justice, Penitentiaries.'

British Cable News Service B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 236 (iv).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7400; on M. for 3°, Ques. of Order, 7343, 7469, (iii).

Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14437 (vi).

Budget, The, 1740 (i).

Business of the Hse. (remarks) 871, 2501 (i).

——— Govt. Legislation, &c. (remarks) 1350 (i); 6352 (iii).

——— on M. to take in Mondays, 3711 (ii).

——— Ry. Resolutions, &c. (remarks) 11422 (v).

See 'Govt.'

Butter Adulterations, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5054; in Com., 5422; (amt.) 5430 (iii).

Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Can. Associated Press Despatches: *See* 'British Cable,' &c.

Canadian Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14510 (vi).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5596, 5616 (iii).

C. P. R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14501 (vi).

Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 189 (Mr. *Birkett*) in Com., 7484 (iii).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5555 (iii).

Canals, Tonnage Dues, Abolition of (Ques.) 874 (i).

Casey, Mr., and Archives, 13505 (vi).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 376 (i).

——— Par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 14054 (vi).

Cattle purchased in S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5473 (iii).

Census of 1901, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 290 (i).

See 'Pub. Accts.'

Census Expenditure, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13710, 13721 (vi).

See 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 5360, 5584 (iii).

Chateauguay and Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14486 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 843 (i).

——— *See* 'Criminal Code B. 215.'

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12368 (v); in Com. on B., 13813, 13834; on M. for 3°, 13946 (vi).

Clergue Contract with Govt. for Steel Rails, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

Collingwood Dry Dock: *See* 'Dry Docks.'

Country Postmasters, Salary, &c., in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5678 (iii).

Cricket Playing on Parlt. Grounds: *See* 'Parliament,' &c.

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) Amt. B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 3240 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7491, 7501 (iii); (cigarettes) 10748 (v).

Cumberland Coal and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 4010 (ii).

Debates, Official, 6th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Champagne*) to conc., 9350 (iv).

Discriminating Freight Rates *re* Ocean Vessels (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13688 (vi).

Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14337 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 894 (i); in Com., 13584 (vi).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3010, 3026 (ii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).

Embargo on Cattle: *See* 'Cattle.'

Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3226, 3580, 3751 (ii).

Ewart, Mr., Address to Judge *re* Treadgold Commission, &c. (remarks) 11072 (v).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 296 (i).

Fast Atlantic: *See* 'Atlantic.'

Fitzgerald, W. W., Homestead Pre-emption (M. for cor.) 289 (i).

France and Can. SS. Subsidy B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 10811; in Com. on B., 12299 (v).

Franking of Provincial Documents, 14036 (vi).

Freight Rates: *See* 'Rys.,' 'Discriminating,' &c.

Geological Survey, Maps: *See* 'Maps.'

Germans in Canada, Recruiting for Naval Service (remarks) 8717 (iv).

German Tariff Cor., Papers laid on Table (remarks) 1460 (i).

Govt. Business, &c. (remarks) 13547 (vi).

——— Precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 940 (i).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Govt. Business, &c. *See* 'Business of the House,' &c.

Grain Blockade in N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'

Grain Weighers: *See* 'Inspection.'

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 3°, 8057 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8746 (iv); in Com. on B., 10424, 10635, 11307, 11390, 11393, 11967, 11975, 12064, 12111, 12206, 12235 (v); on M. for 3°, 12657 (vi).

——— Ques. of Order, *re* Irregularity of Introduction of B., Speaker's ruling asked for, 7726 (iv), 12774 (vi).

——— 'Hansard' Reporters not reporting Com., Mr. Speaker's ruling asked for, 10633 (v).

——— (M.) that Com. rise, 10633 (v).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13268, 13273 (vi).

——— on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) *re* Pets., Ques. of Order, 13266 (vi).

——— *See* 'Ry. Policy.'

G. T. P. Bill 235, Distribution to Members (remarks) 8919 (iv).

Halifax Elevator (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12825 (vi).

'Hansard' Reporters not reporting Com., Mr. Speaker's ruling asked for, 10633 (v).

Haycock, Mr., Inspector of Binder Twine, Authority to Inflict Penalties, Opinion of Min. of Jus., 14044 (vi).

Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 679 (i).

Hides Inspection, Tel. from W. F. Maclean, M.P. (read) 3969 (ii).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 742 (i).

Hudson's Bay and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 117) 1°*, 1642 (i).

Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Sup., 6590 (iii).

——— *See* 'Barr.'

Imperial Defences, and prop. Res. of Lord Rosebery (remarks) 410 (i).

Insolvency B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 3249 (ii).

Inspection, General, Act (weighmasters) Amt. B. 266 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 14311 (vi).

Intercolonial Conference, Cor. *re* (remarks) 8230 (iv).

Iron and Steel Bounties Act Amt. B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10799 (v).

Joint High Commission, Letter *re* Reciprocity (read) 14053 (vi).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10788; in Com. on B., 11418 (v).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 255 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (Quebec) 12301 (v).

——— Retiring Allowances B. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8103, 8371 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 14290 (vi).

Kingston Penitentiary, Contracts *re* Groceries, &c. (Ques.) 10100 (v).

——— *See* 'Supply—Justice, Penitentiaries.'

Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14490 (vi).

Lake St. John Ry. to La Tuque, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8201 (iv).

Librarians of Parlt. B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 13832; in Com. on B., 14299 (vi).

Lt. Governor of Ont., Appnmt. of Administrator, on M. for Com. of Sup,, 121 (i).

——— (remarks) 663, 1206 (i).

Loan Companies, Extension of Powers B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2351 (i).

Lumber Combine in N. W. T. (remarks) 1587 (i).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints *re* (remarks) 14225 (vi).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14397 (vi).

Maps, Printing for Geological Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).

——— *See* 'Supply—Geological.'

Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5097 (ii), 5359 (iii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Lighthouse,' &c,

Martineau, Inquiry for Papers, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Militia.'

Matane and Gaspé Ry. Subsidy, in Com on Res., 14484 (vi).

Meaford, Ry. to Wharf, &c. (remarks) 14507 (vi).

Midway to Vernon Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) 5715 (iii)

Militia Pensions Act Amt. B. 78 (Sir *F. W. Borden*) on M. for 1°, 872; in Com., 2240 (i).

Milk Cans B.: *See* 'Weights,' &c.

Ministers, Reduction in Number, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 282 (i).

Montreal and Atlantic and South Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14486 (vi).

Montreal *Herald* and Mr. Fisher: *See* 'Privilege.'

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 5418 (iii).

Mowat, Sir Oliver: *See* 'Lt.-Gov.'

Mulloy, Trooper of S. A. Contingent, Pension by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14593 (vi).

Nationality of Mr. Gallery, 13506 (vi).

Navigable Waters Act (swing bridges) Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12779.

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Nepigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14395 (vi).

New Canadian Co.'s B. 83 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 1512 (i).

Newspaper Despatches from G.B.: *See* 'British,' &c.

Newspaper Postage: *See* 'Post Office B. 208.'

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s B., on M. to receive Pet., 5511 (iii).

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Ry. and Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14337 (vi).

Nicolet River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).

Nova Scotia and Eastern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14327 (vi).

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12310 (v).

Ottawa Buildings, Govt. Offices rented, leased, &c. (M. for ret.) 588 (i).

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineers, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for Copies, 1314 (i).

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) on prop. Res., 6270; in Com. on B., 6806 (iii).

Ottawa Northern and C. P. Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).

Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 59 (Mr. *Monk*) 2° m., 1511 (i).

Parliamentary Documents, Postage *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14036 (vi).

Parliament Grounds, Mutilation, &c. (remarks) 2398, 2421 (i).

Paspebiac to Gaspé Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 10825 (v).

Penny Banks Establishment B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10797 (v).

Pilotage Act (Montreal and Quebec Districts) Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12782; in Com., 13630 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 5241; in Com., 5667 (iii).

Post Office Revenue, Increase of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup,, 14033 (vi).

Post Office Savings Banks B. 220 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6814 (iii).

Preferential Trade, Offer of Can. Govt. to G.B. (remarks) 3219 (ii).

Press Despatches from G.B.: *See* 'British,' &c.

Prime Minister, Congratulations *re* twenty-five years as Member (remarks) 11690 (v).

Private Bills, Extension of Time (remarks) 2396 (i); 4958 (ii); 10490 (v).

——— Notices, &c., on M. (Mr. *Demers*) to amend Rules; Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13548 (vi).

Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (Mr. *Fisher*) 5314 (iii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in Ottawa *Journal* (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* Visitors to Corridors, 11563 (v).

——— (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters,' 10503, 10513 (v).

Procedure *re* Adjournment of Hse. (remarks) 6630 (iii).

Provincial Autonomy to N.W.T.: *See* 'N.W.T.'

Public Accounts Com., producing Census Schedules (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7058 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Resolutions (remarks) 14042, 14280, 14402 (vi).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 563 (i).

Ry. Commissioners Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8122 (iv).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 264 (i); in Com., 3542, 3716, 3834, 3856, 3883, 3991 (ii), 5250, 5568, 5688, 6121, 6174, 6203, 6279 (iii), 8194 (iv); (telephones) 5519 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to M. for 3°, 8352 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 13835 (vi).

——— on M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Com. *re* Senate Amts., 14520 (vi).

——— Ques. of Order *re* (Mr. *Campbell*) 6105 (iii).

——— Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2557 (ii).

Railway Appropriations voted by Parlt., Transferred to other Appropriations, 14060 (vi).

Railways constructed without Govt. Aid, Man. and N.W.T. (Ques.) 8487 (iv).

Ry. Mail Clerks, in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5667 (iii).

Ry. Policy, Announcement by Govt. (remarks) 6426 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7118 (iii).

Ry. Rates, Control by Govt., Sec. 6 of Res. (remarks) 14502 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies by Provs., Amounts to each Prov., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14484 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies, General Policy (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14363 (vi).

——— (inquiry) 11422 (v).

——— Payments of, &c. (remarks) 14513 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14320, 14431; (cost of ry. bridges) 14512; auditing books by Aud. Gen., 14516 (vi).

Ry. Transportation in N.W.T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2496 (i).

Reciprocity with U.S. and Joint High Commission, Letter from an M.P. (read) 14053 (vi). *See* 'Joint.'

Red Deer Valley Ry. & Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 1813 (i).

Representation in the House of Commons, B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°, 713; on M. for 2°, 1282; (amt.) 1284; neg. (Y. 37; N. 72) 1292 (i); in Com., 10944; 10958, 11057, 11470, 11511, 11584, 11628, 12294; (Brant) 11105; on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) to M. for 3°, 12433 (v).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Representation in the House of Commons, Evidence, Papers, &c. (remarks) 11424 (v).

Representation in H. of C. from Ont., Cor., &c. (M. for copies *) 2337 (i).

Rosebery and Imperial Defence : *See* 'Imperial.'

St. Francis River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).

Salmon Industry, B.C., Complaints *re* (remarks) 9979 (iv).

San José Scale *re* Nursery Stock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13502 (vi).

Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s incorp. B. 113 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) in Com., 3225 (ii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5084 (ii); in Com. 6481, 7212 (iii).

Senate Amts. to Money Bills, Unconstitutionalty of (remarks) 14290 (vi).

Settlers' Claims *re* Rebellion of 1885, on M. for Sup., 13950 (vi).

Shipping Federation of Canada incorp. B. 93 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 2° m., 1328 (i).

South African Medals, Regulations *re* (remarks) 8267, 8320 (iv).

See 'Hay,' &c.

South-eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 457 (i).

Statutes, Revision Commission, Names, Progress, &c. (Ques.) 1029 (i).

Statutes, Revised, Publication Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 634 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 225 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 6542 (iii).

Steel Rails, Clergue's Contract, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7046 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Bill 218 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6171 (iii).

——— (remarks) *re* one-fifth vote, 6408 (iii).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13506; (archives) 13503; (Can. exhibit at Imp. Institute) 13511 (vi); (census schedules) 7054; (census, total cost) 7053; (cold storage) 7637; (creameries) 7636 (iv); (fumigating stations) 13502; (Toronto industrial exhibition) 13051; (tuberculosis, aid to Can. association) 13517 (vi).

Canals (Galops rapids, deepening, &c.) 8396 (iv); Sault Ste. Marie (coaling facilities) 7561; (construction) 7560 (iii).

Charges of Management (Dom. notes, printing) 14252; (public debt) 14254 (vi).

Civil Govt.: Aud. General (promotions) 14256 (vi); Customs (salaries) 319 (i); Geological Survey (Low, Mr., salary) 13771; (salaries) 13770, 13771 (vi); High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 13772 (vi); Indian Affairs (salaries) 282 (i); 13760 (vi); Interior (salaries) 13762; (Mines branch, salaries) 13764 (vi); Labour Dept. (salaries) 7151 (iii); Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 342 (i); (salaries) 13663 (vi); N.W. Mounted Police (salaries) 13761 (vi); Public Works (architect's salary) 13499

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt.—Con.

(salaries) 13500 (vi); Railways and Canals (2nd class clerk) 14055 (vi); (salaries) 333 (i); Sec. of State (clerks' salaries) 14254 (vi).

Customs (contingent expenses) 3782, 3787, 3901; (inspectors, preventive service, &c.) 3952; (preferential tariff) 3932; (stationery, &c.) 3964 (ii).

Dom. Lands (Banff, roads and bridges) 6788; (boundary delimitations) 6791; (commissioner's salary) 6765; (inspectors' expenses) 6766 (iii); (maps, printing, &c.) 14272; (salaries, outside service) 13772 (vi); (surveys, &c.) 6759 (iii); (surveys, plans, &c.) 13777 (vi); (tree culture) 6779 (iii).

Excise (analysts, &c.) 5393; (inspectors' salaries) 5381; (liquor analysis) 5396 (iii).

Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5279, 5293 (iii); (fish hatcheries) 13660 (vi); (salaries) conc., 6069; (steamers, construction, &c.) 5296 (iii); (steamers, new) 13659 (vi); (U. S. licenses, &c.) 5309 (iii).

Geological Survey (coal discovery, Sudbury) 6824; (exploration, &c.) 6822 (iii); (maps, lithographing, &c.) 13778 (vi); (plans, plottings, &c.) 6827 (iii).

Govt. of N. W. T. (registrars, &c.) 13787 (vi).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6658; (Ellis, Dr., inspector) 6702; (expenditure) 6616 (iii); (general expenses) 2300 (i); (trachoma, &c.) 6843 (iii).

Indians: B.C. (medical attendance) 13785 (vi); (schools, medical attendance) 7255 (iii); (steam launch) 13787 (vi).

Generally (agency inspectors) 6425; (general vote) 6425; (legal expenses) 6418 (iii).

Man., &c. (agricultural implements, &c.) 6422; (medical attendance) 6351 (iii): (agricultural implements) 13782; (industrial schools) 13784; (medical attendance, Dr. West) 13784; (surveys) 13784; (triennial clothing) 13783 (vi).

N. W. T. (supplies) 6422 (iii).

N. S. (medical attendance and medicines) 6421; (seed grain, relief, &c.) 6417, 6420 (iii).

Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6327 (iii).

Ont. and Que. (Doncaster reserve road) 13780 (vi); (medical attendance) 6327 (iii); (Rama indians, roads, &c.) 13781; (roads, repairs) 13779 (vi).

Que. (St. Regis lockup) 6416 (iii).

Yukon (relief, medical attendance, &c.) 7270 (iii).

Inland Revenue (Bourassa, Mr., guarantee policy) 5407; (Ferguson, Mr., legal services) 5412 (iii).

Interior (assay office, Vancouver) 6799; (astronomical observatory) 6791; (Keewatin govt.) 6797; (Keewatin lunatics) 6798; (litigation expenses) 6794; (telescope for observatory) 6792 (iii).

Justice, Administration of: B. C. (Judges' travelling allowance) 3400 (ii).

Exchequer Court (salaries) 3406 (ii).

Generally (executions, expenditure) 3401 (ii).

N.W.T. (Supreme Court judge) 14258 (vi).

Ont. (Nipissing judgeship) 14258 (vi).

Supreme Court (library) 3404 (ii).

Yukon (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3414 (ii); (law library) 14267 (vi); (living allowance, judges) 3411; (living allowances, officials) 3411 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Justice, Administration of—Con.

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3513; (Kingston) 3511; (Manitoba) 3534; (St. Vincent de Paul) 3534 (ii).

Labour Dept. (*Gazette*, printing, &c.) 7197 (iii).

Legislation: House of Commons (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing) 14269 (vi); (messengers, &c.) 5265 (iii), 14243 (vi); (printing, advertising, &c.) 5268 (iii); (salaries, increases) 14112 (vi); (voters' lists) 5274 (iii).

Library of Parlt., 5267 (iii).

Senate (contingencies) 5264 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agency, Montreal) 13632; (gas lights) 13635; (Halifax harbour, buoys) 13639; (Marconi stations) 13640; (St. Lawrence lights) 13632; (sweeping boats) 13636 (vi).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 13678 (vi); (freight rates, &c.) 7586 (iii); (G.B. and Can.) 13672; (Magdalen islands) 13676 (vi); (St. John and Belfast) 7731 (iv); (St. John, N.B., and Glasgow) 13674; (Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence) 13677; (Victoria and Vancouver) 13694; (wrecking plant) 13698 (vi).

Militia (annual drill) 3606, 5005; (cadet training) 3773 (ii); (Dom. arsenal) 7089 (iii); (Esquimalt defences) 3778; (G.O.C.) 3780; (grants to associations) 3773; (Martineau investigation) 3752; (pay and allowance) 3601; (Valleyfield strike) 3753 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Perkins, Wm., Lisgar election petition) 14251 (vi); (tobacco commission) 8268 (iv); Yukon (Canadian Bank of Commerce) 14274 (vi).

N.W. Mounted Police (compensation for injuries) 5264 (iii); (Yukon) 5003 (ii); (Yukon, salaries) 5263 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (life-saving awards) 13544 (vi); (masters and mates examination) 13525 (vi); (St. Lawrence transportation) 4046 (ii); (surveys, northern coast) 13760; (wrecks, investigation) 13545 (vi).

Public Works: Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 972 (i).

N.B. (St. John immigration) 413; (St. John quarantine water service) 415 (i).

N.S. (Halifax) 411 (i).

Ont. (Alexandria P.O.) 494; (Bowmanville) 510; (Clinton P.O.) 523; (Cobourg armoury) 640; (Dom. renewals, &c.) 636; (Ft. William) 636; (Guelph P.O.) 638; (Kingston military stables) 639; (London, drill hall) 645; (Toronto, custom house) 649; (Toronto, post office) 956; (Toronto Junction, post office) 650 (i).

Ottawa (additional land) 353; (astronomical observatory) 342; (electric lighting) 988; (furniture, &c.) 980; (rentals, &c.) 989; (Rideau Hall, drainage) 647 (i); (Rideau Hall grounds) 5006 (ii); (Royal Mint) 348; (Victoria museum) 365 (i), 14243 (vi).

Que. (hospital for trachoma) 14246 (vi); (Thetford Mines) 441; (Valleyfield P.O.) 444 (i).

Docks (repairs, &c.) 2978, 2979 (ii),

Dredging (dredge vessels) 2612; (new dredges) 2673 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Arrow Lakes) 13305; (Columbia River) 13304; (dredging plant, &c.) 13311; (Fraser river, improvements) 13305; (Quatsino, wharf) 13305; (Williams Head, wharf) 13306;

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

(general vote) 13308 (vi).

Generally (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2650 (ii).

Man. (Dauphin Lake) 1448; (Gull Harbour) 1448; (Hnausa, wharf) 1448; (Manitoba Lake) 1449 (i); (St. Andrews Rapids) 3356; (snag boat) 2672 (ii); (White Mud, dredging) 1450 (i).

Mar. Provs. (dredging plant) 2669 (ii); (hydraulic dredge) 13312 (vi).

Ont. (Bowmanville, pier) 1353; (Depot Harbour) 1359 (i); (dredging plant) 2672 (ii); (general repairs) 1372; (Goderich harbour) 1368; (Lake Temiscamingue, wharf) 1376; (Petewawa narrows) 1425, 1442, 1447 (i); (Port Arthur) 3348 (ii); (Point au Baril route) 1365; (Port Elgin, dredging) 1424; (Port Hope, pier) 1425; (Rivière aux Puces) 1425; (Rondeau harbour) 1427 (i); (St. Joseph's wharf) 3385 (ii); (Sturgeon Falls, wharf) 1431; (Southampton, harbour) 1428; (Thornbury, harbour) 1432 (i); 13450 (vi); (Wendover, wharf) 1438 (i).

P. E. I. (dredging plant) 13314 (vi).

Que. (Barachois de Malbaie) 13445 (vi); (Batiscan channel) 2280 (i); (Bonaventure East, breakwater) 13446; (Caplan, breakwater) 13449; (Chambord, wharf) 13454; (Chateau Richer) 13456; (Douglastown, isolated block) 13457 (vi); (Esquimaux Point) 2278 (i); (Gatineau River, C.P.R. Bridge) 13457 (vi); (Grande Vallée, pier) 1514, 1523; (Grosse Isle) 425; (Kamouraska, pier) 13458 (vi); (Lake Temiscamingue, dredging) 2247; (Le Tableau, wharf) 2256 (i); (Lotbinière wharf) 13460; (Mont Louis, wharf) 13461 (vi); (Murray Bay, wharf) 2269; (Newport, breakwater) 2277; (Nicolet River) 2278; (Pointe St. Pierre) 2279; (repairs, improvements) 2241; (Rivière aux Renards) 2280; (St. Francis, ice pier) 2284 (i); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3310 (ii); (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2258; (St. Maurice, dredging) 2286 (i); (Seven Islands, wharf) 13483; (Sorel, wharf) 12856, 12869 (vi); (Three Rivers, wharfs) 2297 (i).

Yukon (Lewes and Yukon river) 13307 (vi).

Miscellaneous (transportation commission) 13363 (vi).

Roads and Bridges, N.W.T. (Peace River, pack trail) 13324; (Pelly River bridge) 13368; Ottawa (Dufferin, &c.) 13321 (vi).

Slides and Booms (salaries) 2974; (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2975 (ii).

Telegraph Lines—B.C. (working expenses) 13368 (vi).

Mar. Provs. (Chatham to Tracadie) 13325 (vi).

Que. (Marconi, Chateau Bay) 13325 (vi).

Yukon (generally) 2994 (ii); (Yukon, working expenses) 14041 (vi).

Quarantine (cattle, &c.) 5503; hog cholera) 5505 (iii); (public health) 5007 (ii), 5490 (iii); (small-pox) 5007 (ii), 5491 (iii).

Railways—G.T.R. (rental) 12887 (vi).

I.C.R. (Connolly's claims) 14105 (vi); (draw bars, exchange) 8289; (Halifax, accommodation) 8316 (iv); 12825; (general vote) 12877 (vi); (Moncton work shops) 8313; (Pintsch gas equipment) 8292; (rolling stock) 8294

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—Con.

(iv); 14100; (St. John accommodation) 12823; (sidings, additional) 14055 (vi); (steel rails, &c.) 5006 (ii); 14097 (vi); (Toronto stock yards) 8317 (iv).

P. E. I. (Hillsborough bridge) 12829, 12838, 14117 (vi).

Yukon Govt. (administration, &c.) 13367 (vi); (Eldorado Gusher) 7277; (hospital grants) 7291; (roads and bridges) 7283 (iii).

Supreme Court Registrar B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14308, 14403 (vi).

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12304 (v).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4908 (ii).

Tilsonburg and Lake Erie Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14385 (vi).

Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14430 (vi).

Tobin Co. and Trois Pistoles Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 14462 (vi).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9425 (iv).

Transcontinental Ry. B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°; Ques. of Order, 7726 (iv).

——— *See* 'G. T. P. B. 235.'

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13363 (vi).

——— Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3442 (ii).

——— Par. in Montreal *Herald re* Mr. Préfontaine's Speech (remarks) 865 (i).

——— *See* Rys.,' &c.

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson newspapers (remarks) 11070 (v).

——— (remarks) 13792 (vi).

Trent Canal, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2331 (i).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2343 (i).

Westminster Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 249 (Mr. *Morrison*) on M. to receive Pet., 10744 (v).

Winnipeg Beach to Icelandic River, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14339 (vi).

York and Carleton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14488 (vi).

Yukon Ter. Act (approval of regulations) in Com. on Res., 13792 (vi).

Yukon, Regulations *re* Dom. Lands, in Com. on Res., 13792 (vi).

Stephens, Mr. G., *Kent (O).*

Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 171) 1°*, 2675 (ii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 841 (i).

Stephens, Mr. G.—*Con.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9963 (iv).

Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8103 (iv).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11005; (Kent) 11576 (v).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6183 (iii); (drainage) 4751 (ii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7213, 7235 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies) 4097 (ii).

Stewart, Mr. D. A., *Lisgar.*

Automatic Grain Weighers in N. W. T., Rep. of Inspector, &c. (M. for ret.) 847 (i).

Brandon, Saskatchewan & Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 157) in Com., 5985 (iii).

Grain Weighing in Man. and N. W. T. (remarks) in Com. on B. 188, 4194 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10235 (v).

Hudson's Bay and Pacific Ry. Co. (B. 124) 1°*, 1764 (i).

Morden Board of Trade, Res. *re* Wheat Freight Rates (Ques.) 12074 (v).

Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meeting, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 469 (i).

SUPPLY:

Excise (Fyfe, Mr., salary) 5384 (iii).

Weights and Measures Act (scales) Amt. B. 188 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4194 (ii).

Wheat Freight Rates, Res. of Morden Board of Trade (Ques.) 12074 (v).

Sutherland, Hon. James (Minister of Public Works) *N. Oxford.*

Alaskan Boundary Commission, Reported Interview of Mr. Aylesworth (remarks) 13961 (vi).

Amherst, Post Office, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 1591 (i).

Anglo-American Tel. Co. and P. E. I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vi).

Annandale ier, P. E. I., Amount expended (Ans.) 2921 (ii).

Armouries Construction: *See* 'Supply—Public Works, Buildings, Generally.'

Arsenault, Capt., Compensation for Damages to Schooner (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

Art Gallery, Expenditure on Paintings, &c. (Ans.) 12717 (vi).

Assiniboine and Red Rivers Navigation, Improvement, &c. (Ans.) 1298 (i).

——— Rep. of Board of Trade, Winnipeg (Ans.) 1860 (i).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5888, 5961, 6846 (iii).

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11171 (v).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

Bay of Quinte Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14436 (vi).

Beauharnois Electoral District, Representation and Independence of Parlt. Act, on M. to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com., 7103 (iii).

Blind River Wharf, Contracts, Plans, &c. (Ans.) 1298 (i).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 6656 (iii).

Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14439 (vi).

C. P. R. car 001, Improvements to, &c. (Ans.) 14282 (vi).

C. P. R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14498 (vi).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5885 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12502 (v).

Desjardins, Camille, Appnmt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 3537 (ii).

Digby Port, Wharf Extension, &c. (Ans.) 2101 (i).

Dredges at Midland, Capacity, &c. (Ans.) 5317 (iii).

Dredges, New, Cost, Capacity, &c. (Ans.) 1856 (i).

Dunnville Dredging: *See* 'Grand River.'

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).

Electric Lighting of Buildings, Ottawa (Ans.) 3235 (ii).

Electric Lighting of Chamber, Change of Lamps, &c. (Ans.) 816 (i).

See 'Supply—Pub. Works, Bldgs., Ottawa.'

Emerson Mail Service, &c. (Ans.) 5321 (iii).

Eureka, Str., Loaned by Govt. (Ans.) 14285 (vi).

——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. *Tarte*) 14687 (vi).

Fielding, Dredge, Plans for Construction, &c. (Ans.) 14283 (vi).

Fishing Industry in N. S., Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vi).

Floating Lighthouses, Applications from Captains, &c. (Ans.) 666 (i).

Fuel Contracts, Interest on unpaid Accounts (Ans.) 5318 (iii).

Gananoque and Brockville Channel, Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13320 (vi).

Geological Museum, Construction (Ans.) 11188 (i).

See 'Supply—Pub. Works, Bldgs., Ottawa.'

Georgian Bay Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vi).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 941 (i).

Grain Blockade in N. W. T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'

Grand River, Dredging at Dunnville, &c. (Ans.) 12498 (v), 13027 (vi).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5154, 5233 (iii), 7856 (iv).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Maclean*) 7815 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10593, 11202 (v).

Harrison, Mr., Resignation as Inspector of Fisheries (Ans.) 288 (i).

Immigrants at Quebec, Medical Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 5318 (iii).

Imperial Building, Ottawa, Govt. Occupation, &c. (Ans.) 3803 (ii).

I. C. R. Supplies B.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 258.'

International Dredge Leased by Govt. (Ans.) 12218 (v).

Isle of Orleans, Cable: *See* 'Submarine.'

James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi).

Jerome, Martin, and Man. Elections, &c. (Ans.) 5321 (iii).

King Edward VII., Portrait: *See* 'Portrait.'

Lake Superior Ry. (Peninsula Harbour) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14505 (vi).

Larkin, Capt. W. S., Charges against (Ans.) 2922 (ii).

L'Assomption Post Office, Site, &c. (Ans.) 3230 (ii).

Le Canada and L. J. Latour *re* Circular issued, &c. (Ans.) 1033 (i).

Listowel Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13124 (vi).

Lobster Packing Factory in N. S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).

Lotbinière and Megantic Ry. Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13495 (vi).

Loy: *See* 'Beauharnois.'

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14397 (vi).

Mara, Rama, &c., Flooding of Lands, on M. (Mr. *Grant*) for Reps., 2764 (ii).

Marine Engineers B.: *See* 'Steamboat,' &c.

Martineau Commission Report, and Fire Protection: *See* 'Ottawa,' &c.

Medical Examiner at Quebec of Immigrants (Ans.) 3536 (ii).

Midland Water Front, Lease to Pratt & Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5751 (iii).

Mint Building, Establishment, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 344 (i), 14244 (vi).

Mint, Canadian, Erection of (Ans.) 10955 (v).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4457 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Sheds, Plans, &c. (Ans.) 14282 (vi).

Napanee Post Office, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 1594 (i).

Nepean Point, Ottawa, Improvement, &c. (Ans.) 11829 (v).

Nepigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14395 (vi).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

Ottawa Buildings, Leases and Rentals for Govt. Offices, on M. (Mr. *Sproule*) for Ret. *re*, 589 (i).

——— Fire Protection, Rep. *re* Martineau Investigation, &c. (Ans.) 4674 (ii).

——— *See* 'Imperial,' 'Woods,' &c.

Owen Sound Harbour, Water Lot, &c. (Ans.) 5317 (iii).

Parliament Buildings, Lighting: *See* 'Electric.'

Parliament Grounds, Dust Nuisance (remarks) 2104 (i), 13119 (vi).

Portrait of King Edward, Painting, &c., by Canadian Artists (Ans.) 13026 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. (B. 208) 1°m., 5240 (iii).

P. E. I. Telegraph System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).

——— *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Tel. Lines,' &c.

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters' and Western Rys., 10511 (v).

Public Works Act Amt. (B. 193) 1°m., 3970; in Com., 4221 (ii).

Public Works, Deptl. Report (presented) 6 (i).

Public Works Employees, Dismissals, Promotions, &c., on M. for Ret. (Mr. *Léonard*) 1058 (i).

Public Works, Amount expended by Govt. in Provs. (Ans.) 1197 (i).

Quebec Harbour Pier, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 3972 (ii).

——— Construction of, &c. (remarks) 2238 (i).

Racette, Vital, Purchase of Land, &c. (Ans.) 3231 (ii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3559 (ii),

——— supplies for I. C. R. Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12959 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14382, 14428, 14505 (vi).

Ry. Transportation from N. W. T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2489 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10964, 11436, 11462, 11572, 11622; (Brant) 11109; (Dauphin) 11748; (Portage la Prairie) 11781; (Toronto) 11693; (Waterloo) 11647; (York) 11665; on M. for 3°, 12395; on Amt. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) to M. for 3°, 12458; on Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to M. for 3°, 12468 (v).

——— Printing of Evidence *re* (remarks) 11423 (v).

Richelieu River Inundations, &c. (Ans.) 10496 (v).

Roseau River Reserve, Sale of Lots (Ans.) 5320 (iii).

Rural Mail Delivery, Establishment (Ans.) 285 (i).

St. Andrews Rapids, Bridge Construction (Ans.) 14284 (vi).

——— Contract, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 288 (i).

——— Expiration of Contract (Ans.) 10490 (v).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

St. Boniface, Money Order Branch, Closing (Ans.) 5321 (iii).

St. Lawrence Channel: *See* 'Gananoque,' 'Supply—Harbours and Rivers, Quebec.'

St. Mary's River Ry. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4590 (ii).

St. Mary's River Ry. (Galt Road) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Sir Wilfrid Laurier Dredge, Sinking in Lake Ont. (Ans.) 5587 (iii).

Skinner's Pond (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13446 (vi).

Sorel Wharf, Cor., &c., on Inquiry for Papers, 2302 (i).

——— *See* 'Supply—Public Works, Harbonrs and Rivers, Quebec.'

Springhill, N.S., Explosion in Dom. Building, Report *re* (read) 13257 (vi).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).

Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3293 (ii).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7027 (iii).

Sturgeon Falls Pulp and Lumber Co. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14428 (vi).

Submarine Cable to Isle of Orleans (Ans.) 11187 (v).

Summerside, P.E.I., Breakwater, Completion of Work, &c. (Ans.) 3234 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Canals: Welland (Dunnville, dam) 7811 (iv).

Civil Govt.: Customs (contingencies) 332 (i).
Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 239 (i).
Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 342; (salaries) 341 (i).
Public Works (architect's salary) 13498 (vi); (contingencies) 5824 (iii); (Hunter, J. B., salary) 13499; (salaries) 333 (i), 13500 (vi).

Fisheries (Hurley, J. M., inspector) 5129 (ii).

Justice, Administration of: Supreme Court (library) 3403 (ii).

Legislation: Elections (*Advocate*, Prince Albert printing) 14271 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Pratt & Co.'s lease of water front) 5751 (iii); (St. Lawrence navigation) 4148 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (P.E.I. and Newfoundland) 13676 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4071; (meteorological service) 4118 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, B.C. (Nelson P. O.) 13131; (Rossland, armoury) 13133; Rossland P. O.) 13131; (Vancouver P. O.) 13132 (vi).
Dom. (architect's office) 961; (caretakers) 1021; (electric power) 1067; (furniture) 1006; (heating, &c.) 1065; (lighting, &c.) 1067; (Orillia, caretaker) 1016 (i); (rents, &c.) 13133 (vi); (water supply) 1067 (i).
Generally (armouries) 965; (clerks of works) 963; (experimental farms) 972 (i); (immigrant buildings) 14247 (vi).
Man. (immigration, hospitals, &c.) 5845 (iii); (Winnipeg, immigration station) 13126; (Winnipeg, military buildings) 13127; (Winnipeg, military stores) 13126; (Winnipeg P.O.) 13127 (vi).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Buildings—*Con.*

Mar. Provs. (renewals, &c.) 422 (i).

N.B. (Campbellton P.O.) 13037 (vi); Dom. buildings) 421 (i); (Fredericton, military buildings) 13041 (vi); (Marysville) 5841 (iii); (Moncton P.O.) 13038; (Newcastle, improvements) 13038 (vi); (Richibucto) 412 (i); (St. John, drill hall) 13042 (vi); (St. John, immigrant shed, &c.) 412 (i), 13040 (vi); (St. John, quarantine water service) 414, 486 (i), 13041; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 13038; (Woodstock, armoury) 13039; (Woodstock P. O.) 13041 (vi).

N. S. (Antigonish, post office) 13034 (vi); (Arichat) 5827 (iii); (Digby) 13034 (vi); (Guysborough) 5830 (iii); (Halifax, building) 411 (i); (Halifax, custom house) 13031; (Halifax, immigration shed) 13033 (vi); (Lawlor's Island, quarantine station) 412 (i); (Middleton, armoury) 5841 (iii); (North Sydney, post office) 13035; (Springhill, repairs) 14247; (Sydney Mines) 13028; (Sydney, post office) 13035 (vi).

N.W.T. (court-houses, &c.) 958 (i); (Edmonton jail) 13129 (vi); (Macleod, court-house) 959 (i); (Moosejaw P.O.) 13130; (Prince Albert court-house) 13129 (vi); (Red Deer, court-house) 960; (renewals, &c.) 959 (i); (Strathcona Horse barracks) 13130 (vi); (Yorkton, court-house) 961 (i).

Ont. (Alexandria P.O.) 487; (architects) 524 (i): (Belleville, armoury) 13082 (vi); (Bowmanville) 508 (i); (Brantford, drill hall) 13108; (Bridgeburg, P.O.) 13113 (vi); (Clinton P. O.) 518; (Cobourg armoury) 640 (i); (Cobourg, P.O.) 13118 (vi); (Deseronto) 5842 (iii); (Deseronto, P.O.) 13112 (vi); (Dom. buildings, renewals) 636 (i); (Fort William) 636 (i); (Guelph, armoury) 13083 (vi); (Guelph P.O.) 637 (i); (Hamilton, building) 13113 (Hawkesbury, P.O.) 13119; (Kingston, barracks) 13118 (vi); (Kingston military stables) 638 (i); (Kingston, military school) 5842 (iii), 13094; (Kingston, military college stables) 13117 (vi); (London drill hall) 641 (i); (London, magazine) 13115 (vi); (Orillia, caretaker) 1016 (i); (Oshawa, P.O.) 13110; (Picton, P.O.) 13113; (St. Catherines, drill hall) 13106; (St. Mary's, P.O.) 13109; (Sault Ste. Marie, P. O.) 13107; (Sarnia, P. O.) 13118; (Stratford, armoury) 13125; (vi); (Toronto, branch post office) 5920 (iii); (Toronto custom-house) 648, 958 (i); (Toronto, drill hall) 13115; (Toronto examining warehouse) 13118: (Toronto, military buildings) 13086, 13115 (vi); (Toronto, post office) 956 (i), 5842 (iii); (Toronto P.O., addition) 13096; (Toronto postal station) 13112 (vi); (Toronto, rec. gen.'s office, vault) 5842 (iii); (Toronto, renewals, &c.) 956; (Toronto Junction, post office) 650 (i); (Windsor, P.O.) 13113; (Wingham, P.O.) 13120; (Woodstock, armoury) 13125; (Woodstock, P. O.) 13108 (vi).

Ottawa (additional land) 353 (i); (additional rooms, H. of C.) 13006 (vi); (astronomical observatory) 342 (i); (bacteriological laboratory) 5842 (iii); (census building) 991 (i); (coal sheds) 13115 (vi);

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con*

Public Works—Con.

Buildings—*Con.*

Ottawa—*Con.*

(electric lighting) 988 (i); (electric light; ing, transformers) 5843 (iii); (elevators-1012 (i), 13115 (vi); (furniture, &c.) 973; (geological museum) 352; (grounds) 1015; (heating, &c.) 1008; (light, maintenance) 974, 1012; (Major's Hill park) 1015 (i); (paving, tar macadam) 13119 (vi); (post-office, elevator) 5844 (iii); (post office, improvements) 13117 (vi); (rentals, &c.) 989; (Rideau Hall, drainage) 647; (Rideau Hall, light, &c.) 1005; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 995 (i); (Rideau Hall, repairs) 13087 (vi); (Royal Mint) 344 (i); (steel shelving) 13087 (vi); (telephones) 1013 (i); (ventilation of chamber) 13011 (vi); (Victoria museum) 365 (i), 14243; (Western Block, heating) 13087 (vi).

P. E. I. (Charlottetown, armoury) 13035; (Charlottetown, Dom. building) 13036 (vi).

Que. (Acton Vale P.O.) 13059 (vi); (Grosse Isle) 425; (L'Assomption) 427; (Lévis) 431 (i); (Lévis, P.O.) 13053, 13055; (Longueuil, P.O.) 13070; (Magog, P.O.) 13081 (vi); (Montmagny) 5841 (iii); (Montmagny, P.O.) 13066; (Montreal, barracks) 13076 (vi); (Montreal, examining warehouse) 433 (i), 13058; (Montreal, P.O.) 13067; (Montreal, postal station) 13081 (vi); (Montreal, renewals, &c.) 437 (i); (Quebec, citadel) 13053; (Quebec, citadel drill shed) 13056; (Quebec, drill hall addition) 13077; (Quebec, hospital for trachoma) 14245; (Quebec, marine stores) 13053; (Quebec, military buildings) 13054; (Quebec, military iron foundry) 14247 (vi); (Quebec, renewals, &c.) 422; (St. Hyacinthe) 439 (i); (St. Hyacinthe, drill hall) 13067; (St. John's examining warehouse) 13069; (St. John's P.O.) 13059; (St. Louis de Mile-End, P.O.) 13080; (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 13079; (Terrebonne, P.O.) 13059 (vi); (Thetford Mines) 441 (i); (Three Rivers, custom house), 13080; (Three Rivers, heating, &c.) 13069 (vi); (Valleyfield, P.O.) 443 (i).

Yukon (White Horse, P.O.) 13133 (vi).

Docks (commission's rep.) 2983 (ii); (Kingston graving dock) 13023 (vi); (Lévis graving dock) 2979 (ii).

Dredging (vessels repairs) 2612; (dredges, new, Que.) 2674; (Ont. and Que. dredging plant) 2671 (ii).

Generally (transportation facilities) 3365 (ii), 13024 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, B.C. (Anderson Lake) 1451 (i); (Arrow Lakes) 13304 (vi); (Columbia river) 1451 (i), 13304; (dredging plant, &c.) 13311 (vi); (Esquimalt, graving dock) 5919 (iii); (Fraser river, improvements) 13305; (Hardy Bay, wharf) 5916 (iii), 13305 (vi); (Mr. Sinclair's dismissal) 1451; (Quatsino, wharf) 13305; (Victoria Harbour, dredging) 13306; (Williams Head quarantine wharf) 13306 (vi).

Generally, 13308 (vi); (new dredges) 2673; (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2633; (transportation facilities) 3365 (ii), 13024 (vi).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

Man. (Dauphin lake) 1448 (i); (dredging) 2665 (ii); (dredging plant) 13311 (vi); (Gimli, wharf) 1450; (Gull Harbour, wharf) 1448; (Hnausa, wharf) 1448; (Lake Francis outlet) 1449 (i); (*Manitoba*, dredge) 13311 (vi); (Manitoba Lake) 1449; (repairs, &c.) 1448 (i); (St. Andrews Rapids) 3354 (ii); (Selkirk, wharf) 1450 (i); (snag boat) 2673 (ii); (White Mud, dredging) 1450 (i).

Mar. Provs. (dredging plant) 2665 (ii); (dredging, &c., salaries) 13309 (vi); (hydraulic dredge) 2612 (ii), 13312 (vi); (repairs, &c.) 1185 (i).

N. B. (Alma Pier) 1184; (Anderson's Hollow) 1163 (i); (Arsenault, Capt., damages, &c.) 13231 (vi); (Bay du Vin) 1164 (i); (Black Brook) 13228 (vi); (Campbellton, wharf) 1164 (i); 13005, 13229; (Campobello, breakwater) 13228; (Cape Tormentine) 13228 (vi); (Caraquet wharf) 1173 (i); (Chatham, lightship) 13231; (Cocagne wharf, damages, &c.) 13231; (Dalhousie wharf) 13233; (Dipper Harbour, breakwater) 13233; (Grand Manan, breakwater) 13234 (vi); (Great Salmon River) 1177 (i); (Hopewell Cape, wharf) 13233 (vi); (Lord's Cove, wharf) 1177 (i); (Miscou, wharf) 13234 (vi); (Negro Point breakwater) 1181; (Oromocto, wharf) 1181 (i); (Petit Rocher) 13234; (Pointe du Chêne) 13235 (vi); (Richibucto wharf) 1177 (i); 13235 (vi); (St. Andrews wharf) 5894 (iii); (St. John harbour) 1183; (St. John river wharfs) 1178; (St. John tributaries) 1177 (i); (Shippegan harbour) 1183 (i).

N. S. (Abbot's Harbour) 13141; (Abram's wharf) 13141 (vi); (Amagandus wharf) 1068 (i); (Arichat) 13217 (vi); (Bailey's Brook, wharf) 1072 (i); (Baxter's, breakwater) 13142; (Bayfield, wharf) 13141; (Benoit's Cove) 13143; (Berlin, breakwater) 13180; (Big Harbour, wharf) 13143 (vi); (Big Pond, wharf) 1072, 1073 (i); (Breton Cove) 13151 (vi); (Bridgewater, dredging) 1074 (i); (Cariboo island, causeway) 13179; (Chegoggin, pier) 13179; (Chéticamp, wharf) 13179 (vi); (Cheverie breakwater) 1078 (i); (Chezzetcook, breakwater) 13217 (vi); (Church Point, breakwater) 1078 (i); (Cow Bay, breakwater) 1078 (i); 13178 (vi); (Digby pier) 1083 (i); (Donald's Head, breakwater) 13179 (vi); (Drumhead, breakwater) 1083 (i); 13179; (Duncan's Cove, wharf) 13179; (East Bay, wharf) 13180 (vi); (Economy, wharf) 1087 (i); (Finlay Point) 13181; (Five Islands, wharf) 13180 (vi); (Fort Lawrence, pier) 1087 (i); 13181; (Freeport, pier) 13182 (vi); (Friar's Head, harbour) 1087 (i); (Frudes Point, wharf) 13180; (Gabarouse, breakwater) 13182; (Georgeville, wharf) 13198 (vi); (Glace Bay) 1087 (i); (Glace Bay, wharf) 13184 (vi); (Grand Étang, entrance) 1095; (Grand Narrows, wharf) 1094 (i), 13198 (vi); (Grand River, entrance) 1094 (i); (Granite Village, pier) 13182 (vi); (Green Cove, harbour) 1100 (i); (Hall's harbour) 13198 (vi); (Hawk Point Inlet, channel) 1102; (Herring Cove, breakwater) 1102 (i); (Indian harbour, wharf) 13199; (Iona, harbour) 13200 (vi); (Janvrin's Island, wharf) 1102 (i); (Jeddore, wharf) 13179 (vi); (Judique, breakwater) 1103 (i); (Ketch, harbour) 13202 (vi); (Kingsport, pier) 1103 (i), 13202; (L'Ardoise, breakwater) 13201 (vi); (Larry's River, breakwater) 1104; (Lingan Beach) 1105 (i); (Livingstone Cove) 13200; (McKay's Point, wharf) 13201; (McNutt's Island, beach) 13201; (Main-à-Dieu) 13201; (Malagawatch, channel) 13203; (Malignant Cove) 13201 (vi); (Margaree, wharf) 1133 (i); (Margaretsville, breakwater) 13202; (Melbourne, wharf) 13203 (vi); (Meteghan Cove) 1133 (i); (Middle river, dam) 13202; (Morrison's point, wharf) 13203; (Musquodoboit, harbour) 13202; (Necum Teuch, wharf) 1137 (i), 13203 (vi); (Neil's Harbour) 1139; (New Campbellton, wharf) 1142; (New Harbour) 1144 (i); (Noel, wharf) 1324; (Ogden's Pond) 13204; (Oyster Pond) 13204; (Parrsborough, landing) 13205; (Pembroke, breakwater) 13205 (vi); (Petit du Grat, dredging) 1146 (i); (Pickett's, pier) 13205 (vi); (Pictou, light beach) 13205 (vi); (Poirierville, wharf) 1146 (i), 13205; (Porter's channel) 13206 (vi); (Port George, breakwater) 1146 (i), 13210; (Port Greville, breakwater) 13210 (vi); (Port Hastings, wharf) 1146; (Port Hawkesbury) 1146 (i); (Port Hood, pier) 13206; (Port Howe, wharf) 13210; (Port Latour, breakwater) 13210; (Port Maitland) 13211; (Port au Pique, wharf) 13211; (Prospect, wharf) 13205; (Pugwash, landing) 13205; (St. Ann, wharf) 13203; (Sable Island, East End) 13180 (vi); (Sandy Cove, breakwater) 1149 (i); (Scott's Bay) 13211 (vi); (Short Beach) 1149 (i); (Skinner's Cove) 13213 (vi); (South Ingonish, wharf) 1149 (i); (Spry Bay) 13213; (Summerville, wharf) 13213; (Swim's Point, wharf) 13211; (Sydney, quarantine wharf) 13213; (Tenecape, breakwater) 13213 (vi); (Tiverton, breakwater) 1150 (i); (Victoria, beach wharf) 13213; (Wallace, harbour) 13216 (vi); (Washabuck Centre, wharf) 1150 (i); (Wedge Point) 13217; (Wentworth, wharf) 13216 (vi); (West Baccaro, channel) 1150 (i); (West Bay, wharf) 13217; (White's Cove, breakwater) 13217; (Windsor Harbour, sheer dam) 14248; (Wolfville, wharf) 13217; (Yarmouth, bar) 13218 (vi).

N. W. T. (repairs, &c.) 1450 (i).

Ont. (Amherstburg, dredging) 1185 (i) 13235 (vi); (Barrie wharf) 1187 (i); (Barry's Bay) 13236 (vi); (Bayfield pier) 1188; (Belle Rivière) 1192 (i); (Blind River, wharf) 13235 (vi); (Bowmanville pier) 1352 (i); (Bracebridge, wharf) 13236 (vi); (Bronte, harbour) 1354 (i); (Bronte improvements) 13236 (vi); (Bruce Mines) 5911 (iii); (Burk's Falls) 1358; (Burlington channel) 1359 (i), 13237 (vi); (Cobourg, repairs) 5909 (iii); (Collingwood improve-

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

Ont.—*Con.*

ments) 13239; (Couchiching, Lake Simcoe) 13252; (Cumberland wharf) 13238; (vi); (Depot harbour) 1359 (i), 13239 (vi); (general repairs) 1369; (Goderich harbour) 1365 (i), 13240; (Gore's wharf) 13244; (Grand Bend, pier), 13239 (vi); (Kaministiquia river) 5825 (iii); (Kingsville) 13244 (vi); (Lake Temiscamingue wharf)1376(i); (Leamington,wharf) 13246; (Little Bear Creek) 13245; (Little Current) 13245 (vi); (Midland, dredging) 5909 (iii); (Midland, harbour) 1376 (i), 13246 (Oakville pier) 1376; (Orillia wharf) 1377 (i); (Ottawa River) 13251 (vi); (Owen Sound, harbour) 1377 (i); (Parry Sound wharf) 13248; (Petewawa narrows) 1425, 1442 (i), 13251 (vi); (Pickering harbour) 1377; (Point au Baril route) 1365 (i); (Point Edward) 13249 (vi); (Port Arthur) 3341 (ii), 13012; (Port Burwell) 13249 (vi); (Port Colborne) 3368 (ii); (Point Edward, dredging) 1377; (Port Elgin, dredging) 1424; (Port Hope pier) 1425 (i); (Port Perry) 13249; (Port Stanley) 13249 (vi); (Prescott, dredging) 5915 (iii); (Rivière aux Puces) 1425; (Rondeau harbour) 1427 (i); (Rosedale, wharf) 13250 (vi); (St. Joseph, wharf) 3382 (ii); (Sault Ste. Marie) 13253 (vi); (Southampton harbour), 1428; (Sturgeon Falls, wharf) 1431 (i); (Sydenham river) 13250; (Thessalon, breakwater) 13254 (vi); (Thornbury harbour) 1432; (Toronto harbour) 1433 (i); (Toronto, Magann & Phinn claim) 13255, (Toronto, pier) 13255 (vi); (Trenton, dredging) 1434 (i); (Victoria harbour) 13255 (vi); (Wendover wharf) 1434 (i); (Wiarton wharf) 13256 (vi); (Wolfe Island dredging) 1443 (i), 13252 (vi).

P.E.I. (Aitken's wharf) 1159 (i); (Beach point) 13218 (vi); (Belfast, pier) 1153 (i); (Canoe Cove) 13218; (Cape Traverse, survey) 13219 (vi); (Cascumpec, harbour) 1153 (i); (Cove Head, channel) 13222 (vi); (Cove Head, harbour) 1155; (creosoted timber) 1155 (i); (dredging) 13310; (dredging plant) 13313 (vi); (Gaspereaux, harbour) 1155; (Higgin's shore pier) 1159 (i), 13222; (Lewis point, pier) 13223; (North Cardigan) 13223 (vi); (New London) 1160 (i); (New London, channel) 13223 (vi); (piers, repairs, &c.) 1161 (i); (Point Prim, wharf) 13223; (Richmond Bay) 13223; (Skinner's Pond) 13309 (vi); (Souris Knight's Point) 1162 (i); (Summerside, breakwater) 13224 (vi); (Summerside, harbour) 3367 (ii); (Tignish breakwater) 1162 (i).

Que. (Anse aux Gascons wharf) 13445; (Anse aux Gris Fonds) 13445; (Anse St. Jean wharf) 13445; (Barachois de Malbaie breakwater) 13445 (vi); (Batiscan channel) 2280 (i); (Bois Brulé pier) 13448; (Bonaventure East, breakwater) 13446 (vi); (Cacouna wharf) 5896 (iii), 13442; (Caplan, breakwater) 13448; (Chambord, wharf) 13454 (vi); (Chateauguay river) 2280 (i), 3208 (ii); (Chateau Richer) 13455 (vi); (Crane Island, wharf) 1513; (Cross

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con,*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

Que.—*Con.*

Point pier) 1512 (i); (Desjardins, Allumette wharf) 13457 (vi); (Doucet's Landing) 5907 (iii); (Douglastown, isolated block) 13457 (vi); (Esquimaux Point) 2278; (Father Point, pier) 1513 (i); (Gatineau River, C. P. R. bridge) 13457; (Grande Rivière, wharf) 13457 (vi); (Grande Vallee, pier) 1514-72 (i); (Hull wharf) 5901 (iii); (Isle aux Coudres wharf) 2242 (i); (Isle Grosbois) 5902 (iii); (Kamouraska, pier) 13457; (Lake St. John, dredging) 13459 (vi); (Lake St. John, wharf) 2243; (Lake Temiscamingue, dredging) 2246; (Laprairie ice piers) 2248 (i), 13460 (vi); (Le Tableau, wharf) 2249; (L'Ile d'Alma) 2257 (i); (Lotbinière, wharf) 13460 (vi); (Magdalen Islands) 2264 (i); (Maguasha, pier) 13461 (vi); (Maria pier) 2265 (i); (Mistook, wharf) 13461; (Mont Louis, wharf) 13461 (vi); (Montreal harbour) 3365 (ii); (Murray Bay, wharf) 2266; (Newport breakwater) 2277 (i), 13462; (New Richmond breakwater) 13463 (vi); (Nicolet river) 2278 (i); (Nominingue Lake, wharfs) 13460; (Notre Dame du Portage) 13463; (Paspebiac landing pier) 13464; (Perce pier) 13467; (Pierreville, wharf) 13468; (Pointe Fortune, wharf) 13468 (vi); (Pointe St. Pierre) 2278 (i); (Pointe aux Trembles, wharf) 13468; (Port Daniel, wharf) 13468 (vi); (Quebec, harbour) 3336 (ii); (repairs, improvements) 2241 (i); (Repentigny, wharf) 13468; (Rimouski, pier, &c.) 13468 (vi); (river and bridge works) 5907 (iii); (Rivière Jesus, dredging) 13470; (Rivière du Loup, harbour) 13476 (vi); (Rivière du Loup, wharf) 2281 (i); (Rivière du Nord) 5907 (iii); (Rivière aux Renards) 2279 (i); (Rivière Verte) 13470 (vi); (St. Alexis Bay) 2289 (i); (St. Alphonse, Ha-Ha Bay) 13489 (vi); (St. André de Kamouraska, pier) 2290 (i); (Ste. Anne de la Pérade, wharf) 13488; (Ste. Anne de la Pocatière) 13489; (Ste. Anne de Saguenay, wharf) 13488; (Ste. Anne de Sorel) 13489; (Ste. Famille, pier) 13488; (St. Fidèle, wharf) 13493 (vi); (St. Francis, ice pier) 2282; St. François, Orleans) 2290 (i); (St. Fulgence, wharf) 13491; (St. Gédéon Islands, wharf) 13491; (St. Godfroi de Nouvelle, breakwater) 13489 (vi); (St. Irénée, wharf) 2291 (i); (St. Jean des Chaillons, wharf) 13495 (vi); (St. Jerome, wharf) 2291 (i), 5909 (iii); (St. Laurent, wharf) 5906 (iii); (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2257 (i); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3218, 3304 (ii); (St. Louis river) 13473 (vi); (St. Maurice, Grandes Piles) 2286 (i); (St. Maurice River) 5904 (iii); (St. Maurice River, dam) 13491; (St. Michel de Bellechasse) 13494 (vi); (St. Nicholas, pier) 5905 (iii); (St. Simeon, wharf) 13493; (Sabrevois, wharf) 13485; (Sacré-Cœur, wharf) 13478; (Saguenay, dredging) 13472; (Seven Islands, wharf) 13479; (Shegawake, harbour) 13479 (vi); (Sorel, wharf) 2291 (i), 3374 (ii), 5921 (iii), 12848, 12869 (vi); (Three Rivers, wharfs)

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

Que.—*Con.*

2296; (Touladie River) 2286 (i); (Valleyfield, dredging) 2298 (i), 5905 (iii); (Ville Marie, wharf) 14248; (Yamaska lock, dredging) 13498 (vi).

Yukon (Lewes and Yukon river) 13306 (vi).

Miscellaneous: (architect's office) 2747 (ii); (arbitrations and awards) 13339 (vi); (art gallery) 2725; (clerical assistance) 2753 (ii); (Ottawa river, surveys) 13340 (vi); (salaries, engineers, &c.) 2726 (ii), 13340 (vi); (surveys, inspections, &c.) 2715, 2720 (ii); (transportation commission) 13362 (vi).

Roads and Bridges: Generally (Bryson, approaches) 13321 (vi); (Dom. traffic, bridges) 2701 (ii); (Edmonton, flooring) 13323; (Moisie Post road) 13322; (Peace River, pack trail) 13323 (vi).

N.W.T. (Pelly river bridge) 13367 (vi).

Ottawa, 2700 (ii); (Ottawa, Dufferin, &c.) 13321; (Union bridges, Ottawa) 13321; Quebec (Bryson) 13321 (vi); (Portage du Fort) 2690 (ii).

Yukon (Trading and Exploring Co.) 5826 (iii).

Slides and Booms (Gagner, Mr., salary) 2976; (Gatineau) 2977; (generally) 2690 (repairs, &c.) 2978; (St. Maurice slides) 2676; (salaries) 2974; (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2974 (ii).

Telegraph Lines—B.C., 2992 (ii); (Alberni-Clayoquot) 5918 (iii); (Ashcroft-Dawson) 2992 (ii); (Kamloops, Nicola line) 13337 (vi); (Quesnel-Atlin branch) 5826 (iii); (Vancouver Island to Salt Springs) 13337; (working expenses) 13368 (vi).

Mar. Provs. (Chatham to Tracadie) 13325; (Deer Island to Eastport) 13325 (vi); (land and cable, Mar. Provs.) 2701 (ii).

N.W.T., 2991 (ii); (Alexander, Indian agency) 5918 (iii); (Edmonton and Athabasca) 13335; (Edmonton, Indian agency) 13334; (Victoria to Andrews) 13335; (Wood Mountain Post) 13335 (vi).

P.E.I. (Marconi system) 13326 (vi); (P.E.I. and mainland) 2988 (ii), 5918 (iii).

Que. (Anticosti, &c.) 5917 (iii) 13325 (vi); (Belle Isle) 2712, 2989 (ii); (Bersimis to Godbout) 13332; (Chicoutimi, St. Charles) 13333 (vi); (Magdalen Islands) 2714 (ii); (Marconi, Chateau Bay) 13326; (Murray Bay, &c.) 13326; (Orleans Island) 13330; (Petite Rivière, St. Agnes) 13334 (vi); (Quebec, repairs, &c.) 2711 (ii); (Ste. Anne du Saguenay) 13331 (vi).

Yukon (working expenses) 14041 (vi).

Yukon Govt. (administration, &c.) 13367 (vi).

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14381, 14511 (vi).

——— (remarks) in Com. on B. 270, 14737 (vi).

Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14428 (vi).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) M. to ref. back to Com., 7813 iv).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

Toronto Island, Damage by Storms, &c. (Ans.) 5589 (iii).

Toronto to Lindsay, &c., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Toronto Post Office, Contract of Mr. Coleman (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13099 (vi).

Toronto Public Works Employees, Delay of Payment, &c. (Ans.) 5588 (iii).

Translators, Debates, Rent of Office, &c. (Ans.) 2311 (i), 3799 (ii).

Transportation Com., in Com. of Sup., 12854, 13362 (vi).

——— Instructions, &c. (remarks) 4120 (ii).

——— Meetings, Business transacted, &c. (Ans.) 13027 (vi).

——— N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'

See 'Supply—Pub. Works, Harbours, Que., Sorel,'

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11074 (v).

——— Rep. *re* (remarks) 13134, 13258 (vi).

Valleyfield P.O., Site, Erection, &c. (Ans.) 98 (i).

——— Tenders *re* (Ans.) 11187 (v).

Ventilation of Chamber, &c. (remarks) 4362 (ii) 13011 (vi).

Wharfs, Govt. Policy *re* Construction, 13156 (vi).

Winnipeg City Water B.: *See* 'Assiniboine.'

Woods, J. W., Rental of Buildings, &c. (Ans.) 5764 (iii).

Woodstock, N. B., P. O., Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 672 (i).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 4563 (ii).

Yukon Telegraph Line, Management, &c., Complaints *re*, 7004 (iii).

See: 'Supply—Public Works — Telegraph Lines, Yukon.'

Sutherland, Mr. R. F., *N. Essex.*

Box Freight Cars, Ladders, &c.: *See* 'Ry. B. 21.'

Budget, The, 1860 (i).

Cattle Guards: *See* 'Ry. B. 21.'

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) M. to refer back to Com., 5959 (iii).

Drainage on Rys.: *See* Ry. B. 21.'

G.T.Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9447 (iv).

Osler, Mr. and 'Grafters.': *See* 'Privileges.'

Privileges and Elections, Sel. Com., 1st Rep. *re* Mr. Schell (presented) 5511 (iii).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry., Subsidy, 10520 (v).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., (box-cars, safety appliances, amt.) 6325; (cattle guards, amt.) 6220 (iii); in Com. (drainage) 4754 (ii).

Schell, J. T., M.P., 1st Rep. of Priv. and Elections Com. *re* (presented) 5511 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (exhibitions) 4623 (ii).

Customs (salaries, &c.) 3909 (ii).

Windsor, Ont., Customs Officers, Overtime, &c., in Com. of Sup., 3909 (ii).

Talbot, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7370 (iii).
Campaign Literature and Mail Bags, Govt. Ownership (Ques.) 14286 (vi).
Campaign Literature, Employment of Sessional Messengers (Ques.) 14286 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12340, 12521 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5150 (iii), 7909 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9472 (iv); in Com. on B., 11951 (v); on M. for 3°, 12736 (vi).
——— Pets. *re*, Authenticity of, (M.) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13265 (vi).
——— Pets., Irregularities, &c., Par. in Montreal *Star*, (M.) to adjn., Affidavits, &c., 14845 (vi).
——— Pets. *re* (remarks) 12944 (vi).
——— *See* 'Petitions,' &c.
G. T. Ry. Co., Loans by Govt. (Ques.) 2920 (ii).
——— Terminal Facilities: *See* 'Transportation.'
Hagar, Miss, Emplymt. at Experimental Farm (Ques.) 5316 (iii).
Interprovincial and James Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 144) 1°*, 2396 (i).
Isle of Orleans, Submarine Cable, &c. (M. for ret.*) 11301 (v).
——— *See* 'Submarine.'
McCraney, W., Letter *re* Legislation (ques. of order) 5362 (iii).
Mail Bags: *See* 'Campaign.'
Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 73) 1°*, 814 (i).
Petitions *re* G. T. P. Ry. Co., Responsibility of Members, &c. (remarks) 12715 (vi).
——— *See* 'G. T. P. Ry.'
Pilotage Act Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12786; on M. for 3°, 13939 (vi).
——— Statement of Mr. L. E. Morin (read) 12786 (vi).
Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in *Citizen*, 3127 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Co.'s (B. 145) 1°*, 2396 (i).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14454 (vi).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14454, 14495 (vi).
Ry. Subsidies for Man., &c. (remarks) 14495 (vi).
Saunders, Mr. C. E,, Appnmt. at Experimental Farm (Ques.) 1676 (i).
Submarine Cable to Island of Orleans, &c. (Ques.) 11186 (v).
——— *See* 'Isle of Orleans.'

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (exhibitions) 4623 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Que. (Levis) 431 (i); (Montmagny, P. O.) 13067 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers: Generally (dredges, repairs, &c.) 2627 (ii); Que. (Grande Vallee pier) 1547 (i).

Talbot, Mr. O. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways: I. C. R. (Amqui, accommodation) 12601 (v).
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*), (M.) to adjn. deb., 4868 (ii).
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3469 (ii).
Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11082 (v).
Woolf Valve Gear Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 161) 1°*, 2582 (ii).

Tarte, Hon. J. Israel, *Montreal, St. Mary's.*

Alaskan Boundary Commission Award, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 14818 (vi).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen & Co.'s Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6981 (iii).
Beauharnois Electoral District, Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act, on M. to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com., 7104 (iii), 8025 (iv).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7303, 7322, 7353 (iii).
Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation, Par. in Toronto *News* (remarks) 6751 (iii).
——— *See* 'Ministerial.'
Budget, The, 1619 (i).
Cabinet Changes: *See* 'Ministerial.'
Cable News with G. B. and Can. B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8235 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5602 (iii).
Can. Northern Ry., Cor. between Govt. and Mackenzie & Mann (M. for ret.*) 916 (i).
C. P. R. and Car Shortage in N. W. T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'
Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 392 (i).
Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4419 (ii).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 842 (i).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7519 (iii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3098 (ii).
Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6447 (iii).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3006 (ii).
Eureka, Str., Personal Explanation, 14687 (vi).
Georgian Bay Canal: *See* 'Ottawa.'
Grain Blockade in N. W. T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9644 (iv); in Com. on B., 10420, 10467 (v).
G. T. R. Transcontinental Ry. (M. for cor.) 447 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties B, 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7937 (iv).
Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. on Sup., 4322 (ii).
Le Canada and Mr. Latour: *See* 'Postmasters,' &c.

Tarte, Hon. J. Israel—*Con.*

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2504, 2521 (ii).

——— Settlement, &c., Tel. (read) 2677 (ii).

Loy, Geo. M., and Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act, Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elections, on M. to conc., 8025 (iv).

——— *See* 'Beauharnois.'

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7998 (iv).

Ministerial Changes (explanation) 136 (i).

——— Par. in Toronto *News* (remarks) 6751 (iii).

Montreal Dry Dock, Site, &c. (M. for O. Cs. cor., &c.*) 706 (i).

——— *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Docks.'

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4452 (ii).

Montreal Subway Co., O. Cs. Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 705 (i).

Newspaper Agents and Quebec Postmasters (M.) to adjn. Hse., 14669 (vi.)

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineer, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for Copies, 1309 (i).

Petersen-Tate Deposit: *See* 'Supply—Miscellaneous.'

Postmasters in Quebec and Newspaper Agents, &c. (remarks) 14669 (vi).

Public Printing and Stationery Act Amt. B. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4211 (ii).

Public Works Dept. and Mr. Préfontaine: *See* 'Supply—Public Works, Harbours and Rivers, Quebec.'

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14721 (vi).

Quebec Harbour Improvements, Reps. to Council, &c. (M. for copies*) 706 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 2299 (i), 3337 (ii).

Racine Bros., Claims against Contractors of Nelson, P.O. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7168 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 254 (i); in Com., 6103 (iii).

Ry. Commissioners' Salaries B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8121 (iv).

Ry. Labour Dispute B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2579 (ii).

Ry. Transportation from N. W. T., and Freight Blockade, Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2445 (i).

Reciprocity Negatiations, Emissaries from Can. (remarks) on Alaskan Boundary Award, 14819 (vi).

Resignation as Minister: *See* 'Ministerial,' &c.

St. Lawrence Channel: *See* 'Supply—Public Works, Que.'

Sorel Wharf: *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Harbours and Rivers, Que.'

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c. (M. for cor.) 451 (i).

Tarte, Hon. J. Israel—*Con.*

South Shore Ry., Working, &c. (M. for cor.) 448 (i).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7051 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Canals: Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 7560; (transportation facilities) 7562; Soulanges (construction) 7550; Trent (construction) 7552; (Corry & Laverdure, contract, &c.) 7559 (iii).

Civil Govt.: Interior (salaries) 269 (i); Labour Dept. (Racine Bros. claims) 7168 (iii).

Customs (Montreal port) 3901 (ii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6679 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 7576, 7584 (iv).

Miscellaneous (industrial disputes royal commission) 6985; (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6981 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs) 4046; (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4067; (hydrographic surveys) 4118; (meteorological service) 4118; (steamboat inspection) 4119; (tidal surveys) 4116; (wrecks, investigation, &c.) 4116 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, N.B. (St. John immigration) 413; (quarantine station, St. John) 487; (St. John quarantine water service) 414 (i).

Ont. (architects) 524 (i).

Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 342; (geological museum) 352; (Royal Mint) 344; (ventilation, &c.) 488; (Victoria Museum) 365 (i).

Que. (Thetford Mines) 441; (Valleyfield P.O.) 444 (i).

Docks (Montreal) 2981; (rep. of commission) 2981 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers: B.C. (Columbia River) 1457 (i).

Generally (dredge vessels, repairs,) 2612; (hydraulic dredge) 2612 (ii).

Man. (dredging) 2665; (St. Andrews Rapids) 3355 (ii).

N. B. (Campbellton wharf) 1168; (Caraquet wharf) 1176; (St. John River wharfs) 1178 (i).

N. S. (Bridgewater, dredging) 1075; (Cow Bay) 1081; (Glace Bay) 1090; (Grand Etang, bridge works) 1097; (Lunenburg Harbour) 1109 (i).

Ont. (Amherstburg, dredging) 1185 (i); (dredging plant) 2671 (ii); (Petawawa narrows) 1444 (i); (Port Arthur) 3341; (Port Colborne) 3369; (St. Joseph, wharf) 3382 (ii); (St. Lawrence, dredging) 1444 (i).

Que. (Grande Vallée pier) 1537; (Lake St. John, wharf) 2243; (Lake Temiscamingue, dredging) 2246; (Laprairie ice piers) 2248; (Le Tableau wharf) 2249; (Magdalen islands) 2264; (Maria, pier) 2266 (i); (Montreal, harbour) 3365; (Murray Bay, wharf) 2266; (Que. harbour) 3336 (ii); (St. Alexis Bay) 2289; (St. André de Kamouraska) 2290; (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2258 (i); (St. Lawrence, ship channel) 3305 (ii); (Sorel, deep water wharf) 2292 (i), 3377 (ii); (Three Rivers wharfs) 2297; (Touladie river) 2286 (i); (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2633, 2945; (transportation facilities) 3365 (ii); (Valleyfield, dredging) 2299 (i).

Tarte, Hon. J. Israel—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2633, 2 45 (ii).

Telegraph Lines (Ashcroft-Dawson) 2992; (Belleisle station) 2989; (Marconi stations) 2989; (Yukon) 2992 (ii).

Tariff, Govt. Policy (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4843, 4875 (ii); (Neg. Y. 50; N. 102) 4955 (ii).

——— (remarks) 4263 (ii).

Tariff Revision, Inquiry for Cor., &c., 3003 (ii).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co. (M. for cor.) 672 (i).

Transcontinental Ry., G. T. Pac. Ry. (M. for cor.) 447 (i).

——— *See* 'G. T. P. Ry.'

Transportation Commission, O.C., Cor., &c. *re* Appnmts. (M. for copies) 1324 (i).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2633, 2926, 3305, 3369, 3451 (ii), 7562 (iii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works,' &c.

Treadgold Concessions, Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4522 (ii).

Valleyfield, P. O. Site: *See* 'Beauharnois.'

——— *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Buildings.'

Yukon Supplies, Tenders, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4071 (ii).

Taylor, Mr. G., *South Leeds.*

Alien Restriction Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 3283 (ii).

Anderson, Mr. J. G., Allegations *re* Inspection of Fruit (remarks) 13508 (vi).

Auditor General and Finance Dept. (remarks) 11423 (v).

Aud. Gen. and Payment of Members (remarks) 11552 (v).

Auditor General and Treasury Board, Circular (read) 11552 (v).

Bayfield, Str., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7302, 7323; in Com. on B., 7384 (iii).

Binder Twine, Inspection and Penalties (remarks) 14049 (vi).

Bonding Privileges with U.S.: *See* 'Coasting,' &c.

Boyd, Sir John, Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 5990 (iii).

Brockville and North-western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 89 (Mr. *Calvert*) on M. for 1°, 1193 (i).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 6655, 7137, 7430 (iii).

——— on Order for resuming adjnd. Deb., 6847 (iii).

——— (M.) that com. rise, 7339 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order, 7339 (iii).

——— on M. for 3° (amt.) 7469 (iii).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co., (M.) to reprint Bill, 7467 (iii).

Brockville and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 67) 1° *, 813 (i).

Budget, The, 1974 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5055, 5066 (ii); in Com. on B., 5422, 5461 (iii).

Campaign Literature, *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Canadian (3rd) Mounted Rifles, Medals, &c. (Ques.) 1675 (i).

Census of 1901, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 203 (i).

——— (M. for ret.) 289 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 479, 544 (i).

——— (remarks) 204 (i).

Chickens, Killing of: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 836 (i).

Cigarettes Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 1°, 2014 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12493, 12571 (v).

Clergue Contract for Steel Rails, Quality, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

Coasting Privileges *re* U.S. (remarks) 12714, 12756 (vi).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 6638; in Com., 7491 (iii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3048; in Com. on B., 4011 (ii).

See 'Masters,' &c.

Customs Employees, Transfers, &c. (M.) for Ret., 5318 (iii).

Election Pamphlets: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Ferry Bill: *See* 'Navigable.'

France and Can. SS. Service B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 11422 (v).

Grain in Bond: *See* 'Coasting.'

Grain Inspection Act (weigh masters) Amt. B. 266 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. of Res., 13807 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10485, 10555, 10562, 11290, 11982, 12252 (v); on M. for 3°, 12697, 12770; (amt.) 12750 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13270, 13301 (vi).

Haycock, Jos., Inspector of Binder Twine, &c. (Ques.) 4960 (ii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Inspection,' &c.

Howe Island Ferry: *See* 'Navigable,' &c., 'Wolfe,' &c.

Hurley: *See* 'Supply—Fisheries,' 'Lighthouse Service,' &c.

I. C. R. Supplies Bill: *See* 'Ry. B. 258.'

Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 225 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 12301 (v).

Le Canada: *See* 'Pelletier.'

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Cor. *re* Mr. Mullen, &c.) 5757 (iii).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Mails carried *via* New York (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7729 (iv).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks) 14549 (vi).

——— Campaign Literature, Statement *re* Special Trains, 14681 (vi).

——— Refund of Express Charges (remarks) 14684 (vi).

Masters of Vessels, Instructions *re* Postage, &c., in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5664 (iii).

Militia Estimates (remarks) 13369 (vi)

Militia Tents, Rush Ordér, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 5764 (iii).

See 'N. W. M. P.'

Milk Cans Bill: *See* 'Weights,' &c.

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4484 (ii); in Com. on B., 5418 (iii).

Napanee Post Office, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 1594 (i).

Navigable Waters Act (swing bridges) Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12780; in Com. on B., 12984 (vi).

N. W. Mounted Police Tents, Wood & Co.'s Tender, &c. (Ques.) 3804 (ii).

——— Remarks, 6850 (iii).

Officers Mess, Fisheries Protection Service, Regulations *re* (Ques.) 9819 (iv).

Parliament Buildings, Ottawa: *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Buildings,' 'Ventilation.'

Parliament Grounds, Dust Nuisance (remarks) 2104 (i).

Pelletier, Mr. H. L., and *Le Canada*, Canvass (remarks) 13982 (vi).

——— Salary, &c. (remarks) 13992 (vi).

——— *See* 'Postmasters,' &c.

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 10829 (v).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12791 (vi).

Postal Newspaper Boxes for Streets, Manufacture, &c. (Ques.) 14283 (vi).

Postmasters in Quebec and Newspaper Agents, &c. (remarks) 14671 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5064 (iii).

Poultry, Fattening, &c.: *See* Supply—'Agriculture.'

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) M. to adjn. Hse., 10535 (v).

Public Works Dept. and Mr. Préfontaine: *See* 'Pilotage Bill.'

Quadra, Str., Officers Mess, Regulations *re* (Ques.) 9819 (iv).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3750, 3896 (ii); 6299 (iii).

——— Suggestions *re* Sel. Com. (remarks) 5313.

Ry. Act (supplies for I.C.R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12950 (vi).

Ry. Commission: *See* 'Supply—Rys.'

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Railway Policy of Govt., on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7129 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14464 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11014, 11483; on M. for 3°, 12478 (v).

Rideau Canal Employees, Payment of, Delay, &c. (remarks) 13302 (vi).

St. Lawrence Islands, Improvements, &c., in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7215, 7242 (iii).

Sessions of the Hse, Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 475 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 13503 (vi); (census enumerators, Gananoque) 4823; (patent branch, salaries) 4351 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7640; ('wringing chickens' necks') 7640 (iv).

Canals—Cornwall (electric lighting) 14139 (vi); (Galops, deepening, &c.) 8400; (enlargement) 7804 (iv).

Gene ally (toll collectors) 12932 (vi).

Grenville (Tucker, Henry, investigation *re* Supt.) 14157 (vi).

Lachine (electrical appliances) 7806 (iv).

Murray (Supt.'s duties and expenses) 14146; (wire fencing) 14150 (vi).

Rideau (Brasses' Point bridge) 7808 (iv); (swing bridge, Concession St., Ottawa) 14150 (vi).

Soulanges (bank repairs) 14153 (vi); (construction) 7550 (iii); (Goodwin's claim) 14143; (J. & M. O'Leary's claims) 14651 (vi).

Welland (Dunnville dam) 7811 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 237; Justice (salaries) 212 (i); (marine contingencies) 5033 (ii); Militia (salaries) 2 2 (i); Post Office (junior 2nd-class clerks) 13996 (vi).

Culling Timber (salaries) 7798 (iv).

Customs (contingent expenses) 3897; (contingent expenses, Montreal) 3784; (Gananoque port) 3897 (ii); (Kilroy, Mr., payment to) 13994 (vi); (locks, instruments, &c.) 3962; (preferential ta iff) 3932; (preventive service) 3949; (printing, &c.) 3962 (ii); (salaries, extra) 13980 (vi).

Dom. Lands (Teulon, North, road) 6927; (tree culture) 6773 (iii); (tree planting) 13775 (vi).

Excise (inspectors salaries) 13978 (vi); (tobacco stamps) 5373; (travelling expenses, &c.) 5373 (iii).

Fisheries (Bance, Mr., promotion) 5277; (*Bayfield*, str.) 5280, 5292 (iii); (Canadian fishery exhibit) 4174 (ii), 5308 (iii); (fish-breeding stations) 4174; (fishery officers) 5050; (fishways) 4174; (Hurley, J. M., inspector, &c.) 5123, (ii); 5280, 5305; (intelligence bureau) 5277; (Ottawa exhibit) 4174 (ii), 5308 (iii); (protection service, B.C.) 4174 (ii); (U. S. licenses, &c.) 5309 (iii).

Immigration (Ques. of order) 6855; (tents, &c.) 6850 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7773; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7763 (iv).

Justice, Administration of — Penitentiaries (binder twine circular) 3512 (ii).

Supreme Court (contingencies) 3404; (reporter) 3402 (ii).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Justice, Administration of—Con.

Yukon (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3414; (Eilbeck, allowances, &c.) 3509; (police magistrates) 3415; (Taylor, Geo. L.) 3415 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (messengers, &c.) 5265; (printing, &c.) 5267; (senate contingencies) 5264 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 4173 (ii); (Hurley, J. M.) 5740 (iii); (lighthouse supplies) 4168; (lightkeepers' salaries) 4132; (wharfs, repairs) 4174 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 7729; (St. John and Belfast) 7731 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 5033 (ii).

Militia (military college) 3778 (ii).

Miscellaneous (arbitration, Dom. and Provs.) 12590 (v).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 13543 (vi); (Dominion steamers, repairs) 5034; (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4084 (ii); masters and mates examination) 13528 (vi); (meteorological service) 4118; (steamer supplies, Drolet, F.X.) 5036 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings, Generally (armouries) 970; (Gananoque armoury) 970 (i).

Man. (military buildings) 13128 (vi).

N. B. (St. John quarantine station) 486.

N. W. T. (Moose Jaw, P.O.) 13130 (vi.); (Prince Albert, court house) 13129 (ii).

Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 503 (i); (Kingston military college, stables) 13117, 13128; (Wingham, P.O.) 13123 (vi).

Ottawa (coal sheds) 13116; (elevator, west Block) 13115 (vi).

Docks (commissioner's rep.) 2983 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Anderson's Hollow) 1163; (Campbellton, wharf) 1166; (Caraquet, wharf) 1175 (i).

N. S. (Amagandus wharf) 1068; (Bailey's Brook, wharf) 1072; (Big Pond, wharf) 1071; (Bridgewater, dredging) 1074 (i); (cement, piers, &c.) 13184 (vi); (Grand Etang bridge works) 1098; (Kingsport Pier) 1103 (i).

Ont. (Bronte, harbour) 1354; (Gananoque, harbour) 1371 (i)

P.E.I. (Souris Knight's Point) 1162 (i).

Que. (St. Jean des Chaillons, wharf) 13494 (vi); (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2258 (i).

Miscellaneous (Ottawa river, surveys) 13344 (vi).

Slides and Booms (Ottawa river staff) 2980 (ii).

Telegraph Lines—B.C. (Kamloops, Nicola line) 13337; N.W.T. (Wood Mountain, &c.) 13336 (vi).

Quarantine (cattle) 5504; (Dr. Couture) 5504; (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5496 (iii); (public health, small-pox) 5008 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (Clergue's rails) 14097; Miscellaneous (Ry. commission, salaries) 14155 (vi).

Trade and Commerce (Chinese immigration Act) 7759; (iron and steel bounties, legal expenses) 7797 (iv).

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7282; (roads and bridges) 7284; (supplies purchased, &c.) 6930 (iii).

Swing Bridges Bill: *See* 'Navigable,' &c.

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Ques. of Order (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) *re* Mr. Tarte, 4843 (ii).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Thousand Islands, Improvement: *See* 'St. Lawrence.'

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14464 (vi).

Tyerman, P. D., Payments to, by Govt. (Ques.) 286 (i).

U. S. Coasting Privileges: *See* 'Coasting.'

Valleyfield Post office, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 11187 (v).

Ventilation of Chamber, Fans, &c. (remarks) 4362 (ii), 6406 (iii).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2344 (i); on M. to ref. to Special Com., 3247 (ii).

Williamsburg Canal, Collector, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12935 (vi).

Wolfe Island and Howe Island wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13498 (iii).

Woods, J. W., Amount paid for Tents, &c. (Ques.) 3804 (ii), 5764 (iii).

——— Rental of Buildings to Govt. (Ques.) 5764 (iii).

Thompson, Mr. A. T., *Haldimand and Monck.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex's Speech (moved) 7 (i).

Budget, The, 1994 (i).

C. P. Ry. Co.'s (B. 75) 1°*, 872 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13583 (vi).

General Inspection Act (hides) Amt. B. 48 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, Deb. adjourned, 1065 (i).

G.O.C., Lord Dundonald's Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2415 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12206 (v).

Hides Bill: *See* 'General Inspection B.'

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 26) 1°*, 1204.

Loan Companies Extension (B. 24) 1°m., 284; 2°m., 2349; in Com., 2350 (i).

Mexican Light and Power Co.'s (B. 126) 1°*, 1853 (i).

Militia Force, Condition, Pay, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 5702 (iii).

Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s B. 57 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 1811 (i).

Ry. Act (subsidies) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1059 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11635, 11659 (v).

SUPPLY:

Militia (annual drill) 3606 (ii); (pay and allowance) 13430 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 499; (Cayuga) 499 (i).

United Empire Life Ins. Co.'s (B. 163) 1°*, 2582; in Com., 3796, 3983 (ii)

Thomson, Mr. T. I., *N. Grey.*

Balaclava and Owen Sound Mail Contract (Ques.) 13263 (vi).

Bayfield, Str., Sale, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 5586 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).

See 'Supply—Fisheries,' 'Lighthouse Service.'

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7359, 7372; in Com. on B., 7383, 7391 (iii).

See 'Supply—Inspection.'

Cement in Buildings: *See* 'Supply—Public Works, Buildings, Ottawa.'

Census: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Commercial Agencies, Duties, &c. (Ques.) 4360 (ii).

Dredges at Midland, Capacity, &c. (Ques.) 5317 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3011 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9573 (iv).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections) 13277 (vi).

Grey County, Public Buildings wanted, &c., List read, in Com. of Sup., 5835 (iii).

Indians: *See* 'Supply—Indians.'

I. C. R. Supplies B.: *See* 'Ry. Act.'

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8226 (iv).

Meaford Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13124 (vi).

Owen Sound, Dock: *See* 'Dry Docks B.'

——— Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13063 (vi).

——— Water Lot, &c. (Ques.) 5317 (iii).

See 'Supply—Public Works, Buildings, Ont.'

Public Works, Contracts awarded, &c. (Ques.) 9080 (iv).

——— Govt. Policy *re* Public Buildings, 5831 (iii).

Ry Act (stores of I. C. R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12967 (vi).

Representation in H of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10999, 11528 (v).

Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Dredge, Sinking in Lake Ont. (Ques.) 5587 (iii).

Small-pox: *See* 'Supply—Quarantine.'

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census, Grey counties) 4826 (ii).
Excise (Standard Chemical Co.) 5380 (iii); (wood alcohol) 5380 (iii).
Fisheries (str. *Bayfield*) 5278 (iii).
Indians—B.C. (salaries) 7257; (schools, &c.) 7257; (travelling expenses) 7262; Yukon (expenses, generally) 7272 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7775; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7775 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (*Bayfield*, str. reps. *re*) 5743; (*Bayfield*, str., sale, &c.) 5763 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4096 (ii).

Thomson, Mr. T. I.—*Con.*

SUPPLY.—*Con.*

Post Office (Chatsworth, vacancy) 6057; (postmasters' salaries arrears) 5924; (postmasters, &c.) 6057 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Arichat) 5831; (Guysborough) 5840 (iii).
Ont. (Bridgeburg, P. O.) 13113; (Guelph, armoury) 13083; (Oshawa, P. O.) 13111 (vi); (Owen Sound) 439, 533 (i), 13063; (Picton, P.O.) 13114; (St. Mary's, P.O.) 13109; (Sault Ste. Marie, P. O.) 13107 (vi); (Toronto Junction post office) 652 (i); (Wingham, P. O.) 13120; (Woodstock, P.O.) 13108 (vi).
Ottawa (coal sheds) 13115 (vi).
Que. (Longueuil, P. O.) 13070 (vi)
Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (dredging, plant, &c.) 13311; (Fraser river, improvement) 13305 (vi).
Mar. Provs. (dredging) 13309; (hydraulic dredge) 13312 (vi); (dredging, repairs) 2639 (ii).
Ont. (general repairs) 1370 (i); (Kaministiquia river) 5825 (iii); (Owen Sound, harbour) 1377 (i); (Port Arthur, dredging) 13013 (vi).
P.E.I. (dredging plant) 13313 (vi).
Que. (Grande Vallee, pier) 1515 (i).
Yukon (Lewes and Yukon river) 13307 (vi).
Quarantine (small-pox) 5011 (ii).
Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7276 (iii).

Wood Alcohol: *See* 'Supply—Excise.'

Tisdale, Hon. David, *S. Norfolk.*

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5968 (iii).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 157 (Mr. *Stewart*) on Amt. (Mr. *Henderson*) 5989 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4378, 4962 (ii).

Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3229 (ii).

Chignecto Marine Ry. Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4422 (ii).

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 1327 (i), 3243 (ii).

Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 576 (i).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6438 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3012 (ii).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 613 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5168 (iii).

Indian Agents, Brant Reserve, Leases, &c. (M. for copies*) 1322 (i).

Indian Agents, Guardians, &c. (Ques.) 819 (i).

Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 78 (Sir *Frederick Borden*) in Com., 1117 (v).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 4870 (ii).

Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) in Com., 5982 (iii).

Tisdale, Hon. David—*Con.*

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for Com., 2586; in Com., 2593, 3721, 3835, 3882 (ii), 6075 (iii).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10960, 10911 ; (Brant) 11087 ; (Norfolk) 11117, 11427 ; on M. for 3°, 12372 (v).

SUPPLY :

Militia (annual drill) 3603 ; (association grants) 3767 : (defence scheme) 3763 ; (G.O.C.) 3779; (Martineau investigation) 3584, 3752 ; (military college) 3778 ; (pay and allowance, 3584 (ii) ; (pay and allowance, general statement) 13405 (vi) ; (stores branch) 3608 ; (Valleyfield strike) 3591, 3756 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—N. B. (St. John, drill hall) 13043 (vi).

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Manitoba Newspapers *re* Judges (remarks) 11082 (v).

Wilson, Stephen Relief B. 228 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 9150 (iv).

Tobin, Mr. E. W., *Richmond and Wolfe.*

Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 115) 1°*, 1575 (i).

SUPPLY :

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies) 4090 (ii).

Tolmie, Mr. J., *W. Bruce.*

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10944 (v).

Tucker, Mr. J. J., *St. John City, (N.B).*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5186 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Ocean and River Service (Dom. steamers, supplies, &c.) 5043 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert, K.C.M.G., *Pictou.*

Alaskan Boundary Commission, Award, &c. (remarks) 14280 (vi).

Criminal Code (immoral entertainments) Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 316 (i).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 303, 628 (i).

Hay and Oats bought by Can., for S. A. War, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 682 (i).

Inverness and Richmond Ry. Subsidy, &c. (Ques.) 872 (i).

Juvenile Offenders Act Amt. (B. 10) in Com., 314 (i).

Judges of High Court, B.C., Salaries, &c. (remarks) 14305 (vi).

Minister of Mines, Appnmt. of, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 276 (i).

Ministers, Reduction in Number, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 276 (i).

Pensions to S. A. Veterans by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14599 (vi).

Post Office Savings Banks Deposits, Defalcations of Postmasters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14275 (vi).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert—*Con.*

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c., 14368 (vi).

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt. Interior (salaries) 269 (i).

Miscellaneous—Yukon (Canadian Bank of Commerce) 14274 (vi).

Supreme Court Registrar's B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14305 (vi).

Yukon Ter. Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 314 (i).

Turgeon, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*

Leprosy at Tracadie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13039 (vi).

SUPPLY ;

Public Works : Buildings—N. B. (Tracadie Lazaretto) 13039 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, Generally (dredges, repairs) 2631 (ii) ; N. B. (Caraquet wharf) 1176 ; (Shippegan harbour) 1184 (i).

Vrooman, Mr. A. E., *S. Victoria (O.)*

Budget, The, 1832 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10102 (v).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11500, 11658 (v).

Pigeon Lake Island, Sale, &c. (remarks) in Com., of Sup., 6412 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Indians (survey, reserves) 6412 (iii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Seven Islands, wharf) 13484 (vi).

Quarantine (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5501 (iii) ; (small-pox) 5025 (ii) ; (trachoma epidemic) 5496 (iii).

Wade, Mr. F. B., *Annapolis.*

Beauharnois Electoral District: *See* 'Loy, Geo. M.'

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7336, 7371 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7492 (iii).

Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8245, 8361 (iv).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6909 (iii).

Fruit Marks Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. *Henderson*) on M. for 2°, 3819, 3829 (ii).

G. T Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5174, 5199 (iii), 7859 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9820 (iv).

Judges' Retiring Allowance B. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8100, 8371 (iv).

Loy, Geo. M., Violation of Independence of Parlt., &c., Rep. of Privs. and Elections Com. (presented) 7916 (iv).

——— (M.) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 8008 (iv).

McDermid, Ellen, Relief (B. 229) 1°*, 7922 (iv).

Wade, Mr. F. B.—*Con.*

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5094 (ii), 5359 (iii).

Mills, Mr., Claims against (Ques.) 6167 (iii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4469 (ii).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 4868 (ii).

Postage Rates for Books, &c. (remarks) in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5869 (iii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5869 (iii).

Privileges and Elections Com., Rep. of Com. *re* Geo. M. Loy, M.P. (M.) to conc., 8008; on Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 8034 (iv).

——— 2nd Rep. (presented) 7916 (iv).

Ry. Act (consolidation Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4581, 4702 (ii), 6115, 6192, 6209, 6291 (iii).

Ry. Debts Bill: *See* 'Exchequer.'

SUPPLY:

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Furness-Withy Co.) 7734; (St. John and London) 7734 (iv).

Public Works: Buildings, N.S. (Arichat) 5835 (iii).

Wilson, Stephen, Relief (B. 228) 1°*, 7922 (iv).

Ward, Mr. H. A., *E. Durham.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10010 (iv).

Parliament Grounds, Cricket Playing (remarks) 2423 (i).

SUPPLY:

Militia (annual drill) 3603; (military property) 3621 (ii); (pay and allowance) 13425 (vi); (properties) 3612; (Valleyfield strike) 3599 (ii).

Trent Canal, Hastings and Trenton, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 129 (i).

——— Surveys at Rice Lake, (M for reps.) 2313, 2333 (i).

Wilmot, Mr. R. D., *Sunbury and Queen's.* (*N.B.*)

Bathurst Harbour Buoys, &c. (Ques.) 3630 (ii).

Bourgeois, M. E., Sub-Collector of Customs at Tracadie, N.B., Dismissal (Ques.) 543 (i).

Census, Sunbury, N.B., Religious Classification, &c, (Ques.) 4005 (ii).

Daly, Michael, Harbour Master, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3630 (ii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4687 (ii).

Gagetown, N.B., Mail Contract, &c. (Ques.) 1676 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7902; on M. for 3° (amt.) 8067 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9980 (iv).

Harrison, Mr., Inspector of Fisheries, N.B., Resignation (Ques.) 288 (i).

Wilmot, Mr. R. D.—*Con.*

Hatchey, Nazaire, Appnmt. as Harbour Master, (Ques.) 3630 (ii).

McMonagle, Miles, Dismissal from Beacon Light, N.B. (Ques.) 1194 (i).

Mehan, Dr., Meterological Service, Removal, &c. (Ques.) 3630 (ii).

Oromocto Shoals, N.B., Dismissal of Miles McMonagle, &c. (Ques.) 1194 (i).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14323 (vi).

Rivers, Robert, Dismissal from Miscou Lighthouse (Ques.) 3631 (ii).

St. John Valley Ry., Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14323 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census, N.B., religions) 4821 (ii).

Indians: N.B. (St. John river, pet., &c.) 6352 (iii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Bay du Vin) 1164; (Lord's Cove, wharf) 1177; (Great Salmon River) 1177; (Negro Point, breakwater) 1182; (Oromocto, wharf) 1181; (St. John, harbour) 1183; (St. John river, tributaries) 1177 (i).

Tracadie Customs Collector, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 543 (i).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co., Contract with Govt., &c. (Ques.) 2759 (ii).

Venoit, P. I., Customs Collector at Bathurst, Absence, &c. (Ques.) 3629 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. U., *Lennox.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen's Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6969 (iii).

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11169 (v).

Binder Twine Inspector, Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 4959 (ii).

——— Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 5588 (iii).

——— Penalties *re* Inspection (remarks) 14048 (vi).

——— *See* 'Supply—Inspection.'

Bridges over Canals, Maintenance by Govt., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5617 (iii).

Doukhobors Homestead Entries, &c. (Ques.) 541 (i).

——— Loans to by Govt. (Ques.) 5587 (iii).

——— Pilgrimage, Expenses, Losses, &c. (Ques.) 542 (i).

Ernestown Station Postmaster, Changes, &c. (Ques.) 1034 (i).

False Creek, B.C., Lease to Burnett & Kelly (Ques.) 2758, 2919 (ii).

Grain carried by C. P. R. to St. John (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9367 (iv); in Com. on B., 10697 (v).

G. T. Pacific Bill, Distribution to Members (remarks) 8918 (iv).

Wilson, Mr. U.—*Con.*

Haycock, Jos., Appnmt. as Inspector of Binder Twine (Ques.) 4959 (ii), 5588 (iii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Inspection of Staples.'

Immigrants at Quebec, Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 5318 (iii).

Immigration Expenditure, 1902 to 1903 (Ques.) 6269 (iii).

Immigration, Inspection, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 6546 (iii).

——— Notice of M., 6522 (iii).

——— Nationality, &c., (Ques.) 2310 (i).

Immigration into Man., Houses and Fuel, &c. (Ques.) 542 (i).

Immigration refused Admission, &c. (Ques.) 2310 (i), 2502 (ii).

Iron and Steel, Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7925, 7929, 7986 (iv).

Iron and Steel, Bounty Payments (Ques.) 6435 (iii).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8088 (iv), 10763 (v).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8206, 8228 (iv).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 10828 (v).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on Sen. Amts., 13846 (vi).

Ry. Carriage of Mails, &c. (Ques.) 6268 (iii).

Railway Subsidies, Amounts paid from 1900 to 1903 (Ques.) 13370 (vi).

——— Interest payable, &c. (Ques.) 3970 (ii).

——— voted for 1900, 1901, 1902 (Ques.) 12842, 13027, 13259, 13934 (vi).

——— voted and paid by Govt. 1901-3 (Ques.) 2306 (i).

Rural Mail Delivery, Service *re* (Ques.) 13259 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (experimental farms) 4549 (ii).
Canals: Beauharnois (dykes) 14152; Generally (lockmen, &c., increased wages) 14157 (vi).
Civil Govt.: Finance (contingencies) 227 (i); Finance (insurance) 12587 (v); Sec. of State (printing, &c.) 223; (salaries) 223 (i).
Customs (Napanee collector, salary) 3919 (ii).
Dom. Lands (Banff Hot springs, baths) 6789; (Stewart, inspector of forests) 6774; (tree culture) 6774 (iii).
Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5283 (iii).
Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6660; (Devlin, Mr., successor) 6731; (expenditures) 6615; (White, Mr., expenses) 6732 (iii).
Indians: B.C. (industrial schools) 7254 (iii).
Inland Revenue (excise inspections) 5364 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7766; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7766 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 5878 (iii); (St. John and Belfast) 7731 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Paris agency) 12589 (v); (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6969 (iii); (Printing Bureau, plant) 12587 (v).

Wilson, Mr. U.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4104 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (Dom. renewals, &c.) 636; (Ft. William) 637 (i).
Ottawa (additional rooms) 13012 (vi); (Rideau Hall, grounds, &c.) 5006 (ii); (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 993 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Glace Bay) 1094 (i).
Ont. (Port Arthur, dredging) 13019 (vi).
Miscellaneous (arbitrations and awards) 13339 (vi).
Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 2701; (Portage du Fort) 2699 (ii).
Slides and Booms (St. Maurice slides) 2678 (ii).
Telegraph Lines (St. Lawrence) 5007 (ii).
Quarantine (diseased immigrants) 5494; (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5499 (iii); (small-pox) 5029 (ii); (trachoma disease) 5494 (iii).
Railways: I.C.R. (G. T. R. rental) 12888 (vi); (Rivière du Loup engine houses, &c.) 12593 (v); Miscellaneous (Ry. commission, salaries) 14155 (vi).

Wright, Mr. A. A., *S. Renfrew.*

Binder Twine, Inspection and Penalties (remarks) 14052 (vi).

British Cable News Service between Can. and G. B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10735 (v).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5076 (ii); in Com. on B., 5424 (iii).

Can. Central and O. & B. Ry., Compensation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5622 (iii).

C. P. R. Transcontinental Trains, Water Supply, &c. (remarks) 9455 (iv).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10754 (v).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3054 (ii).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6446 (iii).

Electric Lighting in Renfrew, 14137 (vi).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 300 (i).

France and Can. SS. Subsidy (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 10817 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10483 (v).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com, of Sup., 772 (i).

Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14392 (vi).

Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8095 (iv).

K. and P. Ry. (remarks) 5622 (iii).

Milk Can B.: *See* 'Weights,' &c

Newspaper Despatches from G.B.: *See* 'British.'

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineers, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for Copies, 1307 (i).

Wright, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (telegraph poles) 5350 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6480, 7225, 7228 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 7629 ; (creameries) 7633 (iv).

Canals : Cornwall (electric lighting) 14137 (vi).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 7593 (iv).

Wright, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works : Buildings, Ont. (Sault Ste. Marie, P.O.) 13108 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Sorel, deep water wharf) 12858 (vi).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3455 (ii)

Weights and Measure Act (milk cans) Amt. B. (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2346 (i).

INDEX—PART II

SUBJECTS

ABBOTT'S HARBOUR, N.S., BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).

ABRAM'S RIVER, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).

ACADEMY OF ARTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12589 (v).

——— *See* 'Agriculture, Arts.'

ACADIANS, HISTORICAL DATA: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).

'ACADIAN,' SALE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13658 (vi).

——— *See* 'Marine.'

ACETYLENE, GAS BUOYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13633 (vi).

——— IN LIGHTHOUSES: in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).

ACTON VALE POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).

ADDRESS, THE, IN ANS. TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: moved (Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*) 7; seconded (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) 18 (i).

Debate: (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 23; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 40; (Mr. *Monk*) 55; (Mr. *Charlton*) 67; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 75 (i).

ADDRESS, THE, REPLY FROM HIS EX.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1204 (i).

AD HOC JUDGES: in Com. of Sup., 3402 (ii).

ADJOURNMENTS:

ASCENSION DAY: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3127 (ii).

DOMINION DAY: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5589 (iii).

EASTER: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1115 (i).

LABOUR DAY, DELAYING SESSION, &C. (remarks) 10742 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 10489 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 10712 (v).

PROCEDURE *re* ADJOURNMENT: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Sproule*) 6630 (iii).

THANKSGIVING DAY: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13790 (vi).

Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1**, 4; *pro forma*.

ADMIRALTY COURT, ACCOMMODATION FOR SITTINGS: in Com. of Sup., 3408 (ii).

——— REGISTRAR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3408 (ii).

ADULTERATION OF FOOD, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).

ADVERTISING (GOVT.) IN NEWSPAPERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5267–5274 (iii).

'ADVOCATE,' PRINCE ALBERT, PAYMENTS FOR PRINTING *re* ELECTION PROCLAMATION: in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).

——— *See* 'Prince Albert.'

AFFIDAVITS *re* P. O. SUPPLIES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 6138 (iii).

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS FOR N. W. INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS, REBATE FOR 1901–2: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3803 (ii).

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION SEL. COM.: M. to add Name (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5679 (iii).

——— REP. *re* BINDER TWINE: *See* 'Binder Twine,' &c.

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS:

ACADEMY OF ARTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12589 (v).

ACADIANS, HISTORICAL DATA *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).

ADULTERATION OF FOOD, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).

AGRICULTURAL LECTURERS IN QUEBEC, NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 8615 (iv).

AGRICULTURE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4429, 4548, 4800 (ii), 7053 (iii),

——— CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 4353 (ii).

——— SALARIES, CONTINGENCIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4349 (ii).

AIDS TO AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4432 (ii).

ANDERSON, MR. J. G., APPNMT. AS FRUIT INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 13372 (vi).

——— Remarks *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13508 (vi).

ANTHRAX IN CATTLE, PAR. IN NEWSPAPERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 10102 (v).

APPLES, CANADIAN, MR. PRESTON'S STATEMENT *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) 11184 (v).

ARCHIVES, CANADIAN, REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 5417 (iii).

——— RE-ORGANIZATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13503 (vi).

——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

ART GALLERY, ENCOURAGEMENT TO CANADIAN ARTISTS: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. of Sup., 13513 (vi).

——— EXPENDITURE ON PAINTINGS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 12717 (vi).

——— NATIONAL: in Com. of Sup., 2725 (ii), 12589 (v).

BURRARD, B.C., CENSUS COMMISSIONERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7079 (iii).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

BUTTER ADULTERATION BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Blain*) *re* Irish Butter in Com. of Sup., 7627 (iv).
BUTTER AND CHEESE WEIGHING, REP. OF INVESTIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 5414 (iii).
BUTTER, CANADIAN, MR. PRESTON'S INTERVIEW, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 10712, 10745 (v).
BUTTER MADE AT EXPERIMENTAL FARM, OTTAWA, SALE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1593, 1857 (i).
CANADIAN APPLES: *See* 'Apples.'
CANADIAN ARTISTS AND ART GALLERY: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. of Sup., 13513 (vi).
CANADIAN ASSOCIATION, GOVT. A D *re* TUBERCULOSIS: in Com. of Sup., 13517 (vi).
CANADIAN BUTTER, MR. PRESTON'S INTERVIEW: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 10712, 10745 (v).
CAN. EMPLOYMENT BUREAU, SUIT AGAINST W. T. R. PRESTON: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12220 (v).
CANADIAN EXHIBITS AT IMPERIAL INSTITUTE: in Com. of Sup., 13508 (vi).
——— *See* 'Imperial.'
CANADIAN TRADE WITH JAPAN: *See* 'Japan Exhibition.'
CARLETON, N.B., CENSUS *re* RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 4004 (ii).
CATTLE EMBARGO IN G.B.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 110 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 267 (i).
——— LORD ONSLOW'S DECLARATION: Par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 14054 (vi).
——— Papers laid on Table, 591 (i).
CATTLE INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi).
——— ON STEAMERS: in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).
CATTLE PURCHASED BY BRITISH GOVT.: Par. in Montreal *Gazette* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 5415.
CATTLE PURCHASED FOR S. AFRICA: Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5463; (Neg. Y. 48; N. 78) 5489 (iii).
CATTLE QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5502 (iii).
CENSUS: in Com. of Sup., 4594 (ii).
——— CARLETON, &C., N.B., RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 4004 (ii).
——— CIRCULAR OF MR. COTE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4657 (ii).
——— COMMISSIONER FOR PROV. OF QUEBEC, TRAVELLING, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Monk*) 1058 (i).
——— EXPENDITURE, 1881, 1891 AND 1901, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13699; Neg. (Y. 35; N. 69) 13759 (vi).
——— Notice of Motion (Mr. *Monk*) 13368 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13672 (vi).
——— GRAND MANAN, N.B., RELIGIOUS ENUMERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 3801 (ii).
——— LAND VALUES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4640 (ii).
——— PAYMENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 286 (i).
——— ST. JOHN, RELIGIOUS ENUMERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 3800 (ii).
——— SCHEDULES, HALTON, PEEL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6436, 6894 (iii), 11425 (v).
——— SCHEDULES, 1891, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7054 (iii)
——— SCHEDULES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4635.
——— STAFF EMPLOYED *re* ALTERATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*) 13935 (vi).
——— TOTAL COST: in Com. of Sup., 7053 (iii).
——— TOTAL COST TO DATE: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1593 (i).
——— TOTAL COST, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Taylor*) 289, 479, 544 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 203 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 204 (i).
CIRCULARS TO CURÉS, P.Q., *re* CENSUS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4657 (ii).
CLASSIFYING RECORD: in Com. of Sup., 12592.

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

COLD STORAGE: in Com. of Sup., 4671 (ii), 7086 (iii), 7610 (iv).
COUTURE, VET. SURGEON AT QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5504 (iii).
CREAMERIES IN N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7632.
CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).
DAIRYING BRANCH, AGRICULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 7610 (iv).
——— COLD STORAGE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4671 (ii).
DEPUTY MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE: Remarks *re*, in Com. of Sup., 4356 (ii).
DROLET, CENSUS ENUMERATOR: Amount paid to (remarks) in Com. of Sup, 7055 (iii).
EXHIBITION FURNITURE, &C., AT PAN-AMERICAN EXPOSITION: in Com. of Sup., 4603 (ii).
EXHIBITIONS, GENERAL VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 4599 (ii).
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 4548 (ii).
——— REPORT: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1937 (i).
FOOD ANALYSIS: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).
FRUIT INSPECTORS BUYING APPLES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13508 (vi).
——— *See* 'Anderson.'
FRUIT SHIPMENTS IN COLD STORAGE TO EUROPE, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 3805 (ii).
——— VALUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 3232 (ii).
FUMIGATION STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 4434 (ii), 13502 (vi).
GAUDET, COMPILATION OF ACADIAN HISTORY: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).
GENERAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).
GOLD NUGGETS, EXHIBITION AT GLASGOW: in Com. of Sup., 4612 (ii).
GREY COUNTIES, CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4826 (ii).
GROSSE ISLE, SUPPLIES *re* QUARANTINE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5496 (iii).
HAGAR, MISS, APPNMT. AT EXPERIMENTAL FARM: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 5316 (iii).
HALTON, CARDWELL AND PEEL, CENSUS SCHEDULES: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6436, 6894 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 7092 (iii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iii).
See 'Census.'
HEALTH ACT, PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4440 (ii). *See* 'Public Health.'
HISTORICAL DATA *re* ACADIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).
HOG CHOLERA, OUTBREAK IN BRUCE: in Com. of Sup., 550 (iii).
——— OUTBREAK IN YARMOUTH, ONT.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Ingram*) 1058 (i).
IMPERIAL INSTITUTE, CANADIAN EXHIBIT: in Com. of Sup., 4435 (ii), 13508 (vi).
JAPANESE IMMIGRATION, INFLUX OF: Remarks (Mr. *Morrison*) 3713 (ii).
JAPAN EXHIBITION, GENERAL STATEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 4626 (ii).
KARS, CENSUS ENUMERATION, COR., &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Fowler*) 3804 (ii),
KELLY, WM., CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR N. HASTINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7080 (iii).
LECTURERS ON AGRICULTURE IN QUEBEC, NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 8615 (iv.)
LEPROSY IN CAN.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes. Victoria*) in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
LIVE STOCK EXHIBIT, ST. LOUIS EXHIBITION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4602 (ii).
See 'St. Louis.'
MINING EXHIBIT.: *See* 'Can. Exhibit,' &c.

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

NATIONAL ART GALLERY: in Com. of Sup., 12589 (v).
See 'Arts,' &c.
O'HALLORAN, GEO. F., DEP. MIN. OF AGRICULTURE: Remarks *re*, in Com. of Sup., 4356 (ii).
ONSLOW, LORD, *re* CATTLE EMBARGO; *See* 'Cattle Embargo.'
ONTARIO, NORTH, CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4826 (ii).
OSAKA EXHIBITION: *See* 'Japan.'
PATENT BRANCH, SALARIES, CONTINGENCIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4350 (ii).
PATENTS, CLASSIFICATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4433 (ii).
PEEL, CARDWELL AND HALTON, CENSUS SCHEDULES: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6436 (iii).
See 'Halton,' &c.
PETHICK, DR., VET. SURGEON, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
'POULTRY FARMING,' PAMPHLET OF DEPT.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com. of Sup., 7640 (iv).
PUBLIC HEALTH ACT, UNORGANIZED DISTRICTS, QUARANTINE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5490 (iii).
See 'Health.'
PUBLIC HEALTH, QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii), 5490 (iii).
QUARANTINE, LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i) 13030 (vi).
QUARANTINE, ORGANIZED DISTRICTS: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (i).
ROACH, MR., CENSUS ENUMERATOR FOR N. ONTARIO: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7083 (iii).
RUTHERFORD, DR., DUTIES IN ENGLAND: in Com. of Sup., 5509 (iii).
ST. LOUIS EXHIBITION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4599 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3001 (ii).
——— LIVE STOCK EXHIBIT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 4237 (ii).
See 'Live Stock.'
SAN JOSE SCALE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4434 (ii).
SAUNDERS, DR. C. E., APPNMT. AT EXPERIMENTAL FARM: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 1676 (i).
SHUTT, PROF., REPORT *re* SOFT PORK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4556 (ii).
SIMCOE COUNTY, CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4825 (ii).
SMALL-POX, QUARANTINE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii), 5491 (iii).
SUNBURY, N.B., CENSUS *re* RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 4005 (ii).
TORONTO INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITION, GOVT. AID TO: in Com. of Sup., 5341 (i), 13501 (vi).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 4439 (ii).
TUBERCULOSIS, AID TO CAN. ASSOCIATION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13517 (vi).
VETERINARY CHIEF INSPECTORS, SALARIES, &C: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1591 (i).
VETERINARY DIVISION, QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5502 (iii).
'YEAR BOOK': in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

AIDS TO AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4432 (ii).

AIDS TO NAVIGATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).

——— CHANNEL SWEEPING BOATS: in Com. of Sup., 13633 (vi).

——— LIGHTHOUSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5736 (iii).
See 'Marine,' &c.

AIR BRAKES FOR FREIGHT CARS, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 7527 (iii), 8281 (iv).

AITKEN'S WHARF, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).

ALASKAN BOUNDARY AWARD, &C., TEL. FROM LONDON *re* LORD ALVERSTONE'S REFERENCE TO CANADIAN CRITICISM: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 13963 (vi).
——— ALLEGED INTERVIEW WITH MR. AYLESWORTH: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13957 (vi).
——— ALLEGED INTERVIEW WITH MR. AYLESWORTH, VERIFICATION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 13667 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 14287 (vi).
——— Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 14280 (vi).
See 'Interview.'
——— Official Information, Inquiry for Cor., &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*. *Halifax*) 14521 (vi).
——— BOND-HAY TREATY, &C.: Inquiry for Papers *re* (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 878 (i).
——— Inquiry (Mr. *Monk*) 853 (i).
——— COMMISSION, CABLEGRAM FROM LORD ALVERSTONE: Read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13806 (vi).
——— Cor. *re*, Laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 14688 (vi).
——— CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY, ABROGATION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 109 (i).
——— Inquiry for ret. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 7297 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) on Alaska Award, 14521 (vi).
——— COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 2299 (ii).
——— EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iii), 13957 (vi).
——— GOVT. RESPONSIBILITY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 14791 (vi).
——— HISTORY OF CASE, &C.: Recapitulation (Mr. *Bourassa*) 14773 (vi).
——— JUDGMENT, &C.: Par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (Mr. *Bell*) 13671 (vi).
——— Notice *re* proposed Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 14765 (vi).
——— REFUSAL OF CAN. COMMISSIONERS TO SIGN AWARD: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 14402 (vi).
——— SUMMARY PUBLISHED: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 10536 (v).
——— TEL. FROM MR. SIFTON: Read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 14529 (vi).
——— TREATY, CONVENTION RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 480 (i).
'ALASKA,' STR., PURCHASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 6629 (iii).
ALBANY STATION ACCOMMODATION, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
ALBERNI-CLAYOQUOT TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
——— *See* 'B.C.'

Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 42 (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 591; 2°*, 665 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 75.)

Alberta Railway and Coal Co.'s B. No. 119 (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 1675; 2°*, 1853 (i); in Com., 3582; in Com., and 3°*, 3752 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 76.)

ALBERT COUNTY, HARBOUR-MASTER, DISMISSAL OF CAPT. BISHOP: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).

ALBERTON, P.E.I., RY. STATION: in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).
ALCOHOL: *See* 'Wood.'
ALERT,' STR., *re* CANAL SURVEYS: Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).
ALEXANDER INDIAN AGENCY, TELEPHONE TO: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
ALEXANDRIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 487 (i).
ALEXANDRIA WOOD EXPORT CO.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12924 (vi).
Algoma Ry.: *See* 'Bruce.'
Algonquin Lumber and Power Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 165 (Mr. *Gould*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2172 (ii); in Com., 5361; 3°*, 5361 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 77.)
ALIEN LABOUR ACT, PROSECUTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3971 (ii).
Aliens Restriction Act Amt. B. No. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) 1°m., 1295; 2°m., 2387 (i), 3282 (ii).
Aliens: *See* 'Naturalization.'
ALLANS' CONTRACT *re* ATLANTIC SERVICES, DISCRIMINATING RATES *re* CAN. FREIGHT: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13674 (vi).
—— *See* 'Atlantic Fast SS.'
ALLAN LINE STEAMSHIPS WITHDRAWN FROM ST. JOHN: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 13937 (vi).
—— *See* 'Atlantic,' 'C.P.R. Steamers,' &c.
Allan, William, Relief B. No. 196 (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 4179; 2°*, 4404; in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 78.)
Alliance Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 212 (Mr. *Russell*) M. to receive Pet., 4958 (ii); 1°*, 5512; 2°m., 5585; in Com., 7470; 3°*, 7478 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 79.)
ALLISTON PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 495 (i).
ALMA PIER, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).
ALNWICK BAND, MISSISSAGA INDIANS, CLAIMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McColl*) 6895 (iii).
ALUMINUM, OXIDE OF, IMPORTS INTO CAN., PORTS OF ENTRY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson*, *N.B.*) 1035 (i).
ALVERSTONE, LORD: *See* 'Alaskan Boundary.'
AMAGANDUS WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1068 (i).
Amalgamated Engineers: *See* 'Dom. Institute,' &c.
AMHERSTBURG HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1185 (i), 13235 (vi).
AMHERST, N.S., POST OFFICE, RENTAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1591 (i).
AMQUI STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).
ANALYSTS, PUBLIC: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).
ANCHOR LINE SALVAGE COMPENSATION FOR 'SCOTIA': in Com. of Sup., 14107 (vi).
ANDERSON AND KENNEDY LAKE: in Com. of Sup. 1451 (i).
ANDERSON'S HOLLOW WHARF, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup, 1163 (i).
ANDERSON, MR. J. G., APPNMT. AS FRUIT INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 13372 (vi).
—— Remarks *re*, in Com. of Sup., 13508 (vi).
ANGLO-AMERICAN TEL. CO., MONOPOLY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13328, 13338 (vi).
Animals Contagious Diseases B. No. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) 1°*, 4003; 2°m., 4224; in Com., 4225, 4690; 3°*, 4691 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 11.)
ANN NDALE PIER, P.E.I., AMT. EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2921 (ii).
—— RANGE LIGHTS, AMT. EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2921 (ii)
ANNUAL DRILL, CAMPS: in Com of Sup., 5005 (ii).
ANNUAL DRILL OF MILITIA: in Com. of Sup., 3603 (ii).
ANSE AUX GASCONS, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANSE AUX GRIS FONDS, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANSE ST. JEAN, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANTHRAX IN CATTLE, PAR. IN NEWSPAPERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 10102 (v).
ANTICOSTI ISLAND, FOX BAY, TEL. LINE: in Com of Sup., 13325 (vi).
—— LIGHTSHIP: in Com. of Sup., 5737 (iii).
—— TEL LINE: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).
ANTIGONISH POST OFFICE, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
APPLES, CANADIAN, MR. PRESTON'S STATEMENT *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) 11184 (v).
ARBITRATION AND AWARDS, *re* PUBLIC WORKS, PAYMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vi).
ARCHITECT S (CHIEF) OFFICE, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2747 (ii).
ARCHITECTS *re* PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 524 (i).
ARCHITECTS STAFF, PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 961 (i).
—— *See* 'Public Works.'
ARCHIVES, CANADIAN, REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 5417 (iii).
—— DEPT., RE-ORGANIZATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13503 (vi).
—— SALARIES, &C.: in om. of Sup., 4429 (ii).
ARICHAT, N S., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5527 (iii).
ARICHAT, WEST, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
ARMOURIES, CONSTRUCTION OF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13082 (vi).
ARMOURIES, GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 965 (i).
ARROW LAKES IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).

ARSENALS, DOM., CONSTRUCTION IN CAN.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13054 (vi).

ARSENAULT, CAPT., COMPENSATION *re* DAMAGES TO SCHR.: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

ART GALLERY, ENCOURAGEMENT TO CANADIAN ARTISTS: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. of Sup., 13513 (vi).

—— EXPENDITURE ON PAINTINGS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 12717 (vi).

—— NATIONAL: in Com. of Sup., 2725 (ii).

—— *See* 'Portrait.'

ASCENSION ADJOURNMENT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3127 (ii).

ASHCROFT-BARKERVILLE MAIL CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1595 (i).

ASHCROFT-DAWSON TEL. LINE AND BRANCHES: in in Com. of Sup., 29 2 (ii).

Ashley, Harford, Relief B. No. 236 (Mr. *Porter*) 1°*, 8115; 2°*, 9431 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 12146 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 80).

ASSAY OFFICE, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 6799 (iii); 13779, 13965 (vi).

ASSENT, ROYAL: *See* 'Bills.'

ASSINIBOINE AND RED RIVERS NAVIGATION, COM. FROM WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1298 (i).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. No. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) 1°*, 3970; 2°*, 4132 (ii); in Com., 5558, 5584, 5887, 5960, 6845; 3°*, 6845 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 203).

ASTRONOMICAL, DEMARCATION WORK, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).

ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 342 (i); 6791 (iii).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. No. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) 1°*, 446; on order for 2°, 631, 664, 852; 2° m., 1505 (i); M. *re* Ry. Com., 6617 (iii).

ATLANTIC AND LAKE SUPERIOR RY. SUBSIDY, CLAIMS AGAINST, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 3299 (ii).

ATLANTIC FAST SERVICE, GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4007 (ii).

—— Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 14158; Neg. (Y. 20; N. 58) 14218 (vi).

Debate: (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 14171; (Mr. *Sproule*) 14178; (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 14185; (Mr. *Bell*) 14193; (Mr. *Logan*) 14203; (Mr. *Gourley*) 14204; (Mr. *Ross, N.S.*) 14215; (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 14216 (vi).

—— TENDERS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3882, 4120 (ii).

—— INQUIRY (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) for Stmnt., 4445 (ii).

—— TENDERS RECEIVED: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4727 (ii).

—— ALLAN'S CONTRACT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv); 13672 (vi).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Halifax* 7091 (iii).

—— ALLAN STEAMERS LEAVING ST. JOHN, REDUCTION IN NUMBER: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 13937, 14064 (vi).

ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE, ALLAN STEAMERS LEAVING ST. JOHN, REDUCTION IN NUMBER: Remarks *re* Amt. to Sup. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13948 (vi).

—— PETERSEN, TATE & CO.'S DEPOSIT: in Com. of Sup., 6953 (iii).

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 631; M. for Com., 1804; in Com., 1806; M. for 3°, 1810, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 81).

ATLANTIC, QUEBEC AND WESTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14460 (vi).

ATLIN-QUESNEL TEL. BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

Audit Act Amt. B. No. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1° m., 11159 (v); Order dschgd., 13444 (vi).

Remarks (Mr. *Paterson*) 13990 (vi).

—— GOVTL., INTENTION *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 11692 (v), 13258 (vi).

AUDITING DEPTL. FINANCES: Remarks *re* Martineau Investigation, 6933 (iii).

AUD. GENERAL AUDITING BOOKS OF RY. COS., *re* SUBSIDIES: in Com. on Res., 14516 (vi).

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 89 (i).

—— OFFICE, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 14255 (vi).

AUDITOR GENERAL AND TREASURY BOARD, PAYMENTS OF MEMBERS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Barker*) 10956 (v).

AUDITOR GENERAL AND TREASURY BOARD: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 11427 (v).

—— CIRCULAR FROM AUD. GEN.: Read (Mr. *Taylor*) 11552 (iv).

—— *See* 'Audit Act,' &c.

AURORA FOUNDRY, MANUFACTURE OF POST BOXES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13091 (vi).

AURORA, MAIL BAGS REPAIRED, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).

AUSTRALIA AND CAN. SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 5880 (iii), 13677 (vi).

AUTOMATIC GRAIN WEIGHERS IN N. W. T., REP. OF INSPECTORS, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Stewart*) 847, 880 (i).

AUTOMOBILES FOR P.O. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6050 (iii).

AUTONOMY FOR N.W.T., Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 13856; Neg. (Y. 29; N. 63) 13932 (vi).

Debate: (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 13856; (Mr. *Oliver*) 13883 (Mr. *Hackett*) 13894; (Mr. *Sproule*) 13894; (Mr. *Davis*) 13896; (Mr. *McCreary*) 13897; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 13905; (Mr. *Scott*) 13914 (vi).

—— *See* 'Provincial'.

AYLESWORTH, MR.: *See* 'Alaskan Boundary.'

AYR, POSTMASTER ROBSON, RESIGNATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1195 (i).

BACTERIOLOGICAL LABORATORY: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).

BAILEY'S BROOK, N.S., BREAKWATER WHARF: in Com of Sup., 1072 (i).

BAIN, MR., ASS'T COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS, APPNMT., &c.: Remarks in Com. on Customs Act Amt. B., 4010 (ii).

BALACLAVA AND OWEN SOUND MAIL CONTRACT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 13263 (vi).

BALSAM LAKE AND LAKE SIMCOE : in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iii).

BALSAM LAKE LOCKS : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).

——— *See* 'Trent.'

BANANAS IMPORTED, VALUE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 1198 (i).

BANCE, MR., PROMOTION, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5277 (iii).

BANFF, BATH HOUSE, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 6789 (iii), 13955 (vi).

——— COAL RESERVE, LEASES BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 13026 (vi).

——— MUSEUM BUILDING, ADDITION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).

——— ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iii).

Bank Act Amt. B. No. 234 (Mr. *Henderson*) 1°, 7565 (iv).

BANKERS' ASSOCIATION, INSPECTION DUTIES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 819 (i).

BANKERS, PRIVATE, LEGISLATION *re* ; Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 285 (i).

BANK FAILURES SINCE CONFEDERATION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 6435 (iii).

Bank of Montreal B. No. 72 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 814 ; 2°*, 1026 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 82).

Bank of Winnipeg Incorp. B. No. 79 (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 940 ; 2°*, 1026 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 83).

BANKS, UNCLAIMED BALANCES : Rep. presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 3804 (ii).

——— *See* 'Dom. Notes.'

——— *See* 'Alliance,' 'Citizens, &c.', 'City and County,' 'Crown,' 'Home,' 'Mount Royal,' 'Northern,' 'Sterling.'

BAPTISTS, N.B., CENSUS ENUMERATION, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup. 4801 (ii).

BARACHOIS DE MALBAIE, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).

BARNES, AMOS, CLAIMS FOR LAND, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6922 (iii).

BARR COLONY, MR. HAULTAIN'S SPEECH, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) on M. for Sup., 6354 (iii).

Debate : (Mr. *Sifton*) 6355, 6375 ; (Mr. *Lennox*) 6358 ; (Mr. *Bell*) 6360 ; (Mr. *Borden, Hfx*) 6365 ; (Mr. *Gourley*) 6369 ; (Mr. *Scott*) 6371 ; (Sir *William Mulock*) 6383 ; (Mr. *Fowler*) 6384 ; (Mr. *Davis*) 6391 ; (Mr. *Sproule*) 6394, 6400 ; (Mr. *Henderson*) 6404 (iii).

BARR COLONY AND IMMIGRATION BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).

——— NUMBER, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6696 (iii).

BARRIE, WHARF, CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup , 1186 (i), 13452 (vi).

——— P. O., BRANCH : in Com. of Sup., 6062 (iii).

BARRY'S BAY, ONT., MADAWASKA RIVER : in Com. of Sup., 13236 (vi).

BARTON, SIR EDMUND, EXPENDITURE *re* CAN. VISIT in Com. of Sup., 6952 (iii).

BASS RIVER, PERMANENT LIGHT : in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).

BATHURST CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, ABSENCE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3629 (ii).

——— FISHERY INSPECTOR : *See* 'Fishery Overseer.'

——— HARBOUR BUOYS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).

——— HARBOUR MASTER, DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2919 (ii).

BATISCAN RIVER CHANNEL, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i).

BAUXITE, TONS IMPORTED IN 1902 : Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, N.B.*) 1678 (i).

BAXTER'S HARBOUR, N.S., BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).

BAY DU VIN WHARF, RECONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i).

BAYFIELD HARBOUR WORKS, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).

BAYFIELD, ONT., EXTENSION PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 1188 (i).

'BAYFIELD,' STR., REPAIRS AND SALE, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5278, 5282, 5762 (iii).

——— SALE, REPAIRS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5586 (iii).

——— in Com. of Sup., Mr. Evans Reps., &c. : Read (Mr. *Prefontaine*) 5742, 5763 (iii).

BAY OF FUNDY FISH HATCHERY : in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

BAY OF QUINTE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14435 (vi).

BEACH POINT, P.E.I., BOAT CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, FLOODING LANDS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).

BEAUHARNOIS ELECTORAL DISTRICT REPRESENTATION AND INDEPENDENCE OF PARLT. ACT : (Mr. *Monk*) to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com., 7095 (iii).

——— *See* 'Loy, Geo. M.'

BEAVER RIVER FISH HATCHERY, ESTABLISHMENT : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

BEERSVILLE COAL AND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi.).

BEHRING SEA ARBITRATION, EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 13658 (vi).

BELFAST PIER, P.E.I., DREDGING : in Com. of Sup 1153 (i).

BELL, DR., APPNMT. AS DIRECTOR OF GEOLOGICAL SURVEY : Remarks *re*, in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iii).

BELLE ISLE TELEGRAPH LINES : in Com. of Sup. 2712, 2989 (ii).

BELLE RIVIERE, SHEET PILING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1191 (i).

BELL TELEPHONE AND C. P. R. AGREEMENT, &c : Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 5513 (iii).

——— *See* 'Ry. B. 21,' 'Telephones,' &c.

BELLEVILLE, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup.. 969 (i), 13082 (vi).

——— HARBOUR BOUNDARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 5588 (iii).

BELMONT ACCIDENT, GRATUITIES TO VICTIMS: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 13546, 14154

BENNETT, MR., INCREASE IN SALARY: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) 13967 (vi).

BENOIT'S COVE, N.S., BOAT LANDING: in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).

Berlin, Waterloo, Wellesley and Georgian Bay Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 85 (Mr. *Clare*) 1°*, 1023; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 84).

BERNIER, CAPT., GOVT. AID TO, *re* POLAR EXPEDITION: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 12805 (vi).

BERSIMIS TO GODBOUT, TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vi).

BIG HARBOUR, PORT BEVIS, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).

BIG POND WHARF, N.S., SUPERSTRUCTURE: in Com. of Sup., 1071, 1073 (i).

BILLS, PRIVATE, DELAY IN TRANSLATION AND PRINTING: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 482 (i).

BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT, 5427, 6388 (iii), 8655 (iv), 14858 (vi).

——— COMS. FROM GOV. GEN'S SEC.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 5315, 6353 (iii), 8642 (iv), 14844 (vi).

BILLS WITHDRAWN: M. (Mr. *Hyman*) 7203 (iii).

——— *See* 'Business,' &c.

BILLS:

BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*).
1°*, 4; *pro formâ*.

BILL (No. 2) To amend Chapter 8 of the Statutes of 1900, authorizing the granting of Railway Subsidies.—(Mr. *Charlton*).
1° m., 92; 2° m., 545; in Com., 550; ref. back to Sel. Com. on Rys., 700; in Com., 1059; 3° m., 1199 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 56).

BILL (No. 3) To amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Charlton*).
1°*, 92; 2° m., 885; in Com., 902, 1200 (i). M to place on Govt. Orders, 13373; in Com., 13560, 14405; wthdn., 14769 (vi).

BILL (No. 4) Respecting Telephone Companies.—(Mr. *Maclean*).
1°*, 92; 2° m., 700 (i).

BILL (No. 5) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Maclean*).
1° m., 92; 2° m., 701 (i).

BILL (No. 6) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Lancaster*).
1° m., 93; 2° m., 552; M. to ref. to Ry. Com., agreed to (Y., 99; N., 53) 565 (i); wthdn., 7203 (iii).

BILL (No. 7) To amend Chapter 138 of the Revised Statutes with respect to retiring allowances of Judges.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 93; wthdn., 634 (i).

BILL (No. 8) To amend the Expropriation Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 93; 2°*, 291; in Com., 291, 612, 632; 3°*, 945 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 22).

BILL (No. 9) To amend the Yukon Territory Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 94; 2° m., 313; in Com., 313; 3°*, 314 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 73).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 10) To amend the Act relating to the Custody of Juvenile Offenders in the Province of New Brunswick.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 94; 2°*, 314; in Com., 314; 3°*, 316 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 30).

BILL (No. 11) To amend the Act respecting the Publication of the Statutes.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 94; 2°*, 634; in Com., 634; 3°*, 635 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 65).

BILL (No. 12) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 95; 2°*, 316; in Com., 316; 3° m., 592 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 13).

BILL (No. 13) To amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 95; 2° and in Com., 635; on Order for Com., 945, 1115, 2239; 3°*, 2240 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 12).

BILL (No. 14) To amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. *Law*).
1°*, 113; 2° m., 1061; in Com., 1062 (i).

BILL (No. 15) To amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Clancy*).
1°*, 114; 2° m., 704 (i); in Com., 3236; 3°*, 3237 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 19).

BILL (No. 16) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 114; 2°, 871 (i); wthdn., 7203 (iii).

BILL (No. 17) To aid in the Settlement of Railway Labour Disputes.—(Sir *William Mulock*).
1°*, 114; 2° m., 2535 (ii); in Com., 2923; 3°*, 3298 (ii); Sen. Amts., 5653 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 55).

BILL (No. 18) To amend the Interpretation Act.—(Mr. *Monk*).
1° m., 125; on Order for 2°, 566, 705; 2° m., 916; negatived, 939 (i).

BILL (No. 19) Respecting Drainage on and across the property of Railway Companies.—(Mr. *Cowan*).
1° m., 202; 2°*, 916 (i); wthdn., 7203 (iii).

BILL (No. 20) To amend the Weights and Measures Act.—(Mr. *Campbell*).
1° m., 203; 2° m., 2338 (i), 3245 (ii).

BILL (No. 21) To amend and consolidate the Law respecting Railways.—(Mr. *Blair*).
1° m., 244 (i); 2°*, 2585; M. for Com., 2585; in Com., 2591 (i), 3538, 3713, 3830, 3882, 3974, 3984, 4120, 4564, 4691, 4728 (ii), 5243, 5322, 5513, 5560, 5679, 5765, 6071, 6170, 6172, 6202, 6271, 7299 (iii), 7609, 8125; 3° m., 8334 (iv); Sen. Amts., 13834, 14519, 14663, 14690, 14734, 14740, 14760, 14762, 14844 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 58).
——— Salaries of Ry. Commissioners, &c., Res. prop., 8085; in Com. on Res., 8119 (iv).

BILL (No. 22) To amend the Supreme Court and Exchequer Court Acts.—(Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*).
1° m., 283; 2° m., 2351 (i).

BILL (No. 23) To indemnify those who suffered damages in consequence of Fires caused by Railways.—(Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*).
1° m., 283 (i); 2° m., 2780 (ii); wthdn., 7203 (iii).

BILL (No. 24) To extend the power of Loan Companies.—(Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*).
1° m., 284; 2°*, 1025; in Com., 2349 (i); 3°*, 2756 (ii); Sen. Amts., 14763 (vi).

BILL (No. 25) Respecting the Eastern Townships Bank.—(Mr. *McIntosh*).
1°*, 367; 2°*, 631; in Com., and 3°*, 1853 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 115).

BILL (No. 26) To incorporate the Winding Ledges Power and Boom Company.—(Mr. *Costigan*).
1°*, 367; 2° m., 630, 664 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 27) Respecting the Canada National Railway and Transport Company.—(Mr. *Campbell*).
1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 631 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1025 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 92).

BILL (No. 28) Respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Lemieux*).
1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 631 ; M. for Com., 1804 ; in Com , 1806 ; M. for 3°, 1810, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 81).

BILL (No. 29) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Geoffrion*).
1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 631 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 121).

BILL (No. 30) To incorporate the Federal Oil Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*).
1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 631 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 120).

BILL (No. 31) Repecting the Canadian Order of the Woodmen of the World.—(Mr. *Calvert*).
1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 632 ; in Com., 1854 ; 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 206).

BILL (No. 32) To incorporate the Dominion Institute of Amalgamated Engineering.—(Mr. *Morrison*).
1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 632 (i).

BILL (No. 33) To incorporate the Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*).
1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 632 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 141).

BILL (No. 34) To incorporate the Edmonton and Peace River Railway Company.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 446 ; 2°*, 632 (i).

BILL (No. 35) To incorporate the Coast Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Macpherson*).
1°*, 446 ; 2°*, 632 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 108).

BILL (No. 36) Respecting the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company.—(Mr. *Ball*).
1°*, 446 ; on Order for 2°, 631, 664, 852 ; 2° m., 1505 (i) ; M. *re* Ry. Com., 6617 (iii).

BILL (No. 37) Respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company. —(Mr. *Champagne*).
1°*, 540 ; 2°*, 665 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 173).

BILL (No. 38) Respecting the Great North-West Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCreary*).
1°*, 541 ; 2°*, 665 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 124).

BILL (No. 39) To make further provision for the prevention of cruelty to Animals, and to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. *Brock*).
1°*, 541 ; 2°*, 1324 ; in Com., 1324 (i) ; 2779, 3237 (ii)

BILL (No. 40) To confer on the Commisssioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the International Railway Appliance Company. —(Mr. *Brock*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 665 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 133).

BILL (No. 41) Respecting the Kootenay Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 665 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 142).

BILL (No. 42) Respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 665 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 75).

BILL (No. 43) To incorporate the Regina and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 852 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 182).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 44) Respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada. —(Mr. *McCreary*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 665 (i).

BILL (No. 45) Respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCreary*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 665 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 89).

BILL (No. 46) Respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—(Mr. *Harty*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 976 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5560 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 139).

BILL (No. 47) To incorporate the Nipissing and Pontiac Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCool*).
1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 665 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 166).

BILL (No. 48) To amend the General Inspection Act.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1° m., 592 ; 2° m., 1065 (i) ; 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 2786 (ii).

BILL (No. 49) To amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
Res. prop., 204 ; in Com. on Res., 593 ; 1°* of B., 597 ; 2°, 1116 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1116 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 10).

BILL (No. 50) Respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway (Mr. *Morrison*).
1°*, 654 ; 2°*, 853 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 87).

BILL (No. 51) To incorporate the Northern Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *McCreary*).
1°*, 654 ; 2°*, 853 (i) ; in Com., 2753 ; 3°*, 2755 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 168).

BILL (No. 52) To incorporate the Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bazinet*).
1°*, 654 ; 2°*, 977 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 135).

BILL (No. 53) Respecting Insolvency.—(Mr. *Monk*).
1° m., 654 ; 2° m., 2373 (i) ; on Order for 2°, 2787 ; 2° m., 3248 ; neg. (Y., 41 ; N., 74), 3256 (ii).

BILL (No. 54) Respecting the Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Corporation, and to change its name to the Canada Permanent Mortgage Corporation.—(Mr. *Osler*).
1°*, 707 ; 2°*, 977 ; in Com., 2303 ; 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 94).

BILL (No. 55) Respecting the Central Ontario Railway.—(Mr. *Osler*).
1°*, 707 ; 2°*, 977 (i).

BILL (No. 56) To incorporate the Quebec, Saguenay and Gulf of St. Lawrence Railway Company.—(Mr. *Girard*).
1°*, 707 ; 2°*, 977 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 179).

BILL (No. 57) Respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr *German*).
1°*, 707 ; 2°*, 977 ; in Com., 1811 ; 3°*, 1812 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 161).

BILL (No. 58) Respecting the Edmonton Street Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis*).
1°*, 707 ; 2°*, 977 (i).

BILL (No. 59) Respecting the Ottawa Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. *Monk*).
1°*, 707 ; on Order for 2°, 977 ; 2° m., 1327, 1511 (i) ; M. *re* Ry. Com., 6523 ; Neg. (Y., 51 ; N., 87), 6537 (iii).

BILL (No. 60) Respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. *Ross, Ontario*).
1°*, 707 ; 2°*, 1327 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 130).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 61) Respecting the Winnipeg Western Land Corporation, Limited.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 204).

BILL (No. 62) Respecting the Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Company, Limited.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., 2716; 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 169).

BILL (No. 63) Respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—(Mr. *McGugan*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 145).

BILL (No. 64) To incorporate the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); M. for Com., 4132; M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 4441, 4586; M. for Com., 4871 (ii); in Com., 5139 (iii) 7814; 3° m., 8055, 8321 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 122).

BILL (No. 65) Respecting the Mutual Life Assurance Company of Canada (Mr. *Bruce*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 977; in Com., 2304; 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 159).

BILL (No. 66) To Readjust the Representation in the House of Commons.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*).
1° m., 708; 2° m., 1207; ref. to Sel. Com., 1294 (i); Rep. of Sel. Com. (presented) 7293 (iii); M. for Com., 10832, 10903; in Com., 10911, 10958, 11087, 11427, 11567, 11692, 12293; 3° m., 12372, 12492 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 60).

BILL (No. 67) To incorporate the Brockville and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor*).
1°*, 813 (i).

BILL (No. 68) To incorporate the Lumbermen's Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Charlton*).
1°*, 813; 2°*, 1328; in Com., and 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 146).

BILL (No. 69) To incorporate the North-west Coal and Coke Railway Company.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 813; 2°*, 977; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 167).

BILL (No. 70) To incorporate the Macleod, Cardston and Montana Railway Company.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 814; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 147).

BILL (No. 71) To incorporate the Imperial Company.—(Mr. *Bickerdike*).
1°*, 814; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., 2956, 3170 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 132).

BILL (No. 72) Respecting the Bank of Montreal.—(Mr. *Bickerdike*).
1°*, 814; 2°*, 1026; in Com., and 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 82).

BILL (No. 73) To incorporate the Ontario and Quebec Power Co.—(Mr. *Belcourt*).
1°*, 814; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., 4868; 3° m., 4869; 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 170).

BILL (No. 74) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Guthrie*).
1° m., 814 (i); 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 3247 (ii).

BILL (No. 75) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*).
1°*, 872; 2°*, 1026; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 98).

BILL (No. 76) To enable the City of Vancouver to acquire certain lands and interests adjoining Vancouver Harbour.—(Mr. *Macpherson*).
1°*, 872; 2°*, 1026 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 77) To promote the Safety of Railway Employees.—(Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*).
1°* m., 872; 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 2387 (i); wthdn., 7203 (iii).

BILL (No. 78) To amend the Militia Pension Act, 1901.—(Sir *Frederick W. Borden*).
1°* m., 872; 2°*, 1116; in Com., 1116, 2240; 3°*, 2240 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 35).

BILL (No. 79) To incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 940; 2°*, 1026; in Com. and 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 83).

BILL (No. 80) Respecting the Canada North-west Land Company, Limited.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 940; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 93).

BILL (No. 81) Respecting the Brandon and South-western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*).
1°*, 940; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5585 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 85.)

BILL (No. 82) Respecting and restricting Chinese Immigration.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*).
Res. prop., 265; in Com. on Res., 597; 1°* of B., 945; 2°*, 1116; in Com., 1116, 2398; 3°*, 2399 (i); Sen. Amts., 5872 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 8).

BILL (No. 83) To incorporate the New Canadian Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Lemieux*.)
1°*, 1023; on Order for 2°, 1328; 2° m., 1512, 2241; in Com., 2241 (i), 2720; ref. back to Com., 2753; in Com., 3221; 3°*, 3222 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 160.)

BILL (No. 84) Respecting the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*.)
1°*, 1023; 2°*, 1338; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 176.)

BILL (No. 85) To incorporate the Berlin, Waterloo, Wellesley and Georgian Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Clare*.)
1°*, 1023; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 84.)

BILL (No. 86) To amend the Fruit Marks Act, 1901.—(Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*.)
1°*, 1023; on Order for 2°*, 2387 (i); 2° m., 2788, 3257, 3807 (ii).

BILL (No. 87) To incorporate the Vancouver and Coast Kootenay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Macpherson*.)
1°*, 1111; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., 4587; in Com., and 3°*, 4672 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 199.)

BILL (No. 88) Respecting the Mutual Fire Insurance Company, of the City of Montreal, and to change its name to the 'Montreal Fire Insurance Company.'—(Mr. *LaRivière*.)
1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 158.)

BILL (No. 89) To incorporate the Brockville and North-western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment*.)
1° m., 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i).

BILL (No. 90) Respecting the Niagara-Welland Power Company, Limited; and to change its name to the Niagara-Welland Power Company.—(Mr. *Guthrie*.)
1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 163.)

BILL (No. 91) To incorporate the Dominion Gas Improvement Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*.)
1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 114.)

BILL (No. 92) Respecting the Dominion Burglary Guarantee Company, Limited; and to change its name to the 'Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited.'—(Mr. *Bickerdike*.)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 92)—*Con.*
1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 113.)

BILL (No. 93) To incorporate the Shipping Federation of Canada.—(Mr. *Bickerdike.*)
1°*, 1193; 2° m., 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2956 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 190.)

BILL (No. 94) Respecting Incorporated Companies.—(Mr. *Bickerdike.*)
1°*, 1193 (i); 2° m., 3257 (ii).

BILL (No. 95) To amend the Conciliation Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Puttee.*)
1° m., 1193 (i); 2° m., 2790; 2° m., and in Com., 3259, 3260 (ii).

BILL (No. 96) Respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. *German.*)
1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 138.)

BILL (No. 97) Respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)
1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 148.)

BILL (No. 98) Respecting the Bruce Mines and Algoma Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)
1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1512 (i).

BILL (No. 99) Respecting the Canada Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCreary.*)
1°*, 1294; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 91.)

BILL (No. 100) To incorporate the Sterling Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Calvert.*)
1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512; in Com., and 3°*, 2304 (i) (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 194.)

BILL (No. 101) To Incorporate the London Loan Company of Canada.—(Mr. *McGugan.*)
1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1815 (i).

BILL (No. 102) Respecting the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)
1°*, 1295; 2°m., 1812; 2°*, 1853 (i); in Com., 5892; 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 181.)

BILL (No. 103) Respecting the Royal Trust Company.—(Mr. *Casgrain.*)
1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512; in Com., and 3°*, 2304 (i) (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 185.)

BILL (No. 104) To incorporate the Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)
1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., 6655; on Order for Com., 6846, 7137, 7339; in Com., 7339, 7400; 3°m., 7468 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 88).

BILL (No. 105) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Standard Car Truck Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512; in Com., and 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 192.)

BILL (No. 106) To amend the Act to restrict the importation and employment of Aliens.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°m., 1295; 2°m., 2387 (i), 3282 (ii).

BILL (No. 107) To incorporate the Empire Accident and Surety Company.—(Mr. *Calvert.*)
1°*, 1378; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., 2755; 3°*, 2956 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c* 118).

BILL (No. 108) Respecting the Ottawa Electric Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 1378; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 171.)

BILL (No. 109) To correct a clerical error in the Act to incorporate the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1°*, 1378 (i); 2°*, in Com., and 3°, 2581 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 18.)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 110) Respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 97.)

BILL (No. 111) Respecting the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oliver.*)
1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 116.)

BILL (No. 112) To incorporate the Canada Industrials Corporation, Limited.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4132 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 95.)

BILL (No. 113) To incorporate the Sault St. Louis Light and Power Company.—(Mr. *Bickerdike.*)
1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., 3225; 3°*, 3225 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 188.)

BILL (No. 114) Respecting the Nipissing and James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCool.*)
1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 165.)

BILL (No. 115) To incorporate the Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Tobin.*)
1°*, 1575; 2°*, 1816; in Com., 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 83).

BILL (No. 116) Respecting the Restigouche Boom Company, and to change its name to 'The Restigouche Boom and Log Driving Company.—(Mr. *Logan.*)
1°*, 1575; 2°*, 1816 (i).

BILL (No. 117) To incorporate the Hudson's Bay and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Haggart.*)
1°*, 1642; 2°*, 1816 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 128).

BILL (No. 118) Respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 1642; 2°*, 1816 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 90).

BILL (No. 119) Respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Oliver.*)
1°*, 1675; 2°*, 1853 (i); in Com., 3582; in Com., and 3°*, 3752 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 76.)

BILL (No. 120) Respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)
1°*, 1675; 2°*, 1853 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 143.)

BILL (No. 121) To incorporate the Consolidated Trust Corporation.—(Mr. *McColl.*)
1°*, 1675; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., 3223; 3°*, 3223 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 110).

BILL (No. 122) Respecting the Rathbun Company.—(Mr. *Harty.*)
1°*, 1675; 2°*, 1853 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 180).

BILL (No. 123) To incorporate the Huron, Erie and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)
1°*, 1764; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., 4588; 3°*, 4588 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 131).

BILL (No. 124) Respecting the Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Stewart.*)
1°*, 1764; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3752 (ii (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 129).

BILL (No. 125 To incorporate the Guelph and Georgian Bay Railway Company.—Mr. *Guthrie.*)
1°*, 1764; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii) (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 125).

BILL (No. 126) Respecting the Mexican Light and Power Company, Limited.—Mr. *Thompson.*)
1°*, 1853; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii) (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 153).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 127) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of George M. Depew.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 1853; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 112).

BILL (No. 128, from the Senate) For the relief of William Francis Schooley.—(Mr. *Boyd*).
1°*, 2100; 2° m., 2305 (i); in Com., 3223; 3°*, 3224 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 189).

BILL (No. 129) Respecting the Crown Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Guthrie*).
1°*, 1936; 2°*, 2277 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2756 (ii) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 111).

BILL (No. 130) To amend the Fruit Marks Act, 1901.—(Mr. *Henderson*).
1°*, 1936 (i); 2° m., 3285, 3823 (ii).

BILL (No. 131) To incorporate the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company of Canada, Limited.—(Mr. *McIsaac*).
1°*, 2014; 2°*, 2305 (i); in Com., 5093, 5359; 3°*, 5360 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 149).

BILL (No. 132) To incorporate the Père Marquette International Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Cowan*).
1°*, 2014; 2°*, 2277 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 175).

BILL (No. 133) To prohibit the importation, manufacture, or sale of Cigarettes.—(Mr. *Bickerdike*).
1° m., 2014 (i); 2° m., 3286 (ii).

BILL (No. 134) To incorporate the Erie, Ontario Power Company.—(Mr. *German*).
1°*, 2100; 2°*, 2305 (i); in Com., 3226, 3578, 3751, 3982; 3°*, 3982 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 119).

BILL (No. 135) To incorporate the Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Railway Company.—(Mr. *Logan*).
1°*, 2100 (i); 2°*, 2756 (ii); M. for Com., 5971; in Com., 5978, 6399; 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 178).

BILL (No. 136) To amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 2100 (i); 2° m., 3288 (ii).

BILL (No. 137) To regulate the sale and provide for the inspection of Textile Fabrics.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°, 2101 (i); 2° m., 3294 (ii).

BILL (No. 138) To amend the Pilotage Act.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*).
1°*, 2100 (i); wthdn., 11302 (v).

BILL (No. 139) Respecting the St. Mary's River Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oliver*).
1°*, 2236 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com., 4588; 3°*, 4591 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 187).

BILL (No. 140) To incorporate the Cardiff Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oliver*).
1°*, 2236 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com., 4591; 3°*, 4592 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 103).

BILL (No. 141) Respecting the Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis*).
1°*, 2237 (i); 2°*, 2544 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c,* 152).

BILL (No. 142) Respecting the Elgin and Havelock Railway Company.—(Mr. *Fowler*).
1°*, 2237 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 117).

BILL (No. 143) Respecting the Canadian Northwest Irrigation Company.—(Mr. *Oliver*).
1°*, 2300 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com., 3226, 3582, 3982 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 96).

BILL (No. 144) Respecting the Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*).
1°*, 2395 (i); 2°*, 2720; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 134).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 145) Respecting the Quebec Bridge Company; and to change its name to the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company.—(*Mr. Power*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4586; 3°*, 4587 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 177).

BILL (No. 146) Respecting the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—(Mr. *Vrooman*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2720; in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 144).

BILL (No. 147) Respecting the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company.—(Mr. *Campbell*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4672; order for Com., 4868 (ii); 5555 (remarks), 5882, 6198 (iii); ref. back to Sel. Com., 7812; in Com., 9419; 3°*, 9431 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 196).

BILL (No. 148) respecting certain Trust Funds of the Diocese of Moosonee.—(Mr. *Osler.*)
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2720; in. Com. and 3°*, 3795 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 157).

BILL (No. 149) To incorporate the Hamilton, Berlin and Collingwood Railway Company. (Mr. *Cowan*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4587; 3°*, 4587 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 126).

BILL (No. 150) To incorporate the Columbia River Improvement Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Galliher*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., 5559; in Com., and 3°*, 5585; Sen. Amts., 6847, 6894 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 109).

BILL (No. 151) To incorporate the St. Joseph Transportation Company.—(Mr. *Calvert*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2720 (ii).

BILL (No. 152) To incorporate the Southern Central Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Riley*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 7770 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 191).

BILL (No. 153) To incorporate the Mount Royal Savings Bank.—(Mr. *Bickerdike*).
1°*, 2501; 2°*, 2720 (ii); wthdn., 10831 (v).

BILL (No. 154) To incorporate the Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Railway Company.—(Mr. *German*).
1°*, 2501; 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4592; 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 162).

BILL (No. 155) Respecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to Railway Debts.—(Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*).
1°*, 2501 (ii); 2° m., 8243; in Com., 8244, 8360; 3°*, 8369 (iv); Sen. Amts., 14769 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 21).

BILL (No. 156) To incorporate the Longueuil Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Geoffrion*).
1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii); in Com., 5558; 3°*, 5558 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 156).

BILL (No. 157) To incorporate the Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis*).
1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 5238; in Com., 5985; 3°*, 5989 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 86).

BILL (No. 158) To incorporate the St. Chrysostôme Railway Company.—(Mr. *Brown*).
1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii); ref. back to Sel. Com., 7399 (iii); in Com., 7771; 3°*, 7772 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 186).

BILL (No. 159) To incorporate the Canadian Yukon Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis*).
1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 102).

BILL (No. 160) To incorporate the Stewart River Development Company.—(Mr. *Davis*).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 160)—*Con.*

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 7487 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 195).

BILL (No. 161) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Woolf Valve Gear Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5560 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 205).

BILL (No. 162) Respecting the Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Company, and to change its name to the "Jordan Light, Heat and Power Company."—(Mr. *German*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756; in Com., and 3°*, 3795 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 136).

BILL (No. 163) Respecting the United Empire Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Thompson*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956; in Com., 3796, 3983; 3°*, 3984 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 198).

BILL (No. 164) To incorporate the Pacific Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Galliher*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956; in Com., and 3°*, 3796 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 174).

BILL (No. 165) To incorporate the Algonquin Lumber and Power Company.—(Mr. *Gould*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 3172 (ii); in Com., 5361; 3°*, 5361 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 77).

BILL (No. 166) To incorporate the Gaspé and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Gauvreau*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii); in Com., 5890; 3°*, 5891.

BILL (No. 167) Respecting the Montreal Bridge Company, and to change its name to "The Montreal Bridge and Terminal Company."—(Mr. *Bickerdike*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii).

BILL (No. 168) To incorporate the Chicoutimi and North Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Girard*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 3172 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 7487 (iii).

BILL (No. 169) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of James Sinclair McDougall.—(Mr. *Gallery*.)

M. to rec. Pet., 2397 (i); 1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956; in Com., and 3°*, 4672 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 151).

BILL (No. 170) To incorporate the Nepigon Iron Range Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment*.)

M. to rec. Pet., 2396 (i); 1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956 (ii).

BILL (No. 171) To incorporate the Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Railway Company—(Mr. *Stephens*).

1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 105).

BILL (No. 172) To incorporate the City and County Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Rosamond*.)

1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956; in Com., 3795; 3°*, 3797 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 107).

BILL (No. 173) To change the name of Hudson's Bay.—(Mr. *Maclean*.)

1°m., 2794 (ii).

BILL (No. 174) To amend the Customs Act.—(Mr. *Paterson*.)

Res. prop., 2922; in Com. on Res., 3044; 1°* of B., 3126; 2°*, 4010; in Com., 4010; 3°m., 4187; 3°*, 4674 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 14).

BILL (No. 175) Respecting the Century Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*.)

1°*, 3126; 2°*, 3583 (ii); in Com., 5360, 5555, 5583, 5960, 6199; 3°*, 6202 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 104).

BILL (No. 176) To incorporate the Canadian Transportation and Storage Company.—(Mr. *German*.)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 176)—*Con.*

1°*, 3126; 2°*, 3583 (ii); in Com., 5360, 5555, 5584, 5883; 3°*, 5887 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 101).

BILL (No. 177) Respecting the Klondike Mines Railway Company.—(Mr. *McIsaac*.)

M. to receive Pet., 2778; 1°*, 3219; 2°*, 3583; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 140).

BILL (No. 178) Respecting the encouragement of the construction of Dry Docks.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)

Res. prop., 2237 (i); in Com. on Res., 3004; 1°* of B., 3298; 2°, and in Com., 4678 (ii); 5871; 3°*, 5872 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 17).

BILL (No. 179) To amend the Act respecting the Safety of Ships.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*.)

1°m., 3298 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 6918; 3°*, 6921 (iii). (3 *Edward VII* c. 63).

BILL (No. 180) To incorporate the Prince Edward Island Ferry Company.—(Mr. *Emmerson*.)

1°*, 3391; 2°*, 3984 (ii); in Com., 7771, 7914; 3°, 7914 (iv).

BILL (No. 181) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *German*.)

1°m., 3391 (ii).

BILL (No. 182) To amend Chapter 27 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*.)

1°m., 3392; 2°*, 4203; in Com., 4203; 3°*, 4213 (ii); Sen. Amts., 5872 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 50).

BILL (No. 183) Respecting the Desjardins Canal.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*.)

1°m., 3393; 2°*, 4213; in Com., and 3°*, 4213 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 16).

BILL (No. 184) To amend the Patent Act.—(Mr. *Fisher*.)

1°m., 3622; 2°*, 4213; in Com., 4213, 4674 (ii); 3°*, 5243 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 46).

BILL (No. 185) Respecting the Canadian Steel Company.—(Mr. *German*.)

1°*, 3708; 2°*, 3797; in Com., and 3°*, 4672 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 99).

BILL (No. 186) To amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. *Bernier*.)

1°*, 3708; 2°*, 4007; in Com., 4007; 3°*, 4009 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 26).

BILL (No. 187) To amend the Electric Light Inspection Act.—(Mr. *Bernier*.)

1°*, 3708; 2°m., 4007; in Com., and 3°*, 4007 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 20).

BILL (No. 188) To amend the Weights and Measures Act.—(Mr. *Bernier*.)

1°*, 3708; 2°*, 4009; in Com., 4009, 4187; 3°*, 4203 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 72).

BILL (No. 189) To incorporate the Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Company.—(Mr. *Birkett*.)

1°*, 3864; 2°*, 4132 (ii); in Com., 7479; 3°m., 7485; agreed to (Y., 57; N., 9); 7486 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 100).

BILL (No. 190) Respecting Queen's College, Kingston.—(Mr. *Harty*.)

1°*, 3864; 2°*, 4404 (ii).

BILL (No. 191, from the Senate) To incorporate the Home Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Russell*.)

1°*, 3970; 2°*, 4132 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 127).

BILL (No. 192) To enable the City of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine River Water Power.—(Mr *Puttee*.)

1°*, 3970; 2°*, 4132 (ii); in Com., 5558, 5584, 5887, 5960, 6845; 3°*, 6845 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 203).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 193) To amend the Public Works Act.—(Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford.*)
1° m., 3970; 2°*, 4221; in Com., 4221; 3°*, 4224 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 52.)

BILL (No. 194) Respecting infectious or contagious Diseases affecting Animals.—(Mr. *Fisher*).
1°*, 4003; 2° m., 4224; in Com., 4225, 4690; 3°*, 4691 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 11.)

BILL (No. 195, from the Senate) For the Relief of James Reid Steele.—(Mr. *McCreary.*)
1°*, 4178; 2°*, 4404; in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 193.)

BILL (No. 196, from the Senate) For the Relief of William Allen.—(Mr. *McCreary.*)
1°*, 4179; 2°*, 4404; in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 78.)

BILL (No. 197, from the Senate) Respecting the Rocky Mountains Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°*, 4262; 2°*, 4404 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5560 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 184.)

BILL (No. 198) Respecting Penny Banks.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1° m., 4175 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 6456 (iii), 10793; 3°*, 10798 (v). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 47.)

BILL (No. 199) Respecting the Good Shepherd Reformatory in the City of St. John, N.B.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1° m., 4178; 2°, and in Com., 4840; 3°*, 4842 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 25.)

BILL (No. 200) Respecting the Inspection and Sale of Seeds.—(Mr. *Fisher.*)
1° m., 4442; in Com. on Res., 5084 (ii); 2°*, and in Com., 6463, 7210 (iii); wthdn., 12493 (v.)

BILL (No. 201) To provide for further Advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
Res. prop. 4262; in Com. on Res., 4445; 1°* of B., 4486 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 5417; 3°, m., 5657 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 36.)

BILL (No. 202, from the Senate) To incorporate the Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada.—(Mr. *Russell.*)
1 *, 4727 (ii); 2°*, 5139; in Com., and 3°*, 6846 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 155.)

BILL (No. 203) Respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. *Calvert.*)
M. to rec. Pet., 4261; 1°*, 4727 (ii); 2°*, 5139; in Com., and 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 197.)

BILL (No. 204, from the Senate) To amend the Act relating to Naturalization and Aliens.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)
1°*, 5137; 2°, and in Com., 5872; 3° m., 5991 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 38.)

BILL (No. 205, from the Senate) Respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. *Campbell.*)
1°*, 5238, 2°*, 5362; in Com., and 3°*, 6657 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 200.)

BILL (No. 206) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1903.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5243 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 1.)

BILL (No. 207) To prohibit the importation, manufacture or sale of adulterated, process or renovated Butter, Oleomargarine, Butterine or other substitute for Butter; and to prevent the improper marking of Butter.—(Mr. *Fisher.*)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 207)—*Con.*
Res. prop., 4960; in Com. on Res., 5052 (ii); 1° of B., 5240; 2°, and in Com., 5419, 5430, 5845; 3°*, 5853 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 6.)

BILL (No. 208) To amend the Post Office Act.—(Sir *William Mulock.*)
1° m., 5240; 2° m., 5657; in Com., 5659, 5853; 3°*, 5871 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 49.)

BILL (No. 209) Respecting certain Aid for the Extension of the Canadian Northern Railway.—(Mr. *Blair.*)
Res. prop., 4185; in Com. on Res., 4363, 4961, 5089, 5100 (ii); 1°* of B., 5358; 2°, and in Com., 5589, 5786; 3°*, 5824 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 7.)

BILL (No. 210) Respecting the Nipissing and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCool.*)
1°*, 5679; 2°*, 5989; wthdn., 7203 (iii).

BILL (No. 211) Respecting the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company.—(Mr. *Galliher.*)
M. to rec. Pet., 5511; 1°*, 5512; 2°*, 5585; in Com., 6428 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 164.)

BILL (No. 212) To incorporate the Alliance Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Russell.*)
M. to rec. Pet., 4958 (ii); 1°*, 5512; 2° m., 5585; in Com., 7470; 3°*, 7478 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 79.)

BILL (No. 213) To incorporate the Citizens' Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Clarke.*)
1°*, 5679; 2°*, 5990; in Com., 7478; 3°*, 7479 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 106.)

BILL (No. 214) For the Relief of Florence D. Graves.—(Mr. *Scott.*)
1°*, 5581; 2°*, 5989; in Com., and 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 123.)

BILL (No. 215) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 5581; 2°*, 6638; M. for Com., 6638; in Com., 6639, 7490 (iii), 10746 (v); wthdn., 14768 (vi).

BILL (No. 216) Respecting the Midway and Vernon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Galliher*).
1°*, 5679; 2°*, 5989; in Com., and 3°*, 6558 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 154.)

BILL (No. 217) Respecting Penitentiaries.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 5763 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 8261, 8373 (iv), 10824 (v); Order dschgd, 13444 (vi).

BILL (No. 218) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1903, and the 30th June, 1904.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
Remarks, 6170; 1°*, 2°*, 6170; in Com., 6171; 3°*, 6172 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 2.)

BILL (No. 219, from the Senate) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, respecting the punishment of Fradulent Debtors.
(This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons).

BILL (No. 220) Respecting Government and Post Office Savings Banks.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
1°, 6353; 2°*, and in Com., 6814; 3°*, 6815 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 62.)

BILL (No. 221) Further to amend the Act respecting Public and Reformatory Prisons.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 6427 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 8087; 3°*, 8087 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 51).

BILL (No. 222) Respecting Dominion Notes.—(Mr. *Fielding*)
Res. prop., 6270; in Com. on Res., 6437; 1°* of B., 6448; 2°, and in Com., 6913; 3°*, 6915 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 43).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 223) To amend the Act of 1899, respecting the City of Ottawa.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
Res. prop., 6269; in Com. on Res., 6448; 1°*, of B., 6456; 2°*, and in Com., 6806; 3°*, 6814 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 45).

BILL (No. 224) To amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*).
1° m., 6538; 2°, and in Com., 6896; 3°*, 6913 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 23.)

BILL (No. 225) To amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*).
Res. prop., 6270; in Com. on Res., 6541; 1°* of B., 6543; 2°, and in Com., 6915; 3°*, 6917 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 66.)

BILL (No. 226) To amend the Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*).
Res. prop., 6271; in Com. on Res., 6543; 1°* of B., 6545; 2°, and in Com., 6917; 3°*. 6918 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 34.)

BILL (No. 227, from the Senate) To amend the Companies Act, 1902.
(This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons).

BILL (No. 228, from the Senate) For the relief of Stephen Wilson.—(Mr. *Wade*).
1°*, 7922; 2°*, 8264; M. for Com., 9149; in Com. and 3°*, 9152 (iv). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 202.)

BILL (No. 229, from the Senate) For the relief of Ellen McDermid.—(Mr. *Birkett*).
1°*, 7922; 2°*, 8264; M. for Com., 9148; in Com., and 3°*, 9149 (iv). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 150.)

BILL (No. 230, from the Senate) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, respecting Offences connected with Trade and Breaches of Contract.
(This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons).

BILL (No. 231) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Keller Heater Company of Canada, Limited.—(Mr. *McIsaac*).
M. to rec. Pet., 7091; 1°*, 7294; 2°*, 7487 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 7770 (iv). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 137.)

BILL (No. 232) To amend the Manitoba Grain Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Sifton*).
1° m., 7294 (iii); 2° m., 7988; in Com., 7991, 9350 (iv); Sen. Amts., 13623 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 33.)

BILL (No. 233) Respecting the Manufacture of Binder Twine in Canada.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
Res. prop., 6436; in Com. on Res., 7300, 7353; 1°*, 2°*. 7382; in Com., 7383 (iii), 7728 (iv). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 5.)

BILL (No. 234) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. *Henderson*).
1°, 7565 (iv).

BILL (No. 235) To provide for the construction of a National Transcontinental Railway.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*).
1° m., 7658; Res. prop., 7915; M. for Com. on Res., 8406, 8484, 8559, 8617, 8656, 8718, 8808, 8918, 9082, 9152, 9218, 9351, 9431, 9459, 9582, 9683, 9820, 9980 (iv), 10102, 10243; agreed to (Y. 117; N. 71) 10408; in Com. on Res., 10411; 2°, and in Com. on B., 10412, 10538, 11190, 11302, 11833, 11959, 12074, 12146, 12221 (v); 3° m., 12612, 12720 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 71.)

BILL (No. 236, from the Senate) For the relief of Harford Ashley.—(Mr. *Porter*).
1°*, 8115; 2°*, 9431 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 12146 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 80.)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 237, from the Senate) Further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*).
1° m., 12494 (v); 2°, and in Com., 12777; 3°*, 12779 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 67.)

BILL (No. 238) To amend chapter 8 of the Statutes of 1897, respecting the Bounties on Steel and Iron, and to provide for the payment of Bounties on certain articles manufactured from Steel.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
Res. prop., 6629 (iii); in Com. on prop. Res., 7923; 1°* of B., 7988 (iv); 2°*, and in Com., 10799; 3°*, 10802 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 68.)

BILL (No. 239) To provide for the payment of Bounties on Lead contained in Lead-bearing Ores mined in Canada.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)
Res. prop., 6169 (iii), in Com. on Res., 8195; 1°* of B., 8230 (iv); 2°, and in Com. ,10798; 3°*, 10799 (v).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 31.)

BILL (No. 240) To assist in establishing and maintaining an independent and efficient service of telegraphic news from Great Britain, for publication in the Canadian Press.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)
Res. prop., 8118; in Com. on Res., 8231; 1°* of B., 8243 (iv); 2°m., 10715; in Com., 10718; 3°*, 10741 (v).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 70.)

BILL (No. 241) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1903.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)
1°*; 2°*; in Com., and 3°*, 8404 (iv).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 3.)

BILL (No. 242) To amend the Mounted Police Act, 1894.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*.)
1° m., 8321 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 10741; 3°*, 10742 (v).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 37.)

BILL (No. 243) To amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Acts, the Exchequer Court Act, and the Act respecting Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*.)
Res. prop. 203 (i); withdn., 2582; Res. prop., 3431, 4262 (ii), 5241 (iii), 8087; in Com. on Res., 8369; 1°*; 2°* of B.; in Com. and 3°*, 8372 (iv); Sen. Amts., 14289 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 29).

BILL (No. 244) Respecting the Western Assurance Company.—(Mr. *McCarthy*.)
1°*, 8406; 2°*, 8559 (iv); in Com. and 3°*, 10903 (v).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 201).

BILL (No. 245) To further amend the Civil Service Act.—(Sir *Wm. Mulock*.)
1° m., 9079 (iv); Res. prop., 10410; wthdn., 11301 (v).

BILL (No. 246, from the Senate) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, respecting Freedom of Labour.
[This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.]

BILL (No. 247, from the Senate) To amend the Act respecting the incorporation of Boards of Trade.
[This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.]

BILL (No. 248, from the Senate) Respecting the incorporation of Mining Companies.
[This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.]

BILL (No. 249) To incorporate the Westminster Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*.)
M. to rec. Pet., 10489; 1°, 10744; 2°*, 10903 (v).

BILL (No. 250) Respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*.)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 250)—*Con.*

Prop. Res., 10102; in Com. on Res., 10759; 1°*; 2°*; and in Com., 10792, 11406; 3°*, 11422 (v).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 27.)

BILL (No. 251) To amend the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

1° m., 11159 (v); Order discharged., 13444 (vi).

BILL (No. 252) To amend the Act relating to Ocean Steamship Subsidies.—(Sir *Richard Cartwright.*)

Res. prop., 10410; in Com. on Res., 10802; 1°* of B., 11422; 2°*, and in Com., 12295; 3°*, 12500 (v).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 44.)

BILL (No. 253) To increase the Representation of the North-west Territories in the Senate.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

1° m., 11691; 2°*, and in Com., 12302; 3°*, 12304 (v).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 42.)

BILL (No. 254) Further to amend the Yukon Territory Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

1° m., 11692; 2°*; in Com., and 3°*, 12301 (v).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 74.)

BILL (No. 255) To provide for the Appointment of an Additional Judge of the Superior Court of Quebec.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

Res. prop., 11426; in Com. on Res., 11821; 2° of Res., 11833; 1°* of B. 11833; 2°*, and in Com., 12301; 3°*, 12302 (v).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 28.)

BILL (No. 256) To provide for Advances to the Government of the North-west Territories.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

Res. prop., 10102; in Com. on Res., 12306; 1°* of B., 12330 (v); 2°, and in Com., 12843; 3°*, 12845 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 41.)

BILL (No. 257) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Sir *William Mulock.*)

Res. prop., 10410, 11829; in Com. on Res., 12330; M. for Com., 12493; in Com. on Res., 12500; 1°* of B., 12574 (v); 2°*, and in Com., 13808, 13833; 3° m., 13942; Sen, Amts., 14845 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 9.)

BILL (No. 258) To amend the Act respecting the Department of Railways and Canals.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

Res. prop., 8332 (iv); Res. wthdn., 10715; Res. prop., 11189; in Com. on Res., 12574; 1°* of B., 12584 (v); 2°, and in Com., 12944; 3°*, 12983 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 59.)

BILL (No. 259) To amend the North-west Territories Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

1° m., 12610; 2°, and in Com., 13853; 14287; 3°*, 14289 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 40.)

BILL (No. 260) To amend the Act respecting certain Works constructed in or over Navigable Waters.—(Mr. *Préfontaine.*)

In Com. on Res., 12779; 1°* of B., 12781; 2°, and in Com., 12984; wthdn., 14768 (vi).

BILL (No. 261) Respecting the Pilotage District of Montreal, and the Port and Pilotage District of Quebec.—(Mr. *Préfontaine.*)

Res. wthdn., 12493 (v); in Com. on Res., 12781; 1°* of B. 12800; 2° m., 12984; 2°, and in Com. 13627; 3° m., 13937 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 48.)

BILL (No. 262) To amend the Act respecting the Harbour of North Sydney, in Nova Scotia.—(Mr. *Préfontaine.*)

In Com. on Res., 12304; wthdn., 12492 (v); in Com. on Res., 12800; 1°* of B., 12801; 2°, and in Com., 12993; 3°*, 12994 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 39.)

BILL (No. 263) To amend the Shipping Casualties Act, 1901.—(Mr. *Préfontaine.*)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 263)—*Con.*

In Com. on Res., 12801; 1°* of B., 12805; 2°, and in Com., 12994; 3°, 13560 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 64.)

BILL (No. 264) Respecting the Ottawa Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. *Ethier.*)

1°* 2°*; and ref. to Ry. Com., 12993; in Com., and 3°*, 13330 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 172.)

BILL (No. 265) Respecting the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

1°, 13667; 2°*, and in Com., 14297; 3°*, 14299 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 61.)

BILL (No. 266) Further to amend the General Inspection Act.—(Sir *Richard Cartwright.*)

Prop. Res., 13264; in Com. on Res., 13807; 1°* of B., 13808; 2°, and in Com., 14311; 3°*, 14313 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 24.)

BILL (No. 267) Respecting the Librarians of Parliament.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

Prop. Res., 13670; in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; 2°, and in Com., 14299; 3°*, 14300 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 32.)

BILL (No. 268) Respecting the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

Prop. Res., 13670; in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; 2°, and in Com., 14300, 14403; 3°*, 14405 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 69.)

BILL (No. 269) Respecting the Management and Control of Public and other Works.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

1° m., 14281; 2°, and in Com., 14741: 3°*, 14755 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 53.)

BILL (No. 270) To authorize the granting of Subsidies in aid of the Construction of the lines of Railway therein mentioned.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

Prop. Res., 13549; in Com. on Res., 14313, 14428; 1°*, 14519; 2°, and in Com., 14735, 14740; 3°*, 14741 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 57.)

BILL (No. 271) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1904.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 14765; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 14768 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 4.)

BILL (No. 272) To authorize aid to the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company towards the completion of its undertaking, and to confirm an Agreement between His Majesty and the said Company, with respect to such aid.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

Prop. Res., 14523; on Order for Com. on Res., 14690; 1°* of B., 14734; 2° m., 14734; in Com., and 3°*, 14735 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 54.)

BILL (No. 273) To amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1897.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

In Com. on Ways and Means, 14755; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 14758 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 15.)

BINDER TWINE, AVERAGE PRICE OF MANILLA, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 7566 (v).

BINDER TWINE, AVERAGE PRICE OF SISAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 8085 (iv).

Binder Twine Bounties B. No. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 6436; in Com. on Res., 7300, 7353; 1°*; 2°*, 7382; in Com., 7383 (iii), 7728 (iv). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 5.)

——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7305, 7353 (iii).

BINDER TWINE, CIRCULAR ISSUED, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3512 (ii).

—— CIRCULAR ISSUED *re* SALES: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 4180 (ii).

—— COST IN 1901-2 : Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 447 (i).

—— INSPECTION, ADMINISTRATION OF, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7763, 7772 (iv).

—— INSPECTOR, APPNMT., &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 4959 (ii).

—— INSPECTION, METHOD OF COLLECTING PENALTIES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 14684 (vi).

—— INSPECTOR HAYCOCK, DUTIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5588 (iii).

—— INSPECTOR'S REP. : M. (Mr. *Douglas*) to conc. in Rep. on Agriculture, &c., 13788, 14043 (vi).

—— NAMES OF PURCHASERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 3798 (ii).

—— PRICES FOR CURRENT YEAR, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 203 (i).

—— PRICES FIXED FOR PENITENTIARY SUPPLY : Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 159ç (i).

—— QUANTITY, COST, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*) 2311 (i).

—— QUANTITY IMPORTED FROM U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 7565 (iv).

—— REP. OF AG. COM., DISTRIBUTION OF COPIES : M. (Mr. *Douglas*) to conc., 13788, 14043 (vi).

—— RESIDENCES OF PURCHASERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 4182 (ii).

BIRKETT, MR. T., M.P., LEASE OF LANDS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 12217 (v).

BISHOP, CAPT., DISMISSAL AS HARBOUR MASTER FROM ALBERT, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).

BLACK, A. W., ENGLISH M.P., STATEMENTS *re* COR. BETWEEN CAN. AND GERMAN CONSUL, 12218 (v).

BLACK BROOK, N.B., WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13227 (vi).

BLAIR, HON. A. G., RESIGNATION : Announcement (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6540 (iii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6522 (iii).

—— Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6735 (iii).

BLANKETS, CLOTHING, INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).

BLANKETS, WEBCLOTH, PURCHASED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 10102, 10410, 10714, 10954 (v).

BLIND RIVER, ONT., WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).

—— TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 1298 (i).

BLOOMFIELD POSTMASTER, N.B., CHARGES AGAINST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 818 (i).

BLUESHANK, P.E.I., STRAIGHTENING CURVE: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 14133 (vi).

Boards of Trade Incorp. B. (No. 247, from the Senate). [This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.]

BOIS BRULÉ, TRAINING PIER : in Com. of Sup., 13448 (vi).

BONAVENTURE EAST, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13446 (vi).

BONAVENTURE STATION, TERMINAL FACILITIES, AMOUNT PAID BY GOVT. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).

BOND-HAY TREATY : *See* 'Finance-German.'

BONDING PRIVILEGES WITH U. S. : *See* 'Coasting, &c.'

BONDED WAREHOUSES, P.E.I., RENTAL, CLOSING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 12073 (v).

BOOK-KEEPING *re* I.C.R. EXPENDITURE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 8269 (iv).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 12877

BOOTS FOR MAIL CARRIERS : *See* 'Post Office, &c.'

BOPP, GERMAN CONSUL, COR. WITH DOM. GOVT. *re* FISCAL POLICY : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).

—— *See* 'German Tariff.'

BORDEN, MR., RY. POLICY : *See* 'G. T. Pacific.'

BOUNDARY DELIMITATIONS : in Com. of Sup., 6790.

Bounties, &c. : *See* 'Lead, &c.', 'Steel and Iron'

BOURASSA, INSPECTOR, INLAND REV., QUEBEC, SHORTAGE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5405, 5407 (iii).

BOURGEOIS, M. E., SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT TRACADIE, N.B., DISMISSAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 543 (i).

BOWMANVILLE, BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1352 (i).

—— POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 507 (i).

BOW RIVER BRIDGE, CANMORE, PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6925 (iii).

BOYD, SIR JOHN, PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5990 (iii).

—— RELATIVES IN GOVT. EMPLOY: Ques. (Mr. *Johnston, Cardwell*) 4185 (ii).

BRACEBRIDGE, CUSTOMS PORT : in Com. of Sup., 3960

—— POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13071 (vi).

—— WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13236 (vi).

BRAMPTON ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 966 (i), 13085 (vi).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 157 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 2582 ; 2°*, 2756 (ii) ; M. to ref. back to sel. com., 5238 ; in Com., 5985 ; 3°*, 5989 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 86).

Brandon and Southwestern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 81 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 940 ; 2°* 1026 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5585 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 85).

BRANTFORD DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 13108 (vi).

BRANTFORD ELECTORAL DISTRICT : in Com. on Representation B. 66, 10919 (v).

——*See* 'Representation B. 66.

BRANT INDIANS, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE : in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).

BRASSES' POINT BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 7808 (iv).

BRENNAN, MR. J. P., P.E.I., DISMISSAL : Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).

BRETON COVE, N.S., BOAT LANDING : in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).

BRIDGEBURG PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).

BRIDGES OVER CANALS, GOVERNMENT MAINTENANCE OF, &C.: Remarks in Com of Sup., 14152 (vi).

BRIDGES OF I.C.R., STRENGTHENING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3699 (ii), 8269 (iv).

BRIDGEWATER, N.S., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1074 (i).

BRIGADE CAMP, SUSSEX, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 3235 (ii).

British Cable News Service, G. B. and Can. B. No. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*). Res. prop., 8118; in Com. on Res., 8231; 1°* of B., 8243 (iv); 2°m., 10715; in Com., 10718; 3°*, 10741 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 70).

——Remarks *re* (Mr. *Gourley*) 1396 (vi).

British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 50 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 654; 2°*, 853; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 87).

BRITISH COLUMBIA:

ALBERNI-CLAYOQUOT TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).

ARROW LAKES IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup. 13304 (vi).

ASHCROFT-BARKERVILLE MAIL CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1595 (i).

ASHCROFT-DAWSON TEL. LINE AND BRANCHES: in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii).

ASSAY OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 6799 (iii), 13965 13779 (vi).

ATLIN-QUESNEL TEL. BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

BOUNDARY DELIMITATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).

BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

BURRARD, CENSUS COMMISSIONERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7079 (iii).

CANNING INDUSTRY: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).

——*See* 'Fraser,' 'Salmon,' &c.

CASCA TRANSPORTATION CO., *re* LIARD RIVER MINERS: in Com. of Sup., 6926 (iii).

CLAYOQUOT INDIAN SCHOOL: in Com. of Sup., 7269 (iii).

——*See* 'Indians.'

COLUMBIA RIVER, ABOVE GOLDEN, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).

—— OPENING CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).

—— REVELSTOKE, NAV. OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).

CROW'S NEST PASS COAL LANDS, APPLICATIONS, REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 12217 (v).

DREDGING PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 13311, 13318 (vi).

ESQUIMALT DEFENCES: in Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii).

——GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 5919 (iii).

FALSE CREEK, COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND B.C.: M. (Mr. *Earle*) for Copies*, 2337 (i).

——LEASE TO KELLY & BURNETT: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 7565 (iv).

——Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 2758, 2919 (ii).

——Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Earle*) 3129 (ii), 5513, 6354 (iii).

FISHERIES PROTECTIVE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii).

FISHERIES STEAMERS, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 5278 (iii).

FLAGSHIP, BRITISH, REMOVAL FROM ESQUIMALT: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10957 (v).

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Con.*

FRASER RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vi).

FRASER RIVER SALMON INDUSTRY, COMPLAINTS FROM CANNER'S ASSOCIATION TEL.: Read (Mr. *Earle*) 9968 (iv).

——Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).

——*See* 'Salmon,' &c.

HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i), 5916 (iii), 13304 (vi).

HARDY BAY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5916 (iii), 13305 (vi).

HAZLETON HOSPITAL GRANT: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).

'HOT AIR LINE' RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14490 (vi).

INDIANS: in Com of Sup., 13785 (vi).

——AGENTS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7257 (iii).

——FISHING RIGHTS *re* INVESTIGATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7264 (iii).

——MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13785 (vi).

——INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS: in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iii), 13786 (vi).

——STEAM LAUNCH FOR INDIAN AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES, ROYAL COMMISSION *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6984 (iii).

JUDGES, TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES: in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).

KELLY & BURNETT, LEASE OF FALSE CREEK: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 7565 (iv).

——*See* 'False Creek.'

KETTLE RIVER VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14490 (vi).

KOOTENAY CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).

——CORRECTION, &C: in Com., 14519 (vi).

LABOUR COMMISSION, REP. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 8116 (iv).

—— REP. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 7198 (iii).

—— COMMISSIONERS, APPNMT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 1595 (i).

LABOUR TROUBLES, ON M. FOR COM. OF SUP.: Remarks (Mr. *Smith, B.C.*) 945 (i).

—— *See* 'Industrial.'

LANDS AVAILABLE FOR SETTLERS IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 4836 (ii).

LIARD RIVER MINERS, RELIEF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6926 (iii).

LUMBER TRADE, TEL. FROM MANUFACTURERS: Read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14766 (vi).

MCCRANEY, MR. W., EX-M.P., LETTER *re* LEGISLATION: Read (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 5362 (iii).

MARINE SIGNAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).

MILITARY RESERVE AT PORT MOODY: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 446 (i).

NELSON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

—— RACINE BROS., CLAIMS AGAINST CONTRACTORS: in Com. of Sup., 7157 (iii).

—— *See* 'Racine.'

NICOLA, KAMLOOPS AND SIMILKAMEEN COAL AND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14337 (vi).

NICOLA-KAMLOOPS, TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).

OFFICERS' MESS., STR. 'QUADRA,' REGULATIONS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9819 (iv).

PORT MOODY, MILITARY RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 446 (i).

PREFERENTIAL TARIFF WITH FRANCE *re* SHIPPING B.C. SALMON: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

'QUADRA,' STR., REGULATIONS *re* OFFICERS'

BRITISH COLUMBIA--*Con.*

'QUADRA' STR.—*Con.*

MESS : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9819 (iv).
QUATSINO CITY, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vi).
QUESNEL-ATLIN TELEGRAPH BRANCH : in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).
QUESNEL DAM, OBSTRUCTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 11557 (v).
RACINE BROS., CLAIMS *re* CONTRACTORS OF NELSON P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 7168 (iii).
——— AGREEMENT WITH CONTRACTORS : Read (Mr. *Monk*) 7162 (iii).
——— Letters read from Dep. Minister of Labour, &c., 7164 (iii).
ROSSLAND, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
ROYAL COMMISSION *re* INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES : in Com. of Sup., 6984 (iii).
SALMON COMMISSIONERS : M. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) for Rep., 7109 (iii).
SALMON INDUSTRY, FRASER RIVER, TELS. FROM CANNERS' ASSOCIATION, &C.: Read (Mr. *Earle*) 9968 (iv).
——— INCREASED CAPACITY OF HATCHERIES : Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 12073 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).
SALMON SHIPPED TO FRANCE FROM B.C., TARIFF *re* : Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).
STATUTES, DISALLOWANCE OF, &C.: M. for O.C's., &c.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 706 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2016 (i).
——— M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to print, 2675 (ii).
SONGHEES INDIANS, REMOVAL TO RESERVE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7258 (iii).
TELEGRAPH LINES : in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii), 5826 (iii), 13337 (vi).
——— WORKING EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 13368 (vi).
UPPER SALMON RIVER : in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).
VANCOUVER ISLAND TO SALT SPRINGS ISLAND, TELEPHONE SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).
VANCOUVER POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
——— INSPECTOR, SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 14000 (vi).
VICTORIA AND VANCOUVER ISLAND SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13694 (vi).
VOWELL, MR., INDIAN SUPT., SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 13785 (vi).
WILLIAMS HEAD, QUARANTINE STATION, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).

BRITISH JOURNALISTS' AND MEMBERS' VISIT TO CAN., RECEPTION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 7488 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Ross, N.S.*) 2105 (i).

B.N.A. BANK NOTE CO. *vs.* THE KING, EXPENSES *re* : in Com. of Sup., 14279 (vi).

BRITTON, JUDGE, CHARGES *re* INVESTIGATION OF TREADGOLD COMMISSION, PAR. IN DAWSON NEWSPAPERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 11065 (v).

——— *See* 'Treadgold.'

BROAD COVE, N.S., HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).

Brockville and North-Western Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 89 (Mr. *Dyment*) 1° m., 1193 ; 2°*, 1328 (i).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) 1°*, 1295 ; 2°*, 1512 (i) ; in Com., 6655 ; on Order for Com., 6846, 7137, 7339 ; in Com., 7339, 7400 ; 3° m., 7468 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 88.)
——— M. (Mr. *Galliher*) for Com., 7339 (iii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7339 (iii).
——— Appeal to Speaker from Dep. Speaker's Ruling (Mr. *Taylor*) 7342 (iii).
——— Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7401 (iii) ; M. (Mr. *Speaker*) for 3°, Agreed to (Y. 64 ; N. 35) 7468 (iii) ; 3° m. (Mr. *Galliher*) 7468 ; Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) 7469 (iii).
——— on M. to resume adjnd. Deb., 6847 (iii).

Brockville and Western Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 67 (Mr. *Taylor*) 1°*, 813 (i).

BRONTE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 1354 (i), 13236 (vi).

BRONTE LIGHTHOUSE : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Henderson*) 5755, 5757 (iii).

BROOKFIELD STATION, ENLARGEMENT : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).

BROWN, MRS., GRATUITY TO : in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).

BRUCE COUNTY, REPRESENTATION IN PARLT. : in Com. on Representation B. 66, 10940 (v).
——— *See* 'Representation B. 66.'

Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s B. No. 98 (Mr. *Dyment*) 1°*, 1204 ; 2°*, 1512 (i).

BRUCE MINES AND ALGOMA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14436 (vi).

BRUCE MINES, DREDGING : in Com of Sup., 5911 (iii).

BRUNET, ARTHUR, AND DOM. ELECTION ACT : M. for Pets., O.Cs., &c. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 101 (i).
——— *See* 'St. James,' &c.

BRYSON BRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION OF PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).

BUDGET, THE: Financial Statement (Mr. *Fielding*) 1378, 1743 (i).
——— Reply (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1462, 2192 (i).
Debate: (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1596; (Mr. *Tarte*) 1619 ; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1643 ; (Mr. *Gourley*) 1657 ; (Mr. *Clancy*) 1681; (Mr. *Davis*) 1715; (Mr. *Speaker*, irrelevancy of debate, Ruling) 1735, 1742 ; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1740 ; (Mr. *Fielding*) on Ques. of Order, 1743 ; (Mr. *Heyd*) 1764 ; (Mr. *Blain*) 1785 ; (Mr. *Oliver*) 1799, 1816 ; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 1825 ; (Mr. *Vrooman*) 1832 ; (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*) 1860 ; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1876 ; (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 1891 ; (Mr. *Bell*) 1907 ; (Mr. *Maclaren, Huntingdon*) 1937 ; (Mr. *Richardson*) 1946 ; (Mr. *Holmes*) 1953 ; (Mr. *Taylor*) 1974 ; (Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*) 1994 ; (Mr. *Hackett*) 2017 ; (Mr. *Schell*) 2025 ; (Mr. *Morin*) 2034 ; (Mr. *Ross, Ontario*) 2036 ; (Mr. *Kemp*) 2050 ; (Mr. *Galliher*) 2063 ; (Mr. *Henderson*) 2076 ; (Mr. *Grant*) 2109 ; (Mr. *Broder*) 2119 ; (Mr. *Fraser*) 2131 ; (Mr. *Puttee*) 2149 ; (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2167 ; (Mr. *Paterson*) 2176 ; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Remarks, *re* Winnipeg Speech, 2192 ; (Mr. *Clarke*) 2206 ; (Mr. *Ball*) 2234 (i).

BUDGET, AMT. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Negatived (Y. 54 ; N. 107) 2235 (i).

BUDGET, THE : (Remarks) 1114 (i).

—— REP. IN TORONTO 'GLOBE' : Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 410 (i).

BUFFALO HERD IN BANFF PARK : in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).

BUILDINGS, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

—— MAN. : in Com. of Sup., 5844 (iii), 13126 (vi).

—— N.B. : in Com. of Sup., 412, 421, 486 (i), 13037 (vi).

—— N.W. T. : in Com. of Sup., 958 (i), 13129 (vi).

—— N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 411 (i), 5827 (iii), 13028 (vi).

—— ONT : in Com. of Sup., 487 (i), 5842 (iii), 13082 (vi).

—— OTTAWA : in Com. of Sup., 342 (i).

—— P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).

—— QUEBEC, RENEWALS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 422 (i), 5841 (iii), 13053, 14245 (vi).

—— YUKON TER. : in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).

—— *See* 'Dom. Buildings.'

Burglary Guarantee : *See* 'Dom. Guarantee.

BURK'S FALLS, MAGANETAWAN RIVER WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1358 (i).

BURLINGTON CHANNEL, PIER, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup , 1359 (i), 13237 (vi).

BURRARD, B.C., CENSUS COMMISSIONERS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7079 (iii).

BUSINESS OF THE HSE., COMPLAINTS, &C. : (Mr. *Monk*) 1343 (i).

—— DELAY IN PRINTING BILLS : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 482 (i).

—— INACCURACY OF STATEMENTS : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4347 (ii).

—— LATE SITTINGS : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3207 (ii).

—— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) *re* Victoria Day Adjournment, 3127 (ii).

—— ON M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) TO TAKE IN MONDAYS : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3708 (ii).

—— PRIVATE BILLS PROCEDURE : Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5138 (iii).

—— PUBLIC BILLS, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 2300 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2386 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 1110 (i), 3794, 5051 (ii), 5581, 5959, 7090 (iii), 7728, 7812 (iv).

—— *re* SUPPL. ESTIMATES : Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 4957 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 2394 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 871 (i).

—— *See* 'Govt. Business.'

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. No. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) Res. prop., 4960 ; in Com. on Res., 5052 (ii) ; 1° of B., 5240 ; 2°, and in Com , 5419, 5430, 5845 ; 3°*, 5853 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 6.)

BUTTER ADULTERATION BILL : Remarks (Mr. *Blain*) *re* Irish Butter in Com. of Sup., 7627 (iv).

BUTTER AND CHEESE WEIGHING, REP. OF INVESTIGATION : in Com. of Sup., 5414 (iii).

BUTTER, CANADIAN, MR. PRESTON'S INTERVIEW, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 10745 (v).

—— *See* 'Canadian.'

BUTTER MADE AT EXPERIMENTAL FARM, OTTAWA, SALE, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1593, 1857 (i).

CABINET CHANGES : *See* 'Ministerial Changes.'

CABLE AND LAND LINES, MAR. PROVS. : in Com. of Sup., 2701 (ii).

Cable News Service between G. B. and Can : *See* 'British Cable.'

CACOUNA WHARF, EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 5896 (iii), 13448 (vi).

CADET TRAINING, &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3773 (ii).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. No. 45 (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 665 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 89).

CALGARY AND EDMONTON RY., REGULATIONS *re* MORTGAGE DEEDS : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 13024 (vi).

'CAMPANA,' INVESTIGATION *re* WRECK : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).

CAMPAIGN LITERATURE AND MAIL BAGS, AUTHORITY TO USE : Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 14286 (vi).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Marcil*) 14219 (vi).

—— *See* 'Mail Bags.'

CAMPAIGN LITERATURE, EMPLYMT. OF SESSIONAL MESSENGERS : Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 14286 (vi).

—— *See* 'Franking.'

CAMPBELL, D. J., POSTMASTER AT MACLEOD, DISMISSAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 8082 (iv).

CAMPBELLFORD, PORT OF ENTRY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).

—— POST OFFICE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13073 (vi).

—— PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 504 (i).

CAMPBELLTON, N.B., PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13037, 13042, 13052 (vi).

—— WHARF, EXTENSION AND REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i), 13005, 13229 (vi).

CAMPOBELLO, N.B., BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).

Canada Atlantic Railway Co.'s B. No. 118 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 1642 ; 2°*, 1816 (i) ; in Com., and 3ˣ, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 90).

C. A. RY., STRIKE OF SECTION MEN : Remarks (Mr. *Schell*) 2303 (i).

CAN. AND AUSTRALIA MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 5880 (iii), 13677 (vi).

Canada Bank : *See* 'Sterling Bank of Canada.'

Canada Central Railway Co.'s B. No. 99 (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 1294; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 91).

CAN. AND G. B. MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 5997 (iii), 7728 (iv).

Canada Industrial Corporation, Limited, Incorp. Co.'s B. No. 112 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4132 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 95).

CANADA IRON FOUNDRY, TORONTO, STRIKE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iii).

—— REPRESENTATIONS TO MIN. OF LABOUR: Remarks (Mr. *Smith*, *Vancouver*) 7205 (iii).

Canada National Railway and Transport Co.'s B. No. 27 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 631; in Com., and 3°*, 1025 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 92).

Canada North-west Land Company, Limited, Co.'s B. No. 80 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 940; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 93).

Canada Permanent Mortgage Corporation Co.'s B. No. 54 (Mr. *Osler*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977; in Com., 2303; 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 94).

CAN. AND SOUTH AFRICA MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 5878 (iii), 7746 (iv).

CANADA STEEL CO., RY. SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14479 (vi).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. No. 14 (Mr. *Law*) 1°*, 113; 2° m., 1061; in Com., 1062.

CANADIAN APPLES: *See* 'Apples.'

CANADIAN ARTISTS AND ART GALLERY: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. of Sup., 13513 (vi).

—— *See* 'Art,' &c.

CANADIAN ASSOCIATION, GOVT. AID *re* TUBERCULOSIS: in Com. of Sup., 13517 (vi).

CAN. BANK OF COMMERCE, YUKON, COMPENSATION TO: in Com. of Sup., 14274 (vi).

CANADIAN BEEF SUPPLIED TO BRITISH TROOPS: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*, *Victoria*) 483 (i)

—— *See* 'Cattle.'

CANADIAN BUTTER, MR. PRESTON'S INTERVIEW: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 10712 (v).

—— *See* 'Butter.'

CANADIAN CATTLE EMBARGO IN G. B.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 110 (i).

—— *See* 'Cattle.'

CAN. CENTRAL AND OTTAWA AND BROCKVILLE RYS., AMALGAMATION, COMPENSATION TO CERTAIN MUNICIPALITIES: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).

CANADIAN COAST LIGHTING: in Com. of Sup., 4164 (ii).

CANADIAN COMPANY (NEW) INCORP. B. No. 83 (MR. LEMIEUX): M. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) to ref. back to Sel. Com., 2753 (ii).

—— *See* 'New.'

CAN. EMPLOYMENT BUREAU, SUIT AGAINST W. T. R. PRESTON: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12220 (v).

CANADIAN EXHIBITS AT IMPERIAL INSTITUTE: in Com. of Sup., 4435 (ii), 13508 (vi).

CANADIAN FISHERY EXHIBIT: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii).

—— *See* 'Fisheries.'

CANADIAN FREIGHT CLASSIFICATION, APPROVAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 3537 (ii).

—— O. C. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 3302 (ii).

CANADIAN-GERMAN FISCAL POLICY, COR. WITH DOM. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 12218 (vi).

—— *See* 'German Tariff.'

CANADIAN MAIL VIA NEW YORK, NUMBER OF TONS, &C.: (Mr. *Bell*) 10713 (v).

CANADIAN MINING INSTITUTE, PUBLICATION OF DOCUMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13965 (vi).

CANADIAN MINT, ERECTION OF BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 10955 (v).

—— *See* 'Ottawa.'

CANADIAN MOUNTED RIFLES, MEDALS, &C.: Ques. Mr. *Taylor*) 1675 (i).

—— *See* 'Militia.'

Canadian, New Co.: *See* 'New Canadian.'

Canadian Northern Railway Co.'s B. No. 110 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 97).

—— **Aid B. No. 209** (Mr. *Blair*) Res. prop., 4185; in Com. on Res., 4363, 4961, 5089, 5100 (ii); 1°* of B., 5358; 2°, and in Com., 5589, 5786; 3°*., 5824 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 7).

CAN. NORTHERN RY., COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND MACKENZIE & MANN: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 916 (i).

—— Ret. *re* Estimate of Cost laid on Table, 5052.

Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. No. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 2300 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com., 3226, 3582, 3982 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 96).

Canadian Order of Woodmen: *See* 'Woodmen.'

Canadian Pacific Railway Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. *Thompson*, *Haldimand*) 1°*, 872; 2°*, 1026; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 98).

C. P. R., ARRANGEMENTS WITH JAMES BAY RY. CO., &C.: Remarks in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).

—— CAR SHORTAGE AND FREIGHT CONGESTION IN N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation from N.W.T.'

—— ELKHORN BRANCH SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14497 (vi).

—— EXPENDITURE FOR ROLLING STOCK: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 2311 (i).

—— EXTENSION TO WINNIPEG BEACH SUBSIDY: Remarks in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).

—— AND GREAT NORTHWEST CENTRAL RY. CO.'S AGREEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 2306 (i).

—— LANDS EXEMPT FROM TAXES IN MAN. AND N. W.T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 916 (i).

—— LANDS AND SCHOOL TAXATION: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 4006 (ii).

—— LANDS IN MAN., TAX EXEMPTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 667 (i).

C.P.R., Private Car No. 001, Improvements, &c., Payment by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Demers, St. John*) 14282 (vi).
——— Steamers leaving St. John: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. of Sup. 14076 (vi).
——— *See* 'Allan Line.'
——— Transcontinental Trains, Water Supply: Remarks (Mr. *Wright*) 9455 (iv).

Can. Press Despatches: *See* 'British Cable, &c.'

Canadian Steel Co.'s B. No. 185 (Mr. *German*) 1°, 3708; 2°, 3797; in Com., and 3°, 4672 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 99).

Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 189 (Mr. *Birkett*) 1°*, 3864; 2°, 4132 (ii); in Com., 7479; 3° m., 7485; agreed to (Y. 57; N. 9) 7486 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 100).
——— in Com.: Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 7479 (iii). Neg. (Y. 9; N. 57) 7486 (iii).

Canadian Trade with Japan: *See* 'Japan Exhibition.'

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 176 (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 3126; 2°*, 3583 (ii); in Com., 5360, 5555, 5584, 5883; 3°*, 5887 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 101).

Canadian Yukon Western Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 159 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 102).

CANALS:

'Alert,' Str., Canal Surveys: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi.)
Balsam Lake and Lake Simcoe: in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iii).
——— Locks: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).
Beauharnois Canal, Flooding Lands, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
Canals: in Com. of Sup., 7803, 8268 (iv); 12895, 14134 (vi).
——— Conc., 8374 (iv).
Canal Collectors, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12933 (vi).
——— Employees, Increases of Wages: in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 2303 (i).
——— in Ont. and Quebec, Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1594 (i).
——— Miscellaneous Vote: in Com. of Sup., 12910 (vi).
——— Operating Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 12920 (vi).
——— Tolls, Collectors Duties, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12929 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14148 (vi).
——— Tonnage Dues, Abolition of: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 874 (i).
Casselman, Lockmaster, Williamsburg Canal, Superannuation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
Chambly, Collector of Tolls, Salary: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12497 (v).
——— Dismissal of Jules Quesnel: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 7203 (iii).
——— *See* 'Moreau.'
——— Electric Station By-Wash: in Com. of Sup., 12906 (vi).

CANALS—*Con.*

Chambly, Land Damages: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
——— Landing Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
——— Macadamizing Tow Path: in Com. of Sup., 12906, 14151 (vi).
Cornwall, Electrical Equipment for Lock Gates: in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).
——— Lighting, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iii), 12895 (vi).
——— Supt.'s Duties, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12896 (vi).
Corry Award, 7557 (iii).
Engineers Salaries *re* Canals: in Com. of Sup., 12910 (vi).
Farran's Point, Acetylene Gas Equipment: in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).
——— Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12898 (vi).
——— Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iii), 14150 (vi).
Galops, Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv), 12899, 14141 (vi).
——— surveys, lifting boulders: in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).
——— Dam: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 12608 (vi).
——— Rapids Channel, Deepening, &c.: M. to conc. (Mr. *Fielding*) Agreed to (Y. 36; N. 14) 8403 (iv).
——— deepening, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8268 (iv), 14644 (vi).
——— *See* 'Farrans,' 'North Channel,' 'Williamsburg,' &c.
Grenville, Guide Piers at Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 12909 (vi).
——— Payment to Henry Tucker *re* Investigation: in Com. of Sup., 14166 (vi).
Gibault, Mr. Edward, Gratuity to Widow: in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
Howie, F. W., Legal Expenses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6795 (iii).
Iroquois Canals, Electric Lighting: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12901.
Lachine, Electrical Appliances, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7806 (iv), 14142 (vi).
——— Enlargement, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12903 (vi).
——— Gratuities: in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
——— Lighting: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14139 (vi).
——— Lock Gate Protection: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
——— Masonry Wall, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12906 (vi).
Lockmen, &c., on Canals: in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
Mill Street, Paving, Lachine Canal: in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).
Moreau, Mr. H., Collector on Chambly Canal: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12497 (v).
——— *See* 'Chambly—Dismissal,' &c.
Morrison, Mrs., Claims *re* Lands, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14104 (vi).
Murray, Purchase of Mr. Johnson's House: in Com. of Sup., 14143 (vi).
——— Goodrich, Mr., Removal: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) in Com. of Sup., 14144 (vi).
——— Wire Fencing: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
North Channel and Dam, Galops Rapids: in Com. of Sup., 12899 (vi).
——— Completion: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
——— *See* 'Farrans,' 'Galops,' &c.

CANALS—*Con.*

North Channel Construction of Dam: in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv).
O'Leary, J. & M., Claims *re* Soulanges Canal Contracts; in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).
Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Engineer's Reports: M. for copies (Mr. *Murray*) 1299 (i).
Peterborough Canal, Lift Lock: in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
—— Entrance Pier, Trent Canal: in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Schell*) *re* appmnt. of Mr. Stewart on Canals, 14599 (vi).
Quesnel, Jules, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 7203 (iii).
Ramy's Point, Welland Canal, Removal of Obstructions: in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vi).
—— *See* 'Welland'.
Rapide Plat Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 12898 (vi).
Rideau Canal: in Com. of Sup., 7808 (iv).
—— Birkett, Mr. T., M.P., Lease of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 12217 (v).
—— Concession St. Bridge, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
—— Employees, Delay in Payment: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 13302 (vi).
—— Swing Bridge at Hog's Back: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).
St. Francis Lake, to complete Dam: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
St. Lawrence, Equipment for Transportation Facilities: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 12845-7 (vi).
St. Ours, Landing Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
—— Stop Logs: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
Sault Ste. Marie, Coaling Accommodation *re* Sault Ste. Marie Canal: in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iii).
—— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iii)., 12904 (vi).
Simcoe Lake, Flooding of Lands in Mara, &c.: M. (Mr. *Grant*) for Reps., 2762 (ii).
Soulanges Canal, Compensation to George Goodwin: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
—— Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iii).
—— Contractor Stewart's Claims: in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vi).
—— Payment of O'Learys' Claims: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).
—— Repairs to Breach in Bank: in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).
Stewart, Mr., Appnmt as Supt. of Canals: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Schell*) 14599 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com. of Sup., 14146 (vi).
'Townsend' Valve *re* Lock Gates, Welland Canal: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
Trent, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 7551 (iii)., 14645 (vi).
—— Dodds, Thos., Payment to: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 8118 (iv).
—— Employment of Medical Officers: Ques. (Mr *Hughes, Victoria*) 8117 (iv).
—— Hastings and Trenton, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 129 (i).
—— Messrs. Corry & Laverdure, Interest *re* Arbitration: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).
—— *See* 'Corry'.
—— Peterborouch Entrance Pier: in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).
—— *See* 'Peterborough'.

CANALS—*Con.*

Trent, Rep. of Engineer McLeod, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 12716 (vi).
—— Rosedale Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
—— Specifications, Reports, &c.: M. (Mr. *Ward*) for copies, 2313 (i).
See 'Simcoe.'
Tucker, Henry, Payment *re* Investigation: in Com. of Sup., 14156 (vi).
Welland, Deepening, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv).
—— Drainage, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
—— Dunnville Dam & Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 7809 (iv).
—— Electric Lighting, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12900, 14148 (vi).
—— Land Damages: in Com. of Sup., 7805 (iv).
—— Lock Tenders, Salaries: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12921 (vi).
—— Lowering Mitre Sills: in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv)., 14149 (vi).
—— Ramy's Point: *See* 'Ramy's Point.'
—— Stone Protection Walls: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).
—— Surveys *re* Govt. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
—— Townsend Valve, 12905 (vi).
—— Water Power, O.Cs., *re*., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1859 (i).
—— Water Power, Rep. of Board of Trade, St. Catharines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 668 (i).
Williamsburg, Appnmt. of Supt., &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
—— Collector's Salary: in Com. of Sup., 12934 (vi).
—— Gate Lifter: in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).
—— Lockmaster Cassleman, Superannuation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
—— Overseer's House: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
—— Working Scow: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
Wire Fencing, Murray Canal: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
—— *See* 'Murray.'
Yamaska Lock, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 13498 (vi).

Cane Bros., Grants for Timber License, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2757 (ii).

Canning Industry in B.C.: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).

Canoe Cove, P.E.I., Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).

Canso Ferry Service, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7525 (iii), 12602 (v), 14093 (vi).

Cape Tormentine, N.B., Pier Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).

Cape Tormentine Ry. Subsidy: Remarks (Mr *Campbell*) in Com. on Res., 14470 (vi).

Cape Traverse, P.E.I., Survey, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13219 (vi).

Caplan Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13448 (vi).

Caraquet Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1173 (i).

Cardiff Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 2236 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com., 4591; 3°*, 4592 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 103).

Caretakers, Dom. Buildings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).

CARETAKERS, GOVT. POLICY *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13061 (vi).

CARGILL, HENRY, LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12937 (vi).

CARIBOO ISLAND, N.S., HARBOUR OF REFUGE: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

CARLETON, N.B., CENSUS *re* RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 4004 (ii).

——— *See* 'Census.'

CARLETON HEAD, P.E.I., SURVEY *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13219 (vi).

CARLIN, MR., POSTMASTER AT WHITNEY, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 130, 668 (i).

CAR SHOPS, NEW MACHINERY: in Com. of Sup., 14106 (vi).

See 'I.C.R.'

CARTOONS IN 'MILITARY GAZETTE,' &c.: (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2103 (i).

CARVER *vs.* KING, COMMUTATION OF SENTENCE: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13303 (vi).

CASCA TRANSPORTATION CO. AND LIARD RIVER MINERS: in Com. of Sup., 6926 (iii).

CASCUMPEC HARBOUR, P.E.I., BEACH OPENING: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i).

CASEY, GEO. E., EX-M.P., AND ARCHIVES: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 13504 (vi).

CASSELMAN, LOCKMASTER, WILLIAMSBURG CANAL, SUPERANNUATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).

——— *See* 'Canals.'

CATTLE EMBARGO IN G.B.: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bell*) 368 (i).

Debate: (Mr. *Fielding*) 375; (Mr. *Sproule*) 376; (Mr. *Maclean*) 381; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 384; (Mr. *Casgrain*) 385; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 388; (Mr. *Tarte*) 392; (Mr. *Sherritt*) 393; (Mr. *Cargill*) 395; (Mr. *Ross*) 396; (Mr. *McGowan*) 396; (Mr. *Boyd*) 397; (Mr. *Clancy*) 398; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 400; (Mr. *Ingram*) 401; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 402; (Mr. *Hackett*) 405; (Mr. *Haggart*) 408 (i).

CATTLE EMBARGO in G.B.: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 267 (i).

——— LORD ONSLOW'S DECLARATION: Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' 14054 (vi).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 110 (i).

——— papers laid on Table, 591 (i).

CATTLE GUARD COMMISSION, APPNMT. OF MR. GEO. ROBERTSON, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 668 (i).

——— APPNMT. OF MR. HOLT AND RETIREMENT OF MR. ROBERTSON, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lennox*) 1059 (i).

——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Lennox*) 3396 (ii).

——— NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 874 (i).

——— REP., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 669 (i).

——— REP.: Inquiry (Mr. *Pringle*) 14686 (vi).

——— REP. OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1199 (i).

——— REP. LAID ON TABLE, PRINTING, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 14758 (vi).

——— WITHDRAWAL OF MR. ROBERTSON, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 1034 (i).

Cattle Guards: *See* 'Railway Act.'

CATTLE INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi).

——— ON STEAMERS: in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).

CATTLE PURCHASED BY BRITISH GOVT.: Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 5415 (iii).

CATTLE PURCHASED FOR S. AFRICA: Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5463; Neg. (Y., 48; N., 78) 5489 (iii).

Debate: (Mr. *Fisher*) 5467; (Mr. *Henderson*) 5468; (Mr. *Gourley*) 5469; (Mr. *Sproule*) 5473; (Mr. *Logan*) 5475; (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 5477; (Mr. *Broder*) 5478; (Sir *William Mulock*) 5480; (Mr *Lennox*) 5484; (Mr. *Macpherson*) 5487; (Mr. *Oliver*) 5488 (iii).

CATTLE QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5502 (iii).

CAYUGA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 502 (i).

CEMENT USED FOR BUILDINGS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).

CENSUS, BUILDINGS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).

——— CARLETON, &c., N.B., RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 4004 (ii).

——— CIRCULAR OF MR. COTE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4657 (ii).

——— COMMISSIONER FOR PROV. OF QUEBEC, TRAVELLING, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Monk*) 1058 (i).

——— COST, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4800 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 204 (i).

——— ENUMERATORS, EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4800 (ii).

——— EXPENDITURE, 1881, 1891 AND 1901, &c.: Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13699; Neg. (Y., 35; N., 69) 13759 (vi).

Debate: (Mr. *Fisher*) 13707; (Mr. *Clarke*) 13708; (Mr. *Sproule*) 13721; (Mr. *Heyd*) 13724; (Mr. *Henderson*) 13730; (Mr. *Holmes*) 13733; (Mr. *Sherritt*) 13737; (Mr. *Bell*) 13740; (Mr. *McEwen*) 13753; (Mr. *Clancy*) 13755 (vi).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13672 (vi).

——— EXPENDITURE: Notice of Motion (Mr. *Monk*) 12368 (vi).

——— GRAND MANAN, N.B., RELIGIOUS ENUMERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 3801 (ii).

——— LAND VALUES: in Com. of Sup., 4640 (ii).

——— N.B., RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4801 (ii).

——— PAYMENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 286 (i).

——— SCHEDULES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4635 (ii), 7054 (iii).

——— SCHEDULES, HALTON, PEEL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6894 (iii).

——— SCHEDULES, 1891, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7054 (iii).

——— ST. JOHN, RELIGIOUS ENUMERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 3800 (ii).

CENSUS SCHEDULES, *re* HALTON AND CARDWELL: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 11425 (v).

——— STAFF EMPLOYED *re* ALTERATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*) 13935 (vi).

——— TOTAL COST, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Taylor*) 289; Amt. (Mr. *Fielding*) 289 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Taylor*) 479, 544 (i).

CENSUS BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 203 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1593 (i).
—— TOTAL COST: in Com. of Sup., 7053 (iii).
—— VOTE: in Com. of Sup , 4594 (ii).

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. No. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 3126; 2°*, 3583 (ii); in Com., 5360, 5555, 5583, 5960, 6199; 3°*, 6202 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 104).

Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. No. 55 (Mr. *Osler*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i).

CHABOT, MR. F. X., DISMISSAL AS LIGHTKEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2015 (i).

CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE BANQUET AND GOV. GEN'S SPEECH: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 10100 (v).

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE IN PARIS, COR., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1297 (i).

CHAMBERLAIN, HON. MR., SUGGESTIONS *re* MILITIA ACT: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 6540 (iii).
—— SPEECH *re* PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, 13375 (vi).

CHAMBLY CANAL, COLLECTOR OF TOLLS, SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12497 (v).
—— DISMISSAL OF JULES QUESNEL, Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 7203 (iii).
—— ELECTRIC STATION BY-WASH: in Com. of Sup., 12906 (vi).
—— LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
—— LANDING WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
—— MACADAMIZING TOW PATH: in Com. of Sup., 12906, 14151 (vi).

CHAMBORD WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13454 (vi).

CHAPMAN DOUBLE BALLBEARING CO., LETTER *re*: Read (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. of Sup., 7524 (iii).
—— REP. *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 8283 (iii).

CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 12584 (v).
—— *See* 'Dom. Notes.'

CHARLOTTETOWN ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
—— DOM. BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13036 (vi).
—— STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 14131 (vi).
—— REBUILDING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4442 (ii).

CHARTERED BANKS, LIST: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1575 (i).

CHATEAU DE RICHER, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13455 (vi).

CHATEAUGUAY AND NORTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14510 (vi).

CHATEAUGUAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14486 (vi).

CHATEAUGUAY RIVER DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i), 3208 (ii).

CHATHAM DREDGING CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1185 (i).

CHATHAM, N.B., LIGHTSHIP SLIP: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

CHATHAM TO TRACADIE, N.B., TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).

Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 171 (Mr. *Stephens*) 1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 105).

CHATSWORTH POST OFFICE, VACANCY: in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iii).

CHAUDIERE JUNCTION, ENGINE HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 8314 (iv), 12594 (v), 14106 (vi).

CHEGOGGIN, N.S., PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

CHÉTICAMP, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

CHEVERIE, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).

CHEVRIER FAMILY, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 12498 (v), 12716 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 13971 (vi).

CHEZZETCOOK, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).

Chicoutimi and North Eastern Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 168 (Mr. *Girard*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 3172 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 7487 (iii).

CHICOUTIMI TELEGRAPH SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).

CHIGNECTO MARINE RY., SETTLEMENT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Logan*) 4404 (ii).

CHINESE IMMIGRATION ACT, ADMINISTRATION OF: in Com. of Sup., 7759 (iv).

Chinese Restriction Immigration B. No. 82 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) Res. prop., 265; in Com. on Res., 597; 1°* of B., 945; 2°*, 1116; in Com., 1116, 2398; 3°*, 2399 (i); Sen Amts., 5872 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 8).

Church Missionary Society of Canada Incorp. B. No. 202 (Mr. *Russell*) 1°*, 4727 (ii); 2°*, 5139; in Com., and 3°*, 6846. (3 *Edward VII*, c. 155).

CHURCH POINT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).

CIGARETTES, LEGISLATION *re*, in Com. on Criminal Code, 10748 (v).

CIGARETTES, PROHIBITION OF: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 820; Agreed to (Y. 103; N. 48) 847 (i).
Debate: (Mr. *Holmes*) 824; (Mr. *Barker*) 830; (Mr. *Lennox*) 831; (Mr. *Roddick*) 832; (Mr. *Logan*) 833; (Mr. *Taylor*) 836; (Mr. *Demers*, *Iberville*) 837; (Mr. *Bureau*) 838; (Mr. *Heyd*) 838; (Mr. *Broder*) 839; (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 839; (Mr. *Stephens*) 841; (Mr. *Ross*, *Victoria*) 841; (Mr. *Tarte*) 842; (Mr. *Sproule*) 843; (Mr. *Macdonald*) 843; (Mr. *Brock*) 844; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 845 (i).

Cigarettes Prohibition Sale B. No. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°m., 2014 (i); 2°m, 3286; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 3286 (ii).

CIRCULARS TO CURÉS, P.Q. *re* CENSUS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4657 (ii).

Citizens' Bank of Canada B. No. 213 (Mr. *Clarke*) 1°*, 5679; 2°*, 5990; in Com., 7478; 3°* 7479 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 106).

City and County Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 172 (Mr. *Rosamond*) 1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956; in Com., 3795; 3°*, 3797 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 107).

CITY POST OFFICES, APPNMT. OF CLERKS ON PERMANENT STAFF: in Com. of Sup., 14001, 14009 (vi).

CIVIL GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 207, 267, 319 (i).

CIVIL SERVANTS AND GUARANTEE COMPANIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3233 (ii).

CIVIL SERVANTS IN MAN., AND INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS: Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3141; Neg. (N. 71; Y. 22) 3206 (ii).

Debate: (Mr. *McCreary*) 3152; (Mr. *Lancaster*) 3158; (Mr. *Scott*) 3164; (Mr. *Ingram*) 3167, 3183; Ques. of Order, 3167; (Mr. *Speaker*) Ruling, 3167; (Mr. *Blain*) 3169; (Mr. *Boyd*) 3172; (Sir *William Mulock*) 3176, 3185; (Mr. *Davis*) 3179; (Mr. *Puttee*) 3181; (Mr. *Clancy*) 3189 (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3191; (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 3197; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3198 (ii)

——— Notice of Amt., 3126 (ii).

CIVIL SERVICE ACT, ADMINISTRATION OF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2726 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. No. 245 (Sir *William Mulock*) 1°m., 9079 (iv); Res. prop. 10410; wthdn., 11301 (v).

——— **B. No. 257** (Sir *William Mulock*) Res. prop. 10410, 11829; in Com. on Res., 12330; M. for Com., 12493; in Com. on Res., 12500; 1°* of B., 12574 (v); 2°*, and in Com., 13808, 13833; 3°m., 13942; Sen. Amts., 14845 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 9).

See 'Post Office Bill'.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMT. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12330; Amts. (Mr. *Birkett*) 12349, 12370, 12510 (v).

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AND TECHNICAL OFFICERS, &C.; Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13771 (vi).

CIVIL SERVICE, DECORATIONS: *See* 'Imperial Service'

——— EMPLOYEES CLASSIFICATION, SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 9681 (iv).

——— EXAMINATIONS *re* CUSTOMS EMPLOYEES: Remarks in Com. on Customs Bill, 4016 (ii).

——— EXAMINERS LIST: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 479 (i).

CIVIL SERVICE LIST: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 125 (i).

Civil Service Superannuation Act Amt. B. No. 49 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 204; in Com. on Res., 593; 1°* of B., 597; 2°m., 1116; in Com., and 3°*, 1116 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 10).

CLARKE, DUNCAN, EX. COURT: in Com. of Sup., 3406 (ii).

CLASSIFYING RECORDS: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v).

CLAYOQUOT INDIAN SCHOOLS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7269 (iii).

CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY, ABROGATION, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 109 (i).

CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY, COR. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on Alaskan Boundary Award, 14521 (vi).

CLAYTON, &C., Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 7297 (iii).

See 'Alaskan.'

CLEMENT, JULES, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13664 (vi).

CLERGUE'S CONTRACT WITH I. C. R. FOR STEEL RAILS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

See 'Steel Rails.'

CLERGUE SYNDICATE, LABOUR DISTURBANCES: Remarks, 12610, 12717, (vi).

——— *See* 'Sault Ste. Marie.

CLERGUE RY. SYNDICATE, SUBSIDIES, &C.: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14397 (vi).

CLERGUE WORKS, SAULT STE. MARIE, CONTRACT FOR GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross, Ontario*) 13668 (vi).

CLERKS OF PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 963 (i).

See 'Public Works.'

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Notification of Appnmt. (Mr. *Speaker* 1 (i).

'CLEVELAND' CYLINDER, PATENT *re* I. C. R.: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 8284 (iv).

CLINTON, ONT., CENSUS ENUMERATOR: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4820 (ii).

CLINTON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 518 (i), 5834 (iii).

CLOTHING FOR INDIANS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13783 (vi).

COAL CONTRACTS FOR DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. on Sup., 1065 (i).

COAL FIELDS, SURVEY, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).

COAL IMPORTED INTO ONT. FROM JUNE, 1901, TO MARCH, 1903, &C.: Ques. (Mr *Clarke*) 669 (i).

COALING ACCOMMODATION *re* SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iv).

COAL LANDS IN CROW'S NEST PASS APPLICATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 12217 (v).

COAL MINING IN BANFF RESERVE, LEASE BY GOVT.: (Mr. *Northrup*) 13026 (vi).

COAL RATES, I. C. R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 6167 (iii).

COAL SHEDS, OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).

COASTING LAWS AND BONDING PRIVILEGES OF U. S., REGULATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Paterson*) 13135 (vi).

——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12714 (vi).

Coast Yukon Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 35 (Mr. *Macpherson*) 1°*, 446; 2°*, 632; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 108).

COBOURG, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 639 (i), 13084 (vi).

——— HARBOUR REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii).

——— POST OFFICE IMPROVEMENTS; in Com. of Sup., 13118 (vi).

COCAGNE, WHARF, N.B., COMPENSATION TO CAPT. ARSENAULT: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

COCHRANE, HON. SEN., TEL. *re* HEALTH (Mr. *Fielding*) 3000 (ii).

COLBORNE ARMOURY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).

COLD STORAGE: in Com. of Sup., 4671 (ii), 7086 (iii), 7610 (iv).
See 'Agriculture.'
COLDSTREAM GUARDS BAND, ARRANGEMENTS *re* VISIT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*, Victoria) 9683 (iv).
COLEMAN, A. B., TENDERS *re* TORONTO POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).
COLLINGWOOD DOCK, ESTIMATED COST: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 5871 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4679 (ii).
COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR, ONT., HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).
COLLINS, MR., PAYMENT *re* FISHERY INSPECTION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5129 (ii).
COLONIAL CONFERENCE, BOND HAY TREATY AND ALASKA: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Monk*) 853 (i).
—— MEMORANDUM OF CAN. MINISTERS: in Budget Speech, 1404 (i).
—— REP. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 3632 (ii).
COLONIAL OFFICE AND CAN. PRIME MINISTER, COR. *re* GERMAN FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 12218 (v).
—— *See* 'German.'
COLUMBIA RIVER, B. C., ABOVE GOLDEN, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).
—— OPENING CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).
—— REVELSTOKE, NAV. OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
Columbia River Improvement Company Limited, Incorp. B. No. 150 (Mr. *Galliher*) 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., 5559; in Com., and 3°*, 5585; Sen. Amts., 6847, 6894 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 109).
COMMANDERS OF GOVT. STEAMERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 446 (i).
COMMERCIAL AGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 7760 (iv).
COMMERCIAL AGENCIES, DUTIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson*, Grey) 4360 (ii).
COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS, PRIVILEGES, FARES, &C.: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Bill (Mr. *Clarke*) 5680 (iii).
COMMISSIONER, ASS'T., CUSTOMS: *See* 'Customs Act Surtax.'
COMMITTEES:
COMMITTEES, SEL. STANDING: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5 (i).
—— STANDING: Lists presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 197 (i).
—— M. to meet during Sittings of Hse. (Mr. *Hyman*) 8405 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 8333 (iv).
AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION: M. to add Name (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5679 (iii).
—— REP. *re* BINDER TWINE: M. to conc., 13788, 14043 (vi).
DEBATES: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5 (i).
ELECTION LAWS: M. (Mr. *Fielding*) to add Name, 6734 (iii).
INTERNAL ECONOMY: M. for Com., 91 (i).
LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 244 (i).
COMMITTEES:—*Con.*
PRINTING, JOINT: List presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 244 (i).
—— M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. (Mr. *Parmelee*) 5314 (iii).
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS, 1ST REP. OF SEL. COM.: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland*, *Essex*) 5511 (iii).
—— M. to employ stenographer (Mr. *Fraser*) 7202 (iii).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS, MEETING CONCURRENTLY WITH SITTINGS OF HSE.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 8334 (iv).
—— Motion to add Name (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 3431 (ii).
—— M. *re* Pub. Accts. (Mr. *Fraser*): 67 (i).
—— PRODUCING CENSUS SCHEDULES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7058 (iii).
COMMUTATION OF CARVER: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 13303 (vi).
Companies Act (1902) Amt. B. No. 227, (from the Senate). This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.
Compulsory Voting: *See* 'Dom. Elections B. 3.'
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. No. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) 1°m., 1193 (i); 2°m., 2790, 3259; in Com., 3260 (ii).
CONCILIATION BOARD, REGISTRATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3628 (ii).
CONCILIATORS, SETTLEMENT OF LABOUR DISPUTES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 4003 (ii).
CONNOLLY, M., PAYMENT FOR DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14103 (vi).
CONROY, MR., SUB-COLLECTOR TIGNISH, DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13993 (vi).
CONSERVATIVE LITERATURE: *See* 'Mail Bags,' &c.
Consolidated Revenue, &c.; *See* 'Audit Act.'
Consolidated Trust Corporation Incorp. B. No. 121 (Mr. *McColl*) 1°*, 1675; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., 3223; 3°*, 3223 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 110).
CONSOLIDATION OF STATUTES: *See* 'Revision of Statutes.'
Contagious Diseases: *See* 'Animals.'
Contracts, Public Works: *See* 'Public Works Act.'
CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, CERTIFICATES, &C.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
Controverted Elections Bill: *See* 'Dominion Election Bills.'
COOKE VS. COLE, LITIGATION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iii).
CORN DUTIES, ABOLITION OF BY IMP. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 1681 (i).
CORNWALL CANAL, ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT FOR LOCK GATES: in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).
—— ENLARGEMENT, ELECTRIC LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12895 (vi).
—— LIGHTING, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iii).
—— SUPT'S. DUTIES, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, Grenville) in Com. of Sup., 12896 (vi).

CORNWALL ROAD P. O., MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 14038 (vi).

CORONATION CONTINGENT, EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iii).

CORRY & LAVERDURE, AWARD *re* CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iii).

—— COMPENSATION *re* TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).

CORY, W. W., SALARY, DUTIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6853 (iii).

COTTEE, HERBERT, SALARY AND RE-APPOINTMENT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3610 (ii).

COUCHICHING AND SIMCOE LAKES, REGULATIONS OF WATER: in Com. of Sup., 13252 (vi).

COUILLARD, ALFRED, GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 13546 (vi).

COUNTY COURT JUDGES, APPOINTMENTS FROM LOCAL BARS: Remarks (Mr. *Lennox*) 5582 (iii).

—— APPOINTMENTS., RETIREMENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 4960 (ii).

COUNTRY POSTMASTERS: in Com. of Sup., 6037 (iii).

—— SALARIES: in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5662, 5676, 5863 (iii).

—— SALARY INCREASES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14011 (vi).

Court of Appeal, Yukon: *See* 'Yukon B. 254.'

COURTS, YUKON, PURCHASE OF LAW BOOKS: in Com. of Sup., 3506 (ii).
See 'Yukon.'

COUTURE, VET. SURGEON AT QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5504 (iii).

COVE HEAD HARBOUR, CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS: in Com of Sup., 1155 (i), 13222 (vi).

COW BAY, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13178 (vi).

COW BAY (POINT MORIEN) BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).

CRANDALL, BRAKESMAN, GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 13546 (vi).

—— *See* 'Belmont.'

CRANE ISLAND WHARF, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1513 (i).

CREAMERIES IN N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7632 (iv).

CREOSOTED TIMBER FOR PIERS AND BREAKWATERS, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).

CRICKET PLAYING ON PARLIAMENT GROUNDS: Objection (Mr. *Sproule*) 2398, 2421 (i).

Criminal Code (immoral entertainments) Amt. B. No. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 95; 2°*, 316; in Com., 316; 3° m., 592 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 13.)

Criminal Code, 1892 (cruelty to animals) Amt. B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) 1°*, 541; 2°*, 1324; in Com., 1324 (i), 2779, 3237 (ii).

Criminal Code (1892) Amt. B. No. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°*, 5581; 2°*, 6638; M. for Com., 6638; in Com., 6639, 7490 (iii), 10746 (v); wthdn., 14768 (vi).

Criminal Code (fraudulent debtors) B. (No. 219, from the Senate). This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.

Criminal Code (1902) Act (trades and contracts) Amt. B. (No. 230, from the Senate). This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.

Criminal Code (1892) Amt. (freedom of labour) B. (No. 246, from the Senate). This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.

CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

CRISIS IN ONT: *See* 'Lt. Governor.'

CROSS POINT PIER, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1512 (i).

Crown Bank of Canada B. No. 129 (Mr. *Guthrie*) 1°*, 1936; 2°*, 2277 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2756 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 111.)

CROWN TAILORING CO., TORONTO, SUPPLIES FOR P.O. DEPT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iii).

CROWS NEST PASS COAL LANDS, APPLICATIONS, REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 12217 (v).

Cruelty to Animals: *See* 'Criminal Code.'

CULLING TIMBER, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7798 (iv).

CUMBERLAND RY. AND COAL CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 14506 (vi).

CUMBERLAND WHARF, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).

CUMMINGS, JAMES, PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 9458 (iv).

Currency Amt.: *See* 'Dom. Notes.'

CURRY, JAMES, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT CHARLOTTETOWN, SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3918 (ii), 13992 (vi).

Customs Act Amt. B. No. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) Res. prop., 2922; in Com. on Res., 3044; 1°* of B., 3126; 2°*, 4010; in Com., 4010; 3° m., 4187; 3°*, 4674 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 14.)

—— **(German Surtax) Amt. B. No. 273** (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Ways and Means, 14755; 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 14758 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 15.)

CUSTOMS:

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS, REBATE FOR 1901-2: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 3803 (ii).

ALUMINUM, OXIDE OF, IMPORTATION INTO CANADA, PORTS OF ENTRY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson*, *N.B.*) 1035 (i).

BAIN, MR., ASST. COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS, APPNMT., &C.: Remarks in Com. on Customs Act Amt. B., 4010 (ii).

BANANAS IMPORTED, VALUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson*, *Elgin*) 1198 (i).

BATHURST CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, ABSENCE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3629 (ii).

BAUXITE, TONS IMPORTED IN 1902: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson*, *N.B.*) 1678 (i).

BONDED WAREHOUSES, P.E.I., RENTAL, CLOSING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 12073 (v).

BONDING PRIVILEGES WITH U.S.: *See* 'Coasting.'

BOURGEOIS, M. E., SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT TRACADIE, N.B., DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 543 (i).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

BRACEBRIDGE CUSTOMS PORT: in Com. of Sup., 3960 (ii).

CAMPBELLFORD PORT OF ENTRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).

CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATIONS *re* CUSTOMS EMPLOYEES: Remarks in Com. on Customs Bill, 4016 (ii).

COAL IMPORTED INTO ONT. FROM JUNE 1901 TO MARCH 1903, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 669 (i).

COASTING LAWS AND BONDING PRIVILEGES OF U. S.: Regulations (Mr. *Paterson*) 13135 (vi).
——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12714 (vi).

COMMISSIONER, ASST.: *See* 'Customs Act, B. 174.

CONROY, MR., SUB-COLLECTOR, TIGNISH, DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13993 (vi).

CORN DUTIES, ABOLITION OF BY IMP. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 1681 (i).

CURRY, JAMES, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT CHARLOTTETOWN, SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3918 (ii), 13992 (vi).

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE, PER CAPITA REVENUE, 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13935 (vi).
——— *See* 'Per Capita.'

CUSTOMS CLAUSE G. T. P. BILL, LEGAL OPINIONS: Read (Mr. *Osler*) 11320 (v).

CUSTOMS DEPT., CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 331 (i), 3782, 3897 (ii).
——— DEPTL. SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 319 (i).
——— PORTS OF ENTRY, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3697 (ii).
——— OVERTIME OF OFFICERS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13980 (vi).
——— TRANSFERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 5318 (iii).
——— PRINTING, STATIONERY, &C., in Com. of Sup., 3962 (ii).
——— TEMPORARY CLERKS. APPNMT., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Customs Bill, 4012 (ii).

DAUPHIN, PORT OF ENTRY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).

DIME NOVELS: *See* 'Jesse James.'

DRESDEN CUSTOMS HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3960 (ii).

FREE LIST, CHANGES IN TARIFF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 817 (i).

GANANOQUE PORT OF ENTRY, COLLECTIONS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. 3791, 3897 (ii).

GERMAN GOODS ('TEAPOTS, &C.') IMPORTED UNDER PREFERENTIAL TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. on Customs Act, 3056 (ii).

GERMAN SURTAX: in Com. on Ways and Means, 14755 (vi).

GERMAN SURTAX, PURCHASES PREVIOUS TO IMPOSITION: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3394 (ii).

GERMAN TEAPOT AND MR. BLAIN: *See* 'German Goods.'

GOODS IMPORTED DIRECT INTO CAN., VALUE OF DUTY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Oster*) 12716 (vi).

GRAIN IMPORTATIONS THROUGH WESTERN LAKE PORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 97 (i).

GRANT, J. G., BARRIE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DEFAULT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5991 (iii).

IMPORTS FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, &C., DUTIES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 13935 (vi).

INSPECTION OF CUSTOMS SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3949 (ii).

INTERNATIONAL TARIFF, CUSTOMS BUREAU: in Com. of Sup., 7760 (iv).

JAPANESE TARIFF *re* U. S. PRODUCTS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9217 (iv).

JAPAN TRADE WITH CAN., CUSTOMS DUTIES *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 8617 (iv).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

'JESSE JAMES' SERIES OF PUBLICATIONS, CUSTOMS DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 11426 (v).

KILROY, ACTING CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, WINDSOR, ONT, PAYMENT TO: in Com. of Sup., 13993 (vi).

KING'S WAREHOUSE AT WINNIPEG: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 6268 (iii).

LINSEED OIL, DEPUTATION *re* IMPORTATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3934 (ii).

LOCKS FOR CUSTOMS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup. 3962 (ii).

'MARKLAND,' SCHR., SEIZURE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) on M. for Com. of Sup. 5992 (iii).

MIDLAND PORT OF ENTRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).

MONTREAL PORT OF ENTRY, CHANGES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3901 (ii).
——— CONTINGENT EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3783 (ii).
——— EXAMINING WAREHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 433 (i).
——— SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 8115 (iv)

NAPANEE, COLLECTOR: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3919 (ii).

OXIDE OF ALUMINUM IMPORTS INTO CANADA, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, N. B.*) 1035 (i).

PER CAPITA TAX, EXCISE, 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 14284 (vi).

PER CAPITA TAX, REVENUE FROM CUSTOMS AND EXCISE, 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13935 (vi).
——— *See* 'Customs.'

PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, CERTIFICATE OF ORIGIN: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 3583 (ii).

PREFERENTIAL TARIFF WITH FRANCE *re* SHIPPING B. C. SALMON: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).
——— *re* GERMAN GOODS: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 5322 (iii).
——— *See* 'German Goods.'
——— PREVENTION OF FRAUD, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3921 (ii).

PREFERENTIAL TRADE, OFFER OF CAN. GOVT. TO G. B.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 3219 (ii).

PREVENTIVE SERVICE, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3949 (ii).

PULP WOOD, DUTY BY U. S.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) 4362 (ii).

REVENUE COLLECTED FOR 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 12715 (vi).

S. A. COLONIES, AND PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, RES. OF WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 1678 (i).

SUGAR ENTERED FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, TOTAL AMOUNT 1903, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 14285 (vi).

SUGAR IMPORTED INTO CANADA 1902: M. (Mr. *Madore*) for Stmnt.,* 3236 (ii).

TARIFF CHANGES, FREE LIST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 817 (i).

TARIFF PROTECTION, GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) in Com. of Sup., 6684, 6707 (iii).
See 'Tariff.'

TOBACCO (CANADIAN) SALE IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES, AMOUNTS PAID TO MR. BLAISE DUGAS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1034 (i).

TOBACCO DUTIES COLLECTED IN 1902, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 2103 (i), 12217 (v).
——— DUTY ON FOREIGN LEAF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 446 (i).

TORONTO, CUSTOMS PORT OF ENTRY, APPNMTS., SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Supply., 3906 (ii).

TRACADIE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 543 (i).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*
U. S. Coasting Laws, Bonding Privileges, &c.: Regulations *re* (Mr. *Paterson*) 13135 (vi).
See 'Coasting.'
Vegetables imported from U. S., Duty collected at Toronto and Montreal: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1058 (i).
Veniot, P. I., Customs Collector at Bathurst: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3629 (ii).
Walpole Customs House: in Com. of Sup., 3961 (ii).
Warehouse at Winnipeg, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavière*) 6268 (iii).
Weekly Publications, 'Jesse James' Series, Customs Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 11426 (v).
Wheat, Export Freight Rate per Hundred Pounds: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 11188, 11425 (v).
Windsor, Customs Port of Entry, Salaries, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).
See 'Kilroy.'

Cutler and Gore Bay Mail Contract, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iii).

Cutler, Gore Bay Mail Service; Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).

Cutler, Spanish Mills Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).

Dairying Branch, Agriculture: in Com. of Sup., 7610 (iv).
——— Cold Storage, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4671 (ii).

Dalhousie Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).

Daly, M.T., Harbour Master at Bathurst, N.B., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2919 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).

Dauphin, Lake, Lowering: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
——— Port of Entry, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. 3898 (ii).

Dawson Board of Trade, Memorial *re* Treadgold Concessions: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1024 (i).
See 'Treadgold.'

Dawson City to Stewart River, Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Dawson Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii).

Debates, Amanuenses, Increase of Salary: in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).

Debates, Official: in Com. of Sup., 5265 (iii).
——— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) for Com., 5 (i).
——— 1st Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 654 (i).
——— M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 814 (i).
——— 2nd Rep.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 939 (i).
——— M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 1111 (i).
——— 3rd Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 1461 (i).
——— M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 1764 (i).
——— 4th Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 1674 (i).
——— M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 1936 (i).
——— 5th Rep.: M. (Mr. *Champagne*) to ref. back to Com., 7399 (iii).

Debates, 6th Rep.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 7658 (iv).
——— 6th Rep. of Com.: M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 7922, 9349 (iv).
——— 7th and 8th Rep. of Com.: M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 14053 (vi).
——— 8th Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 12216 (v).

Debates Translators, Rental of Offices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 3799 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2311 (i).

Debert Coal Mines Ry. Subsidy: in Com. of Res., 14328 (vi).

Debt of Can.: *See* 'Public Debt.'

Deer Island to Eastport, Me., Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).

Defalcations, &c.: *See* 'Post Office.'

Defaulting Postmasters *re* Saving Banks Deposits: in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).

Defence Scheme *re* Militia: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3763 (ii).
See 'Militia.'

Delegates from Chambers of Commerce, Treatment by U. S. Immigration Officers: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12495 (v).

Demurrage Regulations, I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 4672, 4959 (ii).

Departments, Reorganisation, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 274 (i).

Depew, Geo. M., Patent Relief B. No. 127 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 1853; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 112).

Depot Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i), 13239 (vi).

Deputy Minister of Agriculture: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4356 (ii).

Deseronto Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13112 (vi).

Deschambault, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).

Desjardins, Allumette Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).

Desjardins, Camille, Appnmt., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 3537 (ii).

Desjardins Canal B. No. 183 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 3393; 2°, 4213; in Com., and 3°, 4213 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 16.)

DesRoches, Fishery Guardian, Alleged Frauds: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 10955 (v).

Detroit River, &c., International Waters, U. S. Govt. Work: M. (Mr. *Cowan*) for Cor.,* 2778 (ii).

Devlin, Mr., Successor of, as Immigration Agent, Ireland: in Com. of Sup., 6731 (iii).

Digby, Pier, Renewal, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1083 (i).
——— Post Office, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
——— Wharf Extension, Improvement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2101 (i).

Diocese of Moosonee: *See* 'Trust Funds.'

DIPPER HARBOUR, N. B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).

DISCRIMINATING RATES, G. T. RY. CO. BETWEEN CANADIANS AND AMERICANS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 10745 (v).

DISCRIMINATING FREIGHTS ON OCEAN VESSELS: *See* 'Freight Rates.'

DISTILLERIES, &C., INSPECTORS' SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13974 (vi).

DIVISIONS:

ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 14158; Neg. (Y. 20; N. 58) 14218 (vi).

BROCKVILLE AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. CO.'S INCORP. B. No. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) neg. (Y. 26; N. 44) 7467; M. for 3°, agreed to (Y. 64; N. 35) 7468 (iii).

BUDGET, THE: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Neg. (Y. 54; N. 107) 2235 (i).

CANADIAN TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH CO.'S INCORP. B. No. 189 (Mr. *Birkett*) in Com., Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 7479; Neg. (Y. 9; N. 57) 7486 (iii).

CATTLE PURCHASED FOR S. AFRICA: Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5463; Neg. (Y. 48; N. 78) 5489 (iii).

CENSUS EXPENDITURE, 1881, 1891 AND 1901, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13699; Neg. (Y. 35; N. 69) 13759 (vi).

CIGARETTES, PROHIBITION OF: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 820; Agreed to (Y. 103; N. 48) 847 (i).

CIVIL SERVANTS AND POLITICAL INTERFERENCE, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3151; Neg. (Y. 22; N. 71) 3206 (ii).

FINANCIAL REVIEW: Amt. (Mr. *Bell*) to Com. of Sup., 14601; Neg. (Y. 30; N. 68) 14642 (vi).

G.T. PACIFIC RY. CO.'S INCORP. B. No. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) M. for Com., 4871: Amt. (Mr. *Pringle*) 4871; Neg. (Y. 55; N. 102) 4874 (ii).

G.T.P. B. No. 235: Amt. (Mr. *Borden*) Alternative Route, to M. for 3°, 12642 (Y. 37; N. 75) 12690 (vi).

———Amt. (Mr. *Osler*) Customs Duties, &c., 12693; Neg. (Y. 39; N. 78) 12702 (vi).

———Amt. (Mr. *Alcorn*) Capital Stock, 12704; Neg. (Y. 55; N. 75) 12705 (vi).

———Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) Rates, &c., Neg. (Y. 34; N. 74) 12709 (vi).

———Amt. (Mr. *Puttee*) to M. for Com. on Res., 9148; Neg. (Y, 50; N. 135) 10404 (v).

———Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) 10076 (iv); Neg. (Y. 68; N. 119) 10404 (v).

———Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 10405; Neg. (Y. 70; N. 117) 10407 (v).

———3° of Bill; Agreed to (Y. 117; N. 71) 10407 (v).

———Reporting Debates, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Monk*) Speaker's Ruling sustained (Y. 52; N. 30) 0634 (v).

HAY AND OATS BOUGHT BY IMP. GOVT., AMOUNT PAID BY CAN.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Monk*) 676, 688; Neg. (Y. 35; N. 6) 690 (i).

INSOLVENCY ACT AMT. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) 2°m., 3248; Neg. (Y. 42; N. 74) 3256 (ii).

IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4263; Neg. (Y. 47; N. 91) 4346 (ii).

MARKET GARDENERS, PROTECTION *re* FOREIGN COMPETITION: Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4766; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 100) 4799 (ii).

OTTAWA VALLEY RY. CO.'S B. No. 59 (Mr. *Monk*) M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 6523; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 87) 6537 (iii).

DIVISIONS—*Con.*

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COM. *re* MR. LOY, M.P.: M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print evidence, 7917; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 7918; M. to conc. in Rep., 7922, 8008; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 8008, 8069; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 105) 8080, (iv).

PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY FOR N.W.T.: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 13856; Neg. (Y. 29; N. 63) 13932 (vi).

RY. ACT (cattle guards) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*) 2°m., 552; M. (Mr. *Blair*) to ref. to Com. on Rys..; Agreed to (Y. 99; N. 53) 565 (i).

RY. ACT (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) 3°m., 8334; Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* two cent rate, 8334; Neg. (Y. 34; N. 45) 8359 (iv).

REPRESENTATION IN H. OF C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2°m., 1207, 1265; Amt. (Mr. *Sproule*) to M. for 2°, Neg. (Y. 37; N. 72) 1284, 1292 (i).

———Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) to recommit to Com. of Whole Hse., Neg. (Y. 28; N. 65) 12430 (v).

TARIFF POLICY OF THE GOVT.: Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4843, 4875; Neg. (Y. 50; N. 102) 4955 (ii).

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS: Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2796; Neg. (Y. 52; N. 95) 2914 (ii).

———INSTRUCTION TO COMMISSIONS, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4486; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 88) 4546 (ii).

DIVORCE AND MATRIMONIAL COURTS, N.B., SALARY OF JUDGE: in Com. of Sup., 3400 (ii).

Divorce: *See* 'Allan, William.'

———*See* 'Ashley.'

———*See* 'Graves, Florence.'

———*See* 'McDermid, Ellen.'

———*See* 'Schooley.'

———*See* 'Steele, James Reid.'

———*See* 'Wilson, Stephen.'

DIXON, F. A. PROMOTION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2726–2753 (ii).

———COR., &C. *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Lennox*) 1058 (i).

———Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 5318 (iii).

DIXON, MR. J. W. T., DEAD LETTER OFFICE, WINNIPEG, ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13995 (vi).

DIXON, CAPT., DUTIES IN S. AFRICA: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 7914 (iv).

DOCKS, HARBOURS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2978 (ii). *See* 'Public Works.'

DODD, MR. JUSTICE, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).

DODDS, MR. THOS., PAYMENT TO *re* TRENT CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 8118 (iv).

DOG FISH NUISANCE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13650 (vi)

DOKIS INDIAN RESERVE, COMPLAINTS AGAINST TRESPASSERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 7914 (iv.)

DOM. AND PROVINCIAL ARBITRATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12590 (v).

DOMINION ARSENAL: in Com. of Sup., 7089 (iii).

DOM. ATLANTIC RY. CO. (WOLFVILLE) SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).

DOM. BUILDINGS, HEATING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).

———N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 421 (i).

DOMINION BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i).

——RENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).

—— *See* 'Buildings.'

DOM. COAL, IRON AND STEEL CO.'S ACCOMMODATION AT GLACE BAY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13184 (vi).

—— *See* 'Glace Bay.'

Dominion Controverted Elections Act (trials) Amt. B. No. 13 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 95; 2°, and in Com., 635; on Order for Com., 945, 1115, 2239; 3°*, 2240 (i). (3 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 12).

DOM. CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT AMT. B. NO. 13 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., Objection (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 945 (i).

DOM. DAY ADJOURNMENT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5589 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. No. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) 1°*, 92; 2° m., 885, in Com., 902, 1200 (i); M. to place on Govt. Orders, 13373; in Com., (compulsory voting) 13560; wthdn.. 14769 (vi).

DOM. ELECTIONS ACT AMT.: M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Sel. Com., 3001 (ii); 6734 (iii).

DOM. ELECTIONS ACT AMT. B. NO. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*): Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12720 (vi).

Dominion Elections Act (intimidation) Amt. B. No. 15 (Mr. *Clancy*) 1°*, 114; 2° m., 704 (i); in Com., 3236; 3°*, 3237 (ii). (3 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 19).

DOM. EXHIBITION, TORONTO: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 534 (i).

—— *See* 'Agriculture.'

Dominion Gas Improvement Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 91 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 1193; 2°* 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 114).

Dominion (burglary) Guarantee Co.'s B. No. 92 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 113).

Dominion Institute of Amalgamated Engineers Incorp. B. No. 32 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 632 (i).

DOM. LANDS ACT AMT. B. (Mr. *Sifton*). Motion dropped, 13444 (vi).

DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).

—— COMMISSIONER'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6765 (iii).

—— INSPECTOR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6766 (iii).

—— MAN. AND N.W.T., SALE, PRICES PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 816 (i).

—— OUTSIDE SERVICE, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).

—— SALE, LOCATION, PURCHASERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 670 (i).

—— SURVEYS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6759, 6939 (iii).

DOM. LANDS, SURVEYORS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13772 (vi).

DOM. LANDS *re* YUKON REGULATIONS: in Com. on Res., 13791 (vi).

Dominion Notes B. No. 222 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 6270; in Com. on Res., 6437; 1°* of B., 6448; 2°, and in Com., 6913; 3°*, 6915 (iii). (3 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 43).

DOMINION NOTES, PRINTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5135 (ii) 14252 (vi).

DOM. NOTES SECURITY: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 6270 (iii).

DOMINION POLICE, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).

DOM. STATUTES CONSOLIDATION: *See* 'Revision of Statutes.'

DOM. STEAMERS, REPAIRS, SUPPLIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5033 (ii).

DOM. SUBSIDIES TO PROVINCES, INCREASE, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 691 (i).

DOM. TRAFFIC BRIDGES THROUGH CANADA: in Com. of Sup., 2701 (ii).

DONALD'S HEAD, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

DONCASTER INDIAN RESERVE, SQUATTERS' IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).

DONCASTER INDIAN RESERVE, TERREBONNE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 288 (i).

DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY, CONTRACT *re* FUEL: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 10102 (v).

DOUBLE TRACKING PARTS OF I.C.R. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 14062 (vi).

—— *See* 'I.C.R.'

DOUCET'S LANDING WHARF, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).

DOUGLASTOWN, ISOLATED BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).

DOUKHOBORS, HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 541 (i).

—— LOANS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5587 (iii).

—— PILGRIMAGE, AND GOVTL. ACTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 1030 (i).

—— PILGRIMAGE, EXPENSES, LOSSES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 542 (i).

DOYLE, MR., RY. MAIL CLERK: in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii).

Drainage across Railway Property B. No. 19 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1° m., 202; 2°*, 916 (i); wthdn., 7203 (iii).

See 'Ry. B. 21.'

DRAINAGE CLAUSE IN B. 21, RAILWAY ACT AMT.: 5774 (iii); Amt. (Mr. *Cowan*) 4729, 4735 (ii).

DRAKE, MR., N.W.M.P., INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13761 (vi).

DRAW-BARS, EXCHANGE ON FREIGHT CARS, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7520, (iii), 8288 (iv).

DREDGES AT MIDLAND, CAPACITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).

DREDGES, NEW, COST, CAPACITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 1856 (i).

DREDGING, MAR. PROVS., SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13309 (vi).

DREDGING PLANT, MAINTENANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2674 (ii).

DREDGING PLANT FOR B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13311, 13318 (vi).

—— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii), 13311 (vi).

—— ONT. AND QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 2671 (ii), 13318 (vi).

—— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13313 (vi).

DREDGING VESSELS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (ii).
See 'Public Works.'

DRESDEN CUSTOMS HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3960 (ii).

DRILL HALLS, CONSTRUCTION OF, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13643 (vi).

—— QUEBEC, ADDITION TO: in Com. of Sup., 13077 (vi).

—— QUEBEC, SCHOOL OF GUNNERY: in Com. of Sup., 13056 (vi).

—— ST. JOHN'S, QUE., CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12496 (v).

—— WOODSTOCK, N.B., PURCHASE OF SITE, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Hale*) 3236 (ii).

DROLET, CENSUS ENUMERATOR, AMOUNT PAID TO: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7055 (iii).

DRUMHEAD BREAKWATER REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1083 (i), 13179 (vi).

DRUMMOND COUNTY RY., RENTALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vi).

DRUMMONDVILLE RY. SIDING, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14055 (vi).

Dry Docks Construction B. No. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 2237 (i); in Com. on Res., 3004; 1°* of B., 3298; 2°, and in Com., 4678 (ii), 5871; 3°*, 5872 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 17.)

DUCHESNEAU, RESIGNATION AS WARDEN OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PEN.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 286 (i).

DUFFERIN AND SAPPERS BRIDGES, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).

DUGAS, JUDGE, YUKON TER., REFUND TO DEPT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3411 (ii).

DUGAS, MR. BLAISE, AMOUNT PAID TO, FOR TRIP IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES *re* SALE OF CANADIAN TOBACCO: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1034 (i).

DUNCAN, ARCHIBALD, FISHERY INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 5127 (ii).

DUNCAN'S COVE, N.S., APPROACH TO WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

DUNDONALD, LORD, AND FRAUDULENT TELEPHONE MESSAGE: Remarks (Mr. *Schell*) 10536, 10744 (v).
See 'G. O. C.'

DUNNVILLE DAM AND BRIDGE, WELLAND CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7809 (iv).
See 'Grand River.'

DURHAM POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 506 (i).

EARNINGS, &c., I.C.R., DATE OF INTERIM REPS.: Ques., (Mr. *Barker*) 4444 (ii).
See 'I. C. R.'

EASTER ADJOURNMENT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1115 (i).

EAST BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).

EAST BERLIN, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).

EAST END, CAPE SABLE ISLAND, N.S., HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).

EASTERN EXTENSION CO., CONCESSIONS TO, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2675 (ii).

EASTERN EXTENSION RY., N.B., BALANCE OF INTEREST *re* AWARD: in Com. of Sup., 7528 (iii).

—— FEES OF STENOGRAPHER, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7529 (iii).

Eastern Townships Bank B. No. 25 (Mr. *McIntosh*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 631; in Com., and 3°*, 1853 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 115).

ECONOMY, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).

EDMONTON AND ATHABASCA LANDING, TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).

Edmonton and Peace River Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 34 (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 446; 2°*, 632 (i).

Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co. (correction) B. No. 109 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°*, 1378 (i); 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 2581 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 18.)

EDMONTON BRIDGE, SASKATCHEWAN RIVER, FLOORING: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vi).

EDMONTON INDIAN AGENCY, TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vi).

EDMONTON N.W.T., JAIL: in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).

Edmonton Street Ry. Co.'s B. No. 58 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 707, 2°*, 977 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 111 (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 116.)

EDMONTON, YUKON AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).

EDMUNDSTON, N.B., INDIAN RESERVE, FIRE DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).

EDVILLE POSTMASTER, OPENING OF OFFICE, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14035 (vi).

EEL RIVER, I. C. R. STATION AGENT'S HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 12600 (v).

EILBECK, SHERIFF, YUKON, FEES, LIVING ALLOWANCES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3414, 3507 (ii).

ELDORADO GUSHER, EXPENDITURE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6949, 7275 (iii).

Election Bills: *See* 'Dom. Elections, &c.'

ELECTIONS, CONTROVERTED, CERTIFICATES, &c.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

ELECTION LAWS COMMITTEE: M. (Mr. *Fielding*) to add Name, 6734 (iii).

ELECTION LAW, LEGISLATION *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).

ELECTION PAMPHLETS : *See* 'Mail Bags.'

ELECTION PETITIONS, JUDGMENTS OF SUPREME COURT : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1, 91 (i).

ELECTION PROCLAMATIONS, PRINTING : *See* 'Saskatchewan Elections.'

ELECTIONS IN SASKATCHEWAN, PAYMENT TO PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE': in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).

ELECTORAL LISTS, PRINTING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lèonard*) 288 (i).

——— N.S., PRINTING, &C., CHANGES MADE: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 8331 (iv).

Electric Light Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 187 (Mr. *Bernier*) 1°*, 3708; 2° m., 4007; in Com., and 3°*, 4007 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 20).

ELECTRIC LIGHT INSPECTION, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5407 (iii).

ELECTRIC LIGHTING, BUILDINGS, OTTAWA, CONTRACT PRICES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 3235 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 816 (i).

——— TRANSFORMERS : in Com. of Sup., 5843 (iii).

——— CORNWALL CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).

——— WELLAND CANAL : in Com of Sup., 14148 (vi). *See* 'Canals.'

ELECTRIC POWER FOR DOM. BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).

ELEVATOR ACCIDENT : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 5417 (iii).

ELEVATOR FOR WEST BLOCK : in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
See 'Ottawa Buildings.'

ELEVATOR RATES, ADVANCE, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Douglas*) 11062 (v).
See 'Grain.'

ELGIN COUNTY CENTENARY CELEBRATION : Remarks (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 3129 (ii).

ELGIN COUNTY REDISTRIBUTION, PAR. IN 'TORONTO GLOBE': Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) 6540 (iii).

Elgin and Havelock Railway Co.'s B. No. 142 (Mr. *Fowler*) 1°*, 2237 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com. and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 117.)

ELKHORN AND M. OSOMIN RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 14497 (vi).

ELKHORN INDIAN SCHOOL, N. W. TER., AVERAGE ATTENDANCE : in Com. of Sup., 6348 (iii).
See 'Indians.'

ELLIS, DR., INSPECTOR OF IMMIGRATION : in Com. of Sup., 6702 (iii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3536 (ii).

ELMIRA BRANCH LINE, P. E. I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 12835 (vi).

EMERSON MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5321 (iii).

Empire Accident and Surety Co.'s B. No. 107 (Mr. *Calvert*) 1°*, 1378; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., 2755; 3°*, 2956 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 118.)

EMPLOYEES, PERMANENT AND TEMPORARY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2726-2753 (ii).

Employees on Rys.: *See* 'Ry. Employees.'

Engineers, Marine : *See* 'Steamboat Inspection.'

ENGINEERS' OFFICE, PUB. WORKS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2726 (ii).

——— *See* 'Pub. Works.'

ENGINEERS SALARIES *re* CANALS : in Com. of Sup., 12910 (vi).

Engineers : *See* 'Dom. Institute.'

ENTERPRISE POST OFFICE, DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER : Remarks (Mr. *Avery*) in Com. of Sup., 14007; Memorandum read, 14008 (vi).

Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 134 (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 2100; 2°*, 2305 (i); in Com., 3226, 3578, 3751, 3982; 3°*, 3982 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 119).

ERNESTOWN STATION POSTMASTER, CHANGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1034 (i).

ESQUIMALT DEFENCES : in Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii).

——— GRAVING DOCK : in Com. of Sup., 5919 (iii).

——— NAVAL STATION, REMOVAL OF FLAGSHIP : Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10957 (v).

ESQUIMAUX POINTE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).

ESTIMATES 1902-3 : Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 90 (i).

——— SUPPL., 1903 : Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 707 (i); 4956 (ii).

——— (1904): Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 12868, 14042, 14662 (vi).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. *Monk*) 10832 (v).

ESTIMATES *re* ONE-FIFTH VOTE : Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 6408 (iii).
See 'Supply.'

"EUREKA," STR., LOAN BY GOVT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14285 (vi).

——— Personal Explanation (Mr. *Tarte*) 14687 (vi).

"EUXINE," SCHR., SCUTTLING OF : M. for Cor. (Mr. *McLennan*) 699 (i).

EWART, MR., ARCHITECT OF PUBLIC WORKS, SALARY ARREARS : in Com. of Sup., 13498 (vi).

EWART, JOHN A., ADDRESS PRESENTED TO JUDGE PERDUE : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 11072 (v).

Exchequer Court (railway debts) B. No. 155 (Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*) 1° m., 2501 (ii); 2° m., 8243; in Com., 8244, 8360; 3°*, 8369 (iv); Sen. Amts., 14769 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 21).

——— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to place on Govt. Orders, 8115 (iv).

EXCHEQUER COURT, JUDGES TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE : in Com of Sup., 3407 (ii).

——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3406 (ii).

EXCISE INSPECTORS, TRAVELLING EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 5373 (iii).

——— OFFICERS, SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 5363 (iii).

——— TAXATION, PER CAPITA FOR 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 11284 (vi).
See 'Customs,' &c.

EXECUTIONS, EXPENDITURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3401 (ii).

EXHIBITION, FURNITURE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4603 (ii).

EXHIBITIONS, GENERAL VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 4599 (ii).
See 'Agriculture.'

EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 4548 (ii).

—— REPAIRS TO BUILDINGS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 972 (i).

—— REPORT: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1937 (i).

EXPORT FREIGHT RATES ON WHEAT TO MONTREAL FROM ONT. POINTS: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 11188, 11425 (v).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. No. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 93; 2°*, 291; in Com., 291, 612, 632; 3°*, 945 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 22).

FABER, DR., ILLEGAL PRACTICE, CHARGES *re*: Par. in *Star*; Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6662 (iii).

—— MEDICAL INSPECTOR OF IMMIGRANTS: in Com. of Sup., 6850 (iii).

FAIR WAGES SCHEDULE ON GOVT. CONTRACTS AND LABOUR DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 7156 (iii).
See 'Labour.'

FALSE CREEK, B.C., COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND B.C.: M. (Mr. *Earle*) for Copies*, 2337 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Earle*) 3129 (ii), 5513, 6354 (iii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 7565 (iv).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 2758, 2919 (ii).

FARQUHARSON, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5512 (iii).

FARRAN'S POINT CANAL, ACETYLENE GAS EQUIPMENT: in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).

—— CONSTRUCTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12898 (vi).

—— ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iii); 14150 (vi).

FAST ATLANTIC SS. LINE: *See* 'Atlantic.'

FATHER POINT LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1513 (i).

Federal Oil Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 30 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 631; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 120).

FERGUSON, J. M., LEGAL EXPENSES *re* ADULTERATION ACT: in Com. of Sup., 5412 (iii).

FERRIES, CONTROL OF: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13696 (vi).

Ferries Bill: *See* 'Navigable.'

FIELDING, HON. MR., PLEDGES *re* MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S SCHEME: Par. in Montreal *Star*, 13936 (vi).

"FIELDING, W. S.", DREDGE, PREPARATION OF PLANS, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14283 (vi).

FINANCE:

ASSAY OFFICE, B.C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13779, 13965 (vi).

AUDIT ACT AMT. BILL, GOVTL. INTENTION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 11692 (v), 13258.

AUDITING DEPTL. FINANCES: Remarks *re* Martineau Investigation, 6933 (iii).

AUDITOR GENERAL AND TREASURY BOARD, PAYMENTS OF MEMBERS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Barker*) 10956 (v).

FINANCE—*Con.*

AUDITOR GENERAL AND TREASURY BOARD: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 11427 (v).

—— CIRCULAR FROM AUD. GEN.: Read (Mr. *Taylor*) 11552 (v).

AUD. GENERAL AUDITING BOOKS OF RY. COS., *Re* SUBSIDIES: in Com. on Res., 14516 (vi).

—— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 89 (i).

—— OFFICE, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 14255 (vi).
See 'Audit.' &c.

BANKERS ASSOCIATION, INSPECTION DUTIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 819 (i)

BANKERS, PRIVATE, LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 285 (i).

BANK FAILURES SINCE CONFEDERATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 6435 (iii).

BANKING BUSINESS: M. (Mr. *Russell*) to receive Pet., 4958 (ii).

BANKS, UNCLAIMED BALANCES: Rep. presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 3804 (ii).

BARTON, SIR EDMUND, EXPENDITURE *re* CAN. VISIT: in Com. of Sup., 6952 (iii).

BLACK, A. W., ENGLISH M.P., STATEMENTS *re* COR. BETWEEN CAN. AND GERMAN CONSUL: 12218 (v).

BOPP, GERMAN CONSUL, COR. WITH DOM. GOVT. *re* FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).
See 'German Tariff.'

B.N.A. BANK NOTE CO. *vs.* THE KING, EXPENSES *re*: in Com. of Sup., 14279 (vi).

BUDGET, THE: Financial Statement (Mr. *Fielding*) 1378 (i).

—— REP. IN TORONTO 'GLOBE': Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 410 (i).
See 'Financial Review.'

CAN. BANK OF COMMERCE, YUKON, COMPENSATION TO: in Com. of Sup., 14274 (vi).

CANADIAN-GERMAN FISCAL POLICY, COR. WITH DOM. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).
See 'German Tariff.'

CANADIAN MINT, ERECTION OF BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 10955 (v).
See 'Mint.'

CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 12584 (v).
See 'Dom. Notes.'

CHARTERED BANKS, REP. *re*: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1575 (i).

COLONIAL OFFICE AND CAN. PRIME MINISTER, COR. *re* GERMAN FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).

DEBT OF CAN.: *See* 'Public Debt.'

DOM. AND PROVINCIAL ARBITRTION, &c.; in Com. of Sup., 12590 (v).

DOM. NOTES, PRINTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5135 (ii), 14252 (vi).
See 'Charges,' &c.

DOM. SUBSIDIES TO PROVINCES, INCEASE, &c.; M. for Cor., (Mr. *Lemieux*) 691 (i).

ESTIMATES, 1902-3: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 90.

ESTIMATES *re* ONE-FIFTH VOTE: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 6408 (iii).

—— SUPPL., 1903; Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 707 (i), 4956 (ii).

—— SUPPL., 1904: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 12868, 14042, 14662 (vi).

—— *See* 'Supply,' &c.

FIELDING, HON. MR., PLEDGES *re* MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S SCHEME: Par in Montreol *Star*, 13936 (vi).

FINANCE DEPT., SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 224 (i).

FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS BETWEEN N.S. AND CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3001 (ii).

FINANCE—*Con.*
FINANCIAL REVIEW: Amt. (Mr. *Bell*) to Com. of Sup., 14601 (vi).
See 'Budget, &c.'
GERMAN CONSUL BOPP, COR. WITH CAN. GOVT. *re* FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).
GERMAN TARIFF, COR. &C.: Papers laid on Table, 1460 (i).
——— DISCRIMINATION AND BOND-HAY TREATY: Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 1324 (i).
——— LORD STRATHCONA'S LETTER: in Budget Speech, 1413 (i).
——— MR. FIELDING'S MEMORANDUM *re* MR. BOPP: in Budget Speech, 1414 (i).
GOV. GEN.'S SPEECH AT CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE BANQUET: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 10100 (v).
IMPERIAL CONFERENCE, COR., &C., CAN. GOVT'S REFUSAL TO PUBLISH: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 9457 (iv).
——— PAPERS *re*: laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9582 (iv).
INSOLVENCY ACT, LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 818 (i).
INSURANCE COS. OF CANADA, ABSTRACT OF STATEMENT: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1025 (i).
INSURANCE, REPORT OF SUPT.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 9350 (iv).
——— OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 12586 (v).
IRON AND STEEL BOUNTIES, ADMINISTRATION OF ACT: in Com. of Sup., 7762 (iv).
——— LEGAL EXPENSES *re*: in Com. of Sup., 7795 (iv).
——— PAID FOR 1890-1903: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 11556 (v)
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6435 (iii).
IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on M. to adjn., 4260 (ii).
——— AMT.: (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4263 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) *re* Notice of Motion, 3864, 4040 (ii).
LADY LAFONTAINE, PENSION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14252 (vi).
LOANS, GOVT., &C.: *See* 'Public Debt.'
MANUFACTURERS' DELEGATION *re* TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) 265 (i).
MINT, ESTABLISHMENT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. of Sup., 14244 (vi)
See 'Can. Mint.'
NORTH-WEST TER., ADVANCE ACCOUNT, &C.: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 10102 (v).
——— INCREASED SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).
See general heading.
N. S. AND DOM. OF CAN. FINANCIAL TERMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3001 (ii).
PREFERENTIAL TARIFF AND S. A. COLONIES, RES. OF WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 1678 (i).
PREFERENTIAL TRADE, MEMORANDUM OF MR. BALFOUR, PRES. OF BRITISH BOARD OF TRADE: in Financial Statement, 1402 (i).
——— Par. in Montreal 'Star' *re* Mr. Fielding's pledges *re* Mr. Chamberlain's scheme, 13936 (vi).
PRIVATE BANKERS: *See* 'Bankers.'
PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES, INCREASES, &C.: M. for Cor., &c., (Mr. *Lemieux*) 691 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux* 5764 (iii).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 89 (i).
PUBLIC DEBT, DECREASE OF INTEREST: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14665 (vi).
PUBLIC DEBT CONVERSION, PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVANTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14253 (vi).
RECEIVER GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 12584 (v).

FINANCE—*Con.*
RECEIVER GENERAL'S OFFICE, TORONTO, ADDITIONAL VAULT: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE FOR 1903, AMOUNTS COLLECTED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 13370 (vi).
STEEL SHIPBUILDING, BOUNTY TO AID: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES: Inquiry for (Mr. *Monk*) 10832 (v).
SUPPLY: Remarks *re* one-fifth vote (Mr. *Fielding*) 6408 (iii).
SUPPLY BILL, VOTE *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 5995 (iii).
——— Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 6003 (iii).
See general heading.
TARIFF AND TAXATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. on Immigration, 6861 (iii),
——— NEGOTIATIONS WITH FRANCE: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4957 (ii).
——— POLICY OF GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Tarte*) 4263, 4843, 4875 (ii).
——— CORRESPONDENCE, *re*: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Tarte*) 3003 (ii).
——— PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. on Binder Twine, B. 233, Remarks (Mr. *Maclean* &c.) 7304, 7392 (iii).
——— REVISION, CORRESPONDENCE *re*: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Tarte*) 3003 (ii).
TREASURY BOARD: *See* 'Auditor General.'
WAYS AND MEANS—GERMAN SURTAX: in Com. on B. 273, 14755 (vi).
——— Res. for Com. (Mr. *Fielding*) 89, 1378 (i).
——— Financial Statement, 1378 (i).
——— FOR DEBATE: *See* 'Budget.'
FINLAY POINT, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13181 (vi).
FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS BETWEEN N.S. AND CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3001 (ii).
FINANCIAL REVIEW: Amt. (Mr. *Bell*) to Com. of Sup., 14601; Neg. (Y., 30; N., 68) 14642 (vi).
FIRE AT MORTIMER & CO., GOVT. PROPERTY DESTROYED: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 4836 (ii).
Fire Damages: *See* 'Railway Act.'
Fire Guards: *See* 'Railway Act.'
FIRE PROTECTION OF STATIONS, RESTAURANTS, I.C.R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 14663 (vi).
FIRE REGULATIONS, N.W.T.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6775 (iii).
FIRE, SECURITY FROM, IN PARLT. BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 4673 (ii).
FISHER, CHAS. A. L., INSPECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS, SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1592 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt., B. No. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1° m., 6538; 2°, and in Com., 6896; 3°*., 6913 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 23).
FISHERIES:
BANCE, MR., PROMOTION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5277 (iii).
BATHURST FISHERY INSPECTOR: *See* 'Fishery Overseer.'
BAY OF FUNDY FISH HATCHERY: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
BEAVER RIVER FISH HATCHERY, ESTABLISHMENT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
CANADIAN FISHERY EXHIBIT: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii), 5308 (iii).
CANNING INDUSTRY IN B.C.: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).
COLLINS, MR., PAYMENT *re* FISHERY INSPECTION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5129 (ii).

FISHERIES—*Con.*

DesRoches, Fishery Guard, Alleged Frauds: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 10955 (v).

Dog Fish Nuisance, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13650 (vi).

Duncan, Archibald, Fishery Inspector: in Com. of Sup., 5127 (ii).

False Creek B.C., Lease to Burnett & Kelly: *See* 'B.C.'

Fish Breeding Establishments: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

Fish Breeding and Lobster Hatcheries: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii).

Fisheries Intelligence Bureau, Compiling Reps.: in Com. of Sup., 5277 (iii).

Fisheries Protective Service, B.C., in Com, of Sup., 4174 (ii).

——— Regulations *re* Officers Mess: Que. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9819 (iv).

Fisheries, Salaries: Conc., 6069 (iii).

——— Steamers in B.C., Construction: in Com. of Sup., 5278 (iii).

Fishermen of N.S., 'Outskirts of Civilization': Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13316 (vi).

——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Roche*, *Halifax*) 13373 (vi).

——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 13374 (vi).

Fishery Exhibit, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii), 5308 (iii).

Fishery Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 5122 (ii), 5278 (iii).

Fishery Officers, Inspections, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5122 (ii).

Fishery Officers, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5050 (ii).

Fishery Overseer, Bathurst, N.B., Complaints, *re:* Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 14686 (vi).

Fishery Rights of Dom. and Provs.: M. to bring down Papers (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 7923 (iv).

Fishermen's Indemnity from U. S. Govt.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3236 (ii).

Fishing Bounties, Guardian DesRoches, Alleged Fraud: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 10955 (v).

Fishing Industry, Mar. Provs., Wharf, Building, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).

Fishing Licenses to U.S. Vessels, Collectors' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5309 (iii).

Fishing Rights *re* Indians, B.C., Investigation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7264 (iii).

Fishing within Three Mile Limit, N.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 4179 (ii).

Fish Inspection, Investigations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).

Fish Shippers, Loss, &c., by Govt. Strs.: Memorandum read (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 4051-54 (ii).
See 'Frozen.'

Fishways, Building, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii).

Fraser River Salmon Industry, Complaints from Canners Ass'n.: Tel. read (Mr. *Earle*) 9968 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).

Frozen Fish, &c., P.E.I.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13520 (vi).

——— Shippers, Losses, &c., Pet. *re:* Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3394 (iii), 13373 (vi).
See 'Fish Shippers.'

Harrison, Mr., Inspector of Fisheries, N.B., Resignation: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 288 (i).

Hurley, J. M., Appnmt., Duties, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5123 (ii), 5280 (iii).

——— Rep., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5740 (iii).
See 'Mullen.'

FISHERIES—*Con.*

James and Hudson Bay Fishing Rights: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lancaster*) 3806 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 6893 (iii).

James and Hudson Bays, Fishing Rights, Applications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1194 (i).

Larkin, Capt. W. S., Complaint *re:* Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2922 (ii).

Lobster Factory Inspection, Halifax: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) in Com. of Sup., 5122 (ii).

Lobster Hatcheries: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

——— Industry, Inspection *re:* in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13151, 13660 (vi).

Lunenburg Fish Hatchery: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

Mullen, Cornelius: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5280 (iii).

——— Letter *re* Hurley, J. M., &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Taylor*) 5757, 5761 (iii).

Oyster Fishing, P.E.I., Pet. *re:* Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2920 (ii).

Oyster, Herring, &c., Fish Inspection, Investigation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Roche*, *Hfx.*), *re* Fishermen of N.S., 13373 (vi).
See 'Fishermen of N.S.'

Rivière du Nord Fish Ladders, &c.: M. for Copies of Reps.* (Mr. *Ethier*) 2778 (ii).

Salmon Canning Industry in B. C.: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).

Salmon Commissioners, B.C.: M. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) for Rep., 7109 (iii).

Salmon Hatcheries, B.C., Increased Capacity: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 12073 (v).

Salmon Industry, Fraser River, B.C., Tels. from Canners Association, &c.: Read (Mr. *Earle*) 9968 (iv).

Salmon shipped to France from B.C., Tariff *re:* Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).

Savard, Mr. P. V., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6895 (iii).

Shepherd, B., Fishery Inspector: in Com. of Sup., 5127 (ii).

Sills, E. H., Payment *re* Storage of Fish Nets: in Com. of Sup., 5128 (ii).

Trap Nets in Gulf St. Lawrence, Pet. *re:* Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2917 (ii).

U. S. Indemnity to Fishermen, Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. *Lemieux*) for Cor.* 3236 (ii).

Five Islands, N.S., Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).

Flagship, Removal from Esquimalt: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10957 (v).

Flesherton Armoury: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).

Flint, T. B., Clerk of Hse., Appnmt.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

Floating Lighthouses, Applications from Captains, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 665 (i).

Food Analysis: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).
See 'Inland Revenue,' 'Customs,' &c.

Forrest, E., Reimbursement, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).

Fort Dufferin, Extension Wharf, River St. John: in Com. of Sup., 1183 (i).

FORT LAWRENCE LANDING PIER, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i), 13181 (vi).

FT. WILLIAM PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i). *See* 'Public Works,' &c.

FRANCE AND CANADA SS. SERVICE: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4957 (ii).

FRANCE AND CAN. STEAMSHIP SERVICE SUBSIDY: Prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 10410 (v). *See* 'Ocean SS. Subsidies Bill.'

FRANK DISASTER, INVESTIGATION *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi). *See* 'Turtle.'

—— Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 2100 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Oliver*) 2106; Tels. read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2106 (i).

—— TEL. TO DEP. MIN. OF INT.: Read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2238 (i).

FRANKING PRIVILEGE *re* CAMPAIGN LITERATURE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 14286 (vi). *See* 'Campaign.'

FRASER RIVER, B.C., IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vi).

FRASER RIVER SALMON INDUSTRY, COMPLAINTS FROM CANNERS' ASSOCIATION, TEL.: Read (Mr. *Earle*) 9968 (iv).

—— SALMON INDUSTRY: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v). *See* 'Fisheries.'

Fraudulent Debtors: *See* 'Criminal.'

FRAUDULENT MARKING ACT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).

FRAWLEY, MR., REMOVAL FROM ORILLIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 1007, 1016 (i).

FREDERICTON MILITARY BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).

FREE LIST, CHANGES IN TARIFF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 817 (i).

FREE PASSES, I.C.R.: M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret., 2337.

FREEPORT, N.S., LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).

FREIGHT CARS OF I.C.R. ON CONNECTING LINES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Haggart*) 3805 (ii).

FREIGHT CLASSIFICATION (CANADIAN), O.Cs,' &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 3302 (ii).

FREIGHT RATES BETWEEN CAN. AND G.B.: (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7582 (iv).

FREIGHT RATES, I.C.R., CLASSES 1-10: M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret.*, 2338 (i).

FREIGHT RATES ON COMMODITIES TO G.B.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) in Com. of Sup., 7582 (iv).

—— DISCRIMINATION BETWEEN CAN. AND U.S. FREIGHT: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 13674 (vi).

—— PROVISION IN CONTRACT *re* DISCRIMINATION: (Remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13677 (vi).

FRENCH CANADIAN IMMIGRATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6674 (iii).

FRENCH CANADIAN REPATRIATION: in Com. of Sup., 6700 (iii).

FRIARS HEAD, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).

FROZEN FISH, &C., P.E.I.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13520 (vi).

FROZEN FISH SHIPPERS, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 13373 (vi).

—— LOSSES, &C., PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3394 (ii).

FRUDES POINT, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).

FRUIT INSPECTORS, BUYING APPLES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13508 (vi). *See* 'Anderson.'

FRUIT SHIPMENTS IN COLD STORAGE TO EUROPE, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 3805 (ii).

—— VALUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 3232 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. B. No. 86 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 1°*, 1023; on Order for 2°, 2387 (i); 2° m., 2788, 3257, 3807 (ii).

—— **B. No. 130** (Mr. *Henderson*) 1°*, 1936 (i); 2° m., 3285, 3823 (ii).

FUEL CONTRACT, INTEREST *re* UNPAID ACCOUNTS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5318 (iii).

FUMIGATING STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 4434 (ii), 13502 (vi).

FURNESS-WITHY CO., SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).

FYFE, MR., INSPECTION REP. *re* GRAIN THRESHING SCALE: Remarks *re*, 4192 (ii).

—— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).

GABAROUSE, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).

GAGETOWN MAIL CONTRACT, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1676 (i).

GALICIAN IMMIGRANTS *re* N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iii).

GALOPS CANAL, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv), 12899, 14141 (vi).

—— SURVEYS, LIFTING BOULDERS: in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).

—— DAM: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 12608 (v).

—— RAPIDS CHANNEL, DEEPENING, &C.: M. to conc. (Mr. *Fielding*) agreed to (Y., 36; N., 14) 8403 (iv).

—— COMPLETION OF CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 8268 (iv), 14644 (vi).

GANANOQUE ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 970(i).

—— CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4823 (ii).

—— CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3791, 3897 (ii).

—— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1371 (i).

GARDEN PRODUCTS, READJUSTMENT OF DUTY, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Léonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4766; Neg. (Y., 51; N., 100) 4799 (ii).

Debate: (Mr. *Speaker*) Members' remarks checked, 4768, 4779; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 4768; (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 4770; (Mr. *Holmes*) 4771; (Mr. *Monk*) 4772; (Mr. *Ethier*) 4777; (Mr. *Speaker* members' remarks checked, 4779; (Mr. *Henderson*) 4782; (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) 4784; (Mr.

GARDEN PRODUCTS—*Con.*

Debate—*Con.*

Fielding) 4785; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4789; (Mr. *Campbell*) 4792; (Mr. *Broder*) 4796; (Mr. *Macpherson*) 4798 (ii).

GAS BUOYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi).

See 'Marine.'

Gas, Dom., Improvement Bill: *See* 'Dom. Gas.'

GASPE AND DALHOUSIE SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 7756 (iv).

Gaspe and Western Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 166 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii); in Com., 5890; 3°*, 5891 (iii).

GASPEREAUX HARBOUR, GRAHAM'S POND: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).

GATE LIFTER, WILLIAMSBURG CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).

GATES OVER RY. CROSSINGS: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Bill (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 5775 (iii).

GATINEAU RIVER, PROTECTION BANK, C. P. R. BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup. 13457 (vi).

GAUDET, MR., COMPILATION OF ACADIAN HISTORY: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).

GAYNOR & GREENE EXTRADITION: M. for Copies of Cor. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 109 (i).

GENELLE *vs.* THE KING, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6795 (iii).

General Inspection Act (hides) Amt. B. No. 48 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1° m., 592; 2° m., 1065 (i); 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 2786 (ii).

——— **(Weigh Masters) Amt. B. No. 266** (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Res. prop., 13264; in Com. on Res., 13807; 1°* of B., 13808; 2°, and in Com., 14311; 3°*, 14313 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 24).

GENERAL STATEMENT, I. C. R.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Blair*) 3633 (ii).

See 'I. C. R.'

GENERAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

G. O. C., APPNMT., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3779 (ii).

——— LORD DUNDONALD'S SPEECH AT HAMILTON: Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 2399 (i).

——— REP. *re* DEFENCE SCHEME: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3763 (ii).

——— REP., &C., PUBLISHMENT OF: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 669 (i).

See 'Militia Act Amt.'

GEOLOGICAL CONGRESS, VISIT TO CANADA: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 8116 (iv).

GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 11188 (v).

GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 352 (i), 6824 (iii).

——— VICTORIA MEMORIAL: in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).

——— EXPLORATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iii).

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, PLOTS, PLANS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6826 (iii).

——— REP.: Presented (Sir. *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13373 (vi).

——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v), 13769 (vi

GEO. M. DEPEW: *See* 'Depew.'

GEORGEVILLE, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com of Sup., 13198 (vi).

GEORGIAN BAY CANAL: Remarks in Com. of Sup. 13340 (vi).

See 'Ottawa and Georgian Bay.'

GEORGIAN BAY ISLANDS, SALE, &C.: in Com. of Sup. 6410 (iii).

GERALD, MR., INLAND REV. DEPT., PRESCOTT, INCREASE OF SALARY: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 13968, 13978 (vi).

GERMAN CONSUL BOPP, COR. WITH CAN. GOVT. *re* FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).

See 'German Tariff.'

GERMAN GOODS (TEAPOT) IMPORTED UNDER PREFERENTIAL TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. on Customs Act, 3056 (ii).

GERMANS RECRUITED IN CANADA FOR NAVAL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 8718 (iv).

German Surtax Bill: *See* 'Customs.'

GERMAN SURTAX: in Com. on Ways and Means, 14755 (vi).

GERMAN SURTAX, PURCHASES PREVIOUS TO IMPOSITION: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3394 (ii).

GERMAN TARIFF, COR., &C.: Papers laid on Table, 1460 (i).

——— DISCRIMINATION AND BOND-HAY TREATY: Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 1324 (i).

——— Lord Strathcona's Letter in Budget Speech, 1413 (i).

——— Mr. Fielding's Memorandum *re* Mr. Bopp in Budget Speech, 1414 (i).

'Gerrymander' Bill: *See* 'Representation.'

GLACE BAY, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).

——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13184 (vi).

GLASS FACTORY, PICTOU: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6723 (iii).

GLENGARRY SCOTTISH DEMONSTRATION: *See* 'Dundonald, Lord.'

GLOCKLING, MR. ROBERT, COR. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 6728 (iii).

GODERICH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13240 (vi).

——— HARBOUR WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1365 (i).

GOLD COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, DAWSON CITY, DEFALCATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iii).

See 'Yukon.'

GOLD NUGGETS, EXHIBITION AT GLASGOW: in Com. of Sup., 4612 (ii).

GOODERICH, MR., REMOVAL FROM MURRAY CANAL: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) in Com. of Sup., 14144 (vi).

Good Shepherd Reformatory St. John, N.B., B. No. 199 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°m., 4178; 2°, and in Com., 4840; 3°*, 4842 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 25).

GOODS IMPORTED DIRECT INTO CAN., VALUE OF DUTY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 12716 (vi).

GOODWIN, GEO., COMPENSATION *re* SOULANGES CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).

GORDON HIGHLANDERS' TROPHY: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 7253 (iii).

GORE'S LANDING WHARF, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 13244 (vi).

GOUINLOCK, GEO. W., LETTER *re* CONTRACT FOR TORONTO P. O.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).

GOVT. APPOINTMENTS OF MEMBERS OF HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3632 (ii).

GOVT. BUILDINGS, OTTAWA, REP. *re* MARTINEAU INVESTIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 4673 (ii).

GOVT. BUSINESS FURTHER LEGISLATION: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13559 (vi).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 13547 (vi).

—— PRECEDENCE ON MONDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3708 (ii).

—— PRECEDENCE ON WEDNESDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1114 (i).

—— PRECEDENCE ON THURSDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 940 (i).

—— PRIVATE MEMBERS' DAY: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 1343 (i).

—— REDISTRIBUTION BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 204 (i).
See 'Business of the Hse.'

GOVT. CONTRACTS TENDERS *re*: Par. in Ottawa *Free Press* (Mr. *Clarke*) 8405 (iv).

GOVT. LANDS: *See* 'Lands.'

GOVT. POLICY *re* DIVISION OF PUBLIC WORKS: *See* 'Public Works Transfer.'

GOVT. PROPERTY DESTROYED BY FIRE: *See* 'Mortimer & Co.'

GOVT. RY. POLICY, DELAY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7298 (iii).
See 'G. T. P. R.'

Govt. Rys., Supplies to: *See* 'Railway Act.'

Govt. Savings Bank: *See* 'Post office.'

GOVT. STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).

—— NAMES OF COMMANDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 446 (i).

—— REPAIRS TO 'STANLEY' AND 'LANSDOWNE': in Com. of Sup., 13518 (vi).

—— SUPPLIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4047, 5033 (ii).
See 'Marine.'

GOVT. STEAMER TO REPLACE 'ACADIA,' &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13659 (vi).

GOV. GEN'S OFFICE, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

GOV. GEN.'S SPEECH AT CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE BANQUET: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 10100 (v).

GRAHAM *vs.* KING, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES *re* PUBLIC WORKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13471 (vi).

Grain Bill: *See* 'Man. Grain Act,' 'General Inspection B. 266.'

GRAIN CARRIED BY C.P.R. TO ST. JOHN, QUANTITY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).

GRAIN IMPORTATIONS THROUGH WESTERN LAKE PORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 97 (i).

GRAIN INSPECTION, COST PER CAR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4837 (ii).

GRAIN INSPECTION *re* STANDARD SAMPLES, RES. OF TORONTO BOARD OF TRADE: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 11177 (v).

—— OFFICIAL GRAIN WEIGHERS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12535 (v).

Grain Scales: *See* 'Weights and Measures B. 188.'

GRAIN SHIPMENTS FROM PORT ARTHUR AND FT. WILLIAM: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 542 (i).

GRAIN STANDARD WEIGHING MACHINES: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com. on B. 188, 4187 (ii).

GRAIN TRAFFIC FROM N.W.T.: *See* Ry. Transportation from N.W.T.

GRAIN WEIGHING MACHINES: in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).
See 'Automatic.'

GRAND BEND, ONT., BREAKWATER PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).

GRAND ETANG BRIDGE ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).

GRANDE RIVIÈRE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).

GRANDE VALLEE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1514-1574 (i); Conc., 6070 (iii).

GRAND MANAN, BREAKWATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).

GRAND MANAN AND MAINLAND SS. SUBVENTIONS in Com. of Sup., 7742 (iv).

GRAND NARROWS, BRIDGE PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14094 (vi).

—— WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).

—— WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i).

GRAND PILES, DAM: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).

GRAND RIVER, DREDGING AT DUNNVILLE: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 12497 (v), 13027 (vi).

GRAND RIVER, N.S., IMPROVEMENTS TO ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i).

GRAND RIVER WHARF, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); M. for Com., 4132; M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 4441, 4586; M. for Com., 4871 (ii); in Com., 5139 (iii); 7814; 3° m., 8055, 8321 (iv). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 122).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RY. CO.'S INCORP. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 3° m., 8055, 8321; amt. (Mr. *Fowler*) 8055, 8321; Amt. (Mr. *Kemp*) 8066; Amt. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 8065; (Mr. *Wilmot*) 8067; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 8324; Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) 8326 (iv).

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Subsidy B. No. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1° m., 7658; Res. prop., 7915; M. for Com. on Res., 8406, 8488, 8559, 8617, 8656, 8718, 8808, 8918, 9082, 9152, 9218, 9351, 9431, 9459, 9582, 9683, 9820, 9980 (iv); 10102, 10243; agreed to (Y. 117; N. 71) 10408; in Com. on Res., 10411; 2°, and in Com. on B. 10412, 10538, 11190, 11302, 11833, 11959, 12074, 12146, 12221 (v); 3° m., 12612, 12720 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 71).

—— AGREEMENT B. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*): Remarks, 8086 (iv).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY CO.'S SUBSIDY B. NO. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1° m., 7658; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7697; Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) 7726; Ruling reserved (Mr. *Speaker*) 7727 (iv).

Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 7915; (M.) for Com. on Res., 8406 (iv).

Debate: (Mr. *Blair*) 8406; (Mr. *Charlton*) 8467, 8489; (Mr. *Monk*) 8526; (Mr. *Fielding*) 8546; (Mr. *Barker*) 8593; (Mr. *Sifton*) 8617; (Mr. *Haggart*) 8680; (Mr. *Emmerson*) 8706, 8718; (Mr. *Sproule*) 8746; (Mr. *Lemieux*) 8776; (Mr. *Oliver*) 8805; (Mr. *Lennox*) 8808; (Mr. *Morrison*) 8859; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 8874; (Mr. *Russell*) 8907. 8919; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 8961; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 9006; (Mr. *Northrup*) 9039; (Mr. *Costigan*) 9064; (Mr. *Guthrie*) 9082; (Mr. *Puttee*) 9120; (Mr. *Kemp*) 9152; (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) 9183; (Mr. *Bennett*) 9198; (Mr. *Macpherson*) 9218; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 9228; (Mr. *Logan*) 9238; (Mr. *Osler*) 9281; (Mr. *Heyd*) 9305; (Mr. *Ganong*) 9327; (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 9351; (Mr. *Wilson*) 9367; (Mr. *Broder*) 9394; (Mr. *Mackie*) 9414; (Mr. *Lavell*) 9431; (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*) 9447; (Mr. *Hackett*) 9459; (Mr. *Talbot*) 9472; (Mr. *Blain*) 9495; (Mr. *Fisher*) 9512; (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 9529; (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 9553; (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 9573; (Mr. *Ross, Victoria*) 9583; (Mr. *Porter*) 9597; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 9622; (Mr. *Tarte*) 9640; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 9666; (Mr. *Clancy*) 9683; (Mr. *German*) 9708; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 9727; (Sir *William Mulock*) 9751; (Mr. *Bell*) 9784; (Mr. *Wade*) 9820; (Mr. *Brock*) 9871; (Mr. *Malouin*) 9882; (Mr. *MacLaren, Perth*) 9898; (Mr. *Bureau*) 9906; (Mr. *Lancaster*) 9909; (Mr. *Ross, Ont.*) 9927; (Mr. *Henderson*) 9942; (Mr. *Stephens*) 9963; (Mr. *Wilmot*) 9980; (Mr. *Girard*) 9992; (Mr. *Ward*) 10010; (Mr. *Davis*) 10019; (Mr. *Richardson*) 10040; (Mr. *Holmes*) 10049; (Mr. *Clare*) 10060; (Mr. *Archambault*) 10071; (Mr. *Boyd*) 10076; (Mr. *Johnston, Lambton*) 10096 (iv); (Mr. *Vrooman*) 10102; (Mr. *Murray*) 10111; (Mr. *Pringle*) 10118; (Mr. *Maclaren, Huntingdon*) 10139; (Mr. *Henry Cargill*) 10146; (Mr. *Parmelee*) 10157; (Mr. *Ball*) 10165; (Mr. *Scott*) 10173; (Mr. *Birkett*) 10216; (Mr. *Beland*) 10224; (Mr. *Stewart*) 10235; (Mr. *Fowler*) 10243; (Mr. *Paterson*) 10275; (Mr. *Clarke*) 10308, 10317; (Mr. *Angers*) 10349; (Mr. *Gourley*) 10353 (v).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC, &C.—*Con.*

Notice of Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax.*) by (Mr. *Monk*) 10315; Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) neg. (Y. 68; N. 119) 10403; Amt. (Mr. *Puttee*) neg. (Y. 50; N. 135) 10404; Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) neg. (Y. 70; N. 117) 10406; M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) agreed to (Y. 117; N. 71) 10407 (v).

3° m., 12612, 12644 (vi).

Debate: (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12612; (amt.) 12642; neg. (Y. 37; N. 75) 12690; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12644; (Mr. *Sproule*) 12657; (Mr. *Haggart*) 12676; (Mr. *Osler*) Amt., 12691; (Mr. *Fielding*) 12694; (Mr. *Broder*) 12695; (Mr. *Taylor*) 12697; (Mr. *Paterson*) 12698; (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 12699; (Mr. *Johnston, C.B.*) 12700; (Mr. *Richardson*) 12701; neg. (Y. 39; N. 78) 12702; (Mr. *Alcorn*) Amt., 12703; neg. (Y. 35; N. 75) 12705; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) Amt., 12706; neg. (Y. 34; N. 74) 12709; (Mr. *Fowler*) Amt., 12709; (Mr. *Northrup*) Amt., 12711; (Mr. *Lancaster*) 12720, Amt., 12721; (Mr. *Blain*) Amt., 12724; (Mr. *Kemp*) 12729; (Mr. *Emmerson*) 12731; (Mr. *Hale*) 12733; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 12734; (Mr. *Talbot*) 12736; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 12736; (Mr. *Hackett*) 12740; (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 12743; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12743; (Mr. *Fowler*) 12744; (Mr. *Taylor*) Amt., 12750; (Mr. *Paterson*) 12755; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12755; (Mr. *Haggart*) 12757; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12758; (Mr. *Bennett*) 12761; (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 12761; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 12762; (Mr. *Bennett*) Amt., 12767; (Mr. *Barker*) Amt., 12768; (Mr. *Charlton*) 12770; (Mr. *Henderson*) Amt., 12770; (Mr. *Bell*) Amt., 12772; (Mr. *Morin*) Amt., 12774 (vi).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Sproule*) Irregularity of Introduction of Bill, 7726 (iv), 12774; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 12744 (vi).

G. T. P. RY., ALTERNATIVE POLICY OF MR. BORDEN, HALIFAX: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 13028 (vi).

—— COMPARISON OF DIFFERENT SYSTEMS: Remarks (Mr. *Cargill*) in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).

—— CONTRACTS *re* EASTERN PORTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 13027 (vi).

—— DISTRIBUTION OF BILL TO MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Wilson*) 8918 (iv).

—— FRENCH TRANSLATION OF BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Léonard*) 8118 (iv).

—— GOVT. POLICY, DELAY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6805, 6921, 7298, 7399 (iii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 7487 (iii).

—— M. (Mr. *Lennox*) to adjn. Debate, 8806 (iv).

—— M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 447 (i).

—— MOUNTAINS CROSSED: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8117 (iv).

—— PARISHES CROSSED, LEVIS TO TEMISCOUATA: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8117 (iv).

—— PETS. *re* IRREGULARITIES, AFFIDAVITS, &C.: Par. in Montreal *Star* (Mr. *Talbot*) 14845; Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14846 (vi).

—— PETS. *re*: M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13265 (vi).

—— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) 13266; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 13266 (vi).

—— PETS. *re*, MEETINGS OF COM. ON PRIVS. AND ELECTS.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13559, 13671 (vi).

—— Remarks *re* (Mr. *Marcil, Bagot*) 12941 (vi).

G. T. P. Ry. Ques. of Order (Mr. *Johnston, C.B.*) Member reading Speech, 10249; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*), 10250 (v).
—— Subsidies : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 671, 1031 (i).
—— Subsidy : Par. in Ottawa *Journal* (Mr. *Kemp*) 5733 (iii).
—— Par. in Toronto *Globe re* Details (Mr. *Haggart*) 5892 (iii).
—— Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi).
—— Mr. Hays Statement *re*, Par. in Montreal *Star*, 14648 (vi).
—— Surveys, 'Business System,' &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14355 (vi).
—— Surveys, Plans, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 8230 (iv).
—— Surveys, Reps. of Surveyors, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14765 (vi).
—— Surveys, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. *Fielding*) 14765 (vi).
—— Two-Cent Rate, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 10462 (iv).
—— Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) 12221 (v).
See 'G.T.R.'
—— Par. in Toronto *Globe*, 5892 (iii).
—— and Trans Canada, Sale, &c.: Par. in Toronto *News* : Read (Mr. *Monk*) 7566 (iv).

Grand Trunk Ry. B. No. 29 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 1°*, 367 ; 2°*, 631 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII* ; *c.* 121).

G. T. Ry. and C.P.R. Fiscal Policy : Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) in Com. of Sup., 12884 (vi).
G.T.R. and I.C.R. Traffic Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 2759 (ii).
G. T. Ry. Co., Discriminating Rates between Canadians and Americans : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 10745 (v).
—— Loans by Fed. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 2920 (ii).
—— Rentals from I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vi).
—— Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
—— Terminals at St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 13495 (vi).
—— Two-Cent Rate, Repeal of Clause in Charter : Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 11556, 11828 (v).
—— Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) in Com. on B. 235, 12221 (v).
See 'G.T.P.Ry.'
Granite Village, N.S., Mooring Pier : in Com. of Sup., (vi).
Grant, J. G., Barrie Customs Collector, Default, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5991 (iii).

Graves, Florence D. Relief B. No. 214 (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 5581 ; 2°*, 5989 ; in Com., and 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 123).

Grazing Lands, N.W.T., Lease to Geo. McDonnell, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 8330 (iv).

G.B. and Can. Mail Service : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv), 13672 (vi).
See 'Can. and G. B.'
Great North-West Central Ry. and C. P. Ry. Co.'s Agreement : Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 2306 (i).

Great North West Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 38 (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 541 ; 2°*, 665 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 124).

Great Salmon River, Groyne and Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
'Grecian,' Str., Reimbursement to Capt. Harrison *re* Suspension of Certificate, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 10239 (v).
Green Cove Boat Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 1100 (i).
Grenville Canal, Guide Pier at Entrance : in Com. ot Sup., 12909 (vi).
—— Payment to Henry Tucker *re* Investigations : in Com. of Sup., 14156 (vi).
Grey Counties, Census Enumerators : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4826 (ii).
Grey County, List of Public Buildings wanted : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5835 (iii).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Station : in Com. of Sup., 425 (i).
—— Supplies *re* Quarantine Service : in Com. of Sup., 5496 (iii).
Guay, Mr. A., Compensation for Loss of Horse : in Com. of Sup., 5406 (iii).

Guelph and Georgian Bay Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 125 (Mr. *Guthrie*) 1°*, 1764 ; 2°*, 2050 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 125).

Guelph, Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 13083 (vi).
—— Post Office Building : in Com. of Sup., 637 (i).
Guilbault, Mr. Edward, Gratuity to Widow : in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
Gull Habbour, St. George's Bay, Man., Wharf Extension : in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
Guns ordered by British Army : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).
Guysborough, N.S., Public Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 5839 (iii).
Haanel, Dr., Supt. of Mines, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13764, 13774 (vi).
Hagar, Miss, Appnmt. at Experimental Farm : Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 5316 (iii).
Haldimand, Census Enumerator : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4822 (ii).
Half-Breed Claims, Commissions, Applications for Scrip, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 110 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2016 (i), 3397 (ii).
—— Schools, Salaries paid, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iii).

HALIFAX AND CANSO MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 6002 (iii).
HALIFAX AND LIVERPOOL MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 7730 (iv).
See 'Can. and G. B.,' 'Mail Subsidies,' &c.
HALIFAX AND SOUTH-WESTERN RY. CLAIMS FOR LABOUR, MATERIAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14332 (vi).
—— AND SOUTH-WESTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14330 (vi).
—— COTTON CO., LOAN OF RAILS TO, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14477 (vi).
—— CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13031 (vi).
—— DEEP-WATER TERMINUS, I.C.R., DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi).
—— ELEVATOR, LAND PURCHASE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12825 (vi).
—— HARBOUR BUOY SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).
—— HARBOUR LIGHTSHIP: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4165 (ii).
—— IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13033 (vi).
—— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8316 (iv), 12597 (v), 12824, 12874, 14080 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12874 (vi).
—— MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPT., REMOVAL, &C., RES. FROM HALIFAX BOARD OF TRADE: Read (Mr. *Bell*) 14279 (vi).
—— MUSEUM, REMOVAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com of Sup., 13032 (vi).
—— POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES, PET. *re* INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on conc., 14759 (vi).
—— SALARY INCREASES: in Com. of Sup., 6004 (iii).
—— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 411 (i).
—— QUARANTINE STATION, LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
—— TIME BALL: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).
—— WHARF, LAND PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).
HALL'S HARBOUR, N.S., IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).
HALTON, PEEL AND CARDWELL, CENSUS SCHEDULES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6436, 6894 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 7092 (iii).
Hamilton, &c., Power Co.: *See* 'Jordan Light, &c.'
Hamilton, Berlin and Collingwood Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 149 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4587; 3°*, 4587 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 126.)
HAMILTON, DRILL HALL, ADDITIONAL LAND: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).
—— ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER CO., RENTAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 3803 (ii).
—— GRIMSBY ELECTRIC RY.: Remarks (Mr. *Lancaster*) 6084 (iii).
HAMILTON INLAND REVENUE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
—— POST OFFICE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, MONTREAL, LOAN B. NO. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 5417 (iii).
See 'Montreal.'
HARBOUR AND RIVERS AND BRIDGES, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1369 (i).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i), 5916 (iii), 13304 (vi).
—— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (ii).
See 'Public Works.'
—— GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii), 13308 (vi).
—— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i), 3354 (ii).
—— MAR. PROVS., GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 1185 (i).
—— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i), 5894 (iii), 13005, 13227 (vi).
—— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1068, 1133 (i), 13141 (vi).
—— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 1185, 1352, 1424 (i), 3341, 3368 (ii), 5909 (iii), 13012, 13235 (vi).
—— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i), 13218 (vi).
—— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 1512, 2241 (i), 3304 (ii), 5896 (iii), 12845, 13445 (vi).
—— YUKON TER.: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).
HARDY BAY, B.C., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5916 (iii), 13305 (vi).
HARRISON, CAPT., STR. *Grecian*, COSTS *re* SUSPENSION OF CERTIFICATE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 10239 (v).
HARRISON, MR., INSPECTOR OF FISHERIES, N.B., RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 288 (i).
HARVEY AND SALISBURY BRANCH RY., SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com. on Res., 14471 (vi).
HATCHEY, NAZAIRE, APPNMT. AS HARBOUR MASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).
HATFIELDS POINT LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).
HAULAGE OF GOVT., &C., CARS, AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9682 (iv).
HAWK POINT INLET, N.S., BOAT CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
HAWKESBURY, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii).
—— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup, 13119 (vi).
HAWKESBURY, ONT., TO SOUTH INDIAN, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14343 (vi).
HAWKESTONE WHARF, GOVT AID *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13453 (vi).
HAY AND OATS BOUGHT BY CAN. GOVT. FOR IMPERIAL GOVT.: M. for Ret. (Mr *Monk*) 676, 688; Neg. (Y. 35; N. 66) 690 (i).
—— M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) for Ret., 1057 (i).
HAYCOCK, MR. J., APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR OF BINDER TWINE: in Com. of Sup., 7763, 7772 (iv).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4960 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 4959 (ii), 5588 (iii).

HAZELTON HOSPITAL GRANT: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).

HEALTH ACT, PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4440 (ii).

HEATH, GEO., COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES: in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).

HENRY, MR. JUSTICE, RETIRING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 14662 (vi).

'HERALD' PRINTING CO., MONTREAL, PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 8329 (vi); Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Fisher*) 5314 (iii).

HERCHMER, MR. L. W., PENSION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 5321 (iii).

HERRING COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).

HÊTU, RUDOLPH, RELEASE OF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 7915 (iv).

Hides Inspection Bill: *See* 'General Inspection.'

HIDES INSPECTION, TEL. FROM W. F. MACLEAN, M.P.: Read (Mr. *Sproule*) 3969 (ii).

HIDES INSPECTION AT QUEBEC, GEO. ROY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3627 (ii).

HIDES, TRADE WITH AUSTRALIA: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 7748 (iv), 13678 (vi).

HIGGINS SHORE PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i), 13222 (vi).

HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup, 12585 (v).

—— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13772 (vi).

HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 12829, 14108, 14115 (vi).

—— CONTRACTORS AGREEMENT, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. Mr. *Hackett*) 2758 (ii).

—— CONTRACTORS NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2584 (ii).

—— PREPARATION OF CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4444 (ii).

HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD, PAINTING OF PORTRAIT BY CANADIAN ARTIST: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 13026 (vi).

HISTORICAL DATA *re* ACADIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).

HNAUSA WHARF EXTENSION, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).

HOG CHOLERA, OUTBREAK IN BRUCE: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).

—— OUTBREAK IN YARMOUTH, ONT.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Ingram*) 1058 (i).

HOLT, MR., APPNMT. AS JUDGE OF HURON COUNTY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

See 'Cattle Guard Comn.'

Home Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 191 (Mr. *Russell*) 1°*, 3970; 2°*, 4132 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 127.)

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND: Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 720 (i).

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND—*Con.*

Debate: (Mr. *Hackett*) 731; (Mr. *Charleton*) 734; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 740; (Mr. *Sproule*) 742; (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 751; (Mr. *Broder*) 754; (Mr. *Belcourt*) 758; (Mr. *Richardson*) 761; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 763; (Mr. *Kemp*) 766; (Mr. *Murray*) 767; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 769; (Mr. *Wright*) 772; (Mr. *Ross, Victoria*) 772; (Mr. *Porter*) 775; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 778; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 782; (Mr. *Sherritt*) 787; (Mr. *Reid*) 787; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 788; (Mr. *Clarke* 794; (Mr. *Ingram*) 809 (i).

—— PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 871 (i).

—— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to present Address to His Maj., 1193 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13894 (vi).

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, FREE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).

—— *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6704 (iii).

—— INSPECTORS: in Com. of Sup., 6766 (iii).

—— LANDS AVAILABLE FOR SETTLERS: Statement read (Mr. *Sifton*) 6787 (iii).

See 'Immigration.'

HOPEWELL CAPE, N.B., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).

HOSPITALS FOR TREATMENT OF TRACHOMA, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 14245 (vi).

See 'Trachoma.'

HOSPITALS OF ISOLATION, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 5845 (iii).

'HOT AIR LINE' RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. of Res., 14490 (vi).

HOUSE OF COMMONS:

ACCOMMODATION FOR MEMBERS: *See* 'Rooms,' &c.

BEAUHARNOIS ELECTORAL DISTRICT, REPRESENTATION AND INDEPENDENCE OF PARLT. ACT: M. (Mr. *Monk*) to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com., 7095 (iii).

—— *See* 'Loy, Geo. M.'

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE, PRIVATE BILLS PROCEDURE: Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5138 (iii).

—— *See* general heading.

CARGILL, HENRY, LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12937 (vi).

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Notification of Appnmt. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

CONSERVATIVE LITERATURE: *See* 'Mail Bags,' &c.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, CERTIFICATES, &C.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

DOOR-KEEPER'S SALARY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14115 (vi).

ELECTION LAW, LEGISLATION *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).

ELECTION PAMPHLETS, FRANKING, &C.: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

ELECTION PETITIONS, JUDGMENT OF SUPREME COURT: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 91 (i).

ELECTIONS OF 1878, CONGRATULATIONS TO PRIME MINISTER (Mr. *Sproule*) 11690 (v).

ELEVATOR ACCIDENT: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 5417 (iii).

FARQUHARSON, MR., late M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5512 (iii).

FLINT, T. B., CLERK OF HSE., APPNMT.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

FRANKING PRIVILEGE *re* CAMPAIGN LITERATURE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 14286 (vi).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

FRANKING PRIVILEGES : *See* 'Mail Bags.'

GOVT. APPOINTMENTS OF MEMBERS OF HOUSE : Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3632 (ii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS, BETTER ACCOMMODATION *re* ROOMS : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13007 (vi).

——— INCREASES TO CLERKS : in Com. of Sup., 5265 (iii), 14112 (vi).

——— LOCKED P.O. BOXES : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Vic.*) in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iii).

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT ACT : *See* 'Loy, Geo. M.'

——— *See* 'Schell, J. T.'

LAVAL, ELECTORAL DISTRICT, SUPREME COURT JUDGMENTS : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

LEGISLATION, HOUSE OF COMMONS : in Com. of Sup., 14112 (vi).

LIBRARY OF PARLT. : in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).

——— DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 6 (i).

See general heading.

LOY, GEO. M., INDEPENDENCE OF PARLT. ACT, &C. : on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections, 8008 ; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 8008 (iv).

——— *See* 'Beauharnois Electoral District.'

——— REP. OF COM. ON PRIVS. AND ELECTIONS : Presented (Mr. *Fraser*) 7203 (iii).

MAIL BAGS AND CAMPAIGN LITERATURE, BLOCKING CORRIDORS : Remarks (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 14219 (vi).

See general heading.

MARTINEAU, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF : Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 10242 (v).

MEMBERS APPOINTED TO GOVT. POSITION : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3805 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3632 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 9582 (iv).

MEMBERS INTRODUCED : 3, 7, 283, 1642 (i).

——— CERTIFICATES OF ELECTION : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 3, 367 (i).

MEMBERS' RIGHTS TO SPEAK *re* MR. SPEAKER'S RULING : Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 10535 (v).

MESSENGERS OF THE H. OF C. : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).

——— *See* 'House.'

MESS. FROM HIS EX. : Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 90, 707 (i). 4956 (ii), 12868, 14042, 14662 (vi).

——— Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 90, 707 (i), 4956 (ii), 14042, 14662 (vi).

——— Read (*Dep. Speaker*) 12869 (vi).

ONTARIO ELECTORAL DISTRICT, CERTIFICATE : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 367 (i).

ORDER, QUES. OF, *re* BRUNET AND DOM. ELECTIONS : Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 108 (i).

OTTAWA PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, ADDITIONAL ROOMS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 13006 (vi).

PARLIAMENT, DATE OF CONVENING, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 462 (i), 14853 (vi).

PARLIAMENT GROUNDS, DUST NUISANCE, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 2104 (i).

——— PLAYING CRICKET : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 2398, 2421 (i).

PERKINS, WM., PAYMENT TO, *re* LISGAR ELECTION : in Com. of Sup., 14251 (vi).

PETITIONS, PRESENTATION OF, RULES, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 6 (i).

PETITIONS REJECTED AS CONTRARY TO RULE 86 : (Mr. *Speaker*) 654 (i).

PRESS REPRESENTATIVES IN GALLERY OF H. OF C., SESSIONAL SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 14114, 14242 (vi).

PRIME MINISTER, CONGRATULATIONS *re* TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AS A MEMBER : (Mr. *Sproule*) 11690 (v).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE,' PRINTING : *See* general heading.

PRIVATE BILLS : M. (Mr. *Morrison*) to extend Time, 10489 (v).

——— M. to suspend Rule (Mr. *Russell*) 4958 (ii).

——— NOTICES, REVISING RULES *re* : M. (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) *re* Rep. of Joint. Com., 13547 (vi).

——— *See* 'Rules.'

——— ORDER FOR PROCEDURE : Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5138 (iii).

PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* VISITORS IN CORRIDORS, 11557 (v).

——— *See* 'Visitors.'

——— (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) *re* ATTENDANCE IN HOUSE, 2015 (i).

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS, DISTRIBUTION TO BOARDS OF TRADE : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 1378 (i).

——— *See* 'Parliamentary Documents.'

QUEENS, WEST, P.E.I. REPRESENTATION *re* : Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13378 (vi).

ROOMS FOR MEMBERS, FURNITURE, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 5265 (iii).

——— *See* 'House,' &c.

RULES OF HSE., REVISION, &C. *re* PETS. FOR PRIVATE BILLS : M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Demers*) 4441 (ii).

——— M. (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) to amend, 12216 (v).

——— *See* 'Private Bills.'

RUSSELL ELECTORAL DIVISION : Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 1023 (i).

ST. JAMES (MONTREAL) ELECTORAL DIVISION, JUDGMENT OF SUP. COURT : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

——— ISSUE OF WARRANT : M. (Mr. *Monk*) 707, 940 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13303 (vi).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 409 (i), 6995 (iii), 13376 (vi).

——— NOTIFICATION OF VACANCY : (Mr. *Speaker*) 1023 (i).

——— *See* 'Brunet.'

SCHELL, J. T., M.P., 1ST REP. OF PRIVS. AND ELECTIONS COM. *re* : Presented (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*) 5511 (iii).

SESSIONAL CLERKS, H. OF C. : in Com. of Sup., 14242 (vi).

——— INCREASES TO, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) in Com. of Sup., 14113 (vi).

——— MESSENGERS : in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).

See 'Messengers.'

SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE, DATE OF MEETING : M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 462 (i), 14853 (vi).

SITTINGS OF HOUSE : *See* 'Govt. Business.'

TRADESMEN'S ACCOUNTS FOR H. OF C. : in Com. of Sup., 14115 (vi).

VACANCIES IN ELECTORAL DISTRICTS : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2, 1023 (i).

VENTILATION IN H. OF C. : in Com. of Sup., 975 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) in Com. of Sup., 13007 (vi).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 4362 (ii), 6406 (iii).

VISITORS IN H. OF C. CORRIDORS : Remarks (Mr. *Lennox*) 11427 (v).

——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Lennox*) 11557 (v).

VOTERS' LISTS, CONTINGENT EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 5274 (iii).

WALLACE, DAVID WARDROPE, MEMBER FOR ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF RUSSELL : Introduced, 1642 (i).

HOWIE, F. W., LEGAL EXPENSES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6795 (iii).

Hudson's Bay, Change of Name B. No. 173 (Mr. *Maclean*) 1° m., 2794 (ii).

Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Co.'s B. No. 124 (Mr. *Stewart*) 1°*, 1764; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3752 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 129.)

Hudson's Bay and Western Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 117 (Mr. *Haggart*) 1°*, 1642; 2°*, 1816 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 128.)
See 'James Bay.'

HULL AND UNION BRIDGES, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).

HULL WHARF, COMPLETION: in Com. of Sup., 5900 (iii).

HUNGARIAN IMMIGRATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6694 (iii).

HUNTER, J. B., PROMOTION: in Com. of Sup., 13499 (vi).

HURLEY, J. M., APPNMT., DUTIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5123 (iii), 5280 (iii).
——— REP., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5740 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 13744 (vi).

HURON COUNTY JUDGESHIP: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

Huron, Erie and Buffalo Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 123 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 1764; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., 4588; 3°*, 4588 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 131.)

Huron and Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. No. 60 (Mr. *Ross, Ontario*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 1327; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 130.)

HUTTON, MAJ.-GEN., INQUIRY FOR RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 206 (i).

HYDRAULIC DREDGE FOR MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (ii), 13312 (vi).

HYDRAULIC LEASES, YUKON TER.: M. for Cor.*, (Mr. *Bell*) 288 (i).
——— O.C.'s &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Ross, Yukon*) 1323 (i).

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 2715, 2720, 4118 (ii).

IMMIGRATION, &C., INADEQUATE INSPECTION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Wilson*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6546; (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 6557; (Mr. *Oliver*) 6562: (Mr. *Puttee*) 6567; (Mr. *Richardson*) 6573; (Mr. *Ross, N.S.*) 6576; (Mr. *Bell*) 6577; (Mr. *Sproule*) 6590; (Mr. *Davis*) 6596; (Mr. *Sifton*) 6603 (iii).

IMMIGRATION:

ACCOMMODATION FOR SETTLERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) on M. for Sup., 1119 (i).
AGENCIES IN OLD COUNTRY: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 6726 (iii).
AGENCIES, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6615, 6658 (iii).
BARR COLONY, IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
——— NUMBER, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6696 (iii).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

BARR COLONY, BUILDINGS, GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
See 'general heading.'
——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 5844 (iii).
CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE DELEGATES, TREATMENT BY U.S. IMMIGRATION OFFICERS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12495 (v).
DEVLIN, MR., SUCCESSOR OF, AS IMMIGRATION AGENT, IRELAND: in Com of Sup., 6731 (iii).
DISEASED IMMIGRANTS, INSPECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5492 (iii).
DOUKHOBORS, HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 541 (i).
——— LOANS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5587 (iii).
——— PILGRIMAGE, EXPENSES, LOSSES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 542 (i).
——— AND GOVTL., ACTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 1030 (i).
ELLIS, DR., INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6702.
——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3536 (ii).
EXPENDITURE, 1902–3: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6269 (iii).
FABER, DR., ILLEGAL PRACTICE, CHARGES *re* PAR. IN 'SIAR': Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6662 (iii).
——— MEDICAL INSPECTOR OF IMMIGRANTS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6850 (iii).
FRENCH CANADIAN IMMIGRATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6674, 6700 (iii).
GALICIAN IMMIGRANTS, *re* N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iii).
GENERAL EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 2299 (i), 6827 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6269 (iii).
GROSSE ISLE QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 425 (i).
HAZLETON HOSPITAL GRANT: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).
HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, FFEE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).
——— *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6704.
——— IMMIGRATION AGENTS, PRE-EMPTION: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Sproule*) 289 (i).
——— INSPECTORS: in Com. of Sup., 6766 (iii).
——— LANDS, AVAILABLE FOR SETTLERS: Statement read (Mr. *Sifton*) 6787 (iii).
HOSPITALS OF ISOLATION, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 5845 (iii).
HUNGARIAN IMMIGRATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6694 (iii).
IMMIGRANTS, LANDING AT QUEBEC, MEDICAL INSPECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5318 (iii).
——— Notice of M. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6522 (iii).
——— *See* general heading.
——— PROVISION FOR NEW SETTLERS: Remarks (Mr. *Puttee*) 866 (i).
——— REFUSED ADMISSION INTO CANADA, NUMBER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 2310 (i), 2501 (ii).
IMMIGRATION INTO MAN., HOUSES AND FUEL: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 542 (i).
——— ONT. AND QUEBEC, GOVTL. ACTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 1593 (i).
——— QUES. OF ORDER *re* DISCUSSION: in Com. of Sup, 6854 (iii).
——— *re* observance of Rules, 6862 (iii).
——— *re* quoting of Speeches, 6870–74 (iii).
——— STATISTICS, TOTAL NUMBER, ORIGIN, EXPENDITURE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross, Ont.*) 1035 (i).
IRELAND, IMMIGRATION OFFICE, CLOSING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1031 (i).
See 'Devlin.'
LAKE ST. JOHN COL. CO., EXPENDITURE *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6888 (iii).
LANDS AVAILABLE FOR SETTLERS IN B.C., MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 4836 (ii).
See 'Homestead' &c.

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

MAR. PROVS., IMMIGRANTS FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*) 1855 (i).
MEDICAL EXAMINER, QUEBEC., &C.: (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3536 (ii).
——— MEDICAL INSPECTION, GOVT. APPNMTS.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2756 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 6695, 6851 (iii).
MURRAY, IMMIGRATION AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 6827 (iii).
NATIONALITIES, &C., IMMIGRATION, 1902-3: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 2310 (i).
N.S. EXODUS TO U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 6709 (iii).
ONT. AND QUEBEC, IMMIGRATION FOR, GOVTL. ACTION, &C.: (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 1593 (i).
PARIS AGENCY, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12589 (v).
PRESTON, MR., INTERVIEW *re* CAN. BUTTER: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 10712 (v).
——— STATEMENT *re* CAN. APPLES: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) 11184 (v).
——— SUIT BY CAN. EMPLOYMENT BUREAU: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12220 (v).
P.E.I. AGENTS *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6884 (iii).
QUARANTINE STATION, LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
REPATRIATION AGENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6674, 6700 (iii).
RITCHIE, MR., U.S. IMMIGRATION AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 6848 (iii).
SETTLERS EFFECTS *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6727 (iii).
TENTS FOR IMMIGRANTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6849 (iii).
TRACHOMA EPIDEMIC *re* IMMIGRANTS: in Com. of Sup., 5493 (iii).
——— HOSPITAL IN QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 14245 (vi).
——— MEDICAL INSPECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6662, 6696, 6843 (iii).
U.S. IMMIGRATION AGENTS: in Com. of Sup., 6848 (iii).
U.S. IMMIGRATION EXODUS TO: in Com. of Sup., 6727, 6874 (iii).
WHITE, MR., EXPENSES *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6732, 6853 (iii).
WIALLARD, PAUL, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 11188 (v).
See 'Interior', 'Indians,' &c.

Immoral Intertainments: *See* 'Criminal Code.'

Imperial Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 71 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 814; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., 2956, 3170 (ii). (3 *Edward VII., c.* 132).

'IMPERIAL' BUILDING, OTTAWA, GOVT. OCCUPATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3803 (ii).
IMPERIAL CONFERENCE, COR., &C., CAN. GOVT'S., REFUSAL TO PUBLISH: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 9457 (iv).
——— Papers *re* laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9582 (iv).
——— *See* 'Colonial.'
IMPERIAL DEFENCE AND PROP. RES. OF LORD ROSEBERY: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 410 (i).
——— *See* 'Naval Reserve,' &c.
IMPERIAL INSTITUTE, CANADIAN EXHIBIT: in Com. of Sup., 4435 (ii), 13508 (vi).
IMPERIAL SERVICE DECORATION, NAMES OF OFFICIALS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 12715, 13936 (vi).
IMPERIAL SERVICE DECORATION SYSTEM *re* SELECTION OF CIVIL SERVANTS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13669 (vi).
IMPORTS FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, &C., DUTIES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 13935 (vi).
See 'Preferential,' 'Tariff,' &c., 'Customs,'&c.

Incorporated Companies B. No. 94 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 1193 (i); 2° m., 3257 (ii).

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT ACT: *See* 'Loy, Geo. M.', 'Schell, J. T.'

INDIANS:

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS FOR N.W. INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
ALEXANDER INDIAN AGENCY TELEPHONE: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
ALNWICK BAND, MISSISSAGA INDIANS, CLAIMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McColl*), 6895 (iii).
BLANKETS, CLOTHING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).
BRANT, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
CLAYOQUOT INDIAN SCHOOL, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7269 (iii).
CLOTHING FOR INDIANS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13783 (vi).
DOKIS RESERVE, COMPLAINTS AGAINST TRESPASSERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*), 7914 (iv).
DONCASTER RESERVE, SQUATTERS' IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*), 288 (i).
EDMONTON AGENCY, TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vi).
EDMUNDSTON RESERVE, N.B., FIRE DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
ELKHORN SCHOOL, N.W.T.. AVERAGE ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6348 (iii).
HALF-BREED CLAIMS, COMMISSION *re* APPLICATIONS FOR SCRIP, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*), 110 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*), 2016 (i), 3397 (ii).
HALF-BREED SCHOOLS, SALARIES PAID, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iii).
INDIAN AFFAIRS, CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 13760 (vi).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 89 (i).
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 272 (i).
——— INSPECTORS: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
INDIAN AGENTS, B.C., SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7257 (iii)
——— GUARDIANS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Tisdale*), 819 (i).
——— TRAVELLING EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7262 (iii).
INDIANS, BRANT RESERVE, LEASE, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tisdale*), 1322 (i).
INDIANS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13785 (vi).
——— INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS: in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iii).
INDIANS, CHIEFS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
——— GENERAL VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
——— LAND MANAGEMENT FUND: in Com, of Sup., 6415 (iii).
——— MEDICAL ATTENDANT, KINGS, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 2501 (ii).
——— N.B., SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
——— N.S., PURCHASE OF RESERVE LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 13781 (vi).
——— N.W.T., AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 6422 (iii).

INDIANS--*Con.*
INDIANS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
——— N.W.T., LIVE STOCK, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iii).
——— ONT. AND QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
——— ONT. AND QUEBEC, ROAD REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
——— QUEBEC, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iii).
——— RESERVES, RE-ALLOTMENT, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7262 (iii).
——— SCHOOLS, MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 6409, 6414 (iii).
——— SCHOOLS, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).
——— SUPPLIES, N.W.T., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6422 (iii).
——— SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS. B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iii).
LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iii),
MACRAE, MR., INDIAN INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, BRANT RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
——— B.C.: in Com of Sup., 13785 (vi).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iii).
——— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).
——— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iii).
MICMAC DICTIONARY: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v).
MISSISSAGA INDIANS, ALNWICK BAND, CLAIMS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McColl*) 6895 (iii).
OKA INDIANS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
RAMA INDIANS, CONTRIBUTION *re* ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 13781 (vi).
RAND'S MICMAC DICTIONARY: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v).
ROBINSON TREATY, PAYMENTS *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
ROSEAU RIVER RESERVE, SALE OF LOTS: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*), 5319 (iii).
ST. JOHN'S RIVER AND ST. MARY'S RIVER INDIANS, PET. *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iii).
SAND, INDIAN BOY ADOPTED BY MR. JOHNSTON: in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iii).
SCHOOLS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iii), 13786 (vi).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
SEED GRAIN, RELIEF: in Com. of Sup., 6417, 6420 (iii).
SECORD, DR., MEDICAL ATTENDANT ON BRANT RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
SMALL-POX OUTBREAK ON BRANT RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
——— N. W. T. Reserves, &c., 6350 (iii).
SONGHEES INDIANS, REMOVAL TO RESERVE, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7258 (iii).
STEAM LAUNCH FOR INDIAN AGENT, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).
SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
TERREBONNE INDIAN RESERVE: M. for cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 288 (i).
——— *See* 'Doncaster.'
VOWELL, MR., INDIAN SUPT., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13785 (vi).
WADSWORTH, MR., INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
WALPOLE ISLAND INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).
WEST, DR., MEDICAL INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
YUKON INDIANS, GENERAL EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 7272 (iii).
——— RELIEF, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7270 (iii)
See 'Immigration' 'Interior,' &c.
INDIAN HARBOUR WHARF, N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
INDIAN RIVER RY. AND LAKE MEGANTIC SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).
INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES, B. C., ROYAL COMMISSION *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6984 (iii).
——— *See* 'Labour,' &c.
INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS FOR INDIANS, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iii).
INGERSOLL TO STRATFORD, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14345 (vi).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. No. 186 (Mr. *Bernier*) 1°*, 3708; 2°*, 4007; in Com., 4007; 3°*, 4009 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 26).
INLAND REVENUE:
ALCOHOL: *See* 'Wood.'
ANALYSTS, PUBLIC: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).
AUTOMATIC GRAIN WEIGHERS in N.W.T., REP. OF INSPECTOR, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Stewart*) 847, 880 (i).
BOURASSA, INSPECTOR, INLAND REV., QUEBEC, SHORTAGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5405, 5407 (iii).
CHEVRIER FAMILY, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 12498 (v), 12716 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 13971 (vi).
CLEMENT, JULES, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13664 (vi).
CULLING TIMBER, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7798 (iv).
DISTILLERIES, &c., INSPECTORS' SALARIES: in Com., of Sup., 13974 (vi).
DUGAS, MR. BLAISE, AMOUNTS PAID TO *re* TRIP TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1034 (i).
ELECTRIC LIGHT INSPECTION, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5407 (iii).
EXCISE OFFICERS, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5363 (iii).
——— SALARIES *re* C. S. ACT AMT.: in Com. of Sup., 13967 (vi).
——— TRAVELLING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 5373 (vi).
EXCISE TAXATION PER CAPITA FOR 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 14284 (vi).
FERGUSON, J. M., LEGAL EXPENSES *re* ADULTERATION ACT: in Com. of Sup., 5412 (iii).
FORREST, E., REIMBURSEMENT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).
FYFE, MR., REP. *re* GRAIN WEIGHING MACHINE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).
——— Remarks *re*, 4192 (ii).
GERALD, MR., INLAND REV. DEPT., PRESCOTT, INCREASE OF SALARY: Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 13968, 13978 (vi).
GRAIN INSPECTION, COST PER CAR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4837 (ii).
——— *re* STANDARD SAMPLES, RES. OF TORONTO BOARD OF TRADE: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 11177 (v).
GRAIN WEIGHING MACHINE: in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*, &c.) in Com. on B. 188, 4187 (ii).
INLAND REVENUE DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Bernier*) 89 (i).
——— DEPTL. SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 227 (i).
——— INSPECTORS, &c.: Salaries in Com. of Sup., 5363 (iii).
INSPECTION OF STAPLES: in Com. of Sup., 7762 (iv).

INLAND EEVENUE—*Con.*

KEILTY, MR., INSPECTOR AT PRESCOTT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5365 (iii).
KELLY, ASST. INSPECTOR, REFUND, &c.: in Com. of Sup. 5405 (iii).
LIQUOR INSPECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5393 (iii).
LONGFORD: *See* 'Wood Alcohol.'
MAGNESS, MR., AND GRAIN THRESHING SCALE: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com. on B. 188, 4191,-4203 (ii).
MAN. GRAIN ACT, ADMINISTRATION OF ACT: in Com. of Sup., 7762 (iv).
——— INSPECTION *re*, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13698 (vi).
——— LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7798 (iv).
METHYLATED SPIRITS, SUPPLIED TO MANUFACTURERS: in Com. of Sup., 5373 (iii).
——— *See* 'Wood Alcohol.'
MONTREAL INLAND REV. OFFICE, MONEY STOLEN: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).
O'REILLY, MR., CLAIMS *re* TOBACCO FACTORY DAMAGED BY FIRE: in Com. of Sup.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13978 (vi).
PRESCOTT, INLAND REV. OFFICIALS, SALARIES, PROMOTIONS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 13968, 13978 (vi).
ROY, GEO., INSPECTOR OF HIDES, QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3627 (ii).
STANDARD CHEMICAL COMPANY, PURCHASE OF WOOD ALCOHOL: in Com. of Sup., 227 (i).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5363, 5373 (iii).
——— CONTRACT: Read (Mr. *Bernier*) 5375 (iii).
TOBACCO COMBINE, CHAIRMAN'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1297 (i).
TOBACCO EXCISE DUTIES: PAR. IN TORONTO 'GLOBE': Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 5701 (iii).
TOBACCO STAMPS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5373 (iii).
TORONTO BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* GRAIN STANDARDS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 11177 (v).
TROTTIER, LOUIS M., EMPLYMT, BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8488 (iv).
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES INSPECTORS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).
WHITE, MR., INLAND REVENUE, PRESCOTT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13970 (vi).
WOOD ALCOHOL, MANUFACTURED AT LONGFORD, OUTPUT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 98 (i).
——— *See* 'Standard.'
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 227 (i), 5373 (iii).

Insolvency B. No. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) 1° m., 654; 2° m., 2373 (i); on Order for 2°, 2787; 2° m., 3248; Neg. (Y. 42; N. 74) 3256 (ii).

INSOLVENT ACT, LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 818 (i).

Inspection Act: *See* 'General.'
——— *See* 'Textile Fabrics.'

INSPECTION OF CUSTOMS SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3949 (ii).
INSPECTION OF IMMIGRANTS. *See* 'Immigration.'
INSPECTION OF STAPLES: in Com. of Sup., 7762 (iv).
INSURANCE COS. OF CANADA, ABSTRACT OF STATEMENT: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1025 (i).
INSURANCE FUND, P. O., REP., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14660 (vi).
——— *See* 'Post Office.'
INSURANCE RATES *re* MARINE SHIPPING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13697 (vi).
INSURANCE, ON OCEAN STEAMERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7591 (iv).
——— REPORT OF SUPT.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 9350 (iv).
——— OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 12586 (v).
INTERCOLONIAL CONFERENCE, COR. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 8230 (iv).
——— *See* 'Imperial Preference.'
——— CONFIDENTIAL REP.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 7923 (iv).

I. C. R., Supplies Bill: *See* 'Ry. Act, B. 258.'

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:
ADDITIONAL SIDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 14055(vi).
——— *See* 'Sidings.'
AIR BRAKES FOR FREIGHT CARS: in Com. of Sup., 7527 (iii), 8281 (iv).
BOOK-KEEPING *re* EXPENDITURE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 8270 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 12877 (vi).
BRIDGES, STRENGTHENING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3699 (ii), 8269 (iv).
BROWN, MRS., GRATUITY TO: in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).
CAR SHOPS, NEW MACHINERY: in Com. of Sup., 14106 (vi).
——— *See* 'Machinery,' 'Moncton,' &c.
'CHAPMAN' BALL-BEARING APPARATUS, REP. *re*: Remarks in Com of Sup., 8283 (iv).
——— LETTER *re*: Read (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. of Sup., 7524 (iii).
——— *See* 'Muhlfeld.'
CHAUDIERE JUNCTION, ENGINE HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 8314 (iv), 12594 (v), 14106 (vi).
CLERGUE'S CONTRACT FOR STEEL RAILS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).
'CLEVELAND' CYLINDER PATENT: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 8284 (iv).
COAL RATES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 6167 (iii).
DEMURRAGE ON CARS, AMOUNT COLLECTED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 4672, 4959 (ii).
DOUBLE TRACKING: in Com. of Sup., 14062 (vi).
DRAW BARS ON FREIGHT CARS: in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 8288 (iv).
DRUMMOND COUNTY RY., RENTALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vi).
DRUMMONDVILLE SIDING, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14055 (vi).
EARNINGS, &C., DATE OF INTERIM REPS.: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 4444 (ii).
FIRE PROTECTION OF STATIONS, RESTAURANTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 14663 (vi).
FREIGHT CARS ON CONNECTING LINES, &C.: M. for Ret.*, (Mr. *Haggart*) 3805 (ii).
——— FREIGHT RATES, CLASSES 1–10: M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret.* 2338 (i).
——— *See* 'Traffic.'
——— RATES FOR LIVE STOCK AND COAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1857 (i).
——— *See* 'Traffic Arrangements,' &c.
GENERAL STATEMENT: on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Blair*) 3633 (ii).
——— INQUIRY FOR PAPERS *re* (Mr. *Haggart*) 3537 (ii).
GENERAL VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 12873 (vi).
HALIFAX DEEP WATER TERMINUS, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi).
HAULAGE OF GOVT., &C., CARS, AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9682 (iv).
I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12593 (v), 12823 (vi).
KINGSTON LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONSTRUCTION FOR I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

LEVIS, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 3703 (ii), 7520 (iii).
——— LAND PURCHASE, PAYMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3631 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES, CARS, &C., PURCHASED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 4361 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES CONSTRUCTED AT MONCTON, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
LORNE SIDING, TRAFFIC, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 2918 (ii).
MACHINERY FOR LOCOMOTIVE AND CAR SHOPS: in Com. of Sup., 8290 (iv), 14106 (vi).
MONCTON, INCREASED SHED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
MONEY SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS, I. C. R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1197 (i).
MONTREAL LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONTRACTS FOR I. C. R.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
MUHLFELD, MR., REP. *re* 'CHAPMAN' BALL BEARING APPARATUS: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 8283 (iv).
See 'Chapman.'
OFFICIAL GUIDE, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3535 (ii).
OPERATING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7811 (iv).
ORIGINAL CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 3698 (ii).
PASSES: M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret., 2337 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9582 (iv).
PENSION SYSTEM, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 9216 (iv).
PINTSH GAS EQUIPMENT: in Com. of Sup., 8291 (iv).
PRIVATE CARS, PURCHASE BY GOVT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2309 (i).
See 'Haulage.'
RAIL POWER SAW CUTTER: in Com. of Sup., 12607 (v).
RATES FOR LIVE STOCK AND COAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1857 (i).
REP. OF MR. POTTINGER *re* TIES, &C.: M. for Copy (Mr. *Haggart*) 3806 (ii).
RESTAURANTS, STATIONS, FIRE PROTECTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 14663 (vi).
RHODES, CURRY & CO., CONTRACT FOR ROLLING STOCK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14100 (vi).
RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, ENGINE HOUSE: in Com. of Sup. 8314 (iv).
——— SHOPS, CONSTRUCTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gouvreau*) 12497 (v).
RIVER OUELLE BRANCH, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 7526 (iii), 12599 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 541 (i).
——— BRANCH LINE TO ST. DENIS WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10490 (v).
ROLLING STOCK: in Com. of Sup., 8292 (iv), 14100 (vi).
'SCOTIA' STR., SALVAGE SERVICES BY ANCHOR LINE, COMPENSATION: in Com. of Sup., 14107 (vi).
——— Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Osler*) 7150 (iii).
——— Statement (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 7206 (iii).
SIDINGS AND INCREASED FACILITIES: in Com. of Sup., 14081, 14107 (vi).
See 'Additional.'
STEEL RAILS, FASTENINGS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5005 (ii).
——— CONTRACT WITH CLERGUE SYNDICATE: in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).
——— CONTRACT, PRICES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 285 (i).
SUPPLIES ENTERED DUTY FREE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Fowler*) 916 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

SUSSEX, N.B., ROUNDHOUSE, GATES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 4672 (ii).
SYDNEY JUNCTION TO NORTH SYDNEY EXTENSION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Johnston, Cape Breton*) 447 (i).
TARIFF RATES, INQUIRY FOR PAPERS: (Mr. *Bell*) 3712 (ii).
See 'Freight.'
TERMINAL FACILITIES AT BONAVENTURE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).
TIES IMPORTED FOR GOVT. RYS., COST, QUANTITY, &C., Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*) 1679 (i).
——— PURCHASED, USED, &C.; M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Haggart*) 3805 (ii).
TRACKMEN ON I. C. R., INCREASE OF WAGES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12874, 14083 (vi).
——— Remarks in Com. on B. 257 (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 12558 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 1297 (i).
TRAFFIC ARRANGEMENTS WITH G. T. R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 2759 (ii).
VESTIBULE EQUIPMENT FOR CARS: in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12600 (v).
WINDSOR JUNCTION ACCIDENT, EVIDENCE *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 3301, 3398 (ii).
WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 12873 (vi).
See 'Railways.'

INTERIOR:

ASSAY OFFICE, VANCOUVER: in Com. of Sup., 6799 (iii).
ASTRONOMICAL DEMARCATION, WORKS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).
ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATORY, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 342 (i) 6791 (iii).
BACTERIOLOGICAL LABORATORY: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
BANFF SPRINGS, BATHS: in Com. of Sup., 6789 (iii) 13955 (vi).
——— MUSEUM BUILDING, ADDITION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).
——— ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iii).
BELL, DR., APPNMT. AS DIRECTOR OF GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iii).
BOUNDARY DELIMITATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).
BUFFALO HERD IN BANFF PARK: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).
CANADIAN MINING INSTITUTE, PUBLICATION OF DOCUMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13965 (vi).
C. P. R. LANDS, AND SCHOOL TAXATION: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 4006 (ii).
CANE BROS., GRANTS FOR TIMBER LICENSE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2757 (ii).
COAL MINING IN BANFF RESERVE, LEASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 13026 (vi).
CORY, W. W., SALARY, DUTIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6853 (iii).
COTTEE, HERBERT, SALARY AND RE-APPOINTMENT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3610 (ii).
CROWS'S NEST PASS COAL LANDS, APPLICATIONS, REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 12217 (v).
DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
——— COMMISSIONER'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6765 (iii).
——— INSPECTOR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6766 (iii).
——— MAN. AND N. W. T., SALE, PRICES PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 816 (i).
——— OUTSIDE SERVICE, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).
——— SALE, LOCATION, PURCHASERS &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 670 (i).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

DOM. LANDS SURVEYORS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13772 (vi).
——— SURVEYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6759, 6939 (iii).
——— YUKON REGULATIONS *re*: in Com. on Res., 13791 (vi).
GEOLOGICAL CONGRESS, VISIT TO CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 8116 (iv).
GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM, VICTORIA MEMORIAL: in Com. of Sup., 352 (i), 14243 (vi).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 11188 (v).
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 6824 (iii).
——— CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).
——— EXPLORATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iii).
——— PLOTS, PLANS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6826 (iii).
——— REP.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13373 (vi).
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v), 13769 (vi).
GEORGIAN BAY ISLANDS, SALE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
GOLD COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, DAWSON CITY, DEFALCATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iii).
GRAZING LANDS, N.W.T., LEASE TO GEO. MCDONNELL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 8330 (iv).
GUAY, MR. A., COMPENSATION FOR LOSS OF HORSE: in Com. of Sup., 5406 (iii).
HAANEL, DR., SUPT. OF MINES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13764, 13774 (vi).
HALF-BREED CLAIMS, COMMISSIONS, APPLICATIONS FOR SCRIP, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 110 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2016 (i), 3397 (ii).
INTERIOR, DEPTL. EMPLOYEES, DATE OF APPNMT., SALARIES, &C.: M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) for Ret.,* 2308 (i).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 89 (i).
——— COMPLAINTS *re* ILLUSTRATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3972 (ii).
——— MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 6922 (iii).
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 267 (i), 13761 (vi).
INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY SURVEY, GEOLOGISTS REP.: in Com. of Sup., 6825 (iii).
——— CONGRESS OF GEOLOGY, VISIT TO CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 8116 (iv).
IRRIGATION, N.W.T., SURVEYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6764 (iii).
JONASSON, MR. S., FOREST RANGER IN MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1198 (i).
LAND GUIDES, *re* SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 6768 (iii).
LAND SALES, WINNIPEG, PURCHASERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1858 (i).
LAND SLIDES: *See* 'Turtle Mountain.'
——— *See* 'Frank Disaster.'
LIARD RIVER MINERS, RELIEF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6926 (iii).
LOW, A. P., TECHNICAL OFFICER, GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13770 (vi).
MCDONALD, GEO., LEASE OF GRAZING LANDS, N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 8330 (iv).
MAGNETIC OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 4118 (ii).
MAN. SCHOOL LANDS, PAYMENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 6169 (iii).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

MAN. AND N.W.T., SCHOOL LANDS, SALES, AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 706 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6893 (iii).
MAPS, LITHOGRAPHING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6800 (iii), 13778 (vi).
——— PRINTING, &C., INFORMATION *re*: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
MEHAN, DR., METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE, REMOVAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).
METALLURGISTS AND PETROGRAPHERS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13778 (vi).
METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4118 (ii).
MINES BRANCH, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13762 (vi).
MINING INSTITUTE: in Com. of Sup., 12591 (v), 13965 (vi).
MOOSE DEER POINT, SALE OF ISLANDS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
NORTH ATLANTIC TRADING CO., CONTRACT WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13372 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13667, 13933 (vi).
N. W. TERS., MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
PIGEON LAKE ISLANDS, SALES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).
P. E. I. COAL FIELDS, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).
SASKATCHEWAN LAND CO., SECTIONS ACQUIRED, &C.: M. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) for Cor.*, 2338.
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lennox*) 7108 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (*W. J. Roche*) 4363 (ii).
——— SALES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2502 (ii).
SQUATTERS CLAIMS ON DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 6925 (iii).
STEWART, E., FOREST INSPECTOR, TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6416, 6774 (iii).
SUDBURY COAL, DISCOVERY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6824 (iii).
SURVEY INSTRUMENTS, PURCHASE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6820 (iii)
SWAMP LANDS, CONSTRUCTION OF ROAD, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).
TELESCOPE FOR OTTAWA OBSERVATORY; in Com. of Sup., 6792 (iii).
TIMBER LICENSES GRANTED TO CANE BROS.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2757 (ii).
TREE CULTURE, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6773 (iii).
——— PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13775 14272 (vi).
TURTLE MOUNTAIN LAND SLIDE, INVESTIGATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13965 (vi).
TYERMAN, P. D., PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 286 (i).
VICTORIA GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM: in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).
See 'Geological.'
WASHINGTON, MR. HECTOR, REP. *re* LAND VALUES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4430 (ii).
WINNIPEG LAND OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 6767 (iii).
YOHO PARK, ROADS CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).
See 'Immigration', 'Indians', &c.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMITTEE: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) for Com., 91 (i).

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY SURVEY, GEOLOGIST'S REP.: in Com. of Sup., 6825 (iii).

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF GEOLOGY, VISIT TO CANADA: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 8116 (iv).

'INTERNATIONAL' DREDGE, LEASED OR BOUGHT FROM M. CONNOLLY: Ques. (Mr *Fowler*) 12218 (v).

International Railway Appliance Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 40 (Mr. *Brock*) 1°*, 591; 2°*, 665; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 133.)

INTERNATIONAL RY. CO. OF N. B., RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).

INTERNATIONAL TARIFF CUSTOMS BUREAU: in Com. of Sup., 7760 (iv).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. No. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) 1° m., 125; on Order for 2°, 566, 705; 2° m., 916; neg., 939 (i).

Interprovincial and James Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 144 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 2395 (i); 2°*, 2720; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 134.)

INTERPROVINCIAL AND JAMES' BAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).
See 'James Bay.'

INTERVIEW WITH N. Y. REPORTERS *re* ALASKAN BOUNDARY: Denial (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13962 (vi).

INVERNESS MINES, N. S., BROAD COVE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).

INVERNESS POSTAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6051 (iii).

INVERNESS RY. AND COAL CO.'S RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).

INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. SUBSIDY, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 872 (i).

IONA, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13200 (vi).

Iron and Steel Bounties Act Amt. B.: *See* 'Steel,' &c.

IRON AND STEEL BOUNTIES, ADMINISTRATION OF ACT: in Com, of Sup., 7762 (iv).

—— LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7795 (iv).

—— PAYMENTS FOR 1890–1903: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 11556 (v).

—— PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6435 (iii).

IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY: (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4263; Neg. (Y. 47; N. 91) 4346 (ii).

Debate: (Mr. *Fielding*) 4278; (Mr. *Bell*) 4279; (Mr. *Kendall*) 4288; (Mr. *Osler*) 4293; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4297; (Mr. *Clancy*) 4300; (Mr. *Pringle*) 4309; (Mr. *Tarte*) 4322; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 4329 (Mr. *Oliver*) 4336; (Mr. *Heyd*) 4338; (Mr. *Pope*) 4341 (ii).

—— TARIFF PROTECTION: Notice of Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3864 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) *re* Notice of Motion, 4040 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on M. to adjn., 4260 (ii).

IROQUOIS CANAL, ELECTRIC LIGHTING: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12901 (vi).

IRRIGATION, N. W. T., SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 6764 (iii).

ISLE AUX COUDRES, WHARF REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2242 (i).

ISLE GROSBOIS. BOUCHERVILLE, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5902 (iii).

ISLAND OF ORLEANS, LAND LINE EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vi).

—— SUBMARINE CABLE, &C.: M. (Mr. *Talbot*) for Ret.*, 11301 (v).

JACKSON, MR., APPNMT. AS JUDGE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).

JAMES AND HUDSON'S BAYS, FISHING RIGHTS, APPLICATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1194 (i).

—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lancaster*) 3806 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 6893 (iii).

JAMES BAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14443 (vi).

James Bay Ry.: *See* 'Interprovincial.'

JANVRIN'S ISLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).

JAPAN EXHIBITION, GENERAL STATEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 4626 (ii).

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION, INFLUX OF: Remarks (Mr. *Morrison*) 3713 (ii).

JAPANESE TARIFF *re* U.S. PRODUCTS: Ques. (Mr *Clarke*) 9217 (iv).

JAPAN TRADE WITH CAN., CUSTOMS DUTIES *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 8617 (iv).

JEDDORE EAST, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

JEROME, MARTIN, M.P.P., AND MAN. ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 5321 (iii).

'JESSE JAMES' SERIES OF PUBLICATIONS, CUSTOMS DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 11426 (v).

JESUS RIVER, DEEPENING, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 289 (i).

—— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).

JOGGINS RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14329 (vi).

JOHNSON, MR., PURCHASE OF HOUSE BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 14143 (vi).

JOINT HIGH COMMISSION AND RECIPROCITY WITH U.S.: Par. in Toronto *World* (Mr. *Sproule*) 14053 (vi).
See 'Alaskan,' 'Colonial,' &c.

—— COR. WITH SENATOR FAIRBANKS: in Budget Speech, 1407 (i).

Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Co.'s Incorp, B. No. 52 (Mr. *Bazinet*) 1°*, 654; 2°*, 977; in Com. and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 135.)

JOLIETTE AND LAKE MANUAN RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

JONASSON, MR. S., FOREST RANGER IN MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1198 (i).

JONQUIERES TO HA HA BAY RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14316 (vi).

Jordan Light, Heat and Power Co.'s B. No. 162 (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 2582: 2°*, 2756; in Com., and 3°*, 3795 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 136.)

JUBILEE STAMPS, SALE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6060 (iii).

Judges of the N. W. Ters. Act Amt. B. No. 259 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 12609 (v); 2°, in Com., 13853, 14287; 3°*, 14289 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 40.)

Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. No. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) Res. prop., 10102; in Com on Res., 10759; 1°*; 2°*, and in Com., 10792, 11406; 3°*, 11422 (v). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 27.)

Judges Retiring Allowance B. No. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), 1° m., 93; wthdn., 634 (i).

Judges Retiring Allowances B. No. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) Res. prop., 203 (i); wthdn., 2582; Res. prop., 3431, 4262 (ii), 5241 (iii), 8087; in Com. on Res., 8369; 1°*, 2°* of B. and in Com., and 3°*, 8372 (iv); Sen. Amts., 14289 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 29.)

Judges of Superior Court (Quebec) Act Amt. B. No. 255 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), Res. prop., 11426; in Com. on Res., 11821; 2° m., 11833; 1°* of B, 11833; 2°*, and in Com., 12301; 3°*, 12302 (v). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 28.)

JUDGES OF THE SUPERIOR COURT, RETIRING ALLOWANCES B.: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), 3431 (ii).

JUDGES APPOINTED AS COMMISSIONERS, ALLUSION IN MR. EWART'S ADDRESS TO JUDGE PERDUE: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*), 11072 (v).

JUDGES APPOINTED FROM LOCAL BAR: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

JUDGES, B.C., TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES: in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).

——— MAN., TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES: in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).

——— N.S., INCREASE OF SALARY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).

JUDGES SALARIES, COUNTY COURTS, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3628 (ii).

——— LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 95 (i).

JUDGESHIP, OFFER TO CONSERVATIVE POLITICIAN: Par. in Montreal *Star*, 13805 (vi).

JUDGES IN QUEBEC AND OUTSIDE LEGAL BUSINESS: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*), 14665 (vi).

JUDIQUE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1103 (i).

JUSTICE:

AD HOC JUDGES: in Com. of Sup., 3402 (ii).

ADMIRALTY COURT, ACCOMMODATION FOR SITTINGS: in Com. of Sup., 3408 (ii).

——— REGISTRAR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3408 (ii).

BEHRING SEA ARBITRATION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 13658 (vi).

BINDER TWINE, COST IN 1901-2: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*), 447 (i)

——— NAMES OF PURCHASERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*), 3798 (ii).

——— PRICES FOR CURRENT YEAR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*), 203 (i).

——— PRICES FIXED FOR PENITENTIARY SUPPLY: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*), 1595 (i).

——— *See* 'Sisal.'

B.C. STATUTES, DISALLOWANCE OF, &C.: M. for O.Cs., &c* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 706 (i).

JUSTICE—*Con.*

B. C. STATUTES, DISALLOWANCE: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2016 (i).

——— M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to print, 2675 (ii).

BRUNET, ARTHUR, AND DOM. ELECTION ACT: M. for Pets., O.Cs., &c. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 101 (i).

CLARKE, DUNCAN, EX. COURT: in Com. of Sup., 3406 (ii).

COMMUTATION OF CARVER: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 13303 (vi.)

CONSOLIDATION OF STATUTES: *See* 'Revision of Statutes.'

COOKE *vs.* COLE, LITIGATION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iii).

COUNTY COURTS, APPOINTMENTS FROM LOCAL BARS: Remarks (Mr. *Lennox*), 5582 (iii).

——— APPNMTS., RETIREMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*), 4960 (ii).
See 'Judges.'

DIVORCE AND MATRIMONIAL COURTS, N.B., SALARY OF JUDGE: in Com. of Sup., 3400 (ii).

DODD, MR. JUSTICE, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).

DOM. STATUTES CONSOLIDATION: *See* 'Revision of Statutes.'

DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY, CONTRACT *re* FUEL: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*), 10102 (v).

EXCHEQUER COURT, JUDGE'S TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 3407 (ii).

——— REGISTRAR, EDITING REPS.: in Com. of Sup., 3407 (ii).

——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3406 (ii).

EXECUTIONS, EXPENDITURES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3401 (ii).

GAYNOR & GREENE, EXTRADITION: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 109 (i).

GENELLE *vs.* THE KING, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6795 (iii).

GRAHAM *vs.* KING, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES *re* PUBLIC WORKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13471 (vi).

HENRY, MR. JUSTICE, RETIRING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 14662 (vi).

HETU, RUDOLPHE, RELEASE OF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*), 7915 (iv).

HOLT, MR., APPNMT. AS JUDGE OF HURON COUNTY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

HOWIE, F. W., LEGAL EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6795 (iii).

JACKSON, MR., APPNMT. AS JUDGE, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).

JUDGES APPOINTED AS COMMISSIONERS, ALLUSION IN MR. EWART'S ADDRESS TO JUDGE PERDUE: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*), 11072 (v).

JUDGES APPOINTED FROM LOCAL BAR: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
See 'County.'

——— QUES. OF ORDER *re*: Ruling (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*), 209 (i).

JUDGES, B.C., TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES: in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).

JUDGESHIP, HURON COUNTY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

——— MAN., TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES: in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).

JUDGESHIP, MANITOBA, DELAY IN APPNMT.; Remarks in Com of Sup., 212 (i).

JUDGE, N.W.TERS. SUPREME COURT, ADDITIONAL: in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).

JUDGES, N.S., INCREASE OF SALARY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).

JUDGES, QUEBEC, COMPLAINTS *re* OUTSIDE BUSINESS: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14665 (vi).

——— JUDGESHIP, OFFER TO CONSERVATIVE POLITICIAN: Par. in Montreal *Star*, 13805 (vi).

——— SALARIES, COUNTY COURTS, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3628 (ii).

JUSTICE—*Con.*

JUDGES, QUE., SALARIES, LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 95 (i).
——— YUKON, TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES: in Com of Sup., 3409 (ii).
JUSTICE, ADMINISTRATION OF: in Com. of Sup., 3506 (ii).
——— DEP. REPT.: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), 90 (i).
——— INCREASE OF SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 14255 (vi).
——— MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURES: in Com. of Sup., 3398 (ii).
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
KEEWATIN GOVT., EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6797 (iii).
KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).
——— CONTRACTS *re* GROCERIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*), 10100 (v).
See 'Binder Twine.'
LAW LIBRARY IN ENGLAND, ESTABLISHMENT, &C.: M. for Copies of Cor. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 98 (i).
LEGAL EXPENSES *re* GOVT. CASES: in Com. of Sup., 12911 (vi).
LEGAL OPINIONS *re* G.T.P. CLAUSE, CUSTOMS DUTIES: Read (Mr. *Osler*) 11320 (v).
LITIGATION EXPENSES *re* INTERIOR: in Com. of Sup., 6794 (iii).
MANITOBA PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3534 (ii).
MATHURIN, JOS. A., DEATH SENTENCE, JUDGE'S REP., &C.: M. for Copies * (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3236 (ii).
MYERS, JUDGE OF MAN., REP. IN HANSARD: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 285 (i).
NIPISSING, JR. JUDGESHIP, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 14258 (vi).
N.W. TER. MAINTENANCE OF PRISONERS: in Com. of Sup., 3398 (ii).
PARDONS, PREROGATIVE OF HIS EX., O. CS., &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 567 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 96 (i).
PENITENTIARY, CONTRACTS *re* GROCERIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 10100 (v).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 90 (i).
——— GENERAL EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).
PRENDERGAST AND MAN. JUDGESHIP, DELAY IN APPNMT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).
PRINCE ALBERT, CLERK OF COURT, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3401 (ii).
REGINA JAIL, ADDITIONAL LAND PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup., 5135 (ii).
REVISION OF DOM. STATUTES, PAYMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14643 (vi).
——— REVISION COMMISSION, NAMES, PROGRESS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1029 (i).
ROBERT *vs.* KING, CLAIMS *re* FLOODING ON LAKE ST. LOUIS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13473 (vi).
ST. REGIS LOCKUP: in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iii).
ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3534 (ii).
——— HOSPITAL: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14284 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 13669 (vi).
——— WARDEN'S RESIGNATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lèonard*) 286 (i).
——— ACTING WARDEN, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lèonard*) 10831 (v).
SISAL USED IN BINDER TWINE, AVERAGE PRICE: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 8085 (iv).
——— *See* 'Binder.'
STEWART *vs.* KING, LEGAL EXPENSES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12912 (vi).

JUSTICE—*Con.*

SUPREME COURT, CONTINGENCIES, DISBURSEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3404 (ii).
——— LIBRARY, PURCHASE OF BOOKS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3402, 3405 (ii).
——— REPORTER, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3402 (ii).
——— REPORTS, BINDING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3405 (ii).
——— SALARY OF MR. TASCHEREAU: in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
——— TICKET OF LEAVE ACT, RELEASE, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 566 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 96 (i).
TOBACCO COMMISSION EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 8267 (iv).
WABY, INDIAN PRISONER, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6418 (iii).
YUKON TER. GOVT., ADMINISTRATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13367 (vi).

Juvenile Offenders (N.B.) Act Amt. B. No. 10 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 94; 2°*, 314; in Com., 314; 3°*, 316 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 30.)

KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5825 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13013 (vi).
KAMOURASKA, EXTENSION PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
KARS, CENSUS ENUMERATION, COR., &C.: M. for Copies * (Mr. *Fowler*) 3804 (ii).
KEEWATIN GOVT., EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6797 (iii).
KEILTY, MR., INSPECTOR AT PRESCOTT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5365 (iii).

Keller Heater Co. of Can. Patent Relief B. No. 231 (Mr. *McIsaac*) M. to receive Pet., 7091; 1°*, 7294; 2°*, 7487 (iii); in Com. and 3°*, 7770 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 137.)

KELLY, ASST. INSPECTOR, REFUND, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).
KELLY & BURNETT, LEASE OF FALSE CREEK: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 7565 (iv).
——— *See* 'False Creek.'
KELLEY'S CROSS, MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5938, 6064 (iii).
KELLY, WM., CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR N. HASTINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7080 (iii).
KENSINGTON, STATION ACCOMMODATION, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 12840 (vi).
KETCH, N.S., HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).

Kettle River Valley Railway Co.'s B. No. 96 (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 138.)

KETTLE RIVER VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14490 (vi).
KILROY, ACTING CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, WINDSOR, ONT., PAYMENT TO: in Com. of Sup., 13993 (vi).
KINGS, N.B., INDIAN MEDICAL ATTENDANT: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2502 (ii).

Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s B. No. 46 (Mr. *Harty*) 1°*, 591; 2°*, 976 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5560 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 139.)

KINGSPORT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1103 (i), 13202 (vi).

King's Printer B.: *See* 'Public Printing.'

KING'S S.A. MEDALS PET., *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 10491 (v).

KINGSTON BARRACKS, R. C. FIELD ARTILLERY: in Com. of Sup., 13118 (vi).

KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK, AWARD TO CONNOLLY & Co.: in Com. of Sup., 13023 (vi).

KINGSTON LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONTRACTS FOR I. C. R.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).

—— GROCERY CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 10100 (v).

KINGSTON ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13094 (vi).

—— STABLE: in Com. of Sup., 638 (i), 13117 (vi).

KINGSVILLE, ONT., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13244 (vi).

KING'S WAREHOUSE AT WINNIPEG: Ques. (Mr. *La-Rivière*) 6268 (iii).

—— *See* 'Customs.'

KINKORA STATION ACCOMMODATION, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).

Klondike Mines Railway Co.'s B. No. 177 (Mr. *McIsaac*) M. to receive Pet., 2778; 1°*, 3219; 2°*, 3583; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 140).

KLONDIKE MINES RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 33 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 632; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 141).

Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 41 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 591; 2°*, 665; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 142).

KOOTENAY CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).

—— CORRECTION, &c.: in Com., 14519 (vi).

LABOUR COMMISSION 1886, NAMES, AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 8083 (iv).

LABOUR COMMISSION, B.C., APPNMT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 1595 (i).

—— REP. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 8116 (iv).

—— Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Ingram*) 7198 (iii).

LABOUR DAY ADJOURNMENT: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 10489 (v).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 10712 (v).

—— DELAYING SESSION, &c.: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 10742 (v).

LABOUR DEPARTMENT, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7151 (iii).

LABOUR DISPUTES, SETTLEMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 4003 (ii).

Labour Disputes Settlement: *See* 'Railway Labour.'

'LABOUR GAZETTE,' CORS., REMUNERATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7154 (iii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 7203 (iii).

LABOUR TROUBLES IN B.C.: on M. for Com. of Sup. Remarks (Mr. *Smith*, *B.C.*) 945 (i).

—— *See* 'Nelson P. O.', 'Racine Bros.' &c., 'Longshoremen, &c.

LAC BOUCHETTE AND QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO'.S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14456 (vi).

LACHINE CANAL, ELECTRICAL APPLIANCES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7806 (iv), 14142 (vi).

—— ENLARGEMENT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12903 (vi).

—— GRATUITIES: in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).

—— LIGHTING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14139 (vi).

—— LOCK GATE PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).

—— MASONRY WALL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12906 (vi).

LADY LAFONTAINE, PENSION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14252 (vi).

Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Co.'s B. No. 120 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 1675; 2°*, 1853 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 143).

LAKE FRANCIS OUTLET, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1449 (i).

LAKE ST. FRANCIS, DYKING: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).

LAKE ST. JOHN COLONIZATION CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6679, 6888 (iii).

LAKE ST. JOHN, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13459 (vi).

LAKE ST. JOHN RY. AND LA TUQUE RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).

—— PIERS, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2243 (i).

LAKE SUPERIOR, LONG LAKE AND ALBANY RY. CO. TO PENINSULAR HARBOUR SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).

LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE AND JAMES BAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).

LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE, IMPROVEMENTS, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2246 (i).

—— *See* 'Temiscamingue.'

LAMBTON POSTMISTRESS, DISMISSAL, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6166 (iii), 14272, 14661 (vi).

LANDS AVAILABLE FOR SETTLERS IN B.C., MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 4836 (ii).

Land Company Bills: *See* 'Canada Northwest,' 'Ontario and Qu'Appelle.'

LAND GRANTS TO RYS., MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2101 (i), 3797 (ii).

—— VOTED BY PARLT., AREA &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 1677 (i).

—— *See* 'Manitoba,' 'N.W.T.', &c.

LAND GUIDES, *re* SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 6768 (iii).

LAND SALES, WINNIPEG, PURCHASERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 1858 (i).

LAND SCRIP, MAN. AND N. W. T. VOLUNTEERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 820 (i).
LAND SLIDE: *See* 'Turtle Mountain,' 'Frank Disaster.'
LAND SUBSIDIES TO RYS. IN MAN. AND N.W. TERS.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1197 (i).
—— UNEARNED, &C., Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 3797 (ii).
LAPRAIRIE ICE PIERS PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 2248 (i), 13460 (vi).
L'ARDOISE, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
LARKIN, CAPT. W. S., COMPLAINTS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2922 (ii).
LARRY'S RIVER BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1104 (i).
L'ASSOMPTION, POST OFFICE, PURCHASE OF SITE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3230 (ii).
—— P O., RECEIPTS, CHEQUES FOR PAYMENT, &C.: M. for Copies*, 3236 (ii).
—— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 427 (i).
LATOUR, L. J., CIRCULAR ISSUED *re* 'LE CANADA': Ques. (Mr. *Lèonard*) 1032 (i).
—— LEAVE OF ABSENCE, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6895 (iii).
—— LEAVE OF ABSENCE, CANVASSING FOR 'LE CANADA,' &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) 13980, 14002 (vi).
—— *See* 'Newspaper Agents.'
LAVAL, ELECTORAL DISTRICT, SUPREME COURT JUDGMENTS: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
LAW LIBRARY IN ENGLAND, ESTABLISHMENT, &C.: M. for Copies of Cor. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 98 (i).
Lead Bounties Payment B. No. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 6169 (iii); in Com. on Res., 8195; 1°* of B., 8230 (iv); 2° and in Com., 10798; 3°*, 10799 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 31).
LEAMINGTON WHARF, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 13246 (vi).
'LE CANADA,' CIRCULAR ISSUED BY L. J. LATOUR, &C.. Ques. (Mr. *Lèonard*) 1032 (i).
—— *See* 'Newspaper Agents,' &c., 'Latour,' &c.
LECTURERS ON AGRICULTURE IN QUEBEC, NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 8615 (iv).
LEGAL EXPENSES *re* GOVT. CASES: in Com. of Sup., 12911 (vi).
—— *re* INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iii).
—— *re* RYS. AND CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 12911 (vi).
—— *See* 'Justice.'
LEGAL OPINIONS *re* G.T.P. RY., CLAUSE 17, CUSTOMS DUTIES: Read (Mr. *Osler*) 11320 (v).
LEGISLATION, HOUSE OF COMMONS: in Com. of Sup., 14112 (vi).
—— PRINTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).
—— *See* 'House of Commons.'
LEMON, MR., TRANSFER TO TORONTO P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).
LEPROSY IN CAN.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*, *Victoria*) in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
—— *See* 'Tracadie.'
LE TABLEAU WHARF, SAGUENAY RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 2249 (i).
LETTER BOX COLLECTIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
LETTER BOXES IN POST OFFICE: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
—— LOCKED BOXES IN H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) 6026 (iii).
LETTER CARRIERS, INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com. of Sup., 14011 (vi).
—— BOOTS, PURCHASE OF: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
LETTER CARRIERS, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 6058, 6063 (iii).
—— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. on Post Office B., 5660, 5672 (iii).
—— SALARY INCREASES: in Com. of Sup., 6004 (iii).
—— SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6013 (iii).
—— TORONTO, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iii).
—— WINNIPEG, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iii).
LEVIS, ACCOMMODATION, I. C. R. STATION: in Com. of Sup., 3703 (ii), 7520 (iii).
—— GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2978 (ii).
—— LAND PURCHASED FOR I. C. R.: M. for O. Cs. &c.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3806 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3631 (ii).
—— PUBLIC BUILDING; in Com. of Sup., 431 (i), 13053 (vi).
LEWES AND YUKON RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).
—— *See* 'Yukon.'
LEWIS POINT, P. E. I., PIER REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
LIARD RIVER MINERS, RELIEF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6926 (iii).
Librarians of Parliament B. No. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) Res. prop., 13670; in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; 2°, and in Com., 14299; 3°*, 14300 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 32.)
LIBRARY OF PARLT.: in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).
—— COM.: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 244 (i).
—— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 6 (i).
LT. GOVERNOR OF ONTARIO AND APPNMT. OF ADMINISTRATOR: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 110, 655, 1204 (i).
—— Remarks, on M. for Com. of Sup., 114 (i).
See 'Mowat.'
LIFE-SAVING AWARDS: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi).
LIFE-SAVING STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi).
LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4132 (ii), 5735, 5751 (iii), 13632 (vi).
—— AGENCIES, RENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi).
—— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5312 (iii).
—— FLOATING LIGHTHOUSES, APPLICATIONS, &C. FROM CAPTAINS: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 665 (i).

LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE, KEEPERS' SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 4132 (ii).
—— KEEPERS, INCREASE OF SALARY, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 14665 (vi).
—— SUPPLIES, MAINTENANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4168 (ii).
LIGHTING DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).
See 'Ottawa Buildings.'
L'ILE D'ALMA, REMOVAL OF ROCKS: in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i).
LIME RIDGE AND MEGANTIC RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).
LIME ROCK, N.S., POSTMASTER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1297 (i).
Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s B. No. 146 (Mr. *Vrooman*) 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2720; in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 144.)
LINDSAY DRILL HALL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13082 (vi).
LINGAN BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 1105 (i).
LINSEED OIL, DEPUTATION *re* IMPORTATION, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3934 (ii).
LIQUOR INSPECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5393 (iii).
See 'Inland Revenue.'
LISGAR ELECTION TRIAL: *See* 'Perkins.'
LISTOWEL PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13123 (vi).
LITHGOW, MR., CONTROLLER, YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iii).
LITIGATION EXPENSES *re* INTERIOR: in Com. of Sup., 6794 (iii).
See 'Justice,' &c., 'Legal,' &c.
LITTLE BEAR CREEK, ONT., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13245 (vi).
LITTLE CURRENT, GEORGIAN BAY, CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 13245 (vi).
LITTLE METIS: *See* 'Metis.'
LIVE STOCK EXHIBIT, ST. LOUIS EXHIBITION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4602 (ii).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.
LIVINGSTONE'S COVE, N. S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13200 (vi).
LLOYDS' REP. *re* ST. LAWRENCE NAVIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 4133–38 (ii).
See 'Marine,' 'St. Lawrence Route, &c.'
Loan Companies, Extension of Power B. No. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*, *Haldimand*) 1° m., 284; 2°*, 1025; in Com., 2349 (i); 3°*, 2756 (ii); Sen. Amts., 14763 (vi).
LOANS, GOVT., &c.: *See* 'Public Debt.'
LOBSTER HATCHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
LOBSTER INDUSTRY, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
—— INDUSTRY, N. S.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).
—— INSPECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).
LOBSTER INSPECTION, HALIFAX: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) in Com. of Sup., 5122 (ii).
See 'Fisheries.'
LOCKMEN, &c., ON CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
LOCKS FOR CUSTOMS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 3962 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES, CARS, &c., I. C. R., PURCHASE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 4361 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES CONSTRUCTED AT MONCTON, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
See 'I. C. R.'
London and Port Stanley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 63 (Mr. *McGugan*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii) (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 145).
LONDON DRILL HALL AND ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).
London Loan Co. of Canada Incorp. B. No. 101 (Mr. *McGugan*) 1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1815 (i).
LONDON MILITARY MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
LONGFORD: *See* 'Wood Alcohol.'
LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE, MONTREAL, GOVTL. ACTION, &c.: Remarks, (Mr. *Monk*) 2504 (ii).
—— PAY OF MILITIA: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4006 (ii).
—— SETTLEMENT, &c.: Tel. Read (Mr. *Tarte*) 2676–7 (ii).
LONGUEUIL BRIDGE: *See* 'Montreal and Longueuil B.'
LONGUEUIL PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com, of Sup., 13069 (vi).
LONG WHARF, ST. JOHN, N.B., LEASE BY GOVT.: Q es. (Mr. *Fowler*) 11828 (v).
LORD'S COVE (DEER ISLAND) WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
LORNE SIDING, I. C. R., TRAFFIC, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 2918 (ii).
'LORD STRATHCONA' WRECKING PLANT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6003 (iii), 13697 (vi).
LOTBINIÈRE WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13460 (vi).
LOW, A. P., TECHNICAL OFFICER, GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13770 (vi).
LOWER MONTAGUE, P.E.I., in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).
LOY, GEO. M., M. P. FOR BEAUHARNOIS, VIOLATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT ACT, REPORT OF COM. ON PRIVS. AND ELECTIONS: Presented (Mr. *Wade*) 7916 (iv).
—— M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7917; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 7918, 7922 (iv)
—— on M. to Conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections, 8008; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 8008 (iv).
—— REP. *re* STENOGRAPHER: Presented (Mr. *Fraser*) 7203 (iii).
—— *See* 'Beauharnois Electoral District.'
LUMBER COMBINE IN MAN. AND N. W. T.: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 1579–1590 (i).
—— N. W. T., COMMISSION, &c.: Ques. (Mr *Scott*) 6168 (iii).
Lumbermen's Fire Insurance Co's. Incorp. B. No. 68 (Mr. *Charlton*) 1°*, 813; 2°*, 1328; in Com., and 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 146).

LUMBER TRADE IN B. C., TEL. FROM MANUFACTURERS: Read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14766 (vi).
LUNENBURG FISH HATCHERY: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
LUNENBURG HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1106 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com of Sup., 13315 (vi).
LURCHER'S SHOAL LIGHTSHIP, CREW AND MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).
MACGREGOR, CAPT., STR. 'BAYFIELD,' GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).
MACKENZIE AND RENOUF FALLS RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14467 (vi).
MACNEE FISHING LICENSES: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 4727 (ii).
Macleod, Cardston and Montana Ry. Co's. Incorp. B. No. 70. (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 814; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 147).
MACLEOD COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
MACLEOD, N. W. T., DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 8082 (iv).
MACPHERSON, D. F., CENSUS ENUMERATOR, CLINTON: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4820 (ii).
MACRAE, MR., INDIAN INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
MCCRANEY, MR. W., ex-M. P., LETTER *re* LEGISLATION: Read (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 5362 (iii).
McDermid, Ellen, Relief B. No. 229 (Mr. *Birkett*) 1°*, 7922; 2°*, 8264; M. for Com., 9148; in Com., and 3°*, 9149 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 150).
MCDONNELL, GEO., LEASE OF GRAZING LANDS, N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 8330 (iv).
McDougall, James Sinclair, Patent Relief B. No. 169 (Mr. *Gallery*) M. to receive Pet., 2397 (i); 1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956; in Com., and 3°*, 4672 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 151).
MCKAY'S POINT, N. S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MCMONAGLE, MILES, DISMISSAL FROM OROMOCTO SHOALS LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1194 (i).
MCNULTY, POSTMASTER, PETS. *re* REMOVAL OF OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).
See 'Lambton.'
MCNUTT'S ISLAND, N. S., BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MABOU AND GULF RY. CO'S. SUBSIDY: in Com. on RES., 14326 (vi).
MACHINERY FOR CAR SHOPS: in Com. of Sup., 14106 (vi).
MAGANN AND PHIN, CLAIMS *re* TORONTO HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 13255 (vi).
MAGDALEN ISLANDS, BREAKWATERS, PIERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2264 (i).
——— LAND TEL. LINES, REPAIRING: in Com. of Sup., 2714 (ii).
MAGDALEN ISLANDS AND MAINLAND SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 7741 (iv), 13675 (vi).
MAGNETIC OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 4118 (ii).
MAGNESS, MR., AND GRAIN THRESHING SCALE: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com. on B. 188, 4191-4203 (ii).
——— *See* 'Fyfe.'
MAGOG PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13081 (vi).
MAGUASHA, LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
MAHONE BAY POSTAL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. of Sup, 14038 (vi).
MAIL BAGS AND CAMPAIGN LITERATURE, BLOCKING CORRIDORS: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil*) 14219 (vi).
——— *See* 'Campaign.'
——— REFUNDING EXPRESS CHARGES: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 14684 (vi).
——— REFUSAL TO ACCEPT IN H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 14550 (vi).
——— SPECIAL TRAINS, ACCOMMODATION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 14680, 14688 (vi).
——— STATEMENT *re* CONFERENCE (Sir *William Mulock*) 14681 (vi).
——— STATEMENT (Sir *William Mulock*) read *re* Threats to Express Cos., 14851 (vi).
——— USE OF ROOMS IN H. OF C., &C.: Remarks (Mr, *Borden, Halifax*) M. to adjn. Hse., 14530 (vi).
——— STATEMENT *re*: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 14565 (vi).
MAIL BAGS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
MAILS CARRIED BY RYS.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6268 (iii).
MAILS CARRIED VIA NEW YORK, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7728 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 10713 (v).
MAIL CARS, N.W.T., INSUFFICIENT ACCOMMODATION: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5870 (iii).
MAIL CLERKS, INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com, of Sup., 13997 (vi).
——— *See* 'Ry. Mail Clerks.'
MAIL-MARKING MACHINES: in Com. of Sup., 6159 (iii).
MAIL SERVICE, P. O. DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 6065 (iii).
MAIL SERVICE, P.E.I.: IRREGULARITY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 5937 (iii).
MAIL SUBSIDIES AND SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 5878, 5997 (iii), 7573, 7728 (iv), 13672, 14249 (vi).
——— *See* 'Trade and Commerce.'
MAIN A DIEU, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MAJOR'S HILL PARK: in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).
MALAGAWATCH, N.S., BOAT CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
MALIGNANT COVE, N.S., HARBOUR REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MALLON, A.D., RETIREMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6037 (iii).
MANAGERS *re* RY. CONFERENCE: *See* 'Railw

MANCHESTER AND MONTREAL SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 7745 (iv).

Manitoba Grain Act (1900) Amt. B. No. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1° m., 7294 (iii); 2° m., 7988; in Com., 7991, 9350 (iv); Sen. Amts., 13623 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 33).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co's. B. No. 44 (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 591; 2°*, 665 (i).

MANITOBA:

ASSINIBOINE AND RED RIVERS NAVIGATION, COM. FROM WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1298 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Larivière*) 1859 (i).
AUTOMATIC GRAIN WEIGHERS, &c., 847, 880 (i).
——— *See* 'Grain.'
BARNES, AMOS, CLAIM FOR LAND, &c.: in Com, of Sup., 6922 (iii).
BUILDINGS, GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 442 (i), 5844 (iii), 13126 (vi).
CORY, W. W., SALARY, DUTIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6853 (iii).
DAUPHIN, LAKE LOWERING: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
——— PORT OF ENTRY, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).
DOM. LANDS, MAN. AND N.W.T., SALE, PRICES PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 816.
——— *See* 'Lands,' &c.
DOUKHOBORS HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 541 (i).
——— LOANS TO, BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5587 (iii).
———PILGRIMAGE, EXPENSES, LOSSES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 542 (i).
DREDGING PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii), 13311 (vi).
ELEVATOR RATES, ADVANCE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Douglas*) 11062 (vi).
EMERSON MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5321 (iii).
EWART, JOHN A., ADDRESS PRESENTED TO JUDGE PERDUE: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 11072 (v).
FYFE, MR., INSPECTION REP. *re* GRAIN THRESHING SCALE: Remarks *re*, 4192 (ii).
——— *See* 'Grain.'
GRAIN ACT, ADMINISTRATION OF ACT: in Com. of Sup., 7762 (iv).
——— INSPECTION *re*, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13698 (vi).
LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7798 (iv).
——— WEIGHING MACHINES: in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*, &c.) in Com. on B. 188, 4187 (ii).
GULL HARBOUR, ST. GEORGE'S BAY, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
HALF-BREED CLAIMS, COMMISSIONS, APPLICATIONS FOR SCRIP, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 110 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2016 (i), 3397 (ii).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i), 3354 (ii).
HNAUSA WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
HOMESTEAD ENTRIES *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6704 (iii).
HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS: in Com. of Sup., 6766 (iii).
HOMESTEAD LANDS, AVAILABLE FOR SETTLERS: Statement read (Mr. *Sifton*) 6787 (iii).
IMMIGRATION BUILDING, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 5844 (iii).

MANITOBA—*Con.*

IMMIGRANTS, ACCOMMODATION FOR SETTLERS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) on M. for Sup., 1119 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Puttee*) 866 (i).
——— HOUSES AND FUEL: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 542 (i).
JEROME, MARTIN, M.P.P., AND MAN. ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 5321 (iii).
JONASSON, MR. S., FOREST RANGER IN MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1198 (i).
JUDGESHIP, DELAY IN APPNMT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).
JUDGES APPOINTED AS COMMISSIONERS, ALLUSION IN MR. EWART'S ADDRESS TO JUDGE PERDUE: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 11072 (v).
JUDGES' TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES: in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).
KEEWATIN GOVT., EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6797 (iii).
KING'S WAREHOUSE AT WINNIPEG: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 6268 (iii).
LAKE FRANCIS OUTLET, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1449 (i).
LAKE MANITOBA, OUTLET *via* FAIRFORD RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1449 (i).
LAND SUBSIDIES TO RYS. IN MAN. AND N. W. TERS.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1197 (i).
——— AREAS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2102 (i).
——— AREA UNPATENTED: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2583 (ii).
LAND SALES, WINNIPEG, PURCHASERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1858 (i).
——— *See* 'Dom. Lands.'
MAGNESS, MR., AND GRAIN THRESHING SCALE: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com. on B. 188, 4191-4203 (ii).
——— *See* 'Grain,' &c.
MAN. POSTMASTERS: *See* 'Postmasters.'
MORDEN BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* WHEAT FREIGHT RATES: Ques. (Mr. *Stewart*) 12074 (v).
MYERS, JUDGE, REP. IN HANSARD: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 285 (i).
NATURALIZATION ACT, REGULATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2015 (i).
NESBITT, MAN., POSTMASTER WATSON, AND EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1196 (i).
PARADIS, AMABLE, FERRY SERVICE AT WHITFORD, COR., &c.: M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) for Copies*, 2338 (i).
PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3534 (ii).
PERKINS, WM., PAYMENT TO *re* LISGAR ELECTION; in Com. of Sup., 14251 (vi).
POSTMASTERS' ASSOCIATION, MAN. AND N.W.T., MEMORIAL *re* SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 125 (i), 13259 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).
——— Stmnt. (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. of Sup., 14016 (vi).
PRENDERGAST AND MAN. JUDGESHIP, DELAY IN APPNMT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply,' 'Public Works.'
RAILWAYS CONSTRUCTED WITHOUT GOVT. AID, MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 8487 (iv).
RY. MAIL CLERKS, MAN. AND N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 14041 (vi).
RY. SUBSIDIES FOR MAN.: Remarks (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com. on Res., 14494 (vi).
RAINY RIVER MAIL SERVICE: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6889 (iii).
REPRESENTATION OF MAN. AND N.W.T. IN THE SENATE: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1297 (i).

MANITOBA—*Con.*
ROSEAU RIVER RESERVE, SALE OF LOTS: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5319 (iii).
ST. ANDREWS' LOCKS CONTRACT, COMPLETION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 287 (i).
ST. ANDREWS' RAPIDS, RED RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 3354 (ii).
——— REPORT *re* CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 14284 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 10490 (v).
ST. BONIFACE, MONEY ORDER BRANCH, CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5321 (iii).
——— POSTAL FACILITIES: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1854 (i).
SCHOOL LANDS, MAN. AND N. W. T., SALE, AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 706 (i).
——— *See* 'Lands,' &c., 'Dom.', &c.
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6893 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 6169 (iii).
SELKIRK WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
SENATE REPRESENTATION IN MAN. AND N.W.T., LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1297 (i).
——— *See* 'N. W. T., B. 254.'
SNAG BOAT, SELF-PROPELLING, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii).
SWAMP LANDS, CONSTRUCTION OF ROAD, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).
TEULON NORTH, CONSTRUCTION ROAD: in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).
VOLUNTEERS OF MAN. AND N. W. T., LAND SCRIP, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 820 (i).
WATSON, JOHN, PRES'DT. OF LIB. ASSOCIATION: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1196 (i).
WHEAT FREIGHT RATES, RES. OF MORDEN BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Stewart*) 12074 (v).
WHITE MUD RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
WINNIPEG BARRACKS, STREET PAVING: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).
WINNIPEG BEACH TO ICELANDIC RIVER RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).
WINNIPEG, CUSTOMS WAREHOUSE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 6268 (iii).
——— IMMIGRATION BUILDINGS AND POSTAL STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
——— LAND OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 6767 (iii).
——— LETTER CARRIERS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com. of Sup., 14011 (vi).
——— MILITARY MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13127 (vi).
——— MILITARY STORES: in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 438 (i), 13127 (vi).
——— Dixon, Mr. J. W. T., DEAD LETTER OFFICE, ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13995 (vi).
——— P.O. INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 14001 (vi).
——— REVENUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*), 666 (i).
WINNIPEGOSIS CHANNEL DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
See 'N.W.T.,' 'Immigration,' 'Interior,' &c.

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. No. 97 (Mr. *Dyment*), 1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 148.)

MANITOULIN AND NORTH SHORE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14397 (vi).
MANUFACTURERS' DELEGATION *re* TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*), 265 (i).
MAPS, LITHOGRAPHING AND PRINTING: in Com. of Sup., 6800 (iii), 13778 (vi).
——— PRINTING, INFORMATION *re*, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
MARA, RAMA, &C., FLOODING OF LANDS: M. (Mr. *Grant*) for Copies of Rep., &c., 2762 (ii).

Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co. of Canada, Limited, Incorp. B. No. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*), 1°*, 2014; 2°*, 2305 (i); in Com., 5093, 5359; 3°*, 5360 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 149.)

MARCONI WIRELESS TEL. APPARATUS AT CHATEAU BAY: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
——— SUCCESS OF SYSTEM: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
——— TELEGRAPH STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 2989 (ii), 13639 (vi).
MARGAREE, N.S., IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).
MARGARETVILLE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
MARIA PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2265 (i).

Marine Engineers Bill: *See* 'Steamboat Bill.'

MARINE:
"ACADIA", SALE, &C.: Remarks in Com of Sup., 13658 (vi).
——— STEAMER TO REPLACE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13659 (vi).
ACETYLENE GAS BUOYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13633 (vi).
ACETYLENE GAS, &C., IN LIGHTHOUSES: in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).
AIDS TO NAVIGATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).
——— CHANNEL SWEEPING BOATS: in Com. of Sup., 13633 (vi).
——— LIGHTHOUSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5736 (iii).
See 'St. Lawrence.'
ALBERT CO., N.B., DISMISSAL OF CAPT. BISHOP: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 6896 (iii).
ANCHOR LINE SALVAGE COMPENSATION FOR "SCOTIA": in Com. of Sup., 14107 (vi).
ANNANDALE RANGE LIGHTS, AMT. EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*), 2921 (ii).
ANTICOSTI LIGHTSHIP: in Com. of Sup., 5737 (iii).
ARSENEAULT, CAPT., COMPENSATION *re* DAMAGES TO SCHR.: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).
BASS RIVER PERMANENT LIGHT: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
BATHURST HARBOUR BUOYS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*), 3630 (ii).
——— HARBOUR MASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 2919 (ii).
"BAYFIELD", REPAIRS AND SALE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5278, 5282, 5762 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*), 5586; in Com. of Sup., Mr. Evans' Reps., &c.: read (Mr. *Préfontaine*), 5742, 5763 (iii).
BIOLOGICAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi).
BISHOP, CAPT., DISMISSAL AS HARBOUR MASTER FROM ALBERT, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 6896 (iii).
BRONTE LIGHTHOUSE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Henderson*), 5757 (iii).
"CAMPANA", INVESTIGATION *re* WRECK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).
CANADIAN COAST LIGHTING: Quotation (Mr. *Préfontaine*), from English paper, in Com. of Sup., 4164 (ii).

MARINE—*Con.*

CHABOT, MR. F. X., DISMISSAL AS LIGHTKEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*), 2015 (i).

COMMANDERS OF GOVT. STEAMERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*), 446 (i).

DALY, M. T., HARBOUR MASTER AT BATHURST, N.B., DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 2919 (ii).

DALY, MICHAEL, HARBOUR MASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*), 3630 (ii).

"EUXINE", SCUTTLING OF SCHR.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *McLennan*), 699 (i).

GAS BUOYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi). *See* 'Acetylene.'

GOVT. STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).

——— NAMES OF COMMANDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*), 446 (i).

——— REPAIRS, SUPPLIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4047, 5033 (ii).

"GRECIAN", STR., REIMBURSEMENT TO CAPT. HARRISON *re* SUSPENSION OF CERTIFICATE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*), 10239 (v).

HALIFAX HARBOUR, BUOY SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).

——— LIGHTSHIP: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4165 (ii).

——— MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPT., REMOVAL, &C., RES. FROM HALIFAX BOARD OF TRADE: Read (Mr. *Bell*), 14279 (iii).

HARRISON, CAPT., STR. "GRECIAN", COSTS *re* SUSPENSION OF CERTIFICATE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*), 10239 (v).

HATCHEY, NAZAIRE, APPNMT. AS HARBOUR MASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*), 3630 (ii).

HATFIELD S POINT LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 6896 (iii).

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 2715, 2720, 4118 (ii).

INSURANCE RATES ON OCEAN STEAMERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7591 (iv), 13697 (vi).

LIFE-SAVING AWARDS: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi.).

LIFE-SAVING STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi).

LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4132 (ii), 5735, 5751 (iii), 13632 (vi).

——— AGENCIES, RENTS, &C.; in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi).

——— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5312 (iii).

——— FLOATING LIGHTHOUSES, APPLICATIONS, &C., FROM CAPTAINS: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 665 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 14665 (vi).

——— KEEPERS SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 4132 (ii).

——— SUPPLIES, MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4168 (ii).

LLOYDS REP. *re* ST. LAWRENCE NAVIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 4133-38 (ii).

——— *See* 'St. Lawrence.'

LURCHER'S SHOAL LIGHTSHIP, CREW AND MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).

MCGREGOR, CAPT., STR. 'BAYFIELD,' GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).

MCMONAGLE, MILES, DISMISSAL FROM OROMOCTO SHOALS LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1194 (i).

MARCONI STATIONS: *See* general heading.

MARINE AND FISHERIES, DEPT. CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 5033 (ii).

——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 244 (i).

——— DEPTL. SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 341 (i).

MARINE—*Con,*

MARINE, DEPTL. SALARIES, INCREASES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13663 (vi).

——— AND TRANSFER OF PUBLIC WORKS: *See* 'Public Works.'

MARINE SIGNAL SERVICE, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).

MASTERS AND MATES EXAMINATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 13524 (vi).

MASTERS OF VESSELS, INSTRUCTIONS *re* POSTAGE: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 5664 (iii).

MAYRAND, DENIS, PETITION *re* DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 9082 (iv).

MENARD, DENIS, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3536 (ii).

METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVATORY, REMOVAL, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6792 (iii).

——— REMOVAL FROM TORONTO: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 6435 (iii).

'MINTO' AND 'STANLEY' STRS., INFORMATION *re* TELEGRAM: Read (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 6 (i).

'MINTO' GOVT. STR., PASSENGERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3631 (ii).

MISCOU LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3631 (ii).

MONTREAL PILOT COMMISSIONERS COURT: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).

MONTREAL SHIPPING INTERESTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Monk*) 5737 (iii).

'MONTEREY' STR. WRECK, PAR. IN MONTREAL 'STAR': Memo read (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 6803 (iii).

NAVAL RESERVE: *See* 'Schools.'

NEWFOUNDLAND COAST WRECKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4167 (ii).

NOBLES, ISRAEL, DISMISSAL FROM HATFIELD LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).

NORTH HALFWAY POINT, LIGHTKEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3536 (ii).

NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS, P. E. I., WINTER NAVIGATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 6895 (iii).

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4041, 5033 (ii).

OFFICERS MESS, STR. 'QUADRA,' REGULATIONS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9819 (iv).

OROMOCTO SHOALS, LIGHTKEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1194 (i).

PARADIS, AMABLE, FERRY SERVICE AT WHITFORD, COR., &C.: M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) for Copies*, 2338 (i).

PEGGY'S COVE, HALIFAX, DISMISSAL OF LIGHTKEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2312 (i).

'PETREL,' REPLACEMENT BY NEW STEAMER: in Com. of Sup., 13658 (vi).

PICTOU LIGHTHOUSE CONSTRUCTION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4167 (ii).

P. E. I. WINTER COMMUNICATION: M. for Copies of Pets., &c. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2765 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4006 (ii).

PUGWASH, N.S., LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1856 (i).

'QUADRA,' STR., REGULATIONS *re* OFFICERS MESS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9819 (iv).

RIVERS, ROBERT, DISMISSAL FROM MISCOU LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3631 (ii).

ST. LAWRENCE GULF FISHING, PET. *re:* Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2917 (ii).

ST. LAWRENCE ROUTE: in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).

——— LIGHTHOUSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi).

——— AND LLOYDS, Cor. *re:* Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13698 (vi).

——— *See* 'Can. Coasts.'

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, NAVIGATION OBSTRUCTION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).

MARINE—*Con.*

ST. LAWRENCE ROUTE, REP. *re*: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4133 (ii).

——— PILOTAGE, *re*, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4132, 4168 (ii).

——— RETIREMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2915 (ii).

——— SHIPPING INTERESTS, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Monk*) 5758 (iii).

ST. LOUIS LAKE, HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).

SCHOOL OF NAVIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 13545 (vi).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. of Sup., 13535 (vi).

SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS AND HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).

'SCOTIA,' STR., SALVAGE CLAIMS, &C.: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Osler*) 7150 (iii).

——— SERVICES BY ANCHOR LINE, COMPENSATION: in Com. of Sup., 14107 (vi).

——— Stmnt. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 7206 (iii).

'STANLEY,' STR., MR. MACMILLAN'S REP. *re* REPAIRS: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 4050 (ii).

——— REPAIRS TO 'STANLEY' AND 'LANSDOWNE': in Com. of Sup., 13518 (vi).

——— AND P. E. I., WINTER COMMUNICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4006 (ii).
See 'Govt. Steamers,' 'Winter,' &c.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 4119 (ii).

——— TORONTO DISTRICT: in Com. of Sup., 13648 (vi).

SWINEHAMMER, GEO., LIGHTKEEPER AT PEGGY'S COVE: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2312 (i).

TIDAL SERVICE, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4114 (ii).

WINTER NAVIGATION, P.E.I., CONSTRUCTION OF STR.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 6895 (iii).

——— COMMUNICATION WITH P.E.I., COR. WITH GOVT.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) 1036 (i).

——— M. for Memorials, &c. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2765 (ii).

WIRELESS STATIONS ON MARINE COASTS: in Com. of Sup., 13639 (vi).
See 'Marconi.'

WRECKING PLANT 'LORD STRATHCONA,' MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6003 (iii), 13697 (vi).

WRECKS, INVESTIGATION *re*: in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii), 6803 (iii), 13524, 13544 (vi).

MAR. PROVS., BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup,, 422 (i).

MARKET GARDENERS, PROTECTION *re* FOREIGN COMPETITION: Amt. (Mr. *Lèonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4766; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 100) 4799 (ii).
See 'Vegetables,' &c.

'MARKLAND,' SCHR., SEIZURE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5992 (iii).

MARTINEAU, ARTHUR, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3802 (ii).

MARTINEAU DEFALCATIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3584 (ii), 6934 (iii).

——— EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iii).

——— AND REPORT *re* FIRE SECURITY: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 4673 (ii).

——— REP. *re* AUD. GENERAL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3752 (ii), 6933 (iii).

MARTINEAU DEFALCATIONS, INQUIRY FOR REP. OF INVESTIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).

MARTINEAU, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 10242 (v).

MARYSVILLE N. B., POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5835, 5841 (iii).

Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. No. 226 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) Res. prop., 6271; in Com. on Res., 6543; 1°* of B., 6545; 2°, and in Com., 6917; 3°*, 6918 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 34.)

MASTERS AND MATES EXAMINATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 13524 (vi).

MASTERS OF VESSELS FROM FOREIGN PORTS AND CUSTOMS DEPT., INSTRUCTIONS *re* POSTAGE: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 5664 (iii).

MATANE AND GASPE RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14481 (vi).

MATHURIN, JCS. A., DEATH SENTENCE, JUDGE'S REP. &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3236 (ii).

MAYRAND, DENIS, PETITION *re* DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 9082 (iv).

MEAFORD POST OFFICE: Remarks (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13124 (vi).

MECHANICS FROM ENG., AND TORONTO LABOUR COUNCIL: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1854 (i).

MEDALS FOR THIRD CAN. MOUNTED RIFLES: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1675 (i).
See 'Militia.'

MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, BRANT INDIAN RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).

——— INDIANS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13785 (vi).

——— INDIANS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).

——— INDIANS, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iii).

——— INDIANS, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).

——— INDIANS, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iii).

MEDICAL INSPECTION OF IMMIGRANTS: in Com. of Sup., 6695, 6851 (iii).
See 'Immigration.'

Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. No. 141 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 2237 (i); 2°*, 2544 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 152.)

MEDICINE HAT RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14503 (vi).

MEHAN, DR., METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE, REMOVAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).

MELBOURNE, N.S., WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).

MEMBERS APPOINTED TO GOVT. POSITIONS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3805 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3632 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 9582 (iv).

MEMBERS INTRODUCED, 3, 7, 283, 1642 (i).

——— NEW, CERTIFICATES OF ELECTION: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).

MEMBERS RIGHTS TO SPEAK, MR. SPEAKER'S RULINGS: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 10535 (v).
See 'H. of C.'

MENARD, DENIS, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3526 (ii).

MESS. FROM HIS EX. : Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 90 707 (i), 4956 (ii), 14662 (vi).

——— Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1204 (i).

——— Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 90, 707, 1204 (i), 4956 (ii), 14662 (vi).

——— Read (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 12869 (vi).

MESSENGERS OF THE H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).
See 'H. of C.'

METALLURGIST AND PETROGRAPHERS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13778 (vi).

METAPEDIA, STATION IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 14096 (vi).

METEGHAN COVE BREAKWATER, RESTORATION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).

METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 4118 (ii).

——— REMOVAL FROM TORONTO : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 6435 (iii).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6792 (iii).

METHYLATED SPIRITS, SUPPLIED TO MANUFACTURERS : in Com. of Sup., 5373 (iii).

METIS STATION, DIVERTING ROAD, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12604 (v), 12828 (vi).

Mexican Light and Power Co., Limited, Co.'s B. No. 126 (Mr. *Thompson*) 1°*, 1853 ; 2°*, 2050 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 153.)

MICMAC DICTIONARY : in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v).

MIDDLE RIVER, N.S., SHEAR DAM : in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).

MIDDLETON ARMOURY, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 969 (i), 5841 (iii).

MIDDLETON AND VICTORIA BEACH RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14330 (vi).

MIDDLETON, N. W., GOLD COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, DEFALCATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iii).

MIDLAND DREDGES, &C., CAPACITY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).

MIDLAND HARBOUR DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i), 5909 (iii).

——— IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13246 (vi).

MIDLAND MERCANTILE CO., RENT OF BUILDINGS ON DOCK, MIDLAND : in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii), 13247 (vi).

——— PORT OF ENTRY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).

——— POST OFFICE BUILDING : Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii).

MIDLAND RY. CO., TRURO BRANCH, RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14488 (vi).

MIDLAND WATER FRONT, LEASE TO PRATT & CO. : Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii), 13247 (vi).

Midway and Vernon Ry. Co.'s B. No. 216 (Mr. *Galliher*) 1°*, 5679 ; 2°*, 5989 ; in Com., and 3°*, 6658 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 154).

MILLER BROS., PAYMENTS *re* DEFAULTING POSTMASTER : in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).

MILITARY ASYLUM, PENSIONS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iii).

——— BUILDINGS, QUE., IRON FOUNDRY : in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
See 'Militia.'

——— COLLEGE, KINGSTON : in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
See 'Royal Military,' 'Kingston,' &c.

MILITIA ACT AMT. AND MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S SUGGESTIONS : Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 6540 (iii).

MILITIA FORCE, CONDITIONS, PAY, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5702 (iii).

DEB. : (Mr. *Sproule*) 5715 ; (Mr. *Gourley*) 5717 ; (Mr. *Fielding*) 5719 ; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 5720 ; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 5722 ; (Mr. *Ingram*) 5725 ; (Mr. *Morin*) 5726 ; (Mr. *Oliver*) 5727 ; (Mr. *Clarke*) 5729 ; (Mr. *Johnson, Cardwell*) 5732 ; (Mr. *Kemp*) 5733 (iii).

Militia Pensions Act Amt. B. No. 78 (Sir *Frederick Borden*) 1°m., 872 ; 2°*, 1116 ; in Com., 1116, 2240 ; 3°*, 2240 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 35.)

MILITIA :

ANNUAL DRILL, CAMPS : in Com. of Sup., 3603, 5005 (ii).

ARMOURIES, GENERALLY : in Com. of Sup., 965 (i).

——— CONSTRUCTION OF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13082 (vi).

ARSENAL, DOM. : in Com. of Sup., 7089 (iii).

——— CONSTRUCTION IN CAN.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13054 (vi).

——— DOM. ARSENAL STORE : in Com. of Sup., 13054 (vi).

BLANKETS, WEB, CLOTH, PURCHASED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bain*) 10102, 10410, 10714, 10954 (v).

CADET TRAINING, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3773 (ii).

CAMPS FOR MILITIA : in Com. of Sup., 3603, 5005 (ii).

CANADIAN BEEF SUPPLIED TO BRITISH TROOPS : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 483 (i).

——— MOUNTED RIFLES, MEDALS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1675 (i).

CARTOONS IN 'MILITARY GAZETTE,' &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2103 (i).

CHAMBERLAIN, HON. MR., SUGGESTIONS *re* MILITIA ACT : Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 6540 (iii).

COLDSTREAM GUARDS BAND, ARRANGEMENT *re* VISIT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 9683 (iv).

COOKE *vs.* COLE, LITIGATION EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iii).

CORONATION CONTINGENT, EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iii).

DEFENCE SCHEME *re* MILITIA : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3763 (ii).

DIXON, CAPT., DUTIES IN S. AFRICA : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 7914 (iv).

DUNDONALD, LORD : *See* 'G. O. C.'

ESQUIMALT DEFENCES : in Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii).

FLAGSHIP, REMOVAL FROM ESQUIMALT : Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10957 (v).

G. O. C., APPNMT., &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3779 (ii).

——— LORD DUNDONALD'S SPEECH IN HAMILTON : Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup. 2399 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*

G. O. C., Rep. *re* Defence Scheme: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3763 (ii).
——— Rep., &c., Publishing of: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 669 (i).
German Recruiting in Canada for Naval Service: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 8718 (vi).
Gordon Highlanders Trophy: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 7253 (iii).
Guns ordered by British Army: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt.: on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) for Ret., Remarks, 1057 (i).
See general heading.
Hutton, Maj. Gen.: Inquiry for Ret., Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 206 (i).
Imperial Defence and prop. Res. of Lord Rosebery: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 410 (i).
See 'Naval Reserve'
King's S. A. Medals, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 10491 (v).
See 'S. A. War.'
Kingston Barracks, R. C. Field Artillery: in Com. of Sup., 13118 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com. of Sup., 13128 (vi).
——— Military College: in Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii), 5842 (iii).
——— drill hall: in Com. of Sup., 13094 (vi).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal, Pay of Militia: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4006 (ii).
——— Strike, Montreal, Govtl. Action, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 2504 (ii).
Martineau, Arthur, Appnmt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3802 (ii).
——— Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3584 (ii), 6934 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Rep. of Investigation; in Com. of Sup., 3752, 3898 (ii).
——— Investigation, Rep. *re* Aud. General: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iii).
Medals for Third Can. Mounted Rifles: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1675 (i).
——— *See* 'S.A.', &c.
Middleton Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 969 (i).
Military Asylum, Pensions, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iii).
Military College: *See* 'Kingston.'
Military Properties, Care and Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 3611 (ii).
Military Reserve at Port Moody: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 446 (i).
Military Riding School, St. John d'Iberville, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8616 (iv).
Military Stores Branch, Reorganization: in Com. of Sup., 3608 (ii).
Militia: in Com. of Sup., 3752 (ii), 7089 (iii).
Militia Bill, Date of Introduction: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 669 (i).
Militia, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir *Frederick Borden*) 283 (i).
——— Dept., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 221 (i).
——— Estimates: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 13368 (vi).
——— Expenditures: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).
Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 13076 (vi).
Montreal Longshoremen's Strike, Payment of Militia: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4006 (ii).
——— *See* 'Longshoremen.'
Mulloy, Trooper, Pension to by Dom. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 14590 (vi).

MILITIA—*Con.*

Naval Defence: Par. in Toronto 'Globe.' (Mr. *Clarke*) 944 (i).
Naval Militia and School of Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 13545 (vi).
Naval Recruiting in Can. for German Navy: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 8718 (iv).
Naval Reserve, &c., in Can., Cor. between G.B. and Can.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 110 (i).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Bourassa*) 7298 (iii).
——— *See* 'Marine.'
Niagara Militia Camp, Annual Drill: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3604 (ii).
Ninety-Fourth Regiment, Senior and Junior Majors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 9080 (iv).
Pay and Allowance: in Com. of Sup., 3584 (ii), 13379 (vi).
——— General Statement (Sir *Frederick Borden*) 13379 (vi).
Permanent Force, Increase, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).
——— Increase of Pay: Ques. (Mr. *Gilmour*) 13371 (vi).
——— Qualifications of Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 4443 (ii), 6434 (iii).
See 'Royal,' &c.
Plains of Abraham and Military Parades &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3234 (ii).
Port Moody, Military Reserve: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 446 (i).
Quebec Military Buildings, Iron Foundry: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
'Ragging' in the British Army: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for Sup., 3130, 3134 (ii).
Rebellion of 1885, Claims of Settlers: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).
Rifle Associations, Grants to: in Com. of Sup., 3767 (ii).
Ross Rifle, Examination by Experts: Ques. (Mr *Morin*) 2758 (ii).
Ross Rifle Factory, Establishment at Quebec: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 109 (i).
——— Imperfect Return: Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2109 (i).
Ross Rifle, Manufacture of: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).
Royal Canadian Regiment, Numerical Strength, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 3801 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie, Labour Trouble: Par. in Montreal 'Star' *re* Militia (Mr. *Borden, Kings*) 12939 (vi).
Settlers Claims *re* Rebellion, 1885: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).
S. A. Constabulary, Information *re* Grievances, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 1027 (i).
——— Purchase of Discharge, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 14287 (vi).
S. A. Contingents, Employees reinstated, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2337 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1026 (i).
——— Pensions to by Dom. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 14590 (vi).
——— Pensions from Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2920 (ii).
S.A., Medals presented by King, Pet. *re* from Non-Com. Officers: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 10491 (v).
——— Regulations *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) on M. for Sup., 8264 (iv).
——— Remarks (Sir *Frederick Borden*) 8319 (iv).
——— Memorial Association Grant: in Com. of Sup., 6992 (iii).

MILITIA—*Con.*

S. A., SADDLES AND BRIDLES CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1675 (i).
——— SUPPLIES PURCHASED FOR IMP. GOVT.: M. *Borden, Halifax*) for Copies of O. Cs., &c., 2760 (ii).
STUART, CAPT. D. C., HALIFAX, DISMISSAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4353 (ii).
SUSSEX, N. B., ARMOURY CONSTRUCTION, &C., OVERSEER'S QUALIFICATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 8331 (iv).
——— BRIGADE CAMP: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 3235 (ii).
TARGET PRACTICE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3772 (ii).
TENTS, RUSH ORDER, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5764 (iii).
See 'Woods.'
TRANSPORT AND FREIGHT FOR MILITARY PURPOSES: in Com. of Sup., 3752 (ii).
VALLEYFIELD STRIKE, PAY OF MILITIA: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3586, 3753 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13371 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2759 (ii).
VETERANS, CANADIAN, PET. *re* MILITARY SERVICE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 11188 (v).
VOLUNTEERS OF MAN. AND N. W. T., LAND SCRIP, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 820 (i).
WEST POINT, U.S.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13095 (vi).
WINNIPEG BARRACKS, STREET PAVING: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).
——— MILITARY MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13127 (vi).
——— MILITARY STORES: in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
WOODS, J. W., AMOUNT PAID FOR TENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3804 (ii), 5764 (iii).

Milk Cans: *See* 'Weights and Measures, B. 20.'

MILLS, MR., ANNAPOLIS, CLAIMS AGAINST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wade*) 6167 (iii).

MILLS, HON. MR. JUSTICE, DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2794 (ii).

MILL STREET PAVING, LACHINE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).

MINES BRANCH, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13762 (vi).

Mining Companies Incorp. B. (No. 248 from the Senate). This bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.

MINING COMPANIES INCORPORATION BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14850 (vi).

MINING INSTITUTE: in Com. of Sup., 12591 (v), 13508 (vi).

MINISTERIAL CHANGES, EXPLANATION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 90 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 110 (i).
——— EXPLANATION *re* MR. TARTE, &C. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 130, 159 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 90 (i).
——— EXPLANATION *re* MR. BLAIR, &C. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6735 (iii).

MINISTERS, REDUCTION IN NUMBERS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 274 (i).

MINT, ESTABLISHMENT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. of Sup., 14244 (vi).
——— *See* 'Royal.'

'MINTO' AND 'STANLEY' STRS., INFORMATION *re* TELEGRAM: Read (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 6 (i).
'MINTO' GOVT. STR., PASSENGERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3631 (ii).
——— *See* 'Marine,' &c.

MIRAMICHI BRIDGE, SUPERSTRUCTURE: in Com. of Sup., 8307 (iv).
——— *See* 'I. C. R.'

MISCOU HARBOUR, N.B., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
——— LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3631 (ii).

Missionary Society of Can.: *See* 'Church Missionary.'

MISSISSAGA INDIANS, ALNWICK BAND, CLAIMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McColl*) 6895 (iii).

MISTOOK (DELISLE) WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).

MOIRA RIVER, FLOODING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).

MOISIE POINT ROAD, IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 13322 (vi).

MONCTON, CAR SHOP EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 8312 (iv).
——— INCREASED SHED ACCOMMODATION FOR I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
——— STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12599 (v).

MONEY SUBSIDIES TO RYS., I.C.R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1197 (i).
See 'Subsidies,' &c., 'Rys., &c.

MONTAGUE BRIDGE SURVEY, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).

'MONTEREY' STR., WRECK, PAR. IN MONTREAL *Star*: Memo. read (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 6803 (iii).
See 'Marine,' &c.

MONTFORT AND GATINEAU COLONIZATION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14316 (vi).

MONT LOUIS, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).

MONTMAGNY PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5841 (iii), 13066 (vi).

MONTREAL AND ATLANTIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14486 (vi).

Montreal Bank: *See* 'Bank.'

MONTREAL BARRACKS: in Com. of Sup., 13076 (vi).
——— *See* 'Militia.'

Montreal Bridge and Terminal Co.'s B. 167 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii).

MONTREAL, BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of of Sup., 436 (i).
——— CUSTOMS DEPT., SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 8115 (iv).
——— CUSTOMS PORT OF ENTRY, CHANGES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3901 (ii).
——— CONTINGENT EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3783 (ii).
——— DRY DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2981 (ii).
——— REP. OF COMMISSION *re* SITE: in Com. of Sup., 2981 (ii).

MONTREAL DRY DOCK, SITE, &c.: M. FOR O. CS., COR., &c.: (Mr. *Tarte*) 706 (i).
——— *See* 'Harbour.'
——— EXAMINING WAREHOUSE, ALTERATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 433 (i), 13058 (vi).

Montreal Fire Insurance Co.'s Change of Name Bill No. 88 (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 158).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan Bill No. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 4262; in Com. on Res., 4445; 1°* of B. 4486 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 5417; 3°m., 5657 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 36).

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 8084 (iv).
——— HARBOUR, DOCK IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).
——— PERMANENT SHEDS, PLANS PREPARED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14282 (vi).
MONTREAL 'HERALD' CO., &c.: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Fisher*) 5314 (iii).
MONTREAL, INLAND REVENUE OFFICE, MONEY ABSTRACTED: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).
——— 'LABOUR GAZETTE,' COR.: in Com. of Sup., 7155 (iii).
——— LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONTRACTS FOR I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
——— LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE, PAYMENT OF MILITIA: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4006 (ii).
See 'Longshoremen's.'

Montreal and Longueuil Bridge Co's. Incorp. B. No. 156. (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii); in Com., 5558; 3°*, 5558 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 156).

MONTREAL, NEW POSTAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).
——— PILOT COMMISSIONERS COURT: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).
See 'Pilotage.' 'Shipping Casualties Bills.'
——— POST OFFICE, ACCUMULATION OF MAIL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3972 (ii).
——— ENLARGEMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).
——— IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13067 (vi).
——— SHIPPING INTERESTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Monk*) 5737 (iii).
——— SUBWAY CO., O. CS., COR., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 705 (i).
MONTREAL TURNPIKE: *See* 'Turnpike Trust.'
MOOSE DEER POINT, SALE OF ISLANDS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
MOOSEJAW POSTMASTER, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).
MOOSEJAW POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).

Moosonee Diocese: *See* 'Trust Funds.'
MORDEN BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* WHEAT FREIGHT RATES: Ques. (Mr. *Stewart*) 12074 (v).
MOREAU, DR. H., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8331 (iv).
——— AT CHAMBLY CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8488 (iv).
MOREAU, MR. H., COLLECTOR ON CHAMBLY CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12497 (v).
MORNING SITTINGS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 8333 (iv).
MORRISBURG PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup. 492 (i).
MORRISON, MRS., CLAIMS *re* LANDS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14104 (vi).
MORRISON'S POINT, N. S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup. 13203 (vi).

Mortgage, &c.: *See* 'Canada Permanent..
MORTIMER & CO'S. FIRE, GOVT. PROPERTY DESTROYED: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 4836 (ii).

Mounted Police: *See* 'N. W. Mounted.'

Mount Royal Savings Bank Incorp. B. No. 153. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 2501; 2°*, 2720 (ii); wthdn., 10831 (v).
MOUNT ROYAL SAVINGS BANK INCORP. B. NO. 153 (Mr. *Campbell*): M. to withdraw Bill and refund fees, 10831 (v).
MOUNT STEWART FREIGHT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup. 7530 (iii).
MOWAT, SIR OLIVER, LT.-GOV. OF ONTARIO. DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1575 (i).
See 'Lt.-Governor.'
MUHLFELD, MR., REP. *re* 'CHAPMAN' BALL BEARING APPARATUS: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 8283 (iv).
See 'I. C. R.'
MULGRAVE AND PETIT DE GRAT S.S. SERVICE: *See* 'Petit de Grat.'
MULLENS, CORNELIUS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5280 (iii).
MULLENS' LETTER *re* HURLEY, J. M., &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5757, 5761 (iii).
MULLOY, TROOPER, PENSION TO BY THE DOM. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 14590 (vi).
MUNICIPALITIES, COMPENSATION FOR AMALGAMATION OF CANADA CENTRAL AND BROCKVILLE AND OTTAWA RYS., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
MUNICIPAL RIGHTS *re* TRAMWAY CO'S., &c.: Remarks in Com. on Railway Bill, 6081 (iii).
MURRAY BAY TO ST. CATHARINES TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vi).
MURRAY BAY, WHARF EXTENSION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2266 (i).
MURRAY CANAL, PURCHASE OF MR. JOHNSTON'S HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 14143 (vi).
——— WIRE FENCING: in Com. of Sup. 14150 (vi).
MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH RY., P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 7530, (iii), 7801 (iv), 12829, 4108, 14115 (vi).
MURRAY, IMMIGRATION AGENT, SCOTLAND: in Com. of Sup., 6827 (iii).
MUSEUM AT HALIFAX, REMOVAL, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13032 (vi).

MUSQUODOBOIT, N. S., WHARF APPROACHES: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).

Mutual Fire Ins.: *See* 'Montreal Fire.'

Mutual Life Assurance Co. of Canada B. No. 65. (Mr. *Bruce*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977; in Com., 2304; 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 159.)

MYERS, JUDGE, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 285 (i).

NAPANEE, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3919 (ii).

——— POST OFFICE, RENTAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1594 (i).

NAPANEE AND TAMWORTH RY., CHARTER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 8084 (iv).

NAPPAN EXPERIMENTAL FARM BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 973 (i).

NATIONAL ART GALLERY: in Com. of Sup., 12589 (v).

See 'Art, &c.

National Ry. and Transport Co.: *See* 'Canada.'

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL: *See* 'G. T. Pacific.'

NATURALIZATION ACT, EXPENDITURE *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6952 (iii).

——— REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2015 (i).

Naturalization and Aliens Act Amt. B. No. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°*, 5137; 2°; and in Com., 5872; 3°IC., 5991 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 38).

See 'Aliens.'

NAVAL DEFENCE, PAR. IN TORONTO 'GLOBE' *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 944 (i).

——— GREAT LAKES, NUCLEUS OF: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 5295 (iii).

NAVAL MILITIA RESERVE AND SCHOOL OF NAVIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 13535, 13545 (vi).

NAVAL RECRUITING IN CANADA FOR GERMAN VESSELS: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 8718 (iv).

NAVAL RESERVE, &C., IN CAN., COR. BETWEEN G.B. AND CAN.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 110 (i).

——— Inquiry for papers (Mr. *Bourassa*) 7298 (iii).

Navigable Waters Act (swing bridges) Amt. B. No. 260 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12779; 1°* of B., 12781; 2°, and in Com., 12984; wthdn., 14768 (vi).

NECUM TEUCH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1137 (i), 13203 (vi).

NEGRO POINT BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1181 (i).

NEIL'S HARBOUR BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1139 (i).

NELSON POST OFFICE, B. C., RACINE BROS., CLAIMS AGAINST CONTRACTORS: in Com. of Sup., 7157 (iii).

NELSON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

NEPEAN POINT, IMPROVEMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 11829 (v).

NEPIGON RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14395 (vi).

NESBITT, MAN., POSTMASTER WATSON, AND EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1196 (i).

NEW BRUNSWICK:

ACADIANS, HISTORICAL DATA: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).

ALBERT CO., N. B., DISMISSAL OF CAPT. BISHOP: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).

ALLAN LINE STEAMSHIPS, WITHDRAWN FROM ST. JOHN: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 13937, 14064 (vi).

ANDERSON'S HOLLOW WHARF, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i).

BATHURST, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, ABSENCE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3629 (ii).

——— FISHERY INSPECTOR: *See* 'Fishery Overseer.'

——— HARBOUR BUOYS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).

——— HARBOUR MASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2919 (ii).

BAY OF FUNDY FISH HATCHERY: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

BISHOP, CAPT., DISMISSAL AS HARBOURMASTER FROM ALBERT CO., N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).

BLACK BROOK, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13227 (vi).

BLOOMFIELD, POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 818 (i).

BOURGEOIS, M. E., SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT TRACADIE, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 543 (i).

BRIGADE CAMP, SUSSEX: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 3235 (ii).

BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 412, 421, 486 (i), 13037 (vi).

CAMPBELLTON, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13037, 13042, 13052 (vi).

——— WHARF, EXTENSION AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i), 13005, 13229 (vi).

CAMPOBELLO BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).

C.P.R. STEAMERS LEAVING ST. JOHN: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. of Sup., 14076 (vi).

See 'Allan.'

CAPE TORMENTINE, PIER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).

CAPE TORMENTINE RY. SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com. on Res., 14470 (vi).

CARAQUET WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1173 (i).

CHATHAM, LIGHTSHIP SLIP: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

CHATHAM TO TRACADIE, TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).

CENSUS, BAPTISTS ENUMERATION, &C., RELIGIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4801 (ii).

——— CARLETON, &C., CLASSIFICATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 4004 (ii).

——— GRAND MANAN, RELIGIOUS ENUMERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 3801 (ii).

——— RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4801 (ii).

——— ST. JOHN, RELIGIOUS ENUMERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 3800 (ii).

COCAGNE WHARF, COMPENSATION TO CAPT. ARSENAULT: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

CONNOLLY, M., PAYMENT FOR DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14103 (vi).

DALY, M. T., HARBOUR MASTER AT BATHURST, DISMISSAL, &C.; Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2919 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).

DEER ISLAND TO EASTPORT, ME., TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).

DIPPER HARBOUR, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup. 13233 (vi).

NEW BRUNSWICK—*Con.*

DIVORCE AND MATRIMONIAL COURTS, SALARY OF JUDGE: in Com. of Sup., 3400 (ii).
DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY, CONTRACT *re* FUEL: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 10102 (v).
EDMUNDSTON INDIAN RESERVE, FIRE DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
FISHERY OVERSEER, BATHURST, COMPLAINTS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 14686 (vi).
FREDERICTON MILITARY BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).
GAGETOWN MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1676 (i).
GAUDET, MR., COMPILATION OF ACADIAN HISTORY: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).
GRAIN CARRIED BY C.P.R. TO ST. JOHN, QUANTITY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).
GRAND MANAN, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
See 'Census,' &c.
GREAT SALMON RIVER, GROYNE AND BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i), 5894 (iii), 13005, 13227 (vi).
HARRISON, MR., INSPECTOR OF FISHERIES, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 288 (i).
HATCHEY, NAZAIRE, APPNMT. AS HARBOUR MASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).
HATFIELD'S POINT LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).
HISTORICAL DATA *re* ACADIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).
HOPEWELL CAPE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).
INDIAN MEDICAL ATTENDANT, KING'S: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2502 (ii).
INDIANS, N.B., SALARY TO AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
'INTERNATIONAL' DREDGE LEASED OR BOUGHT FROM M. CONNOLLY: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 12218 (v).
KARS, CENSUS ENUMERATION, COR., &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Fowler*) 3804 (ii).
LONG WHARF, ST. JOHN, N.B., LEASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 11828 (v).
MCMONAGLE, MILES, DISMISSAL FROM OROMOCTO SHOAL LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1194 (i).
MARYSVILLE, POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5835, 5841 (iii).
MIRAMICHI BRIDGE SUPERSTRUCTURE: in Com. of Sup., 8307 (iv).
MISCOU HARBOUR, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
——— LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3631 (ii).
MONCTON, CAR SHOP EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 8312 (iv).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
——— STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12599 (v).
NEWCASTLE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
NOBLES, ISRAEL, DISMISSAL FROM HATFIELD LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).
OROMOCTO SHOALS, LIGHTKEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1194 (i).
OROMOCTO WHARF, RIVER ST. JOHN: in Com. of Sup., 1181 (i).
PETIT ROCHER, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
POINTE DU CHÊNE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).
RESTIGOUCHE BRIDGE SUPERSTRUCTURE: in Com. of Sup., 8303 (iv).

NEW BRUNSWICK—*Con.*

RICHIBUCTO, HARBOUR, PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i), 13235 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i).
RIVERS, ROBERT, DISMISSAL FROM MISCOU LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3631 (ii).
ST. ANDREWS WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5894 (iii).
ST. JOHN, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13042 (vi).
——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1181, 1183 (i).
——— IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13040 (vi).
——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8315 (iv), 12596 (v), 12823, 14063 (vi).
——— LONG WHARF: *See* 'Long Wharf.'
——— QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).
——— QUARANTINE, WATER AND DRAINAGE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 414, 486 (i).
——— WINTER SERVICE: *See* 'Allan.'
ST. JOHN RIVER AND ST. MARY'S RIVER INDIANS, PET. *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iii).
SHEGAWAKE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13479 (vi).
SHIVES, MR., PRIVATE WHARF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1166 (i).
SMALL-POX PATIENTS, EXPENSES INCURRED BY GLOUCESTER COUNTY: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 14688 (vi).
SUNBURY, CENSUS *re* RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 4005 (ii).
SUSSEX, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 965 (i).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &C., OVERSEER'S QUALIFICATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 8331 (iv).
——— STATION GROUNDS, I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).
TELEPHONE LINES: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
TRACADIE, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 543 (i).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 4439 (ii), 13038 (vi).
VENIOT, P. I., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT BATHURST: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3629 (ii).
WOODSTOCK ARMOURY AND GUN SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13039 (vi).
——— DRILL SHED, PURCHASE OF SITE: M. (Mr. *Hale*) for Cor.,* 3236 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE, REPAIRS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hale*) 705 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 4563, 4593 (ii), 5735 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 672 (i).
See 'N. S.,' 'P. E. I.'

NEW CAMPBELLTON, BALLAST WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1142 (i).

New Canadian Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 83 (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1°*, 1023; on Order for 2°, 1328; 2° m., 1512, 2241; in Com., 2241 (i), 2720; ref. back to Com., 2753; in Com., 3221; 3°*, 3222 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 160.)

NEWCASTLE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
NEWFOUNDLAND, AIDS TO NAVIGATION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13647 (vi).
NEWFOUNDLAND COAST WRECKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4167 (ii).
NEW GLASGOW, EXTENSION TO FREIGHT SHED, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 14095 (vi).
NEW HARBOUR BREAKWATER, PROTECTION SLOPES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1143 (i).

NEW LONDON, P.E.I., HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).

—— REPAIRS TO BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).

NEWMARKET OFFICE SPECIALTY CO., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13088 (vi).

—— Ques. of Privilege (Sir *William Mulock*) 13256 (vi).

NEWPORT, BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 2277 (i), 13462 (vi).

NEW RICHMOND, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13463 (vi).

NEWSPAPER AGENTS AND POSTMASTERS IN QUEBEC: Remarks (Mr. *Tarte*) 14669 (vi).

—— *See* 'Latour.'

NEWSPAPER, CABLE NEWS: *See* 'British Cable,' &c.

NEWSPAPER POSTAGE: in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5856 (iii).

NEWSPAPERS IN UNITED KINGDOM, U. S., &C.: AMOUNTS PAID TO BY GOVT.: M. for Stmnt.,* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).

Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s B. No. 57 (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977; in Com., 1811; 3°*, 1812 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 161.)

NIAGARA MILITIA CAMP, ANNUAL DRILL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3604 (ii).

Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 154 (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 2501; 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4582; 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 162.)

Niagara-Welland Power Co.'s B. No. 90 (Mr. *Guthrie*) 1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 163.)

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Co.'s B. No. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) M. to receive Pet., 5511; 1°*, 5512; 2°*, 5585; in Com., 6428 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 164.)

NICOLA, KAMLOOPS AND SIMILKAMEEN COAL AND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. of Res., 14337 (vi).

NICOLA, KAMLOOPS, TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).

NICOLET RIVER, BRIDGE SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).

—— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).

NINETY-FOURTH REGIMENT, SENIOR AND JUNIOR MAJORS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*), 9080 (iv).

Nipigon Iron Range Ry Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 170 (Mr. *Dyment*), M. to receive Pet., 2396 (i); 1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956 (ii).

Nipissing and James Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 114 (Mr. *McCool*), 1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 165.)

Nipissing and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 210 (Mr. *McCool*): 1°*, 5679; 2°*, 5989; wthdn., 7203 (iii).

Nipissing and Pontiac Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 47 (Mr. *McCool*): 1°*, 591; 2°*, 665 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 166.)

NIPISSING, JR. JUDGESHIP, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 14258 (vi).

NOBLES, ISRAEL, DISMISSAL FROM HATFIELD LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 6896 (iii).

NOEL WHARF, N.S., REPAIRS: in Com of Sup., 13204 (vi).

NOMININGUE LAKE, WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 13460 (vi).

NORTHAM AND RICHMOND STATIONS, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).

NORTH ATLANTIC TRADING CO., CONTRACTS WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 13372 (vi).

NORTH ATLANTIC TRANSPORTATION CO.: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 13667, 13933 (vi).

Northern Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 51 (Mr. *McCreary*), 1°*, 654; 2°*, 853 (i); in Com., 2753; 3°*, 2755 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 168.)

NORTH CARDIGAN, P.E.I., PIER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).

NORTH CHANNEL AND DAM, GALOPS RAPIDS: in Com. of Sup., 12899 (vi).

—— CONSTRUCTION OF DAM: in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv), 14142 (vi).

NORTH HALFWAY POINT, LIGHTKEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 3536 (ii).

NORTH POLE EXPEDITION, GOVT. AID TO CAPT. BERNIER: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*), 12805 (vi).

NORTH SYDNEY, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).

—— STATION ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12597 (v).

See 'I.C.R.', &c., 'Sydney', &c.

North Sydney Harbour Commission: *See* 'Sydney', &c.

NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS, P.E.I., WINTER NAVIGATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*), 6895 (iii).

See 'Winter Navigation.'

North-West Central: *See* 'Great N.W. Central.'

North-west Coal and Coke Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 69 (Mr. *Scott*), 1°*, 813; 2°*, 977; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 167.)

N.W. Mounted Police (1894) Act Amt. B. No. 242 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 1°, 8321 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 10741; 3°*, 10742 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 37.)

N.W. MOUNTED POLICE, APPNMTS AND PROMOTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*), 2921 (ii).

—— COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES: in Com. of Sup., 5264 (iii).

—— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 92 (i).

—— PAY OF FORCE: in Com. of Sup., 5262 (iii).

—— PENSIONS ACT AMT.: M. to introduce B. (Mr. *Scott*), 14280; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*), 14281 (vi).

—— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 224 (i); 13760 (vi).

—— TENTS, WOOD & CO.'S TENDER: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*), 3804 (ii).

—— YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 5003 (ii).

N.W. PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY, IMPERFECT RET. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*), 6891 (iii).
See 'Provincial Autonomy,' &c.

N.W. Ters. Govt., Additional Subsidies B. No. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*), Res. prop., 10102; in Com. on Res., 12306; 1°* of B., 12330 (v); 2°, and in Com., 12843; 3°*, 12845 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 41.)

N.W.T., Senate Representation B. No. 254 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), 1°m., 11691; 2°*, and in Com., 12302; 3°*, 12304 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 42.)

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES :
"ADVOCATE, PRINCE ALBERT," PAYMENTS FOR PRINTING *re* ELECTION PROCLAMATION : in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).
AID TO AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 4432 (ii).
ALEXANDER INDIAN AGENCY, TELEPHONE : in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
AUTOMATIC GRAIN WEIGHERS IN N.W.T., REP. OF INSPECTOR, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Stewart*), 847, 880 (i).
See 'Automatic.'
AUTONOMY FOR N.W.T., AMT. : (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*), on M. for Sup., 13856; Neg. (Y. 29; N. 63), 13932 (vi).
BANFF SPRINGS, BATHS : in Com. of Sup., 6789 (iii), 13955 (vi).
——— MUSEUM BUILDING, ADDITION, &C.: in Com. of Sup , 6927 (iii).
——— ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iii).
BARR COLONY, MR. HAULTAIN'S SPEECH, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*), on M. for Sup., 6354 (iii).
——— AND IMMIGRATION BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
——— NUMBER, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6696 (iii).
BENNETT, MR., INCREASE IN SALARY : Remarks (Mr. *Pope*), 13967 (vi).
BOW RIVER BRIDGE, CANMORE, PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6925 (iii).
BUFFALO HERD IN BANFF PARK : in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).
BUILDINGS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 958, 959 (i), 13129 (vi).
CALGARY AND EDMONTON RY., REGULATIONS *re* MORTGAGE DEEDS : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*), 13024 (vi).
C.P. RY., ELKHORN BRANCH SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14497 (vi).
——— LANDS EXEMPT FROM TAXES IN MAN. AND N.W.T. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*), 916 (i).
——— LAND AND SCHOOL TAXATION : Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 4006 (ii).
See 'Lands.'
COAL MINING IN BANFF RESERVE, LEASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 13026 (vi).
COURT HOUSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 958 (i).
CREAMERIES : in Com. of Sup., 7632 (iv).
DOUKHOBORS PILGRIMAGE AND GOVTL. ACTION : Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 1030 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 542 (i), 5587 (iii).
DRAKE, MR., N.W.M.P., INCREASE OF SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 13761 (vi).
EDMONTON AND ATHABASCA LANDING, TEL. SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).
——— BRIDGE, SASKATCHEWAN RIVER, FLOORING : in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vi).
——— INDIAN AGENCY, TELEPHONE SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vi).
——— JAIL : in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—*Con-*
ELECTIONS IN SASKATCHEWAN, PAYMENTS TO PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE': in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).
ELKHORN INDIAN SCHOOL, AVERAGE ATTENDANCE : in Com. of Sup., 6348 (iii).
ELKHORN AND MOOSOMIN RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 14497 (vi).
FIRE REGULATIONS . Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6775 (iii).
FRANK DISASTER, N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 2100 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Oliver*) 2106; Tels. read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2106, 2238 (i).
——— INVESTIGATION *re* : in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
GALLICIAN IMMIGRANTS *re* N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iii).
GRAIN BLOCKADE : *See* 'Ry. Traffic.'
GRAZING LANDS LEASED TO GEO. MCDONNELL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 8330 (iv).
GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY. AND C. P. RY. CO.'S AGREEMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 2306 (i).
HALF-BREED SCHOOLS, SALARIES PAID, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iii).
HERCHMER, MR. L. W., PENSION, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 5321 (iii).
HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, FREE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).
IMMIGRATION AGENTS, HOMESTEAD PRE-EMPTION : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Sproule*) 289 (i).
IMMIGRATION AND SETTLERS' EFFECTS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6727 (iii).
INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
——— AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 6422 (iii), 13782 (vi).
——— BLANKETS, CLOTHING : in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).
——— CLOTHING : in Com. of Sup., 13783 (vi).
——— LAND MANAGEMENT FUND : in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iii).
——— LIVE STOCK, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iii).
——— MEDICAL ATTENDANCE : in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
——— SCHOOLS : in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
——— SEED GRAIN, RELIEF : in Com. of Sup., 6417, 6420 (iii).
——— SUPPLIES &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6422 (iii).
IRRIGATION, SURVEYS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6764 (iii).
LAND GRANTS TO RYS., MAN. AND N. W. T. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2101 (i).
See general heading.
LAND SLIDES : *See* 'Turtle Mountain.'
——— *See* 'Frank Disaster.'
LUMBER COMBINES, COMMISSION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 6168 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 1579-1590 (i).
MACLEOD COURT HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
——— DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER : Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 8082 (iv).
MACRAE, MR., INDIAN INSPECTOR : in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
MAIL CARS, OVERCROWDING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5870 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).
See 'Postal,' 'Ry. Mail,' &c.
MAINTENANCE OF PRISONERS : in Com. of Sup., 3398 (ii).
MEDICINE HAT RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14503 (vi).
MILITARY ASYLUM, PENSIONS : in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iii).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—*Con.*

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
MOOSEJAW POSTMASTER, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).
MOUNTED POLICE, APPNMTS. AND PROMOTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2921 (ii).
——— COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES: in Com. of Sup., 5264 (iii).
——— M. to introduce Pension Bill (Mr. *Scott*) 14280; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 14281 (vi).
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 224 (i), 13760 (vi).
——— TENTS, WOODS & CO.'S TENDER: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3804 (ii).
See 'Militia.'
N. W. T., GOVTL. EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 6888 (iii).
——— ADDITIONAL GRANT: in Com. of Sup., 6946 (iii), 13787 (vi).
——— MAINTENANCE OF PRISONERS: in Com. of Sup., 3398 (ii).
——— MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
——— NATURALIZATION RETURNS: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3804 (ii).
PEACE AND PELLY RIVERS PACK TRAIL: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vi).
——— BRIDGE AT LETHBRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 13367 (vi).
POSTAL SERVICE IN N. W. TERS.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 14039 (vi).
See 'Mail.'
PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE,' PROCLAMATION *re* SASKATCHEWAN ELECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14268 (vi).
——— CLERK OF COURT, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3401 (ii).
——— COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).
PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 13856; Neg. (Y. 29 N. 63) 13932 (vi).
——— LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1296 (i).
——— O. CS., &C.: M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) for copies,* 2778 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 5088 (ii).
——— Papers laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5512 (iii).
——— M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to print Papers, 5582 (iii).
——— IMPERFECT RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6891 (iii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup. 6946 (iii).
——— FURTHER COR., &C.; Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*) 7295 (iii).
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RYS.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters,' 10497 (v).
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY.: Bonds, Attack on Mr. E. B. Osler, Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Scott*) 14583 (vi). Memorandum from Mr. Kingsmill: Read, 14588 (vi).
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. CO.'S LAND GRANT: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 2338 (i).
——— Ret. laid on Table, 7297 (iii).
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. MORTGAGE, DEEDS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 13024 (vi).
RY. LANDS VOTED, &C., GOVTL. ACTION *re* SELECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 4831 (ii).
RY. MAIL SERVICE IN N. W. T.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 5934 (iii).
See 'Mail, &c.'

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—*Con.*

RY. TRAFFIC IN N.W.T., BLOCKADE, &C.: on M. for Com. of Sup., 2424 (i).
REBELLION OF 1885, CLAIMS OF SETTLERS: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).
RED DEER COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 960 (i).
REGINA JAIL, ADDITIONAL LAND PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup., 5135 (ii).
REGINA, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY, SURVEYS OF RESERVED LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 6939 (iii).
REPRESENTATION *re* SENATE: *See* 'N.W.T. Senate Representation B. 254.'
See 'Senate.'
ROADS AND BRIDGES CONSTRUCTION, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iii), 13323 (vi).
SASKATCHEWAN ELECTION, PROCLAMATION IN PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE': in Com. of Sup., 14268 (vi).
SASKATCHEWAN LAND CO.'S SALES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2502 (i).
SASKATCHEWAN LAND CO., SECTIONS ACQUIRED, &C.: M. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) for Cor.* 2338 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lennox*) 7108 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 4363 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 2306 (i).
SENATE REPRESENTATION: *See* 'N. W. T. Senate Representation B. 254.'
SETTLERS CLAIMS *re* REBELLION, 1885: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).
SINCLAIR, MR. D., DISMISSAL AS FOREMAN OF COLUMBIA RIVER WORKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
SNOW STORMS, REPORTS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 11822 (v).
SQUATTERS CLAIMS ON DOMINION LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 6925 (iii).
STEWART, MR., FOREST INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6774 (iii).
STRATHCONA HORSE BARRACKS: in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).
SUPREME COURT, ADDITIONAL JUDGE: in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 2991 (ii).
TELEPHONE LINES: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
TENTS FOR IMMIGRANTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6849 (iii).
TIMBER AND TREE PLANTING, PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
TREE CULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 6773 (iii), 13775 (vi).
TURTLE MOUNTAIN LAND SLIDE, INVESTIGATION &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13965 (vi).
See 'Frank.'
VICTORIA TO ANDREWS, TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).
WADSWORTH, MR., INDIAN INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
WEST, DR., MEDICAL INSPECTOR OF INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
WOOD MOUNTAIN POST, TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi)
YOHO PARK, ROADS CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).
YORKTON COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 961 (i).
See 'B.C.', 'Man.', &c.
NOTES, DOM.: *See* 'Dom. Notes, &c.'
NOTRE DAME DU PORTAGE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13463 (vi).

NOVA SCOTIA :

ABBOTT'S HARBOUR, BEACH PROTECTION : in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).
ABRAM'S RIVER WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).
AMAGANDUS WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1068 (i).
AMHERST POST OFFICE, RENTAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1591 (i).
AMQUI STATION ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).
ANDERSON AND KENNEDY'S LAKE : in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
ANTIGONISH, POST OFFICE, REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
ARICHAT PUBLIC BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 5827 (iii).
ARICHAT, WEST, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
BAILEY'S BROOK, BREAKWATER WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1072 (i).
BASS RIVER, PERMANENT LIGHT : in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
BAXTER'S HARBOUR, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
BAYFIELD EXTENSION PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 1188 (i).
——— HARBOUR WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).
BAY DU VIN WHARF, RECONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i).
BEAVER RIVER FISH HATCHERY, ESTABLISHMENT : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
BEERSVILLE COAL AND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).
BELMONT DISASTER, GRATUITIES TO VICTIMS, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 13546, 14155 (vi).
BENOIT'S COVE, BOAT LANDING : in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
BIG HARBOUR, PORT BEVIS, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
BIG POND WHARF, SUPERSTRUCTURE : in Com. of Sup., 1071, 1073 (i).
BRETON COVE, BOAT LANDING : in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).
BRIDGEWATER, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 1074 (i).
BROAD COVE, HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 411 (i), 5827 (iii), 13028 (vi).
CABLE AND LAND LINES, MAR. PROVS. : in Com. of Sup., 2701 (ii).
CANADA STEEL CO., RY. SUBSIDY : Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14479 (vi).
CARIBOO ISLAND, HARBOUR OF REFUGE : in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
CARLIN, MR., POSTMASTER AT WHITNEY, SALARY, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 130, 668 (i).
CHEGOGGIN, PIER : in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
CHETICAMP, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
CHEZZETCOOK, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
CHIGNECTO MARINE RY., SETTLEMENT, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Logan*) 4404 (ii).
CHURCH POINT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).
COVE HEAD HARBOUR CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).
COW BAY BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13178 (vi).
COW BAY (POINT MORIEN) BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).
DALHOUSIE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).
DIGBY, PIER RENEWAL, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1083 (i).

N

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

DIGBY, POST OFFICE, IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
——— WHARF EXTENSION, IMPROVEMENT, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2101 (i).
DODD, MR. JUSTICE, INCREASE OF SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).
DOG FISH NUISANCE, &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13650 (vi).
DONALD'S HEAD, N.S., BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
DREDGING, MAR. PROVS., SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 13309 (vi).
DRUMHEAD BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1083 (i), 13179 (vi).
DUNCAN'S COVE, APPROACH TO WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
EAST BAY, WHARF : in Com. of Sup.. 13180 (vi).
EAST BERLIN, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
EAST END, CAPE SABLE ISLAND, HARBOUR ENTRANCE : in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
ECONOMY, WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).
EMIGRATION TO U. S. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 6709 (iii).
'EUXINE', SCUTTLING OF SCHR. : M. for Cor. (Mr. *McLennan*) 699 (i).
FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS BETWEEN N. S. AND CAN. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3001 (ii).
FINLAY POINT, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13181 (vi).
FISHERMEN OF N. S., 'OUTSKIRTS OF CIVILIZATION' : Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13316 (vi).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Roche*, *Halifax*) 13373 (vi).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 13374 (vi).
FISHING INDUSTRY, MAR. PROVS., WHARF, BUILDING, &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).
——— *See* 'Lobsters,' &c.
FISHING WITHIN THREE MILE LIMIT : Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 4179 (ii).
FIVE ISLANDS WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
FORT LAWRENCE, LANDING PIER : in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i), 13181 (vi).
FREEPORT, LANDING PIER : in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).
FRIARS HEAD, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup. 1087 (i).
FRUDE'S POINT, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
GABAROUSE, BREAKWATER EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).
GEORGEVILLE, WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).
GLACE BAY, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).
——— WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13184 (vi).
GLACE BAY, DOM. COAL, IRON AND STEEL COS., ACCOMMODATION AT GLACE BAY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13184 (vi).
——— SHIELDS, MR. C., LETTER *re* GLACE BAY WHARF : Read (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 13186 (vi).
GRAND ETANG BRIDGE ENTRANCE : in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).
GRAND NARROWS, BRIDGE PROTECTION : in Com. of Sup., 14094 (vi).
GRAND NARROWS, WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).
GRAND NARROWS, WHARF REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i).
GRAND RIVER, IMPROVEMENTS TO ENTRANCE : in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

GRANITE VILLAGE, MOORING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).
'GRECIAN', STR., REIMBURSEMENT TO CAPT. HARRISON, *re* SUSPENSION OF CERTIFICATE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 10239 (v).
GREEN COVE BOAT HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1100 (i).
GUYSBOROUGH, PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 5839 (iii).
HALIFAX AND CANSO MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 6002 (iii).
HALIFAX COTTON CO., LOAN OF RAILS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14477 (vi).
HALIFAX, CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13031 (vi).
——— ELEVATOR, LAND PURCHASE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12825, 12874 (vi).
——— HARBOUR BUOY SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).
——— IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13033 (vi).
——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8316 (iv), 12597 (v), 12824, 14080 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12874 (vi).
——— LIGHTSHIP: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4165 (ii).
——— *See* 'Peggy's Cove,' &c.
HALIFAX AND LIVERPOOL MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 7730 (iv).
HALIFAX, LOBSTER FACTORIES, INSPECTION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) in Com. of Sup., 5122 (ii).
——— MUSEUM, REMOVAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 13032 (vi).
——— *See* 'Marine.'
——— POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES, PET. *re* INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) on conc., 14759 (vi).
——— SALARY INCREASES: in Com. of Sup., 6004 (iii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 411 (i).
——— QUARANTINE STATION, LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
——— AND SOUTH-WESTERN, CLAIMS FOR LABOUR, MATERIAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14332 (vi).
——— TIME BALL: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).
——— WHARF, LAND PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).
HALL'S HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1068, 1133 (i), 13141 (vi).
HARRISON, CAPT., STR. 'GRECIAN,' COSTS *re* SUSPENSION OF CERTIFICATE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 10239 (v).
HARVEY AND SALISBURY BRANCH RY. SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com. on Res., 14471 (vi).
HAWK POINT INLET, BOAT CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
HENRY, MR. JUSTICE, RETIRING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 14662 (vi).
HERRING COVE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
HYDRAULIC DREDGE FOR MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (ii).
INDIAN HARBOUR WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
INDIAN SCHOOLS, MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 6409, 6414 (iii).
——— MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iii).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

INVERNESS MINES, BROAD COVE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
——— POSTAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6051 (iii).
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. SUBSIDY, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 872 (i).
IONA, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13200 (vi).
JANVRIN'S ISLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
JEDDORE, EAST, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
JUDGES, INCREASE OF SALARY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).
See 'Henry.'
JUDIQUE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1103 (i).
KETCH HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
KINGSPORT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1103 (i).
——— PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
L'ARDOISE, BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
LARRY'S RIVER BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1104 (i).
LAWLOR'S ISLAND, QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
——— *See* 'Halifax,' &c.
LIME ROCK, POSTMASTER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1297 (i).
LINGAN BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 1105 (i).
LIVINGSTONE'S COVE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13200 (vi).
LOBSTER HATCHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
——— PACKING INDUSTRY, N.S.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).
——— *See* 'Fishing,' 'Halifax,' &c.
LORD'S COVE (DEER ISLAND) WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
LUNENBURG, FISH HATCHERY: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
——— HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1106 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. of Sup., 13315 (vi).
LURCHER'S SHOAL LIGHTSHIP, CREW AND MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).
MAGGREGOR, CAPT., STR. 'BAYFIELD,' GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).
MCKAY'S POINT, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MCNUTT'S ISLAND, BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MAHONE BAY POSTAL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. of Sup., 14038 (vi).
MAIN A DIEU, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MALAGAWATCH, BOAT CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
MALIGNANT COVE, HARBOUR REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MARGAREE, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).
MARGARETVILLE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPT., HALIFAX, REMOVAL, &C., RES. FROM HALIFAX BOARD OF TRADE: Read (Mr. *Bell*) 14279 (vi).
'MARKLAND,' SCHR., SEIZURE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5992 (iii).
MELBOURNE WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

METEGHAN COVE BREAKWATER, RESTORATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).
MIDDLE RIVER, SHEAR DAM: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
MIDDLETON ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 969 (i), 5841 (iii).
MILLS, MR., ANNAPOLIS, CLAIMS AGAINST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wade*) 6167 (iii).
MOISIE POINT ROAD, IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 13322 (vi).
MORRISON'S POINT, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
MUSQUODOBOIT, WHARF APPROACHES: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
NAPPAN, EXPERIMENTAL FARM BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 973 (i).
NECUM TEUCH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1137 (i), 13203 (vi).
NEGRO POINT, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1181 (i).
NEIL'S HARBOUR BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1139 (i).
NEW CAMPBELLTON, BALLAST WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1142 (i).
NEW GLASGOW, EXTENSION TO FREIGHT SHED, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 14095 (vi).
NEW HARBOUR BREAKWATER, PROTECTION SLOPES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1143 (i).
NOEL WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13204 (vi).
NORTH SYDNEY PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12597 (v).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.,' 'Sydney,' &c.
N.S. AND DOM. OF CAN., FINANCIAL TERMS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3001 (ii).
NOVA SCOTIA EASTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14327 (vi).
N.S. EMIGRATION TO U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 6709 (iii).
NOVA SCOTIA STEEL AND COAL CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13028 (vi).
OGDEN'S POND CHANNEL, PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1145 (i), 13204 (vi).
OYSTER POND, BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13204 (vi).
PARRSBOROUGH, LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PEGGY'S COVE, HALIFAX, DISMISSAL OF LIGHTKEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2312 (i).
PEMBROKE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PETIT DE GRAT, PROTECTION WORK, &c.: in Com. of Sup.. 1146 (i).
PICKETT'S PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PICTOU GLASS FACTORY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6723 (iii)
——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8317 (iv), 12827, 14088 (vi).
——— LIGHT BEACH: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
——— LIGHTHOUSE CONSTRUCTION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4167 (ii).
PLEASANT BAY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
POINT TUPPER, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 8309 (iv).
——— DREDGING, CLAIMS OF M. CONNOLLY: in Com. of Sup., 14103 (vi).
POIRIERVILLE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i), 13205 (vi).
PORTER'S CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vi).
PORT GEORGE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i), 13210 (vi).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

PORT GREVILLE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT HASTINGS, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PORT HAWKESBURY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PORT HOOD, HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vi).
PORT HOWE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT LATOUR, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT MAITLAND, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
PORT AU PIQUE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PROSPECT, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PUGWASH, LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1856 (i).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
RY. SUBSIDIES FOR PARRSBORO DISTRICT, N.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Gourley*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14491 (vi).
ST. ANN'S NORTH GUT, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
——— NORTH RIVER, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
SANDY COVE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SCOTCH HILL STATION, I.C.R., PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 872 (i).
SCOTT'S BAY, BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
SHIPPEGAN HARBOUR, PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1183 (i).
SHORT BEACH, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SKINNER'S COVE, PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
SOUTH INGONISH, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SPRINGHILL, ARMOURIES, CARETAKER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1856 (i).
——— BOILER EXPLOSION IN DOM. BUILDING: Remarks (Mr. *Logan*) 13257 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING, REPAIRING: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
SPRY BAY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
STELLARTON, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 8296 (iv).
STUART, CAPT. D. C., HALIFAX, DISMISSAL, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4353 (ii).
SUMMERVILLE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
SWIM'S POINT, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
SWINEHAMMER, GEO., LIGHTKEEPER AT PEGGY'S COVE: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2312 (i).
SYDNEY, ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R. EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 3696 (ii).
——— *See* 'North.'
——— POST OFFICE, ADDITION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— QUARANTINE STATION, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
SYDNEY MINES, POST OFFICE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13028 (vi).
SYDNEY, NORTH, STATION IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 14089 (vi).
——— *See* 'North.'
TENECAPE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
THREE FATHOM HARBOUR, BEACH WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
TIVERTON, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

TRURO STATION ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12603 (v).
VICTORIA BEACH, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
WALLACE HARBOUR, FERRY LANDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13216 (vi).
WASHABUCK CENTRE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).
WEDGE POINT, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WENTWORTH, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13216 (vi).
WEST BACCARO BOAT HARBOUR CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).
WEST BAY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WHITE'S COVE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WHITNEY PIER POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 130, 668 (i).
WILSON'S BEACH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).
WINDSOR HARBOUR, SHEER DAM, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
WINDSOR, NEW STATION, I. C. R., RENTAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).
WINDSOR JUNCTION RY. ACCIDENT, I.C.R.: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Clarke*), 3496, 3713 (ii).
WOLFVILLE, WHARF REPAIRS: in Com of Sup.. 13217 (vi).
YARMOUTH BAR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).
See 'N.B.,' 'P.E.I.,' &c.

OAKVILLE PIER, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i).

Oaths of Office: *See* 'Administration."

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4041, 5033 (ii).

Ocean Steamship Subsidies Act (France and Canada) Amt. B. No. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*); Res. prop., 10410; in Com. on Res., 10802; 1°* of B., 11422; 2°*, and in Com., 12295; 3°*, 12500 (v). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 44.)

OFFICERS' MESS, STR. "QUADRA", REGULATIONS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*), 9819 (iv).

OFFICIAL GUIDE, I.C.R., COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 3535 (ii).

OGDEN'S POND CHANNEL, PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1145 (i), 13204 (vi).

O'HALLORAN, GEO. F., DEP. MIN. OF AGRICULTURE: Remarks *re* in Com. of Sup., 4356 (ii).

OKA INDIANS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).

O'LEARY, J. & M.. CLAIMS *re* SOULANGES CANAL CONTRACTS: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).

O'LEARY STATION, P.E.I. RY. BRANCH LINE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*), 6168 (iii).

O'LEARY'S STATION, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 7536 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*), in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).

Oleomargarine Bill: *See* 'Butter B. 207.'

ONSLOW, LORD, SPEECH *re* CATTLE EMBARGO: *See* 'Cattle Embargo.'

ONTARIO, NORTH, CENSUS NUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4826 (ii).

ONTARIO, NORTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT, CERTIFICATE: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*), 367 (i).

Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. No. 62 (Mr. *McCarthy*), 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., 2716; 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 169.)

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*), 1°*, 814; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., 4868; 3°m., 4869; 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 170.)

ONTARIO:

"ALERT", STR., *re* CANAL SURVEYS: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*), in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).
ALEXANDRIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 487 (i).
ALEXANDRIA WOOD EXPORT CO.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*), in Com. of Sup., 12924 (vi).
See 'Privilege', &c.
ALLISTON PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 495 (i).
ALNWICK BAND, MISSISSAGA INDIANS, CLAIMS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McColl*), 6895 (iii).
AMHERSTBURG HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup, 1185 (i), 13235 (vi).
AURORA FOUNDRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13091 (vi).
AURORA, MAIL BAGS REPAIRED, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
AYR, POSTMASTER ROBSON, RESIGNATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*), 1195 (i).
BALACLAVA AND OWEN SOUND MAIL CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Thompson, Grey*), 13263 (vi).
BALSAM LAKE AND LAKE SIMCOE: in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iii).
BARRIE P.O., BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 6062 (iii).
——— WHARF, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 1186 (i).
——— DOM. AID, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13452 (vi).
BARRY'S BAY, MADAWASKA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 13236 (vi).
BELLE RIVIÈRE, SHEET PILING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1191 (i).
BELLEVILLE, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 969 (i), 13082 (vi).
——— HARBOUR BOUNDARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*), 5588 (iii).
BLIND RIVER, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).
——— TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*), 1298 (i).
BOWMANVILLE, BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1352 (i).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 507 (i).
BOYD, SIR JOHN, PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*), 5990 (iii).
——— RELATIVES IN GOVT. EMPLOY: Ques. (Mr. *Johnston, Cardwell*), 4185 (ii).
BRACEBRIDGE CUSTOMS PORT: in Com. of Sup., 3960 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13071 (vi).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13236 (vi).
BRAMPTON ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 966 (i), 13085 (vi).
BRANTFORD, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13108 (vi).
——— INDIAN RESERVE, LEASES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tisdale*) 1322 (i).
——— MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

BRASSES' POINT BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7808 (iv).
BRIDGEBURG PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
BRONTE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1354 (i), 13236 (vi).
——— LIGHTHOUSE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) in Com. of Sup., 5757 (iii).
BRUCE MINES, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5911 (iii).
BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 487 (i), 5842 (iii), 13082 (vi).
BURKS FALLS, MAGNETAWAN RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1358 (i).
BURLINGTON CHANNEL PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i), 13237 (vi).
CAMPBELLFORD, PORT OF ENTRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13073 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 504 (i).
CAN. CENTRAL RY. AND OTTAWA AND BROCKVILLE RYS., AMALGAMATION, COMPENSATION TO CERTAIN MUNICIPALITIES: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
CANADA FOUNDRY, TORONTO, STRIKE, &C., REPRESENTATIONS TO MINISTER OF LABOUR: Remarks (Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*) 7205 (iii).
See 'Scotch Iron,' &c.
CANALS IN ONT. AND QUE., AMOUNT EXPENDED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1594 (i).
CAYUGA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 502 (i).
CHATHAM DREDGING CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1185 (i).
CHATSWORTH POST OFFICE, VACANCY: in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iii).
CLERGUE WORKS, SAULT STE. MARIE, CONTRACT *re* RAILS FOR GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross Ont.*) 13668 (vi).
See 'Sault.'
CLINTON, CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4820 (ii).
See 'Macpherson.'
CLINTON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 518 (i), 5834 (iii).
COAL IMPORTED INTO ONT. FROM JUNE 1901 TO MARCH 1903, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 669 (i).
COBOURG, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 639 (i).
——— HARBOUR REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii), 13084 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13118 (vi).
COLBORNE ARMOURY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
COLLINGWOOD, DOCK, ESTIMATED COST: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 5871 (iii).
——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).
CORNWALL CANAL, LIGHTING, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iii).
——— ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT FOR LOCK GATES: in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).
——— ELECTRIC LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12895 (vi).
——— SUPT'S. DUTIES, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12896 (vi).
COUCHICHING AND SIMCOE LAKES, REGULATION OF WATERS: in Com. of Sup., 13252 (vi).
CROWN TAILORING CO., TORONTO, SUPPLIES FOR P. O. DEPT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iii).
CUMBERLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup, 13239 (vi).
CUTLER, GORE BAY MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 2308 (i).
——— AND GORE BAY MAIL CONTRACT: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iii).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

CUTLER, SPANISH MILLS MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).
DEPOT HARBOUR, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i), 13239 (vi).
See 'Parry Sound,' 'Grain,' &c.
DESERONTO, POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13112 (vi).
DETROIT RIVER, &C., INTERNATIONAL WATERS, U. S. GOVT. WORK: M. (Mr. *Cowan*) for Cor.* 2778 (ii).
DREDGING PLANT FOR ONT. AND QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 2671 (ii).
DRESDEN CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3960 (ii).
DURHAM POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 506 (i).
EDVILLE POSTMASTER: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14035 (vi).
ELGIN COUNTY, CENTENARY CELEBRATION: Remarks (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 3129 (ii).
——— REDISTRIBUTION, PAR. IN 'TORONTO GLOBE': Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) 6540 (iii),
ENTERPRISE POST OFFICE, DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER: Remarks (Mr. *Avery*) in Com. of Sup., 14007; Memorandum (Sir *William Mulock*) read, 14008 (vi).
ERNESTOWN STATION POSTMASTER, CHANGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1034 (i).
FARRAN'S POINT, ACETYLENE GAS EQUIPMENT: in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12898 (vi).
——— ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iii), 14150 (vi).
FLESHERTON ARMOURY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
FT. WILLIAM, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i).
See 'Grain,' 'Kaministiqua.'
GALOPS CANAL ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv), 12899, 14141 (vi).
——— SURVEYS, LIFTING BOULDERS: in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).
——— DAM: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12608 (vi).
——— RAPIDS, DEEPENING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 8268 (iv), 14644 (vi).
——— M. to conc. (Mr. *Fielding*) Agreed to (Y. 36; N. 14) 8403 (iv).
See 'North Channel.'
GANANOQUE, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 970 (i).
——— CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4823 (ii).
———CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3791, 3897 (ii).
——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1371 (i).
GEORGIAN BAY CANAL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vi).
——— *See* 'Ottawa and Georgian Bay.'
GEORGIAN BAY ISLANDS, SALE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
GERALD, MR., INLAND REV. DEPT., PRESCOTT, INCREASE OF SALARY: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 13968, 13978 (vi).
GODERICH, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13240 (vi).
——— HARBOUR WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1365 (i).
GOODERICH, MR., REMOVAL, MURRAY CANAL: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) in Com. of Sup., 14144 (vi).
GORE'S LANDING WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13244.
GOUINLOCK, GEO. W., LETTER *re* CONTRACT FOR TORONTO P. O.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi),

ONTARIO—*Con.*

GRAIN IMPORTATIONS THROUGH WESTERN LAKE PORTS : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 97 (i).
——— SHIPMENTS FROM PORT ARTHUR AND FT. WILLIAM : Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 542 (i). *See* 'Wheat,' &c.
GRAND BEND, BREAKWATER PIER : in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).
GRAND RIVER, DREDGING AT DUNNVILLE : Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 12497 (v), 13027 (vi).
GRANT, J. G., BARRIE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DEFAULT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5991 (iii).
GREY COUNTIES, CENSUS ENUMERATORS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4826 (ii).
GREY COUNTY, LIST OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS WANTED, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5835 (iii).
GUELPH, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 13083 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 637 (i).
HALDIMAND, CENSUS ENUMERATOR : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4822 (ii).
HALTON, CARDWELL AND PEEL, CENSUS SCHEDULES: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6436, 6894 (iii), 11425. (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 7092 (iii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iii).
HAMILTON, DRILL HALL, ADDITIONAL LAND : in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).
——— ELEVATOR WORKS : Remarks (Mr. *Bruce*) in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
——— INLAND REVENUE BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS : in Com. of Sup., 1185, 1352, 1424 (i), 3341, 3368 (ii), 5909 (iii), 13012, 13235 (vi).
HAWKESBURY, PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13119 (vi).
——— DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii).
HAWKESTONE WHARF, GOVT. AID *re* : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13453 (vi).
HAYCOCK, J., MR., APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR OF BINDER TWINE : in Com. of Sup., 7763, 7772(iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5588 (iii).
HOG CHOLERA, OUTBREAK IN BRUCE : in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
——— OUTBREAK IN YARMOUTH, ONT.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Nr. *Ingram*) 1058 (i).
HOLT, MR., APPNMT. AS JUDGE OF HURON COUNTY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
HUDSON'S BAY : *See* 'James.'
HURLEY, J. M., APPNMT., DUTIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5123 (ii), 5280 (iii).
——— REP., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5740 (iii).
HURON COUNTY JUDGESHIP : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
INDIANS ONT., AND QUEBEC, ROAD REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
INDIAN SCHOOLS, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii). *See* general heading.
IROQUOIS CANALS, ELECTRIC LIGHTING : Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12901 (vi).
JACKSON, MR., APPNMT. AS JUDGE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).
JAMES AND HUDSON BAY FISHING RIGHTS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lancaster*) 3806 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 4727 (ii), 6893 (iii).
——— Ques: (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1194 (i).
JOHNSON, MR., PURCHASE OF HOUSE BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 14143 (vi).
KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 5825 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13013 (vi).
——— *See* 'Port Arthur.'

ONTARIO—*Con.*

KEILTY, MR., INSPECTOR AT PRESCOTT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5365 (iii).
KELLY, WM., CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR N. HASTINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7080 (iii).
KELLY, ASST. CUSTOMS INSPECTOR, REFUND, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).
KILROY, ACTING CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, WINDSOR, ONT., PAYMENT TO: in Com. of Sup., 13993 (vi).
KINGSTON, BARRACKS, R. C. FIELD ARTILLERY : in Com. of Sup., 13118 (vi).
——— GRAVING DOCK, AWARD TO CONNOLLY & CO.: in Com. of Sup., 13023 (vi).
——— MILITARY COLLEGE : in Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii), 5842 (iii).
——— DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 13094 (vi).
——— MILITARY STABLES : in Com. of Sup., 638 (i), 13117 (vi).
——— PENITENTIARY : in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).
——— CONTRACTS *re* GROCERIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 10100 (v).
KINGSVILLE, BREAKWATER EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13244 (vi).
LAMBTON, POSTMISTRESS, DISMISSAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) in Com. of Sup., 6166 (iii), 14278, 14661 (vi).
LEAMINGTON WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13246 (vi).
LEMON, MR., TRANSFER TO TORONTO P. O.: in Com. of Sup , 5929 (iii).
LT.-GOVERNOR OF ONTARIO, &C.: on M. for Com. of Sup., 114 (i).
——— APPNMT. OF ADMINISTRATOR : Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 110, 655, 1204 (i).
——— Remarks *re* Decease, 1575 (i).
LINDSAY DRILL HALL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13082 (vi).
LISTOWEL PUBLIC BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 13123 (vi).
LITTLE BEAR CREEK, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13245 (vi).
LITTLE CURRENT, GEORGIAN BAY, CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 13245 (vi).
LONDON, DRILL HALL AND ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).
——— MILITARY MAGAZINE : in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
MACNEE FISHING LICENSES : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 4727 (ii).
——— *See* 'James.'
MACPHERSON, D. F., CENSUS ENUMERATOR, CLINTON : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4820 (ii).
MCNULTY, POSTMASTER, PETS. *re* REMOVAL OF OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi). *See* 'Lambton.'
MARA, RAMA, &C., FLOODING OF LANDS : M. (Mr. *Grant*) for copies of Rep., &c., 2762 (ii).
MEAFORD POST OFFICE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13069, 13124 (vi).
MECHANICS FROM ENG. AND TORONTO LABOUR COUNCIL : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1854 (i).
MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).
METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE, REMOVAL FROM TORONTO : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 6435 (iii).
MIDLAND HARBOUR, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i), 5909 (iii), 13246 (vi).
——— DREDGES, &C., CAPACITY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).
——— PORT OF ENTRY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).
MIDLAND MERCANTILE CO.'S RENTAL OF BUILDINGS ON DOCK, MIDLAND : in Com. of Sup., 13427 (vi).
MIDLAND, POSTOFFICE BUILDING : Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii).
——— WATER FRONT, LEASE TO PRATT & CO.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

MILITARY COLLEGE : *See* 'Kingston.'
MISSISSAGA INDIANS, ALNWICK BAND, CLAIMS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McColl*) 6895 (iii).
MOIRA RIVER FLOODING : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
MOOSE DEER POINT, SALE OF ISLANDS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
MORRISBURG PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 492 (i).
MOWAT, SIR OLIVER : *See* 'Lt.-Gov.'
MURRAY CANAL, PURCHASE OF MR. JOHNSON'S HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 14143 (vi).
——— STEWART, MR., INSPECTOR : Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com. of Sup., 14146 (vi).
——— WIRE FENCING: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
NAPANEE, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3919 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE, RENTAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1594 (i).
NAPANEE AND TAMWORTH RY. CHARTER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 8084 (iv).
NEPEAN POINT, IMPROVEMENT BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 11829 (v).
NEWMARKET, OFFICE SPECIALTY CO., &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13088 (vi).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Sir *William Mulock*) 13256 (vi).
NIAGARA MILITIA CAMP, ANNUAL DRILL : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3604 (ii).
NINETY-FOURTH REGIMENT, SENIOR AND JUNIOR MAJORS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 9080 (iv).
NIPISSING, JR. JUDGESHIP, SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 14258 (vi).
NORTH CHANNEL, CONSTRUCTION OF DAM : in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv), 12899, 14142 (vi).
See 'Galops.'
OAKVILLE PIER, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i).
ONTARIO ELECTORAL DISTRICT, CERTIFICATE : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 367 (i).
ONTARIO, NORTH, CENSUS ENUMERATORS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4826 (ii).
ORILLIA, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 968 (i), 13086 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, REMOVAL OF CARETAKER : in Com. of Sup., 1007, 1016 (i).
——— WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
OSHAWA PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13110 (vi).
OTTAWA, BRIDGE OVER CONCESSION STREET : in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
——— BRIDGES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2700 (ii), 13321 (vi).
——— BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13117 (vi).
——— VICTORIA GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM : in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).
See general heading.
OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL, ENGINEER'S REPS.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Murray*) 1299 (i).
See 'Georgian,' 'Point au Baril,' &c.
OTTAWA RIVER, PETEWAWA NARROWS : in Com. of Sup., 13251 (vi).
——— SURVEYS OF HEADWATERS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vi).
OWEN SOUND, HARBOUR, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
——— SURVEY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii), 13063, 13110, 13122 (vi).

PARKHILL MAIL CONTRACT, REMUNERATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 1594 (i).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

PARRY SOUND, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13248 (vi).
See 'Depot Harbour.'
PERTH PUBLIC BUILDING : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13075 (vi).
PETERBOROUGH ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 13083 (vi).
——— CANAL, LIFT LOCK : in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
PETEWAWA NARROWS, AWARD TO G. C. POUPORE : in Com. of Sup., 13251 (vi).
PICKERING HARBOUR, REPAIRS TO PIERS &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
PICTON, MAIL SERVICE, IRREGULARITY, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Alcorn*) 13134 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING, LEVELLING GROUNDS : in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
PIGEON LAKE ISLANDS, SALE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).
POINT AU BARIL, GEORGIAN BAY ROUTE CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 1365 (i).
See 'Georgian,' &c.
POINT EDWARD DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i), 13249 (vi).
PORT ARTHUR HARBOUR, DREDGING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3341 (ii), 13012 (vi).
See 'Kaministiquia.'
PORT BURWELL HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT COLBORNE, DREDGING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3368 (ii).
——— ELEVATOR FOUNDATIONS : in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).
——— ENTRANCE IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vi).
——— ROCK CUT : in Com. of Sup., 14148 (vi).
——— SUMMIT LEVELS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 12903 (vi).
——— *See* 'Welland.'
PORT ELGIN, DREDGING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1424 (i).
PORT HOPE PIER, REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
PORT PERRY, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT STANLEY, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT STANLEY, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i).
PRATT & CO., LEASE OF MIDLAND WATER FRONT : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5749 (iii).
See 'Midland.'
PRESCOTT, HARBOUR DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).
——— INLAND REV. OFFICIALS, SALARIES, PROMOTIONS, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 13968 (vi).
PRESQUE ISLE, BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).
——— DOCK, REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i).
PRITCHETT, AND POLITICAL CORRUPTION IN ONT. : Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) 898, 908 (i).
QUINTE BAY BUOYS, PAYMENTS, &c. FOR SERVICES : Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 5587 (iii).
RAMA INDIANS, CONTRIBUTION *re* ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 13781 (vi).
RAPIDE PLAT, ENLARGEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 12898 (vi).
RATHBUN CO.'S RY. CHARTER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 8084 (iv).
RECEIVER GENERAL'S OFFICE, TORONTO, ADDITIONAL VAULT : in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
RENFREW, HORTON AND ADMASTON MUNICIPALITIES, &c. : *See* 'Can. Central.'

ONTARIO—*Con.*

RIDEAU CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7808 (iv).
—— CONCESSION STREET BRIDGE, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
—— EMPLOYEES, DELAY IN PAYMENT: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 13302 (vi).
—— SWING BRIDGE AT HOG'S BACK: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).
RIVIÈRE AUX PUCES, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
ROACH, MR., CENSUS ENUMERATOR FOR N. ONTARIO: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7083 (iii).
ROBSON, MICHAEL, RESIGNATION AS POSTMASTER AT AYR: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1195 (i).
RONDEAU HARBOUR, PIER IMPROVEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i).
ROSEDALE WHARF, TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
—— *See* 'Trent.'
ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE: *See* 'Kingston.'
ST. CATHARINES DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13106 (vi).
ST. JOSEPH'S WHARF, LAKE HURON: in Com. of Sup., 3382 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER ISLANDS, IMPROVEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).
ST. MARY'S PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13109 (vi).
SARNIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13117 (vi).
SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iii), 12904 (vi).
—— COALING ACCOMMODATION *re*: in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iii).
—— CLERGUE SYNDICATE, LABOUR DISTURBANCES: Remarks, 12610, 12717 (vi).
—— PAR. IN MONTREAL 'STAR' *re* MILITIA: Remarks (Sir *Frederick Borden*) 12939 (vi).
—— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13252 (vi).
—— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13107 (vi).
SCOTCH IRON MOULDERS AND TORONTO CAN. FOUNDRY CO.'S. STRIKE: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iii).
—— *See* 'Can. Foundry.'
SECORD, DR., MEDICAL ATTENDANT ON INDIAN RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
SIMCOE COUNTY CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4825 (ii).
SIMCOE LAKE, FLOODING OF LANDS IN MARA, &C.: M. (Mr. *Grant*) for Reps., 2762 (ii).
'SIR WILFRID LAURIER' DREDGE, SINKING IN LAKE ONTARIO: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5587 (iii).
SMALL-POX OUTBREAK ON BRANT INDIAN RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
—— N. W. T. RESERVES, &C., 6350 (iii).
SMITH, WM., LATE, M.P., AND POLITICAL CORRUPTION: Remarks (Mr. *Cowan*) 894 (i).
SOUTHAMPTON HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1428 (i).
STANDARD CHEMICAL CO., LONGFORD: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5363, 5373 (iii).
—— CONTRACT: Read (Mr. *Bernier*) 5375 (iii).
STEAMBOAT INSPECTION, TORONTO DISTRICT: in Com. of Sup., 13648 (vi).
STRATFORD ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13125 (vi).
STURGEON FALLS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1431 (i).
SUDBURY COAL, DISCOVERY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6824 (iii).
SUPREME COURT OF ONTARIO, JUDGES' SALARIES: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 10102 (v).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

SYDNENHAM RIVER IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 13250 (vi).
TEMISCAMINGUE LAKE, IMPROVEMENTS, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2246 (i).
—— REPAIRS TO WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i), 14248 (vi).
THESSALON BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13254 (vi).
THOMPSON, MR. P., 'LABOUR GAZETTE' COR., TORONTO, REMUNERATION: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 7152 (iii).
THORNBURY HARBOUR WORKS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1432 (i).
TIMBER LICENSES GRANTED TO CANE BROS.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2757 (ii).
TORONTO, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 972 (i).
—— ADDITIONAL ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
—— (LETTER READ): in Com. of Sup., 3614 (ii).
—— PAVING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
—— BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* GRAIN STANDARDS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 11177 (v).
—— CANADA IRON FOUNDRY, STRIKE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iii).
—— *See* 'Scotch,' &c.
—— CUSTOMS HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 647, 957 (i).
—— CUSTOMS PORT OF ENTRY, APPNMTS., SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).
—— HARBOUR, EASTERN ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1433 (i), 13254 (vi).
—— MAGANN AND PHIN, CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 13255 (vi).
—— HARBOUR, &C., TOTAL AMT. PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Grant*) 1203 (i).
—— INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITION, GOVT. AID TO: in Com. of Sup., 13501 (vi).
—— ISLAND, DAMAGE BY STORMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5589 (iii).
—— LABOUR COUNCIL AND TEL. *re* MECHANICS FROM ENG.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1854 (i).
—— MILITARY BUILDINGS FOR MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
—— MILITARY BUILDINGS, STORE HOUSES: in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
—— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
—— ADDITIONAL POSTAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13112 (vi).
—— BRANCH OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5920 (iii).
—— COLEMAN, A. B., TENDERS *re* TORONTO POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).
—— ENLARGEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 956 (i), 13096 (vi).
—— LETTER CARRIERS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iii).
—— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 956 (i).
—— PUBLIC WORKS EMPLOYEES, DELAY IN PAYMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5588 (iii).
TORONTO JUNCTION POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 650 (i).
TRENT CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7551 (iii), 14645 (vi).
—— BALSAM LAKE LOCKS: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).
—— CORRY & LAVERDURE, COMPENSATION *re* TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iii), 14651 (vi).
—— EMPLYMT. OF MEDICAL OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 8117 (iv).
—— HASTINGS AND TRENTON, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 129 (i).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

TRENT CANAL, PAYMENTS TO THOS. DODDS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 8118 (iv).
——— PETERBOROUGH ENTRANCE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).
——— REP. OF W. MCLEOD: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 12716 (vi).
——— ROSEDALE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
——— SPECIFICATIONS, REPS., &C.: M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Copies, 2313 (i).
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES, PORT COLBORNE: in Com. of Sup., 13024 (vi).
TRENTON HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1434 (i).
VANKLEEK HILL POSTAL SERVICE, COMPLAINTS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on Conc., 14764 (vi).
WALLACEBURG, POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 505 (i).
WALPOLE, CUSTOMS HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3961 (ii).
WALPOLE ISLAND INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).
WELLAND CANAL, DEEPENING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv).
——— DRAINAGE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
——— DUNNVILLE DAM AND BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7809 (iv).
——— ELECTRIC LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14148 (vi).
——— ELECTRIC LIGHT PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).
——— LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 7805 (iv).
——— LOCK TENDERS, SALARIES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12921 (vi).
——— LOWERING MITRE SILLS: in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv), 14149 (vi).
——— RAMY'S POINT, REMOVAL OF OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vi).
——— STONE PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).
——— SURVEYS *re* GOVT. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
——— 'TOWNSEND' VALVE *re* LOCK GATES: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
——— WATER POWER, REP. OF BOARD OF TRADE OF ST. CATHARINES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 668 (i).
——— O. CS., *re*, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1859 (i).
——— *See* 'Pt. Colborne,' &c.
WENDOVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1434 (i).
WEST LORNE RY. ACCIDENT, COMMISSIONERS' REP. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 6168 (iii).
——— JURY'S VERDICT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3231 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 5088 (ii), 5242 (iii).
WHEAT EXPORT FREIGHT RATE TO MONTREAL FROM ONT. POINTS: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 11188, 11425 (v).
WHEAT SHIPMENTS FROM PORT ARTHUR AND FT. WILLIAM: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 284 (i).
See 'Grain,' &c.
WHITBY PUBLIC BUILDING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13111 (vi).
WHITE, MR., INLAND REVENUE, PRESCOTT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13970 (vi).
WILLIAMSBURG CANAL, COLLECTOR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 12934 (vi).
——— GATE LIFTER: in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).
——— LOCKMASTER CASSELMAN, SUPERANNUATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
——— MORRISON, MRS., CLAIMS *re* LANDS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14104 (vi).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

WILLIAMSBURG CANAL, OVERSEER'S HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
——— STEWART, MR., APPNMT. AS SUPT. OF CANALS: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Schell*) 14599 (vi).
——— WORKING SCOW: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
WINDSOR, CUSTOMS PORT OF ENTRY, SALARIES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).
See 'Kilroy,' &c.
——— POST OFFICE LETTER BOXES: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
WINGHAM PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13120 (vi).
WOLFE ISLAND CHANNEL, RIVER ST. LAWRENCE: in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i), 13252 (vi).
WOODSTOCK ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13125 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13041, 13108 (vi).
OPERATING EXPENSES, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7811 (iv).
ORDER, QUES. OF, IN COM. ON CRIMINAL CODE B.: Ruling (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 318 (i).
ORDER IN THE HOUSE: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12723 (vi).
ORDER, QUESTIONS OF: Mr. Speaker's Rulings (Mr. *Ingram*) 10537 (v).
ORDER, QUES OF, *re* BRUNET AND DOM. ELECTIONS: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 108 (i).
——— *See* 'H. of C.'
O'REILLY, MR., CLAIMS *re* TOBACCO FACTORY DAMAGED BY FIRE: in Com. of Sup., Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13978 (vi).
ORFORD MOUNTAIN RY. CO'S. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14459 (vi).
ORIGINAL CONSTRUCTION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3698 (ii).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.'
ORILLIA, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 968 (i).
——— remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, REMOVAL OF CARETAKER: in Com. of Sup., 1007, 1016 (i).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
ORLEANS ISLAND, MAIL SERVICE &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 670 (i).
——— PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).
See 'Island of Orleans.'
OROMOCTO SHOALS, LIGHTKEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1194 (i).
OROMOCTO WHARF, RIVER ST. JOHN: in Com. of Sup., 1181 (i).
OSAKA EXHIBITION: *See* 'Japan.'
OSHAWA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13110 (vi).
OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL, ENGINEER'S REPS.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Murray*) 1299 (i).
OTTAWA GOVT. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 342 (i), 5842 (iii), 14243 (vi).
——— ADDITIONAL LAND: in Com. of Sup., 353 (i).
——— ADDITIONAL ROOMS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13006 (vi).

OTTAWA GOVT. BUILDINGS, CARETAKERS, MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 982 (i).

—— COAL CONTRACT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1008 (i).

—— COAL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).

—— ELEVATORS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1012 (i).

—— FIRE SECURITY AND MARTINEAU REP. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 4673 (ii).

—— FURNITURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 973, 1006 (i).

—— GOVT. OFFICES, RENTALS, LEASES, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Sproule*) 588 (i).

—— GROUNDS, MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).

—— CRICKET PLAYING: Objection (Mr. *Sproule*) 2398, 2421 (i).

—— PAVING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13119 (vi).

—— LIGHTING &C.: in Com. of Sup., 974, 988 (i).

—— NEW ELEVATOR FOR WEST BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).

—— RENTALS, LEASES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 989 (i).

—— REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii).

—— STEEL SHELVING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13087 (vi).

—— TELEPHONES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).

—— WESTERN BLOCK, HEATING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13087 (vi).

OTTAWA CITY BRIDGES, APPROACHES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2700 (ii).

OTTAWA CITY BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).

OTTAWA, CONCESSION STREET BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).

Ottawa City Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. No. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 6269; in Com. on Res., 6448; 1°* of B., 6456; 2°*, and in Com., 6806; 3°*, 6814 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 45).

Ottawa Electric Railway Co.'s B. No. 108 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 1378; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 171).

OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL ENGINEER'S REP.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Murray*) 1299 (i).
See 'Georgian.'

Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 37 (Mr. *Champagne*) 1°*, 540; 2°*, 665; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 173).

OTTAWA, NORTHERN AND WESTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 14319 (vi).
—— *See* 'Waltham.'

OTTAWA POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 438 (i).

—— ELEVATOR: in Com. of Sup., 5844 (iii).

—— IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13117 (vi).

OTTAWA RIVER, PETAWAWA NARROWS, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i), 13251 (vi).

—— SURVEYS OF HEADWATERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vi).

OTTAWA SUPPLY CO.: in Com. of Sup., 6146 (iii).

OTTAWA VALLEY FIRE SUFFERERS AND GOVTL. ASSISTANCE: Remarks (Mr. *Bourassa*) 3133 (ii).

Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 59 (Mr. *Monk*) 1°*, 707; on Order for 2°, 977; 2° m., 1327, 1511 (i); M. *re* Ry. Com., 6523; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 87), 6537 (iii).

Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 264 (Mr. *Ethier*) 1°*; 2°*, and ref. to Ry. Com., 12993; in Com., and 3°*, 13330 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 172).

OUELLE RIVER BRANCH, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7526 (iii), 12599 (v).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 541 (i).

—— BRANCH LINE TO ST. DENIS WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10490 (v).

OUELLE RIVER, PIER REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).

OWEN SOUND, BUILDING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13122 (vi).

—— HARBOUR DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).

—— HARBOUR SURVEY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).

—— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).

—— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii), 13063, 13110 (vi).

OXIDE OF ALUMINUM, IMPORTS INTO CANADA, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, N.B.*) 1035 (i).

OYSTER FISHING, P.E.I., PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2920 (ii)

OYSTERS, HERRING, &C., FISH INSPECTION, INVESTIGATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).

OYSTER POND, N.S., BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13204 (vi).

Pacific Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 164 (Mr. *Galliher*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956; in Com., and 3°*, 3796 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 174.)

PACIFIC CABLE, CONCESSIONS TO EASTERN EXTENSION CO., LIABILITY OF CAN.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2675 (ii).

PARADIS, AMABLE, FERRY SERVICE AT WHITFORD, COR., &C.: M. (Mr. *LaRiviere*) for copies*, 2338 (i).

PARDON PREROGATIVE OF, BY HIS EX.. NUMBER RELEASED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 96 (i).

—— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 567 (i).

PARIS AGENCY, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12589 (v).

PARIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE: *See* 'Chamber of Commerce.'

PARKHILL MAIL CONTRACT, REMUNERATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 1594 (i).

PARLIAMENT, DATE OF CONVENING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 14853 (vi).
See 'Sessions.'

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES, LOWERING TONE OF: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 14583 (vi).
See 'Debates.'

PARLIAMENTARY DOCUMENTS, OF LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, POSTAGE *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 14036 (vi).

—— TRANSLATION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 545 (i).

PARLIAMENT GROUNDS, DUST NUISANCE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 2104 (i).
——— LAWN MUTILATION: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 2398, 2421 (i).
PARLIAMENT: Opening, 1 (i), Prorogation, 14858 (vi).
PARRSBORO AND SPRINGHILL RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).
PARRSBORO AND TRURO: *See* 'Ry. Subsidies for N.S.', &c.
PARRSBORO, N.S., LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PARRY SOUND, ONT., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13248 (vi).
See 'Depot Harbour.'
PASPEBIAC AND GASPE BASIN SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 13694 (vi).
PASPEBIAC TO GASPE, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14460 (vi).
PASPEBIAC, LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13464 (vi).
PASSES, I. C. RAILWAY: M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret.. 2337 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9582 (iv.)
Patent Act Amt. B. No. 184 (Mr. *Fisher*) 1° m., 3622; 2°*, 4213; in Com.. 4213, 4674 (ii); 3°* 5293 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 46.)
PATENT ACT AMT., LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 97 (i).
PATENT BRANCH, SALARIES, CONTINGENCIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4350 (ii).
——— CLASSIFICATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4433 (ii).
Patent Relief: *See* 'Depew, Geo. M.'
——— *See* 'International Ry. Appliances.'
——— *See* 'Keller.'
——— *See* 'McDougall, James S.'
——— *See* 'Standard Car.'
——— *See* 'Woolf Valve,' &c.
PAVING SIDEWALKS, OTTAWA, CONCRETE: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
PEACE AND PELLY RIVERS, PACK TRAIL: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vi).
PEEL, CARDWELL AND HALTON CENSUS SCHEDULES: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6436 (iii).
See 'Halton.'
PEGGY'S COVE, HALIFAX, DISMISSAL OF LIGHTKEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2312 (i).
PELLETIER, H. L., CANVASSING FOR 'LE CANADA,' PAYMENTS TO, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 13980, 14002 (vi).
See 'Latour,' &c.
PELLY RIVER BRIDGE AT LETHBRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 13367 (vi).
PEMBROKE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. No. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 5763 (iii): 2° m., and in Com., 8261, 8373 (iv), 10824 (v); Order dischg., 13444 (vi).
PENITENTIARIES, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 90 (i).
PENITENTIARIES, GENERAL EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).
——— CONTRACTS *re* GROCERIES: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 10100 (v).
See 'Justice.'
Penny Banks B. No. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1° m., 4175 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 6456 (iii), 10793; 3°*, 10798 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 47.)
Pensions, Militia: *See* 'Militia.'
PENSION SYSTEM, &c., I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 9216 (iv).
PENSIONS TO S.A. SOLDIERS, PETS. *re*; Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2920 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 14590 (vi).
PER CAPITA TAX, EXCISE, 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 14284 (vi).
PER CAPITA TAX, REVENUE FROM CUSTOMS AND EXCISE, 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 13935 (vi).
PERCE, EXTENSION PIER IN NORTH COVE: in Com. of Sup., 13467 (vi).
Père Marquette International Bridge Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 132 (Mr. *Cowan*), 1°*, 2014; 2°*, 2277 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 175.)
PERKINS, W.. PAYMENT TO *re* LISGAR ELECTION; in Com. of Sup., 14251 (vi).
PERMANENT AND TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2726, 2753 (ii).
PERMANENT CORPS, QUALIFICATIONS OF OFFICERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*), 4443 (ii), 6434 (iii).
——— INCREASE, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).
——— INCREASE OF PAY: Ques. (Mr. *Gilmour*) 13371 (vi).
PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. *Bourassa*), *re* STOCK GAMBLING, 7204 (iii).
PERSONAL EXPLANATION *re* REPORT OF SPEECH: (Mr, *Hughes. Victoria*) 14850 (vi).
See 'Privilege.'
PERTH PUBLIC BUILDING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13075 (vi).
PETAWAWA NARROWS, AWARD TO G. C. POUPORE: in Com. of Sup., 13251 (vi).
——— IMPROVEMENT TO CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
PETERBOROUGH, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13083 (vi).
——— CANAL, LIFT LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
——— ENTRANCE PIER, TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).
PETERSEN, TATE & CO.'S, DEPOSIT CHEQUE: in Com. of Sup., 6953 (iii).
See 'Atlantic.'
PETHIC, DR., VET. SURGEON, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
PETIT DE GRAT, PROTECTION WORK, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).

PETIT DE GRAT AND I.C.R. TERMINUS AT MULGRAVE, SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 14249 (vi).
PETITIONS, PRESENTATION OF, RULES, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*), 6 (i).
PETITIONS *re* G.T.Ry., SIGNATURES, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Talbot*), 12715; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*), 12715 (vi).
PETITION REJECTED AS CONTRARY TO RULE 86 (Mr. *Speaker*), 654 (i).
See 'H. of C.'
PETIT ROCHER, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
"PETREL", REPLACEMENT BY NEW STEAMER: in Com. of Sup., 13658 (vi).
See 'Marine.'
PICKERING HARBOUR, REPAIRS TO PIERS, &C: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
PICKETT'S PIER, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PICTON MAIL SERVICE, IRREGULARITY, &C.: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Alcorn*), 13134 (vi).
—— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, LEVELLING GROUNDS: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
PICTOU, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8317 (iv), 12827, 14088 (vi).
—— LIGHTHOUSE CONSTRUCTION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4167 (ii).
—— LIGHT BEACH: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PIERREVILLE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi)
PIGEON LAKE ISLANDS, SALE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).
Pilotage Act (Montreal and Quebec) Amt. B. No. 261 (Mr. *Préfontaine*), Res. wthdn., 12493 (v); in Com. on Res., 12781; 1°* of B., 12800; 2°m., 12984; 2°, and in Com., 13628; 3°m., 13937 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 48.)
Pilotage Act. Amt. B. No. 138 (Mr. *Préfontaine*), 1°*, 2100 (i); wthdn., 11302 (v).
PILOTAGE ACT AMT. B: Prop. Res. wthdn., 12493 (v).
PILOTS, RIVER ST. LAWRENCE, RETIREMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*), 2915 (ii).
—— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4132-4168 (ii).
See 'Shipping Casualties Bill.'
PINTSCH GAS EQUIPMENT FOR I.C.R. CARS: in Com. of Sup., 8291 (iv).
PLAINS OF ABRAHAM AND MILITARY PARADES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 3234 (ii).
PLEASANT BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PNEUMATIC TUBE MAIL SERVICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13998 (vi).
POINTE AU BARIL, GEORGIAN BAY ROUTE CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1365 (i).
POINTE AUX TREMBLES, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
POINTE DU CHENE, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).
POINT EDWARD, ONT., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i). 13249 (vi).
POINTE FORTUNE, WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
POINT PRIM, P.E.I., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
POINT TUPPER, DREDGING, CLAIMS OF MR. CONNOLLY: in Com. of Sup., 14103 (vi).
—— IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 8309 (iv).
POIRIERVILLE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i), 13205 (vi).
POLAR EXPEDITION, GOVT. AID TO CAPT. BERNIER: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*), 12805 (vi.)
POLICE MAGISTRATES, YUKON. LIVING ALLOWANCES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3415 (ii).
See 'Yukon.'
POLITICAL CORRUPTION, &C.: Remarks in Com. on Dom. Elections B., 891 (i).
PORTAGE DU FORT BRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).
PORTAGE, P.E.I., POST OFFICE OPENING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*), in Com. of Sup., 14008 (vi).
PORT ARTHUR, ADDITIONAL DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 3341 (ii)., 13012 (vi).
See 'Ontario,' &c.
PORT BURWELL HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT COLBORNE, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3368 (ii).
—— ELEVATOR FOUNDATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).
—— ENTRANCE IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vi).
—— ROCK CUT: in Com. of Sup., 14148 (vi).
—— SUMMIT LEVELS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12903 (vi).
PORT DANIEL, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
PORT ELGIN, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1424 (i).
PORTER'S CHANNEL, N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vi).
PORT GEORGE, N. S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i), 13210 (vi).
PORT GREVILLE, N. S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT HASTINGS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PORT HAWKESBURY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PORT HOOD, N. S., HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vi).
PORT HOPE PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
PORT HOWE, N. S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT LATOUR, N. S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT MAITLAND, N. S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
PORT MOODY, MILITARY RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 446 (i).
PORT PERRY, ONT., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT AU PIQUE, N. S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).

PORTRAIT PAINTING OF HIS MAJESTY THE KING AND CANADIAN ARTISTS; Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*, *Victoria*) 13026 (vi).
See 'Art,' &c.

PORT STANLEY HARBOUR IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i), 13249 (vi).

Postal Scales: *See* 'Weights and Measures.'

Post Office Act Amt. B. No. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) 1°m., 5240; 2°m., 5657; in Com., 5659, 5853: 3°*, 5871 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 49).

Post Office and Govt. Savings Bank B. No. 220 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°m., 6353; 2°*., and in Com., 6814; 3°*, 6815 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 62).

POST OFFICE BUILDINGS, MONTREAL, ENLARGEMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).

POST OFFICE, GOVT'S. POLICY *re* BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 487-533 (i).

POST OFFICE:

AFFIDAVITS *re* P. O. SUPPLIES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 6138 (iii).

AGRICULTURE DEPT., POSTAGE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4355 (ii).

AMHERST, N. S., POST OFFICE, RENTAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1591 (i).

ASHCROFT-BARKERVILLE MAIL CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1595 (i).

AURORA FOUNDRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13091 (vi).

AURORA, MAIL BAGS REPAIRED, &C.: in Com of Sup., 6139 (iii).

AUTOMOBILES FOR P. O. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6050 (iii).

AYR, POSTMASTER ROBSON, RESIGNATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1195 (i).

BALACLAVA AND OWEN SOUND MAIL CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson*, *Grey*) 13263 (vi).

BARRIE P. O., BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 6062 (iii).

BLOOMFIELD POSTMASTER, N. B., CHARGES AGAINST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 818 (i).

BOXES ON STREET CORNERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13091 (vi).
See 'Postal Boxes,' &c.

BOX RENTS: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).

BRACEBRIDGE POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13071 (vi).

BRENNAN, MR. J. P., P. E. I., DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).

CAMPBELL, D. J., POSTMASTER AT MACLEOD, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Oster*) 8082 (iv).

CAMPBELLFORD POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13073 (vi).

CANADA AND G. B. MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 5997 (iii).

CANADIAN MAIL VIA NEW YORK, NUMBER OF TONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 10713 (v).

CARLIN, PETER, J., POSTMASTER AT WHITNEY PIER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 130, 668 (i).

CHATSWORTH POST OFFICE, VACANCY: in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iii).

CITY POST OFFICES, APPNMT. OF CLERKS ON PERMANENT STAFF: in Com. of Sup., 14001, 14009 (vi).

CLERKS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5853 (iii).

CONVENTION, POSTAL, LONDON, ENG., RES. ADOPTED: Read (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. of Sup., 14018 (vi).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

CORNWALL ROAD P. O., MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 14038 (vi).

COUNTRY POSTMASTERS, SALARY INCREASES, &C.: Remarks in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5662, 5676, 5863 (iii).
See 'Postmasters, Rural.'

COUNTRY POST OFFICES, HOURS OF CLOSING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Lancaster*) in Com. of Sup., 5931 (iii).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6037 (iii), 14011 (vi).

CROWN TAILORING CO,, TORONTO, SUPPLIES FOR P. O. DEPT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iii).

CUTLER AND GORE BAY MAIL CONTRACT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).

——— SPANISH MILLS MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).

DEFAULTING POSTMASTERS *re* SAVING BANKS DEPOSITS: in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).

DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *William Mulock*) 89 (i).

DISTRIBUTION, &C.: REMARKS (Mr. *Bell*) 879 (i).

DEPTL. SALARIES, ADDITIONAL CLERKS: in Com. of Sup., 13995 (vi).

DIXON, MR. J. W. T., DEAD LETTER OFFICE, WINNIPEG, ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13995 (vi).

DOYLE, MR., RY. MAIL CLERK: in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii).

EDVILLE POSTMASTER, OPENING OF OFFICE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14035 (vi).

EMERSON MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5321 (iii).

EMPLOYEES, HOLIDAYS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4005 (ii).

ENTERPRISE POST OFFICE, DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER; Remarks (Mr. *Avery*) in Com. of Sup., 14007; Memorandum (Sir *William Mulock*) read, 14008 (vi).

ERNESTOWN STATION POSTMASTER, CHANGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1034 (i).

FACILITIES TO PARISHES NEAR MONTREAL, PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 12498 (v).

FITTINGS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13090 (vi).

GAGETOWN MAIL CONTRACT, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1676 (i).

GENERAL STATEMENT: in Com. of Sup., (Sir *William Mulock*) 14012 (vi).

GUELPH POST OFFICE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 637 (i).

HALIFAX POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES, PET. *re* INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) on conc., 14759 (vi).

——— SALARY INCREASES: in Com. of Sup., 6004 (iii).

H. OF C., LOCKED P. O. BOXES: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Hughes*, *Victoria*) 6026 (iii).

INSPECTORS, SUPT. OF RY. MAIL SERVICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14001 (vi).

INSURANCE FUND, REP., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14660 (vi).

INVERNESS POSTAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6051 (iii).

JUBILEE STAMPS, SALE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6060 (iii).

KELLEY'S CROSS, MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5938 (iii).

LAMBTON POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) in Com. of Sup., 6166 (iii), 14278 14661 (vi).

LEMON, MR., TRANSFER TO TORONTO P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

LETTER BOX COLLECTIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
LETTER BOXES IN POST OFFICES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
LETTER CARRIERS, INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com. of Sup., 14011 (vi).
——— BOOTS, PURCHASE OF: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 6058, 6063 (iii).
——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. on Post Office B., 5660, 5672 (iii).
——— SALARY INCREASES: in Com. of Sup., 6004 (iii).
——— SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6013 (iii).
——— TORONTO, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iii).
——— WINNIPEG, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iii).
LIME ROCK, N.S., POSTMASTER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1297 (i).
MCNULTY, POSTMASTER, PET. *re* REMOVAL OF OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).
See 'Lambton.'
MACLEOD, N.W.T., DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Oster*) 8082 (iv).
MAHONE BAY, POSTAL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. of Sup., 14038 (vi).
MAIL BAGS, REFUNDING EXPRESS CHARGES: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 14684 (vi).
See general heading.
——— REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
MAIL, CANADIAN, SENT VIA NEW YORK: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 10713 (v).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7728 (iv).
MAILS CARRIED BY RYS.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6268 (iii).
MAIL CARS, N.W.T., INSUFFICIENT ACCOMMODATION: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5870 (iii).
MAIL CLERKS, INCREASE OF SALARY: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 13997 (vi).
See 'Ry. Mail Clerks.'
MAIL MARKING MACHINES: in Com. of Sup., 6159 (iii).
MAIL SERVICE, P. O. DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 6053, 6065 (iii).
——— P.E.I., IRREGULARITY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 5937 (iii).
MALLON, MR., DISMISSAL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6037 (iii).
MAN. POSTMASTERS: *See* 'Postmasters.'
MEAFORD POST OFFICE: Remarks (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).
MILLER BROS., PAYMENTS *re* DEFAULTING POSTMASTER: in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).
MONTREAL POST OFFICE, ACCUMULATION OF MAIL, &C: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3972 (ii).
MOOSEJAW POSTMASTER, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).
NAPANEE POST OFFICE, RENTAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1594 (i).
NESBITT, MAN., POSTMASTER WATSON AND EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1195 (i).
NEWMARKET OFFICE SPECIALTY CO., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13088 (vi).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Sir *William Mulock*) 13256 (vi).
NEWSPAPER BOXES, NAMES OF MANUFACTURERS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 14283 (vi).
See 'Boxes.'

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

N. W. TER., POSTAL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 14039 (vi).
ORLEANS ISLANDS MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 670 (i).
OTTAWA, POST OFFICE, ELEVATOR: in Com. of Sup., 5844 (iii).
——— SUPPLY CO.: in Com. of Sup., 6146 (iii).
OUTSIDE SERVICE, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 5924, 6004 (iii).
PARKHILL MAIL CONTRACT, REMUNERATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 1594 (i).
PARLIAMENTARY DOCUMENTS OF LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, POSTAGE, *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 14036 (vi).
PICTON MAIL SERVICE, IRREGULARITY, &C.: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 13134 (vi).
PNEUMATIC TUBE MAIL SERVICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13998 (vi).
PORTAGE, P.E.I., POST OFFICE, OPENING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 14008 (vi).
POSTAL, BOXES ON STREET CORNERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13091 (vi).
——— CONVENTION: *See* 'CONVENTION.'
——— MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6053 (iii).
POSTMASTERS, ASSOCIATION, MAN. AND N.W.T., MEMORIAL *re* SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 13259 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *LaRiviére*) in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).
——— STMNT. (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. of Sup., 14016 (vi).
——— DEFAULTING *re* SAVINGS BANKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).
——— DISMISSAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1020 (i).
——— IN MAN. AND N.W.T., PETS. *re* SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. *LaRiviere*) 125 (i).
POSTMASTERS, RURAL, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 5920, 6037 (iii).
——— *See* 'Country.'
POSTMASTERS' SALARIES, ARREARS: in Com. of Sup., 5921 (iii).
POST OFFICES IN CITIES, STMNT. OF REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 666 (i).
PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF (Sir *William Mulock*) *re* NEWMARKET OFFICE SPECIALTY CO., 13256 (vi).
QUEBEC POSTMASTERS: *See* 'Newspaper Agents.'
RY. CARRIAGE OF MAILS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6268 (iii).
RY. MAIL CLERKS: in Com. on Post Office B. 208, 5659 (iii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 5926, 6136 (iii).
——— INCREASED SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iii).
——— MAN. AND N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 14041 (vi).
See 'Mail Clerks.'
RY. MAIL SERVICE IN N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 5934 (iii).
RY. MAIL TRANSFER AGENTS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6136 (iii).
RAINY RIVER MAIL SERVICE: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6889 (iii).
ROBSON, MICHAEL, RESIGNATION AS POSTMASTER AT AYR: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1195 (i).
RONAN, MR., AND OTTAWA SUPPLY CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).
RURAL MAIL DELIVERY, FREE ESTABLISHMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 285 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 13259 (vi).
——— P.E.I., Par. in Charlottetown *Patriot*: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13806 (vi).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 506 (i), 6137 (iii); Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) 511 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

ST. BONIFACE, MONEY ORDER BRANCH, CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5321 (iii).
——— POSTAL FACILITIES: Ques (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1858 (i).
SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6136 (iii).
SAVINGS BANKS, DEFALCATIONS OF POSTMASTER: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).
SMITH, F. H., P.O. DEPT., SALARY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14000 (vi).
STAMPING LETTERS BY MINISTERS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6936 (iii).
SUPPLIES AND CURRENT WAGES, DECLARATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iii).
THETFORD MINES POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 441 (i).
TORONTO, ADDITIONAL POSTAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13112 (vi).
TORONTO POST OFFICE, BRANCH OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5920 (iii).
——— AUTOMOBILES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6050 (iii).
TRANSFER OF TEMPORARY CLERKS TO PERMANENT STAFF: in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).
U. S. INSTRUCTIONS TO MASTERS OF VESSELS *re* CUSTOMS MANIFEST, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 5664 (iii).
VALLEYFIELD POST OFFICE, ERECTION, PURCHASE OF SITE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 98 (i).
——— TENDERS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 11187 (v).
VANCOUVER P. O., INSPECTOR, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 14000 (vi).
VANKLEEK HILL POSTAL SERVICE, COMPLAINTS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Bordcn, Halifax*) on Conc., 14764 (vi).
WHITNEY PIER, POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 130, 668 (i).
WINNIPEG P. O., INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 14001 (vi).
——— REVENUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 666 (i).

POTTINGER, MR., I.C.R., REP. OF *re* TIES, &C.: M. for Copy (Mr. *Haggart*) 3806 (ii).

'POULTRY FARMING,' PAMPHLET OF DEPT.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com. of Sup., 7640 (iv).

POUPORE, G. C., AWARD: *See* 'Ottawa River.'

PRATT & CO., LEASE OF MIDLAND WATER FRONT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).
——— *See* 'Midland.'

PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, AND RT. HON. JOS. CHAMBERLAIN'S SPEECH: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 13375 (vi).
——— AND S.A. COLONIES, RES. OF WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 1678 (i).
——— CERTIFICATE OF ORIGIN: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 3583 (ii).
——— WITH FRANCE *re* SHIPPING B. C. SALMON: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).
——— PAR. IN 'MONTREAL STAR' *re* MR. FIELDING'S PLEDGES *re* MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S SCHEME, 13936 (vi).
——— PREVENTION OF FRAUD, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3921 (ii).
——— *re* GERMAN GOODS: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 5322 (iii).
——— MEMORANDUM OF MR. BALFOUR, PRES'DT. OF BRITISH BOARD OF TRADE, IN FINANCIAL STATEMENT, 1402 (i).
——— OFFER OF CAN. GOVT. TO G.B.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 3219 (ii).

PRÉFONTAINE, HON. R., AND PUBLIC WORKS PORTFOLIO: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2266-2273, 2657, 2925, 2956 (ii).

PRENDERGAST, JUDGE, DELAY IN APPNMT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).

PRESCOTT, HARBOUR DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).
——— INLAND REV. OFFICIALS, SALARIES, PROMOTIONS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 13968 (vi).

PRESQUE ISLE, BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).
——— DOCK REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i).

Press Associated Despatches: *See* 'British Cable,' &c.

PRESS REPRESENTATIVES IN GALLERY OF H. OF C., SESSIONAL SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 14114, 14242 (vi).

PRESTON, MR., INTERVIEW *re* CAN. BUTTER: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 10712 (v).
——— STATEMENT *re* CAN. APPLES: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) 11184 (v).
——— SUIT BY CAN. EMPLOYMENT BUREAU: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12220 (v).
See 'Barr Colony,' &c.

PREVENTIVE SERVICE, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3949 (ii).
———*See* 'Customs.'

PRIME MINISTER, CONGRATULATIONS *re* TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AS A MEMBER (Mr. *Sproule*) 11690 (v).

'PRINCE ALBERT ADVOCATE,' PROCLAMATION *re* SASKATCHEWAN ELECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14268 (vi).
——— *See* 'Advocate.'

PRINCE ALBERT, CLERK OF COURT, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3401 (ii).
——— COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).

Prince Edward Island Ferry Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 180 (Mr. *Emmerson*) 1°*, 3391; 2°*, 3984 (ii); in Com., 7771, 7914; 3°, 7914 (iv).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:
AGENTS *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6884 (iii).
AITKEN'S WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).
ALBANY STATION AND LAND PURCHASE, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
ALBERTON RY. STATION: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).
——— STATION: in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).
ANGLO-AMERICAN TEL. CO., MONOPOLY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13328, 13338 (vi).
ANNANDALE, PIER, AMT. EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2921 (ii).
——— RANGE LIGHTS, AMT. EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2921 (ii).
BEACH POINT, BOAT CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).
BELFAST PIER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i).
BLUESHANK, STRAIGHTENING CURVE: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
BONDED WAREHOUSES, RENTAL, CLOSING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 12073 (v).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Con.*

BRENNAN, MR. J. P., DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).
BROOKFIELD STATION, ENLARGEMENT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).
BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
CANOE COVE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).
CANSO FERRY SERVICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7525 (iii), 12602 (v), 14093 (vi).
CAPE TRAVERSE, SURVEY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13219 (vi).
CARLETON HEAD, SURVEY *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13219 (vi).
CASCUMPEC HARBOUR, BEACH OPENING: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i).
CHARLOTTETOWN, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— DOM. BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13036 (vi).
——— STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 14131 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4442 (ii).
COAL FIELDS, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).
CONROY, MR., SUB-COLLECTOR TIGNISH, DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13993 (vi).
COVE HEAD, CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13222 (vi).
CREOSOTED TIMBER FOR PIERS AND BREAKWATERS: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).
CURRY, JAMES, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT CHARLOTTETOWN, SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3918 (ii), 13992 (vi).
DESROCHES, FISHERY GUARD, ALLEGED FRAUDS: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 10955 (v).
DREDGING PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 13313 (vi).
ELMIRA BRANCH LINE: in Com. of Sup., 12835 (vi).
FARQUHARSON, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5512 (iii).
FISHING BOUNTIES, GUARDIAN DESROCHES, ALLEGED FRAUD: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 10955 (v).
FISH SHIPPERS, LOSS, &C., BY GOVT. STRS.: Memorandum read (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 4051-54 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 13373 (vi).
——— PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3394 (ii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13520 (vi).
GASPEREAUX HARBOUR, GRAHAM'S POND: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).
GRAND RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i), 13218 (vi).
HIGGIN'S SHORE PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i), 13222 (vi).
HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE, AGREEMENT, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2758 (ii).
——— CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2584 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4444 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 12829, 14108, 14115 (vi).
KELLEY'S CROSS, MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5938, 6064 (iii).
KENSINGTON STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12840 (vi).
KINKORA STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
LARKIN, CAPT. W. S., COMPLAINTS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2922 (ii).
LETTER CARRIERS: in Com. of Sup., 6058, 6063 (iii).
LEWIS POINT, PIER REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Con.*

LOBSTER INDUSTRY, INSPECTION, *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
LOWER MONTAGUE, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).
MAIL SERVICE, IRREGULARITY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 5937 (iii).
MAIL SUBSIDY, P.E.I. AND G.B.: in Com. of Sup., 6001 (iii).
MONTAGUE BRIDGE SURVEY, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).
MOUNT STEWART FREIGHT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii).
MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH RY., P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 7801 (iv), 12829, 14108, 14115 (vi).
See 'Hillsborough.'
NEW LONDON HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
——— REPAIRS TO BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).
NORTHAM AND RICHMOND STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
NORTH CARDIGAN, PIER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS, WINTER NAVIGATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 6895 (iii).
O'LEARY STATION, P.E.I. RY., BRANCH LINE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 6168 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).
O'LEARY STATION, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 7536 (iii).
O'REILLY, MR., CLAIMS *re* TOBACCO FACTORY, DAMAGED BY FIRE: in Com. of Sup., remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13978 (vi).
OYSTER FISHING, P.E.I., PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2920 (ii).
OYSTERS, HERRING, &C., FISH INSPECTION, INVESTIGATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).
PERCÉ, EXTENSION PIER IN NORTH COVE: in Com. of Sup., 13467 (vi).
PETHICK, DR., VET. SURGEON, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
PIERS AND BREAKWATERS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).
POINT PRIM, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
PORTAGE, POST OFFICE OPENING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 14008 (vi).
P.E.I. AND G. B. MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 6001 (iii), 7744 (iv).
——— AND MAINLAND SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 7741 (iv).
——— AND NEWFOUNDLAND SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 13676 (vi).
——— PROTEST *re* REPRESENTATION IN H. OF C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 5316 (iii).
——— *See* 'Redistribution.'
P. E. I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 7801 (iv), 12608 (v), 12828 (vi).
——— GENERAL VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).
——— MISREPRESENTATION *re* TOTAL COST: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, P. E. I.*) 1679 (i).
——— MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH AND HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 14108, 14115 (vi).
——— RY. SALE OF TICKETS: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).
——— SUBSIDIES BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14472 (vi).
——— WATER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
——— WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Con.*

PUBLIC WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
QUEENS, WEST, REPRESENTATION *re* : Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13378 (vi).
REDISTRIBUTION *re* P. E. I. AND N. B., COR. RESPECTING : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 876 (i).
REPRESENTATION IN P.E.I. AND N B. FOR H. OF C., LAW OFFICERS' OPINION : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 5316 (iii).
RICHMOND AND NORTHAM, P.E.I. RY. STATION : Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).
RICHMOND BAY, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
RURAL MAIL DELIVERY, Par. in Charlottetown *Patriot* : Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13806 (vi).
SEMAPHORE LIGHTS, P.E.I. RY. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4443 (ii).
SHIPPERS OF FROZEN FISH, CLAIMS AGAINST GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 13373 (vi).
SKINNER'S POND : in Com. of Sup., 13308 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com, of Sup., 13445 (vi).
SOURIS, KNIGHT'S POINT BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).
SOUTHPORT AND MURRAY HARBOUR, RY. TENDERS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2584 (ii).
ST. LOUIS, ELMSDALE, COLEMAN AND CONWAY STATION AGENTS, P.E.I. RY., SALARIES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4361 (ii).
"STANLEY," STR., AND P.E.I. WINTER COMMUNICATION : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*), 4006 (ii),
——— MR. MACMILLAN'S REP. *re* REPAIRS : Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*), in Com. of Sup., 4050 (ii).
STATION AGENTS, P.E.I. RY., SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*), 4361 (ii)
STEEL RAILS, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 7802 (iv).
SUMMERSIDE, P.E.I., BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
——— COMPLETION, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*), 3234 (ii).
——— COAL SHEDS : in Com. of Sup., 12828 (vi).
——— HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 3367 (ii), 13227 (vi).
——— WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 12828 (vi).
TELEGRAPH LINES AND MAINLAND : in Com. of Sup., 2988 (ii).
——— RES. OF BOARD OF TRADE : in Com. of Sup., 2702 (ii).
TELEGRAPH SERVICE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vi).
TIGNISH BREAKWATER, REBUILDING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).
WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH P.E.I.: M. for Memorials, &c. (Mr. *Lefurgey*), 2765 (ii).
——— COR. WITH GOVT.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*), 1036 (i).
——— STR. "STANLEY": Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*), 4006 (ii).
——— CONSTRUCTION OF STR.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*), 6895 (iii).

Printing and Stationery Bill: *See* 'Public,' &c.

PRINTING AND STATIONERY, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 1102 (i).

PRINTING BUREAU AND UNION EMPLOYEES : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 4182, 4414 (ii).

——— AND UNION LABELS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Brock*), 4179 (ii).

PRINTING BUREAU, COMPOSITORS AND TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 4444 (ii).
PRINTING BUREAU, INDEBTEDNESS OF MEMBERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*), 4180 (ii).
——— PLANT : in Com. of Sup., 12587 (v).
——— SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 223 (i).
PRINTING COM. : M. (Mr. *Parmelee*) to conc. in 3rd Rep., 5314 (iii).
——— M. (Mr. *Parmelee*) to concur in 4th Rep. of Com., 5581 (iii).
PRINTING OF PARLT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).
PRINTING, STATIONERY, CUSTOMS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3962 (ii).

Prisons Act : *See* 'Reformatory.'

PRITCHARD AND ANDREWS, P.O. SUPPLIES : in Com. of Sup., 6154 (iii).
PRITCHETT, AND POLITICAL CORRUPTION IN ONT.: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*), 898, 908 (i).
PRIVATE BANKERS : *See* 'Bankers.'
PRIVATE BILLS : M. (Mr. *Morrison*), to extend Time, 10489 (v).
——— M. (Mr. *Russell*) to suspend Rule, 4958 (ii).
——— NOTICES, REVISING RULES *re* : M. (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) in Com. on Rep. of Joint Com., 13547 (vi).
——— ORDER FOR PROCEDURE : Remarks (Mr. *La-Rivière*), 5138 (iii).
PRIVATE CARS, AMOUNTS PAID FOR HAULAGE : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 9682 (iv).
——— PURCHASED BY GOVT,, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 2309 (i).
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COM., 1ST REP. OF SEL. COM.: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*), 5511 (iii).
——— M. *re* Stenographer (Mr. *Fraser*), 7202 (iii).
——— 2ND REP. *re* MR. LOY, M.P.: Presented (Mr. *Wade*), 7916 (iv).
——— M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7917 (iv).
——— Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*), 7918 (iv).
——— M. to conc. in Rep., 7922, 8008 ; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*), 8008, Neg. (Y. 40 ; N. 105), 8069, 8080 (iv).
PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF : (Mr. *Fisher*) Par. in Ottawa *Citizen re* Montreal *Herald* Co., 5314 (iii).
——— (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) Par. in *La Patrie*, 6803 (iii).
——— (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* Visitors in Corridors, 11557 (v).
——— (Sir *William Mulock*) *re* Newmarket Office Specialty Co., 13256 (vi).
——— (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys. and 'Grafters,' 10497, 10529 (v).
——— (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) *re* Attendance at House, 2015 (i).
——— (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) *re* Fishermen of N.S., 'Outskirts of Civilization,' 13373 (vi).
——— (Mr. *Schell*) *re* Purchase of Cheese Hoops, 5416 (iii).
——— (Mr. *Schell*) *re* Appnmt. of Mr. Stewart on Canals, 14599 (vi).

PRIVILEGE (Mr. *Scott*) *re* 'Lowering Tone of Debates', in Campaign Literature, 14583 (vi).
——— (Mr. *Talbot*) *re* Par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 3127 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Talbot*) *re* Pets. of G.T.P. Ry. Co., 13265 (vi).
See 'G.T.P.Ry.,' &c.
——— (Mr. *Tarte*) *re* 'Eureka', 14687 (vi).
PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
PROCEDURE *re* ADJOURNMENT: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Sproule*), 6630 (iii).
PROROGATION: Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Secretary (Mr. *Speaker*), 14844 (vi).
——— Mess. from His Ex., 14858 (vi).
PROSPECT, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY FOR N.W.T.: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup.' 13856; Neg. (Y. 29; N. 63), 13932 (vi).
See 'Autonomy.'
——— FURTHER COR.,. &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*), 7295 (iii).
——— IMPERFECT RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 6891 (iii).
——— M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to print Papers, 5582 (iii).
——— Papers laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 5512 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*), 1296 (i).
——— RET., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6946 (iii).
See 'N.W.T. Subsidies B. 256.'

Provincial Court Judges, &c.: *See* 'Judges Retiring,' &c.

PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES, INCREASES, &C.: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 691 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 5764 (iii).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 89 (i).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM.: M. (Mr. *Fraser*) 367 (i).
——— M. to add Name (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3431 (ii).
——— MEETINGS CONCURRENTLY WITH SITTINGS OF HSE.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 8334 (iv).
——— PRODUCING CENSUS SCHEDULES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7058 (iii).

Publication of Statutes: *See* 'Statutes.'

PUBLIC DEBT, CONVERSION, PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVANTS *re*, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14253 (vi).
PUBLIC DEBT, INTEREST DECREASE: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14665 (vi).
PUBLIC DOCUMENTS, DISTRIBUTION TO BOARDS OF TRADE: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 1378 (i).
PUBLIC EXPENDITURE ON PRIVATE WHARFS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13451 (vi).
PUBLIC HEALTH ACT, UNORGANIZED DISTRICTS, QUARANTINE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5490 (iii).
PUBLIC HEALTH, QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii).
——— *See* 'Agriculture.'

Public Printing and Stationery Act Amt. B. No. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 3392; 2°*, 4203; in Com., 4203; 3°*, 4213 (ii); Sen. Amts., 5872 (iii). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 50).

Public Works Act (contracts) Amt. B. No. 193 (Mr. *Sutherland*) 1° m., 3970; 2°*, 4221; in Com., 4221; 3°*, 4224 (ii). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 52).

Public Works Management and Control B. No. 269 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 14281; 2°, and in Com., 14741; 3°*, 14755 (vi). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 53).

PUBLIC WORKS:
ABBOTT'S HARBOUR, N.S., BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).
ABRAM'S RIVERS, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).
ACTON VALE POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).
AITKEN'S WHARF, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).
'ALASKA,' STR., PURCHASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 6629 (iii).
ALBERNI-CLAYOQUOT TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
ALEXANDRIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 487 (i).
ALLISTON PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 495 (i).
ALMA PIER, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).
AMAGANDUS WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1068 (i).
AMHERSTBURG, ONT., HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1285 (i), 13235 (vi).
ANDERSON'S HOLLOW, WHARF, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i).
ANDERSON AND KENNEDY'S LAKE: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
ANGLO-AMERICAN TEL. CO., MONOPOLY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13328, 13338 (vi).
ANNANDALE PIER, P.E.I., AMT. EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2921 (ii).
ANSE AUX GASCONS, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANSE AUX GRIS FONDS, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANSE ST. JEAN, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANTICOSTI TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).
——— FOX BAY, TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
ANTIGONISH POST OFFICE, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
ARBITRATION AND AWARDS *re* PUBLIC WORKS, PAYMENTS &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vi).
ARCHITECT'S (CHIEF) OFFICE, OTTAWA, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2747 (ii).
ARCHITECTS *re* PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 524 (i).
ARCHITECT OF PUBLIC WORKS, SALARY ARREARS: in Com. of Sup., 13498 (vi).
——— STAFF, PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 961 (i).
ARICHAT, N.S., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5827 (iii).
ARICHAT, WEST, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
ARROW LAKES IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).
ASHCROFT-DAWSON TEL. LINE AND BRANCHES: in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii).
ASSINIBOINE AND RED RIVERS NAVIGATION, COM. FROM WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1298 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1859 (i).
See "St. Andrews Rapids" (vi).
ATLIN-QUESNEL TEL. BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

BAILEY'S BROOK, N.S., BREAKWATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1072 (i).
BARACHOIS DE MALBAIE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
BARRIE, ONT., WHARF CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 1186 (i), 13452 (vi).
BARRY'S BAY, ONT., MADAWASKA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 13236 (vi).
BATISCAN RIVER, CHANNEL DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i).
See 'St. Maurice.'
BAXTER'S HARBOUR, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
BAYFIELD EXTENSION PIERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1188 (i), 13141 (vi).
BAY DU VIN WHARF, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i).
BEACH POINT, P.E.I., BOAT CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).
BELFAST PIER, P.E.I., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i).
BELLE ISLE, TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 2712, 2989 (ii).
BELLE RIVIÈRE, SHEET PILING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1191 (i).
BELLEVILLE, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 969, (i), 13082 (vi).
——— HARBOUR BOUNDARIES &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 5588 (iii).
BENOIT'S COVE, N.S., BOAT LANDING: in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
BERSIMIS TO GODBOUT TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vi).
BIG HARBOUR, PORT BEVIS, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
BIG POND WHARF, N.S., SUPERSTRUCTURE: in Com. of Sup., 1071, 1073 (i).
BLACK BROOK, N.B., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13227 (vi).
BLIND RIVER, ONT., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).
——— TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 1298 (i).
BOIS BRULÉ, TRAINING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13448 (vi).
BONAVENTURE, EAST, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13446 (vi).
BOWMANVILLE, BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1352 (i).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 507 (i).
BOW RIVER BRIDGE, CANMORE, PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6925 (iii).
BRACEBRIDGE, ONT., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13236 (vi).
BRAMPTON ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 966 (i), 13085 (vi).
BRANTFORD DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13108 (vi).
BRASSES' POINT BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7808 (iv).
BRETON COVE, N.S., BOAT LANDING: in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).
BRIDGEBURG PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
BRIDGES OVER CANALS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
BRIDGEWATER, N.S., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1074 (i).
B.C. TELEGRAPH LINES, WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 13368 (vi).
BROAD COVE, N.S., HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
BRONTE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1354 (i), 13236 (vi).
——— LIGHTHOUSE: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Henderson*) 5755 (iii).
BRUCE MINES, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5911 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

BRYSON BRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION OF PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
BUILDINGS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
——— GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 956, 1065 (i).
——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 442 (i), 5844 (iii), 13126 (vi).
——— MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 422 (i).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 412, 486 (i), 13037 (vi).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 411 (i), 5827 (iii), 13028 (vi).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 958 (i), 13129 (vi).
——— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 487, 956 (i), 5842 (iii), 13082 (vi).
——— OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 342 (i).
See 'Ottawa.'
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5841 (iii), 13053 14245 (vi).
——— QUEBEC, RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 422 (i).
——— YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).
See 'Dominion Buildings.'
BURK'S FALLS, MAGNETAWAN RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1358 (i).
BURLINGTON CHANNEL PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i), 13237 (vi).
CABLE AND LAND LINES, MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 2701 (ii).
CACOUNA WHARF, EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 5896 (iii), 13448 (vi).
CAMPBELLFORD, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 504 (i).
CAMPBELLTON, N.B., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13037, 13042, 13052 (vi).
——— WHARF, EXTENSION AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i), 13005, 13229 (vi).
CAMPOBELLO, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).
CANOE COVE, P.E.I., BREAKWATER: in of Com. Sup., 13218 (vi).
CAPE TORMENTINE, N.B., PIER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).
CAPE TRAVERSE, P.E.I., SURVEY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13219 (vi).
CAPLAN BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13448 (vi).
CARAQUET WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1173 (i).
CARETAKERS OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS, GOVT. POLICY *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i), 13061 (vi).
CARIBOO ISLAND, N.S., HARBOUR OF REFUGE: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
CARLETON HEAD, P.E.I., SURVEY *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13219 (vi).
CASCUMPEC HARBOUR, P.E.I., BEACH OPENING: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i).
CAYUGA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 502 (i).
CEMENT USED FOR BUILDINGS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
CHAMBORD WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13454 (vi).
CHARLOTTETOWN, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13036 (vi).
CHATEAU DE RICHER, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13455 (vi).
CHATEAUGUAY RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i), 3208 (ii).
CHATHAM, N.B., LIGHTSHIP SLIP: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).
——— TO TRACADIE, N.B., TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
CHATHAM, ONT., DREDGING CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1185 (i).
CHEGOGGIN, N.S., PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

CHETICAMP, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
CHEVERIE, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).
CHEZZETCOOK, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
CHICOUTIMI TELEGRAPH SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).
CHURCH POINT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).
CLERKS OF PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 963 (i).
CLINTON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 518 (i), 5834 (iii).
COAL CONTRACTS FOR DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1065 (i).
See 'Ottawa.'
COBOURG, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 639 (i), 13084 (vi).
——— HARBOUR REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13118 (vi).
COCAGNE WHARF, N.B., COMPENSATION TO CAPT. ARSENAULT: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).
COLBORNE ARMOURY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
COLEMAN, A. B., TENDERS *re* TORONTO POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).
COLLINGWOOD DRY DOCK, ESTIMATED COST: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 5871 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4679 (ii).
——— HARBOUR, ONT., HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).
COLUMBIA RIVER, B.C., ABOVE GOLDEN, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).
——— OPENING CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).
——— REVELSTOKE, NAV. OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
CONNOLLY, M., PAYMENTS FOR DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14103 (vi).
CORRY & LAVERDURE, AWARD *re* CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iii).
COUCHICHING AND SIMCOE LAKES, REGULATION OF WATERS: in Com. of Sup., 13252 (vi).
COUILLARD, ALFRED, GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 13546 (vi).
COVE HEAD HARBOUR, CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i), 13222 (vi).
COW BAY, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i), 13178 (vi).
CRANE ISLAND WHARF, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1513 (i).
CREOSOTED TIMBER FOR PIERS AND BREAKWATERS, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).
CROSS POINT PIER, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1512 (i).
CUMBERLAND, ONT., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).
DALHOUSIE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).
DAUPHIN, LAKE LOWERING: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
DAWSON TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii).
DEER ISLAND TO EASTPORT, ME., TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
DEPOT HARBOUR BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i), 13239 (vi).
See 'Parry Sound.'
DESCHAMBAULT WHARF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DESERONTO, POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13112 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

DESJARDINS, ALLUMETTE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DESJARDINS, CAMILLE, APPNMT., SALARY, &C.: Ques., (Mr. *Bureau*) 3537 (ii).
DIGBY PIER, RENEWALS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1083 (i).
——— IMPROVEMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2101 (i).
——— POST OFFICE, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
DIPPER HARBOUR, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).
DOCKS, HARBOURS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2978 (ii).
DOM. BUILDINGS, HEATING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1065 (i).
——— N. B.: in Com. of Sup., 421 (i).
——— RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i).
——— RENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).
DONALD'S HEAD, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
DOUCET'S LANDING WHARF, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).
DOUGLASTOWN, ISOLATED BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DREDGES, AT MIDLAND, CAPACITY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).
——— NEW, COST, CAPACITY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 1856 (i).
——— PLANT FOR B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13311, 13318 (vi).
——— MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2674 (ii).
——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii), 13311 (vi).
——— MAR. PROVS., SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13309 (vi).
See "Hydraulic" &c.
——— ONT. AND QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 2671 (ii), 13318 (vi).
——— P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 13313 (vi).
——— VESSELS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (ii).
DRILL HALLS, CONSTRUCTION OF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13043 (vi).
See 'Militia.'
——— ST. JOHNS, QUE., CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12496 (v).
DRUMHEAD BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1083 (i), 13179 (vi).
DUFFERIN AND SAPPERS BRIDGES, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
DUNCAN'S COVE, N.S., APPROACH TO WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
DUNNVILLE: *See* 'Grand River.'
DURHAM POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 506 (i).
EAST BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
EAST BERLIN, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
EAST END, CAPE SABLE ISLAND, N.S., HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
ECONOMY, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).
EDMONTON AND ATHABASCA LANDING, TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).
EDMONTON, BRIDGE, SASKATCHEWAN RIVER, FLOORING: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vi).
——— JAIL: in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).
ELECTRIC POWER FOR DOM. BUILDINGS GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).
See 'Ottawa.'
ENGINEERS OFFICE, PUB. WORKS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2726 (ii).
ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 5919 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

ESQUIMAUX POINTE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).

'EUREKA,' STR., LOAN BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14285 (vi).

——— PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. *Tarte*): 14687 (vi).

EXPERIMENTAL FARMS, REPAIRS TO BUILDINGS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 972 (i).

FAIR WAGE SCHEDULE ON GOVT. CONTRACTS AND LABOUR DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 7156 (iii).

FATHER POINT LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1513 (i).

'FIELDING, W. S.,' DREDGE PREPARATION OF PLANS, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14283 (vi).

FINLAY POINT, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13181 (vi).

FISHER, CHAS. A. L., INSPECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS, SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1592 (i).

FIVE ISLANDS, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).

FLESHERTON ARMOURY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).

FT. DUFFERIN EXTENSION WHARF, RIVER ST. JOHN: in Com. of Sup., 1183 (i).

FT. LAWRENCE, N.S., LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i), 13181 (vi).

FT. WILLIAM PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i).

See 'Port Arthur,' 'Kaministiquia,' &c.

FRASER RIVER, B.C., IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vi).

FRAWLEY, MR., REMOVAL FROM ORILLIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 1007, 1016 (i).

FREDERICTON MILITARY BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).

FREEPORT, N.S., LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).

FRIARS HEAD HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).

FRUDE'S POINT, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).

FUEL CONTRACTS, INTEREST *re* UNPAID ACCOUNTS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5318 (iii).

GABAROUSE, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).

GANANOQUE, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 970 (i).

——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1371 (i).

GASPEREAUX HARBOUR, GRAHAM'S POND: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).

GATINEAU RIVER, PROTECTION BANK, C.P.R. BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).

GEORGEVILLE, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).

GEORGIAN BAY CANAL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vi).

See 'Ottawa and Georgian Bay.'

GLACE BAY, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).

——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13184 (vi).

GODERICH, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13240 (vi).

——— HARBOUR WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1365 (i).

GORE'S LANDING, WHARF, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 13244 (vi).

GOUINLOCK, GEO. W., LETTER *re* CONTRACT FOR TORONTO P. O.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).

GOVT. BUILDINGS, OTTAWA, REP. *re* MARTINEAU INVESTIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 4673 (ii).

See 'Ottawa.'

GOVT. CONTRACTS, TENDERS *re*: Par in Ottawa *Free Press* (Mr. *Clarke*) 8405 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

GOVT. POLICY *re* DIVISION OF PUBLIC WORKS: *See* 'Public Works, Transfer.'

GRAND BEND, ONT., BREAKWATER PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).

GRAND ETANG BRIDGE, ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).

GRAND MANAN, N. B., BREAKWATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).

GRAND NARROWS, N.S., WHARF REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i), 13198 (vi).

GRAND PILES DAM: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).

GRAND RIVER, DREDGING AT DUNNVILLE: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 12497 (v), 13027 (vi).

GRAND RIVER, N. S., IMPROVEMENTS TO ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i).

GRAND RIVER WHARF, P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).

GRANDE RIVIERE WHARF, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).

GRANDE VALLEE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1514-1574 (i); on conc., 6070 (iii).

GRANITE VILLAGE, N.S., MOORING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).

GREAT SALMON RIVER, GROYNE AND BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).

GREEN COVE BOAT HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1100 (i).

GREY COUNTY, LIST OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS WANTED, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5835 (iii).

GUELPH, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13083 (vi).

——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 637 (i).

GULL HARBOUR, ST. GEORGE'S BAY, MAN., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).

GUYSBOROUGH, N. S., PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 5839 (iii).

HALIFAX, CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13031 (vi).

——— MUSEUM, REMOVAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 13032 (vi).

——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 411 (i).

——— QUARANTINE STATION, LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).

——— WHARF, LAND PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).

HALL'S HARBOUR, N. S., IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).

HAMILTON DRILL HALL, ADDITIONAL LAND: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).

——— INLAND REVENUE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).

——— POST OFFICE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).

HARBOURS AND RIVERS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 145 (i), 5916 (iii), 13304 (vi).

——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (ii).

——— GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii), 13308 (vi).

——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i), 3354 (ii).

——— MAR. PROVS. GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 1185 (i).

——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i), 5894 (iii), 13065, 13227 (vi).

——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1068, 1133 (i), 13141 (vi).

——— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 1185, 1352, 1424, (i), 3341, 3368 (ii), 5909 (iii), 13012, 13235 (vi).

——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i), 13218 (vi).

——— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 1512, 2241 (i), 3304 (ii), 5896 (iii), 12845, 13445 (vi).

——— YUKON TER.: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).

HARBOURS AND RIVERS AND BRIDGES, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1369 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

HARDY BAY, B.C., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5916 (iii), 13305 (vi).
HAWKESBURY, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13119 (vi).
HAWKESTONE WHARF, GOVT. AID *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13453 (vi).
HAWK POINT INLET, N. S., BOAT CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
HERRING COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
HIGGIN'S SHORE, P.E.I., PIER: in Com. of Sup.. 1159 (i), 13222 (vi).
HNAUSA WHARF, EXTENSION, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
HOPEWELL CAPE, N.B., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).
HULL AND UNION BRIDGES, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
HULL, WHARF, COMPLETION: in Com. of Sup., 5900 (iii).
HYDRAULIC DREDGE FOR MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (i), 13312 (vi).
INDIAN HARBOUR WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
'INTERNATIONAL' DREDGE, LEASED OR BOUGHT FROM M. CONNOLLY: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 12218 (v).
INVERNESS MINES, N.S., BROAD COVE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
IONA, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13200 (vi).
ISLAND OF ORLEANS, LAND TEL. LINE EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vi).
——— SUBMARINE CABLE, &C.: M. (Mr. *Talbot*) for Ret.*, 11301 (v).
See "Orleans," &c.
ISLE AUX COUDRES, WHARF REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2242 (i).
ISLE GROSBOIS, BOUCHERVILLE, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5962 (iii).
JANVRIN'S ISLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
JEDDORE, EAST, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
JESUS RIVER, DEEPENING, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 289 (i).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
JUDIQUE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1103 (i).
KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5825 (iii).
——— Remarks: (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13013 (vi).
See 'Port Arthur.'
KAMOURASKA EXTENSION PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
KETCH, N. S., HARBOUR DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
KINGSPORT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1103 (i).
——— PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK, AWARD TO CONNOLLY & Co.: in Com. of Sup., 13023 (vi).
——— MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com. of Sup., (i), 13094 (vi).
——— MILITARY STABLES: in Com. of Sup., 638 13117 (vi).
KINGSVILLE, ONT., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13244 (vi).
LAKE FRANCIS OUTLET, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1449 (i).
LAKE ST. FRANCIS, DYKING: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
LAKE ST. JOHN, WHARF, PIERS, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2243 (*i*), 13459 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE IMPROVEMENTS, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2246 (i).
See 'Temiscaningue.'
LAPRAIRIE ICE PIERS, PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 2248 (i), 13460 (vi).
L'ARDOISE, N. S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
LARRY'S RIVER BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1104 (i).
L'ASSOMPTION POST OFFICE, PURCHASE OF SITE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3230 (ii).
——— RECEIPTS, CHEQUES FOR PAYMENT, &C.: M. for copies*, 3236 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 427 (i).
LATOUR, L. J., LEAVE OF ABSENCE, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6895 (iii).
——— LEAVE OF ABSENCE, CANVASSING FOR 'LE CANADA,' &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) 13980, 14002 (vi).
See 'Le Canada.'
LEAMINGTON WHARF, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 13246 (vi).
'LE CANADA' CIRCULAR ISSUED BY J. L. LATOUR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 1032 (i).
See 'Pelletier and Latour.'
LE TABLEAU WHARF, SAGUENAY RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 2249 (i).
LEVIS GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2978 (ii).
——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii).
——— LAND PURCHASED FOR I. C. R.: M. for O. Cs., &C.*: (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3806 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3631 (iii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 431 (i), 13053 (vi).
LEWES AND YUKON RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).
LEWIS POINT, P. E. I., PIER REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
LIGHTING DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).
See 'Ottawa.'
L'ILE D'ALMA, REMOVAL OF ROCKS: in Com. of SUP., 2257 (i).
LINDSAY DRILL HALL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13082 (vi).
LINGAN BEACH PROTECTION: in Com of Sup., 1105 (i).
LISTOWEL PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13123 (vi).
LITTLE BEAR CREEK ONT., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13245 (vi).
LITTLE CURRENT, GEORGIAN BAY, CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 13245 (vi).
LIVINGSTONE'S COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13200 (vi).
LONDON, DRILL HALL AND ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).
——— MILITARY MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
LONGUEUIL, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).
LONG WHARF, ST. JOHN, N. B., LEASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 11828 (v).
LORD'S COVE (DEER'S ISLAND) WHARF: in Com., of Sup., 1177 (i).
LOTBINIERE WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13460 (vi).
LOWER MONTAGUE, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).
LUNENBURG HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1106 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. of Sup., 13315 (vi).
MACLEOD COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

McKay's Point, N.S., Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
McNutt's Island, N. S., Beach Protection: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
Magann & Phin, Claims *re* Toronto Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 13255 (vi).
Magdalen Islands, Breakwaters, Piers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2264 (i).
——— Land Tel. Lines, Repairs, Rewiring, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2714 (ii).
Magog Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13081 (vi).
Maguasha Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
Main a Dieu, N. S., Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
Malagawatch, N. S., Boat Channel Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
Malignant Cove, N. S., Harbour Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
Marconi Telegraph Stations, Expenses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2989 (ii), 13639 (vi).
——— Tel. Apparatus at Chateau Bay: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
——— Success of System: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
Margaree, N. S., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).
Margaretsville, N.S., Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
Maria Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2265 (i).
Marysville, N. B.: Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 5835, 5841 (iii).
Meaford Post Office: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13124 (vi).
Melbourne, N.S., Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
Meteghan Cove Breakwater, Restoration, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).
Middle River, N.S., Shear Dam: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
Middleton Armoury, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 969 (i), 5841 (iii).
Midland Harbour, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i), 5909 (iii), 13246 (vi).
——— Dredges, Capacity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).
Midland, Mercantile Co.'s Rental of Buildings on Dock, Midland: in Com. of Sup., 13247 (vi).
——— Post Office Building: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii).
——— Water Front, Lease to Pratt & Co.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).
Miscou Harbour, N.B., Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
Mistook (Delisle) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
Moira River, Flooding: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
Moisie Point, Road Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 13322 (vi).
Moncton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
Mont Louis, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
Montmagny Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 5841 (iii), 13066 (vi).
Montreal, Buildings, Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
——— Examining Warehouse, Alterations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13058 (vi).
——— Harbour Dry Dock, Site, &c.: M. for O. Cs., Cor., &c.*: (Mr. *Tarte*) 706 (i).
——— Harbour Commissioners, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 8084 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

Montreal, Harbour, Permanent Sheds, Plans prepared, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14282 (vi).
——— Harbour Dock Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).
——— New Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).
——— Post Office, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13067 (vi).
——— Post Office, Enlargement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).
Moose Jaw Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).
Morrisburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 492 (i).
Morrison's Point, N.S., Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
Murray Bay to St. Catharines, Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vi).
Murray Bay, Wharf Extension, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2266 (i).
Musquodoboit, N.S., Wharf Approaches: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
Nappan, Experimental Farm Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 973 (i).
Necum Teuch Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1137 (i), 13203 (vi).
Negro Point, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1181 (i).
Neil's Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1139 (i).
Nelson Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
——— Racine Bros'. Claims against Contractors: in Com. of Sup., 7157 (iii).
Nepean Point, Improvement by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 11829 (v).
New Campbellton, Ballast Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1142 (i).
Newcastle Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
New Harbour Breakwater, Protection Slopes, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1143 (i).
New London, P.E.I., Harbour Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
——— Repairs to Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).
Newport, Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2277 (i), 13462 (vi).
New Richmond Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13463 (vi).
Nicola, Kamloops, Telephone Service: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).
Nicolet River, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
Noel Wharf, N.S., Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 13204 (vi).
Nomininge Lake Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 13460 (vi).
North Cardigan, P.E.I., Pier Extension: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
North Sydney Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— *See* 'Sydney.'
N. W. T., Court Houses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 958 (i).
——— Dom. Buildings, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
Notre Dame du Portage, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13463 (vi).
Oakville Pier, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i).
Ogden's Pond, Channel Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 1145 (i), 13204 (vi).
Orillia, Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 968 (i), 13086 (vi).
——— Public Buildings, Removal of Caretaker: in Com. of Sup., 1007 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
ORLEANS, ISLE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i), 5906 (iii).
——— *See* 'Submarine,' 'Island,' &c.
OROMOCTO WHARF, RIVER ST. JOHN: in Com. of Sup., 1181 (i).
OSHAWA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13110 (vi).
OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 342 (i), 5842 (iii), 14243 (vi).
OTTAWA CITY BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
——— APPROACHES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2700 (ii).
——— CONCESSION STREET: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
OTTAWA CITY, BUILDINGS, &C., ADDITIONAL LAND: in Com. of Sup., 353 (i).
——— CARETAKERS, MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 982 (i).
——— CENSUS BUILDING, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
——— COAL CONTRACT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1008 (i).
——— COAL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
——— ELEVATORS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1012 (i).
——— ELEVATOR FOR WEST BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
——— FIRE SECURITY AND MARTINEAU REP. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 4673 (ii).
——— FURNITURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1006 (i).
——— GROUNDS, MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).
——— GROUNDS, PAVING, &C.: in Com of Sup., 13119 (vi).
——— HEATING, &C., WESTERN BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 13087 (vi).
——— "IMPERIAL" BUILDING, OTTAWA, GOVT. OCCUPATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3803 (ii).
——— LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 974, 988 (i).
——— LIGHTING OF CHAMBER, CHANGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 816 (i).
——— LIGHTING, BUILDINGS, OTTAWA, CONTRACT PRICE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 3235 (ii).
——— TRANSFORMERS: in Com. of Sup., 5843 (iii).
——— MAJOR'S HILL PARK: in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).
——— OFFICE FURNITURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 973 (i).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 438 (i), 13117 (vi).
——— FITTINGS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13090 (vi).
——— RENTALS, LEASES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 989 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Sproule*) 588 (i).
——— REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5037 (ii).
——— RIDEAU HALL, LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1005 (i).
——— RIDEAU HALL AND GROUNDS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13087 (vi).
——— ROYAL MINT, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 344 (i).
——— STEEL SHELVING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13087 (vi).
——— TELEPHONES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).
——— VENTILATION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 488 (i).
——— VICTORIA MUSEUM: in Com. of Sup., 365 (i).
OTTAWA RIVER, PETAWAWA NARROWS, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i), 13251 (vi).
——— SURVEYS OF HEADWATERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*
OUELLE, RIVIÈRE, PIER REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
OWEN SOUND, HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i), 13110 (vi).
——— SURVEY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii), 13063, 13122 (vi).
OYSTER POND, N.S., BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13204 (vi).
PARRSBOROUGH, N.S., LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PARRY SOUND, ONT., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13248 (vi).
See 'Depot Harbour.'
PASPEBIAC LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13464 (vi).
PAVING SIDEWALKS, CONCRETE: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
PEACE AND PELLY RIVERS PACK TRAIL: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vi).
PELLETIER, H. L., CANVASSING FOR 'LE CANADA,' PAYMENTS TO, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 13980, 14002 (vi).
PELLY RIVER BRIDGE AT LETHBRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 13367 (vi).
PEMBROKE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PERCÉ, EXTENSION PIER IN NORTH COVE: in Com. of Sup., 13467 (vi).
PERTH, PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13075 (vi).
PETAWAWA NARROWS, AWARD TO G. C. POUPORE: in Com. of Sup., 13251 (vi).
——— IMPROVEMENT TO CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
PETERBOROUGH, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13083 (vi).
PETIT DE GRAT, PROTECTION WORK, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PETIT ROCHER, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
PICKERING HARBOUR, REPAIRS TO PIERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
PICKETT'S PIER, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PICTON PUBLIC BUILDING, LEVELLING GROUNDS: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
PICTOU, N.S., LIGHT BEACH: in Com. of Sup. 13205 (vi).
PIERREVILLE, WHARF: in Com. in Sup., 13468 (vi).
PLEASANT BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
POINTE AU BARIL, GEORGIAN BAY ROUTE, CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1365 (i).
POINTE DU CHENE, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).
POINT EDWARD, ONT., DREDGING: in Com. of SUP., 1377 (i), 13249 (vi).
POINTE FORTUNE, WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
POINT PRIM, P.E.I., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
POINTE AUX TREMBLES, WHARF: in Com of Sup., 13468 (vi).
POINT TUPPER DREDGING, CLAIMS OF M. CONNOLLY: in Com. of Sup., 14103 (vi).
POIRIERVILLE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i), 13205 (vi).
PORTAGE DU FORT BRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).
PORT ARTHUR HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3341 (ii), 13012 (vi).
See 'Fort William,' 'Kaministiquia.'

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

PORT BURWELL HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT COLBORNE, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3368 (ii).
——— ELEVATOR FOUNDATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).
——— ENTRANCE IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vi).
——— ROCK CUT: in Com. of Sup., 14148 (vi).
——— SUMMIT LEVELS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12903 (vi).
See 'Welland.'
PORT DANIEL, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
PORT ELGIN, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1424 (i).
PORTER'S CHANNEL, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vi).
PORT GEORGE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i), 13210 (vi).
PORT GREVILLE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT HASTINGS, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PORT HAWKESBURY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PORT HOOD, N.S., HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vi).
PORT HOPE PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
PORT HOWE, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT LATOUR, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT MAITLAND, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
PORT AU PIQUE, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT PERRY, ONT., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT STANLEY HARBOUR, DEEDGING, IMPROVEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i), 13249 (vi).
POST OFFICES, GOVT.'S POLICY *re* BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 487–533 (i).
POUPORE, G. C., AWARD: *See* 'Ottawa River,' &c.
PRATT & CO., LEASE OF MIDLAND WATER FRONT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).
——— *See* 'Midland.'
PRESCOTT, HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).
PRESQUE ISLE, BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).
——— DOCK, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i).
PRINCE ALBERT, COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).
P.E.I., PIERS AND BREAKWATERS, REPAIRS, &C.- in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).
——— TEL. SERVICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vi).
PROSPECT, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PUBLIC EXPENDITURE ON PRIVATE WHARFS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13451 (vi).
PUBLIC WORKS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
——— MAN.; in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 13037 (vi).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13028 (vi).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).
——— YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 13133, 13306 (vi).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 411, 636 (i), 2612 (ii), 3304, 5006 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CIVIL GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 333 (i), 13498 (vi).
——— CIVIL GOVT., CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 5824 (iii).
——— CONTRACTS AWARDED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*), 9080 (iv).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland*), 6 (i).
——— EMPLOYEES, DISMISSALS, PROMOTIONS, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Leonard*), 1058 (i).
——— AND MARINE DEPT., DIVISION OF WORK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2266-2273 (i), 2657 (ii).
——— TRANSFER OF EXPENDITURES; Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), in Com. of Sup., 2925, 2956 (ii).
——— MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURES: in Com. of Sup., 2925 (ii).
——— PORTFOLIO AND QUEBEC PROVINCE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2925. 2956 (ii).
——— PRESERVATION OF HEALTH, REGULATIONS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 1857 (i).
——— TOTAL AMOUNT OF EXPENDITURE IN CANADA, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*), 1197 (i).
PUGWASH, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
QUARANTINE STATION, LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
QUATSINO CITY, WHARF, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vi).
QUEBEC, CITADEL DRILL SHED; in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).
——— DRILL HALL, ADDITION TO: in Com. of Sup., 13077 (vi).
——— DRILL SHED, SCHOOL OF GUNNERY: in Com. of Sup., 13056 (vi).
——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 3336 (ii).
——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, REPS. TO COUNCIL, &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Tarte*), 706 (i).
——— HARBOUR PIER, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 3972 (ii).
——— HARBOUR WHARF CONSTRUCTION: Par. in *Le Soleil* (Mr. *Casgrain*), 2237 (i).
——— MARINE AND FISHERIES STORE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).
QUESNEL-ATLIN TELEGRAPH BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).
QUESNEL DAM, B.C., OBSTRUCTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*), 11557 (v).
QUINTE BAY BUOYS, PAYMENTS, &C. FOR SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*), 5587 (iii).
RACETTE, V., PURCHASE OF LAND BY GOVT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 3231 (ii).
RACINE BROS., CLAIMS *re* CONTRACTORS OF NELSON P.O., B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7168 (iii).
——— AGREEMENT WITH CONTRACTORS: Read (Mr. *Monk*), 7162 (iii).
——— Letters read from Deputy Minister of Labour, &c., 7164 (iii).
RED DEER, COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 960 (i).
REPENTIGNY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
RICHELIEU RIVER INUNDATIONS, &C., PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 10496 (v).
RICHIBUCTO, NORTH PIER EXTENSION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i), 13235 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i).
RICHMOND BAY, P.E.I., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
RICHMOND, QUE., RIVER ST. FRANCIS ICE PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 2282 (i).
RIDEAU HALL, DRAINAGE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 647 (i).
——— MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 993 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

RIDEAU HALL, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5006 (ii). *See* 'Ottawa,' &c.
RIMOUSKI EXTENSION PIER AND TIDAL BASIN: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
RIVIERE DU LOUP, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13476 (vi).
——— WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 2281 (i).
RIVIERE DU NORD, CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).
RIVIERE AUX PUCES, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
RIVIERE AUX RENARDS, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 2279 (i).
RIVIERE VERTE, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com, of Sup., 13321 (vi).
——— CONSTRUCTION, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iii), 13323 (vi).
——— RECONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).
——— YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).
ROBIN, COLLAS, CO., LANDING PIER AT PASPEBIAC: Remarks in Com. of Supply, 13464 (vi).
RONDEAU HARBOUR, PIER IMPROVEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i).
ROSEDALE WHARF, TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
ROSSLAND, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
ST. AGNES, TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vi).
ST. ALEXIS, BAIE DES HA HA PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2289 (i).
ST. ALPHONSE, HA HA BAY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
ST. ANDRÉ DE KAMOURASKA, PIER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup.. 2290 (i), 13492 (vi).
ST. ANDREWS' LOCKS CONTRACT, COMPLETION, &C.: Que. (Mr. *Puttee*) 287 (i).
ST. ANDREWS' RAPIDS, IMPROVEMENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 10490 (v).
——— RED RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 3354 (ii).
——— MAN., REPORT *re* CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 14284 (vi).
ST. ANDREWS WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5894 (iii).
STE. ANNE TO LAC CLAIR TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).
ST. ANN'S, N.S., NORTH GUT, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
——— NORTH RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
STE. ANNE DE LA PERADE PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE, PIER RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
STE. ANNE DE SAGUENAY, TEL. LAND LINE: in C m. of Sup., 13331 (vi).
——— WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
ST. ANNE DE SOREL, ICE PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
ST. CATHARINES, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13106 (vi).
ST. DENIS WHARF AND MURRAY BAY FERRY SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10496 (v).
STE. FAMILLE, PIER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
ST. FIDÈLE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13493 (vi).
ST. FRANCIS RIVER, ICE PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 2282 (i).
ST. FRANCOIS PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).
ST. FULGENCE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

ST. GÉDEON ISLANDS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
ST. GODFROI DE NOUVELLE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
ST. HYACINTHE, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13067 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
ST. IRENE WHARF, HEADBLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i).
ST. JEAN DES CHAILLONS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13494 (vi).
ST. JEROME, LAKE ST. JOHN, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i), 5909 (iii).
ST. JOHN, N.B., DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13042 (vi).
——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1181, 1183 (i).
——— IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13040 (vi).
——— QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).
——— WATER AND DRAINAGE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 414, 486 (i).
ST. JOHN RIVER TRIBUTARIES: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i), 5895 (iii).
ST. JOHN RIVER WHARFS, TIDAL WATERS: in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).
ST. JOHNS, QUE., CUSTOMS BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).
——— DRILL HALL, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12496 (v).
——— EXAMINING WAREHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).
ST. JOSEPH'S WHARF, LAKE HURON: in Com. of Sup., 3382 (ii).
ST. LAURENT WHARF, ISLE OF ORLEANS: in Com. of Sup., 5906 (iii).
See 'Island of Orleans,' &c.
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER ISLANDS, IMPROVEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER (LOWER) REMOVAL OF ROCKS: in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i).
ST. LAWRENCE, CABLE AND TEL. LINES: in Com. of Sup., 2989, 5007 (ii), 13332 (vi).
——— SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 3218 (ii).
——— SHIP CHANNEL, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3304 (ii).
——— WOLFE ISLAND CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i), 13252 (vi).
ST. LOUIS DE MILE END PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).
ST. LOUIS RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13473 (vi).
ST. MARY'S CURRENT WHARF, CONTRACT WITH POUPORE & MALONE: M. for copy of Contract* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
ST. MARY'S PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13109 (vi).
ST. MAURICE RIVER, DAM: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2286 (i), 5904 (iii).
——— DREDGING EASTERN CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13469 (vi).
——— *See* 'Batiscan.'
——— SLIDES, IMPROVEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii).
ST. MICHEL DE BELLECHASSE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13494 (vi).
ST. NICHOLAS PIER, REBUILDING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5905 (iii).
ST. PIERRE POINTE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
ST. SIMEON, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13493 (vi).
SABREVOIS WHARF, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13485 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

SACRÉ-COEUR WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13478 (vi).
SANDY COVE BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SARNIA, PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13117 (vi).
SAUGENAY RIVER, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13472 (vi).
SAULT STE. MARIE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13252 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13107 (vi).
SCOTT'S BAY, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
SELKIRK WHARF, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
SEVEN ISLANDS WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13479 (vi).
SHEGAWAKE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13479 (vi).
SHERBROOKE, DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 13079 (vi).
SHIELDS MR. C., LETTER *re* GLACE BAY WHARF : Read (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 13186 (vi).
SHIPPEGAN HARBOUR, PROTECTION WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 1183 (i).
SHIVES, MR., PRIVATE WHARF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1166 (i).
SHORT BEACH BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SINCLAIR, MR. D., DISMISSAL AS FOREMAN OF COLUMBIA RIVER WORKS : Remarks in Com. of Sup , 1451 (i).
'SIR WILFRID LAURIER' DREDGE, SINKING IN LAKE ONTARIO : Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5587 (iii).
SKINNER'S COVE, N.S., PROTECTION WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
——— POND, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13308 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
SLIDES AND BOOMS, GENERAL REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).
——— IMPROVEMENTS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii).
——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2974 (ii).
SNAG BOAT, SELF-PROPELLING, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii).
SOREL, DEEP WATER WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i), 3374 (ii), 5921 (iii), 12845 (vi).
——— COR. *re* : Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Pope*) 2302 (i).
See 'St. Anne de Sorel.'
SOURIS KNIGHT'S POINT, P.E.I., BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).
SOUTHAMPTON HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1428 (i).
SOUTH INGONISH WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SPRINGHILL, N.S., ARMOURIES, CARETAKER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1856 (i).
——— BOILER EXPLOSION : Remarks (Mr. *Logan*) 13257 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING, REPAIRING : in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
SPRY BAY, N.S., WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
STAFFORD & CO.'S RENTAL OF DOCK BUILDINGS, MIDLAND : in Com. of Sup., 13247 (vi).
See 'Midland.'
STRATFORD, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 13125 (vi).
STRATHCONA HORSE BARRACKS : in Com of Sup., 13130 (vi).
STURGEON FALLS WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1431 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

SUBMARINE CABLE, ISLE OF ORLEANS : M. (Mr. *Talbot*) for Ret.*, 11301 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 11186 (v).
See 'Island of Orleans,' &c.
SUMMERSIDE HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 3367 (ii), 13227 (vi).
——— BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
——— COMPLETION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3234 (ii).
SUMMERVILLE, N.S., WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
SURVEYS AND INSPECTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 2715, 2720 (ii).
SUSSEX, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 965 (i).
SWIM'S POINT, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
SYDENHAM RIVER IMPROVEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 13250 (vi).
SYDNEY, N.S., POST OFFICE, ADDITION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13028, 13035 (vi).
——— QUARANTINE STATION, WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
See 'North Sydney,' &c.
TELEGRAPH LINES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2701 (ii).
——— B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii), 5826 (iii), 13337 (vi).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 2991 (ii), 5918 (iii).
——— P.E.I. AND MAINLAND : in Com. of Sup., 2988 (ii).
——— P.E.I., RES. OF BOARD OF TRADE : in Com. of Sup., 2702 (ii).
——— QUEBEC : in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).
——— ST. LAWRENCE : in Com. of Sup., 5067 (ii).
TELEGRAPH OPERATORS, SALARIES : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3418 (ii).
TELEPHONE COS. IN MAR. PROVS., NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2585 (ii).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
TELEPHONE, LONG DISTANCE IN H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 5088 (ii).
TEMISCAMINGUE LAKE, REPAIRS TO WHARFS : in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i), 14248 (vi).
See 'Lake Temiscamingue.'
TENDERS *re* GOVT. CONTRACTS, INJUSTICE TO ENGLISH FIRMS : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 8405 (iv).
TENECAPE, N.S., BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
TERREBONNE, POST OFFICE BUILDING, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 289 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).
TEULON, NORTH, CONSTRUCTION ROAD : in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).
THESSALON BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13254 (vi).
THORNBURY HARBOUR WORKS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1432 (i).
THREE FATHOM HARBOUR, BEACH WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
THREE RIVERS, CUSTOM HOUSE, HEATING, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).
——— RETAINING WALL : in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).
——— HARBOUR, ADDITIONAL WHARFS : in Com. of Sup., 2296 (i).
TIGNISH BREAKWATER, REBUILDING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).
TIVERTON BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
TORONTO, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 972 (i).
——— ADDITIONAL ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
——— LETTERS READ : in Com. of Sup., 3614 (ii).
——— PAVING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

TORONTO, CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 647, 957, (i).
——— HARBOUR, EASTERN ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1433 (i), 13254 (vi).
——— MAGANN AND PHIN, CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 13255 (vi).
——— TOTAL AMT. PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Grant*) 1203 (i).
——— ISLAND, DAMAGE BY STORMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5589 (iii).
——— LABOUR COUNCIL AND TEL. *re* MECHANICS FROM ENG.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1854 (i).
——— MILITARY BUILDINGS FOR MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
——— MILITARY BUILDINGS, STORE HOUSES: in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
——— ENLARGEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 956 (i), 13096 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 956 (i).
——— PUB. WORKS EMPLOYEES, DELAY IN PAYMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5588 (iii).
TORONTO JUNCTION POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 650 (i).
TOULADIE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 2286 (i).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
TRANSPORTATION, COMMISSION *re* SOREL WHARF: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) in Com. of Sup., 12849 (vi).
——— FACILITIES, PORT COLBORNE: in Com. of Sup., 13024 (vi).
See general heading.
TRENTON HARDOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1434 (i).
UPPER OTTAWA IMPROVEMENT CO.: in Com. of Sup., 2974 (ii).
UPPER SALMON RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).
VALLEYFIELD, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5905 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 443 (i).
VANCOUVER ISLAND TO SALT SPRINGS ISLAND TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
VICTORIA, N.S., BEACH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
VICTORIA, N.W.T., TO ANDREWS TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).
VILLE MARIE WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
WALLACEBURG POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 505 (i).
WALLACE HARBOUR, N.S., FERRY LANDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13216 (vi).
WASHABUCK CENTRE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).
WATER SUPPLY FOR DOM. BUILDINGS, GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).
WEDGE POINT, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WENDOVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1434 (i).
WENTWORTH, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13216 (vi).
WEST BACCARO, BOAT HARBOUR CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).
WEST BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup,, 13217 (vi).
WHARFS, &C., POLICY OF GOVT. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
——— PRIVATE, GOVT. EXPENDITURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1352-1377 (i).
——— REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

WHITBY PUBLIC BUILDING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13111 (vi).
WHITE'S COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WHITE MUD RIVER DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
WILLIAMS HEAD, B.C., QUARANTINE STATION WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).
WILSON'S BEACH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).
WINDSOR HARBOUR, N.S., SHEER DAM., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE, LETTER BOXES: in Com. of of Sup., 13113 (vi).
WINGHAM PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13120 (vi).
WINNIPEG, IMMIGRATION BUILDING AND POSTAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE BUILDING: in Com of Sup., 438 (i), 13127 (vi).
WOLFE ISLAND, DREDGING SHOAL: in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i), 13252 (vi).
WOOD MOUNTAIN POST TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).
WOODS, J. W., RENTAL OF BUILDING, &C: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5764 (iii).
WOODSTOCK, N.B, ARMOURY AND GUN SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13039 (vi).
——— PURCHASE OF SITE: M. (Mr. *Hale*) for Cor.,* 3236 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE, REPAIRS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hale*) 705 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 5735 (iii).
——— REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 672 (i).
WOODSTOCK, ONT., ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13125 (vi).
——— PUB. BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13108 (vi).
WOODVILLE, N.S., WHARF REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
YARMOUTH, N.S., BAR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).
YORKTON COURT-HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 961 (i).
YUKON TER., PUB. WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).

PUGWASH, N.S., LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1856 (i).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PULP WOOD, DUTY BY U. S.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) 4362 (ii).
'QUADRA,' STR., REGULATIONS *re* OFFICERS MESS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9819 (iv).
Qu'Appelle Land Co. Bill: *See* 'Ontario and Qu'Appelle,' &c.
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. BONDS: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Scott*) *re* 'Lowering Tone of Debates,' 14583 (vi).
——— MEMORANDUM FROM MR. KINGSMILL: Read (Mr. *Osler*) 14588 (vi).
——— CO.'S LAND GRANT: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 2338 (i).
——— Ret. laid on Table, 7297 (iii).
——— MORTGAGE DEEDS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 13024 (vi).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters,' 10497 (v).

QUARANTINE, ORGANIZED DISTRICTS: in Com. of of Sup., 5007 (ii).
——— PUBLIC HEALTH, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5490 (iii).
——— LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
QUATSINO CITY WHARF, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vi).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s B. No. 145 (Mr. *Power*) 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756; in Com. 4586; and 3°*, 4587 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 177.)
Quebec Bridge Subsidy Agreement B. No. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 14523; on Order for Com. on Res., 14690; 1°* of B., 14734; 2° m., 14734, in Com., and 3°*, 14735 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 54.)
——— Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 14280 (vi).
QUEBEC BRIDGE, AMOUNTS PAID IN SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 10496 (v).
——— Papers laid on Table, 14521 (vi).
——— FURTHER AID BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10496 (v).
QUEBEC CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. of Res., 14449 (vi).
QUEBEC, CITADEL DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).
——— DOM. ARSENAL STORE: in Com. of Sup., 13054 (vi).
——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 3336 (ii).
——— REPS. TO COUNCIL, &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Tarte*) 706 (i).
——— PIER, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3972 (ii).
——— WHARF CONSTRUCTION: Par. in *Le Soliel* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2237 (i).
QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi),
Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. No. 84: (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 1023; 2°*, 1328; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 176).
Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No, 135 (Mr. *Logan*) 1°*, 2100 (i); 2°*, 2756 (ii); M. for Com., 5971; in Com., 5978, 6399; 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 178.)
QUEBEC, MARINE AND FISHERIES STORE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).
QUEBEC PILOTS: *See* 'Pilotage,' 'Shipping Causalties Bills.'
QUEBEC POSTMASTERS: *See* 'Newspaper Agents.'
Quebec, Saguenay and Gulf of St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 56 (Mr. *Girard*) 1°*, 707: 2°*, 977; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 179).
Quebec Sup. Court: *See* 'Judges, &c.'
QUEBEC:
ACTON VALE POSTOFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).
ADMIRALTY COURT, QUEBEC, REGISTRAR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3408 (ii).
QUEBEC.—*Con.*
AGRICULTURAL LECTURERS IN QUEBEC, NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 8615 (iv).
AIDS TO NAVIGATION, CHANNEL SWEEPING BOATS: in Com. of Sup., 13633 (vi).
ANSE AUX GASCONS WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANSE AUX GRIS FONDS, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANSE ST. JEAN, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANTICOSTI ISLAND, FOX BAY, TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
——— LIGHTSHIP: in Com. of Sup., 5737 (iii).
——— TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).
ATLANTIC AND LAKE SUPERIOR RY. SUBSIDY, CLAIMS AGAINST, &C.: Remarks (Mr *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 3299 (ii).
BARACHOIS DE MALBAIE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
BATISCAN RIVER CHANNEL DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i).
See 'St. Maurice.'
BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, FLOODING LANDS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
BEAUHARNOIS ELECTORAL DISTRICT REPRESENTATION AND INDEPENDENCE OF PARLT. ACT: M. (Mr. *Monk*) to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com., 7095 (iii).
——— *See* 'Loy, Geo. M.'
BELLE ISLE TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 2712, 2989 (ii).
BERSIMIS TO GODBOUT TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vi).
BOIS BRULÉ TRAINING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13448 (vi).
BONAVENTURE EAST BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13446 (vi).
BONAVENTURE STATION, TERMINAL FACILITIES, AMOUNT PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).
See 'G.T.Ry.'
BOURASSA, INSPECTOR, INLAND REV., QUEBEC, SHORTAGE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5405, 5407 (iii).
BRIDGE AT QUEBEC, AMOUNTS PAID IN SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 10496 (v).
——— FURTHER AID BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10496 (v).
BRUNET, ARTHUR AND DOM. ELECTION ACT.: M. for Pets., O.C.'s &c. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 101 (i).
See 'St. James,' &c.
BRYSON BRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION OF PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
BUILDINGS, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 13053, 14245 (vi).
——— RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 422 (i).
CACOUNA WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 5896 (iii), 13448 (vi).
CANALS IN ONT. AND QUEBEC, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1594 (i).
CAPLAN BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13448 (vi).
CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR PROV. OF QUEBEC, TRAVELLING EXPENSES, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Monk*) 1058 (i).
CHAMBLY CANAL, COLLECTOR OF TOLLS, SALARY Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12497 (v).
———MOREAU, MR., APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8331, 8488 (iv).
——— DISMISSAL OF JULES QUESNEL: (Mr. *Monk*) 7203 (iii).
——— ELECTRIC STATION BY-WASH: in Com. of Sup., 12906 (vi).
CHAMBLY CANAL, LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

CHAMBLY CANAL, LANDING WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
——— MACADAMIZING TOW PATH: in Com. of Sup., 12906, 14151 (vi).
CHAMBORD WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13454 (vi).
CHABOT, MR. F. X., DISMISSAL AS LIGHTKEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2015 (i).
CHATEAU DE RICHER, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13455 (vi).
CHATEAUGUAY RIVER DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i), 3208 (ii).
CHICOUTIMI TELEGRAPH SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).
CIRCULARS TO CURES, P.Q., *re* CENSUS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4657 (ii).
CITADEL DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).
COUILLARD, ALFRED, GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 13546 (vi).
COUTURE, VET. SURGEON AT QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5504 (iii).
CRANE ISLAND, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1513.
CROSS POINT, PIER, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1512 (i).
CUMMINGS, JAMES, PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 9458 (iv).
CUSTOMS SALARIES AT MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 8115 (iv).
DEFAULTING POSTMASTERS *re* SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS: in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).
DESCHAMBAULT, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DESJARDINS, ALLUMETTE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DESJARDINS, CAMILLE, APPNMT., SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 3537 (ii).
DOM. ARSENAL STORE: in Com. of Sup., 13054 (vi).
DONCASTER INDIAN RESERVE, TERREBONNE: M. for cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 288 (i).
——— SQUATTERS' IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
DOUCET'S LANDING WHARF, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).
DOUGLASTOWN ISOLATED BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DRILL HALL, QUEBEC, ADDITION TO: in Com. of Sup., 13077 (vi).
——— SCHOOL OF GUNNERY: in Com. of Sup., 13056 (vi).
——— ST. JOHNS, QUE., CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12496 (vi).
DROLET, CENSUS ENUMERATOR, AMOUNT PAID TO: (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7055 (iii).
DUCHESNEAU, RESIGNATION AS WARDEN OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PEN.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 286 (i).
——— *See* 'St. Vincent.'
DUGAS, MR. BLAISE, AMOUNTS PAID TO *re* TRIP TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1034 (i).
ELLIS, DR., MEDICAL INSPECTOR, QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3536 (ii).
——— INSPECTOR OF IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6702 (iii).
ESQUIMAUX POINT WHARF: in Com. of Sup,, 2278 (i).
FATHER POINT LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1513 (i).
FRENCH CANADIAN IMMIGRATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6674 (iii).
——— *See* 'Immigration,' &c.
GATINEAU RIVER, PROTECTION BANK, C.P.R. BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
GOODWIN, GEO., COMPENSATION *re* SOULANGES CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

GRAND PILES DAM: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
G. T. PACIFIC, MOUNTAINS CROSSED: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8117 (iv).
——— PARISHES CROSSED, LEVIS TO TEMISCOUATA: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8117 (iv).
G. T. RY., STE. ROSALIE TO MONTREAL, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
See 'Bonaventure,' &c.
——— TERMINALS AT ST. JEAN DES CHAILLONS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13495 (vi).
GRANDE RIVIÈRE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
GRANDE VALLÉE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1514, 1574 (i); on Conc., 6070 (iii).
GRENVILLE CANAL, GUIDE PIER AT ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 12909 (vi).
——— PAYMENT TO HENRY TUCKER *re* INVESTIGATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 14156 (vi).
GROSSE ISLE, QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 425 (i).
——— SUPPLIES *re:* in Com. of Sup., 5496 (iii).
GUILBAULT, MR. EDWARD, GRATUITY TO WIDOW: in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS, QUEBEC: in Com. in Sup., 1512 (i), 3304, 3336 (ii), 5896 (iii), 12845, 13445 (vi).
——— IMPROVEMENTS AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2241 (i).
HARBOUR OF QUEBEC, IMPROVEMENTS, REPS. TO COUNCIL, &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Tarte*) 706 (i).
——— IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 3336 (ii).
——— PIER, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3972 (ii).
——— WHARF CONSTRUCTION: Par. in *Le Soleil* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2237 (i).
HÊTU, RUDOLPHE, RELEASE OF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 7915 (iv).
HIDES INSPECTOR AT QUEBEC, GEO. ROY, &C.: (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3627 (ii).
HOSPITAL FOR TREATMENT OF TRACHOMA, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 14245 (vi).
HULL AND UNION BRIDGES, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
IMMIGRANTS LANDING AT QUEBEC, MEDICAL INSPECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5318 (iii).
IMMIGRATION, MEDICAL EXAMINER, QUEBEC, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3536 (ii).
INDIANS, QUEBEC, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iii).
ISLE AUX COUDRES, WHARF REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2242 (i).
ISLE GROSBOIS, BOUCHERVILLE, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5902 (iii).
ISLAND OF ORLEANS, LAND LINE EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vi).
——— SUBMARINE CABLE, &C.: M. (Mr. *Talbot*) for Ret.* 11301 (v).
JESUS RIVER, DEEPENING, &C.: M. for cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 289 (i).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
JUDGES IN QUEBEC AND OUTSIDE LEGAL BUSINESS: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14665 (vi).
KAMOURASKA, EXTENSION PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
LACHINE CANAL, ELECTRICAL APPLIANCES FOR GATES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
——— ELECTRICAL APPLIANCES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7806 (iv).
——— ENLARGEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12903 (vi).
——— GRATUITIES: in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
——— LIGHTING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14139 (vi).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

LACHINE CANAL, LOCK GATE PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
——— MASONRY WALL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12906 (vi).
——— *See* 'Mill St.,' &c.
LAKE ST. FRANCIS, DYKING: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
LAKE ST. JOHN COLONIZATION CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6679, 6888 (iii).
LAKE ST. JOHN, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13459 (vi).
——— WHARF, PIERS, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2243 (i).
LAPRAIRIE ICE PIERS, PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 2248 (i), 13460 (vi).
L'ASSOMPTION, POST OFFICE, PURCHASE OF SITE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 3230 (ii).
———RECEIPTS, CHEQUES FOR PAYMENT, &C.: M. for copies, * (Mr. *Monk*), 3236 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 427 (i)
LATOUR, L. J., CIRCULAR ISSUED *re* "LE CANADA": Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*), 1033 (i).
——— LEAVE OF ABSENCE, CANVASSING FOR "LE CANADA", &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) 13980 14002 (vi).
——— LEAVE OF ABSENCE, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6895 (iii).
LAVAL, ELECTORAL DISTRICT, SUPREME COURT JUDGMENTS: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*), 1 (i)
"LE CANADA," CANVASSING, &C.: *See* Pelletier, and Latour.
——— CIRCULAR ISSUED BY L. J. LATOUR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*), 1032 (i)
LECTURERS ON AGRICULTURE IN QUEBEC, NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*), 8615 (iv)
LE TABLEAU WHARF, SAGUENAY RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 2249, (i)
LEVIS GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup.. 2978 (ii).
LEVIS, LAND PURCHASED FOR I.C.R.: M. for O. Cs., &c.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3806 (ii).
See general heading.
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 431 (i), 13053 (vi).
LIGHTHOUSE KEEPERS SALARIES, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 14665 (vi).
———Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2915 (ii).
L'ILE D'ALMA, REMOVAL OF ROCKS: in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i).
LITTLE METIS: *See* "Metis."
LLOYDS REP. *re* ST. LAWRENCE NAVIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 4133-38 (ii)
See "St. Lawrence".
LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE, MONTREAL, GOVTL. ACTION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), 2504 (ii).
——— PAY OF MILITIA: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 4006 (ii)
———SETTLEMENT, &C.: Tel. Read (Mr. *Tarte*), 2676-7 (ii)
LONGUEUIL PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi)
LOTBINIÈRE WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13460 (vi).
LOY, GEO. M., VIOLATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF PARLT. ACT: on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elect's., 8008; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 8008 (iv).
——— M. (Mr. *Fraser*) to employ stenographer, 7203 (iii).
——— *See* "Beauharnois Electoral District".
MAGDALEN ISLANDS, BREAKWATERS, PIERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2264 (i).
——— LAND TELEGRAPH LINES, REWIRING: in Com. of Sup., 2714 (ii).
MAGOG PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13081 (vi).
MAGUASHA LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

MARCONI WIRELESS TEL. APPARATUS AT CHATEAU BAY: in Com. of Sup. 13325 (vi).
See 'Belle Isle'.
MARIA PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2265 (i).
MARINE AND FISHERIES STORE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).
MARTINEAU, Mr., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 10242 (v).
MATHURIN, JOS. A., DEATH SENTENCE, JUDGES REP., &C: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Laverynе*) 3236 (ii).
MAYRAND, DENIS, PETITION *re* DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 9082 (iv).
MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, *re* QUEBEC INDIANS: in Com. of Sup. 6408 (iii).
MENARD, DENIS, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3536 (ii).
METAPEDIA STATION, I.C.R., IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 14096 (vi).
METIS, LITTLE, STATION CHANGES: in Com. of Sup., 12604 (v), 12828 (vi).
MILITARY BUILDINGS, QUEBEC, IRON FOUNDRY: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
MILITARY RIDING SCHOOL, ST. JOHN D'IBERVILLE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8616 (iv).
MILLER BROS., PAYMENTS *re* DEFALCATION OF POSTMASTER: in Com. of Sup. 14274, 14655 (vi).
MILL STREET PAVING, LACHINE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).
MISTOOK (DELISLE) WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
MONT LOUIS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
MONTMAGNY PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5841 (iii), 13066 (vi).
MONTREAL, BARRACKS: in Com. of Sup., 13076 (vi).
———BONAVENTURE STATION: *See* 'Bonaventure,' 'Victoria Bridge.'
———BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
———CUSTOMS DEPT., SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 8115 (iv).
———CUSTOMS PORTS, CONTINGENT EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3783 (ii).
——— PORT OF ENTRY, CHANGES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3901 (ii).
———DRY DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2981 (ii).
———DRY DOCK, SITE, &C.: M. for O. Cs., Cor. &c.: (Mr. *Tarte*) 706 (i).
———DRY DOCK, REP. OF COMMISSION *re* SITE: in Com. of Sup., 2981 (ii).
———EXAMINING WAREHOUSE, ALTERATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13058 (vi).
———EXAMINING WAREHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 433 (i).
———HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 8084 (iv).
———HARBOUR DOCK IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).
———HARBOUR, PERMANENT SHEDS, PLANTS PREPARED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14282 (vi).
———INLAND REV. OFFICE, MONEY ABSTRACTED: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).
———LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE, PAYMENT OF MILITIA: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4006 (ii).
See 'Longshoremen's.'
———NEW POSTAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).
———PILOT COMMISSIONERS COURT: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).
———POST OFFICE, ACCUMULATION OF MAIL &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3972 (ii).
———POST OFFICE, ENLARGEMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 666 (i).
———POST OFFICE, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13067 (vi).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*
MONTREAL, ST. JAMES ELECTORAL DIVISION : *See* 'St. James.'
——SHIPPING INTERESTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Monk*) 5737 (iii).
See 'St Lawrence.'
—— SUBWAY CO., O. Cs. COR. &c. : M. for Ret. * (Mr. *Tarte*) 705 (i).
—— TURNPIKE : *See* 'Turnpike Trust.'
MOREAU, DR. H., APPNMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8331, 8488 (iv).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12497 (v).
MURRAY BAY TO ST. CATHARINES, TEL. LINE : in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vi).
MURRAY BAY, WHARF EXTENSION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2266 (i).
NEWPORT, BREAKWATER EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 2277 (i), 13462 (vi).
NEW RICHMOND BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13463 (vi)
NICOLET RIVER, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
NOMININGUE LAKE WHARFS : in Com. of Sup., 13460 (vi).
NORTH HALFWAY POINT, LIGHTKEEPER, DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3536 (ii).
NOTRE DAME DU PORTAGE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13463 (vi).
OKA INDIANS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi)
O'LEARY, J. & M., CLAIMS *re* SOULANGES CANAL CONTRACTS : in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).
ORLEANS ISLAND, MAIL SERVICE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 670 (i).
—— PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).
See Island of Orleans.
OUELLE RIVER, PIER REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
PASPEBIAC LANDING PIER : in Com. of Sup., 13464 (vi).
PELLETIER, H. L., CANVASSING FOR "LE CANADA," PAYMENTS TO, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 13980, 14002 (vi).
See 'Latour.'
PIERREVILLE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
PILOTS, RIVER ST. LAWRENCE, RETIREMENT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2915 (ii).
See general heading.
PLAINS OF ABRAHAM AND MILITARY PARADES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3234 (ii).
POINTE AUX TREMBLES WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
POINTE FORTUNE WHARF IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
PORTAGE DU FORT BRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).
PORT DANIEL WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
POSTAL FACILITIES TO PARISHES NEAR MONTREAL, PETS. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 12498 (v).
POSTMASTERS, DEFAULTING *re* SAVINGS BANKS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).
POST OFFICE BUILDINGS, MONTREAL, ENLARGEMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).
See 'Montreal.'
POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS, DEFALCATIONS OF POSTMASTER : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).
PUBLIC WORKS PORTFOLIO AND QUEBEC PROVINCE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2925, 2956 (ii).
QUEBEC BRIDGE : *See* general heading.
QUEBEC CITY : *See* 'Citadel,' 'Drill Hall,' 'Ellis, Dr.,' 'Harbour,' &c.
QUEBEC JUDGES, COMPLAINTS *re* OUTSIDE BUSINESS : Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14665 (vi).
QUESNEL, JULES, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 7203 (iii).
RACETTE, V., PURCHASE OF LAND BY GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3231 (ii).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*
REPENTIGNY WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
RICHELIEU RIVER INUNDATIONS, &c., PET. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10496 (v).
RICHMOND, RIVER ST. FRANCIS, ICE PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 2282 (i).
RIMOUSKI EXTENSION PIER AND TIDAL BASIN : in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
RIVIÈRE AUX RENARDS BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 2279 (i).
RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, ENGINE HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 12593 (v).
—— FREIGHT YARD : in Com. of Sup , 8309 (iv).
—— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13476 (vi).
——WHARF IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 2281 (i).
RIVIÈRE DU NORD CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).
RIVIÈRE DU NORD FISH LADDERS, &c. : M. for Copies of Reps. * (Mr. *Ethier*) 2778 (ii).
ROBERT VS. KING, CLAIMS *re* FLOODING ON LAKE ST. LOUIS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13473 (vi).
ROBIN, COLLAS CO., LANDING PIER AT PASPEBIAC : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13464 (vi).
ROSS RIFLE FACTORY, ESTABLISHMENT AT QUEBEC : M. for Ret. * (Mr. *Casgrain*) 109 (i).
——IMPERFECT RETURN : Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2109 (i)
ROY, GEO., INSPECTOR OF HIDES, QUEBEC : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3627 (ii).
ST. AGNES TELEGRAPH LINES : in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vi).
ST. ALEXIS BAIE DES HA HA PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2289 (i).
ST. ALPHONSE HA HA BAY WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
ST. ANDRÉ DE KAMOURASKA PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i), 13492 (vi).
STE. ANNE DE LA PERADE, PROTECTION WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE PIER, RECONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
STE. ANNE DE SAGUENAY, TEL. LAND LINE : in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vi).
——WHARF IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
STE. ANNE DE SOREL, ICE PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
See 'Sorel.'
STE. ANNE TO LAC CLAIR TEL. SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).
ST. CATHERINE'S BAY AND TADOUSAC SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13695 (vi).
ST. CYRIL STATION IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).
ST. DENIS WHARF AND MURRAY BAY FERRY SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 10496 (v).
STE. FAMILLE PIER EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
ST. FIDÈLE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13493 (vi).
ST. FLAVIE STATION ACCOMMODATION ; in Com. of Sup., 12602 (v).
ST. FRANCIS LAKE, TO COMPLETE DAM : in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
STE. FRANCIS RIVER, ICE PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 2282 (i).
ST. FRANCOIS, PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).
ST. FULGENCE, WHARF ; in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
ST. GÉDÉON ISLANDS, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
ST. GODEFROI DE NOUVELLE, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

St. Hyacinthe, Drill Hall; in Com. of Sup., 13067 (vi).
——— Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
St. Irene Wharf, Headblock: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i).
St. James (Montreal) Electoral Division, Judgment of Sup. Court: Notification, (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
——— Issue of Writ: M. (Mr. *Monk*) 707, 940 (i).
——— Issue of Writ, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 13376 (vi).
——— Issue of Writ: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 13303 (vi).
——— Notification of Vacancy: (Mr. *Speaker*) 1023 (i).
——— Vacancy: Remarks, (Mr. *Monk*) 409 (i). *See* 'Brunet.'
St. Jean des Chaillons, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13494 (vi).
St. Jerôme Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i), 5909 (iii).
St. Johns, Que., Customs Building; in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).
——— Drill Hall, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12496 (v).
———Examining Warehouse: in Com of Sup., 13069 (vi).
St. Lawrence, Cable and Tel. Lines: in Com. of Sup., 2989 (ii).
———Equipment for Transportation Facilities: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) in Com. of Sup., 12845-7 (vi).
———Gulf Fishing, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2917 (ii).
———Lighthouses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi).
———Obstruction to Navigation, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).
———Pilots, Retirement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2915 (ii).
———Removal of Rocks: in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i).
St. Lawrence Route and Fast Atlantic Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7584 (iv).
———and Lloyds, Cor. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13698 (vi).
———Rep. *re* Navigation Obstructions, &c.: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4133 (ii).
St. Lawrence Route: in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 3218, 3304 (ii).
———Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii), 5917 (iii).
———Tel. Service: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vi).
———Transportation Facilities: *See* 'Transportation'.
——— Wireless Telegraph Stations: *See* 'Marconi', &c.
St. Laurent Wharf, Isle of Orleans: in Com. of Sup., 5906 (iii).
See "Island of Orleans."
St. Louis de Mile End, Public Building: in Com. in Sup., 13080 (vi).
St. Louis Lake, Hydrographic Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).
St. Louis River, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13473 (vi).
St. Mary's Current Wharf, Contract with Poupore & Malone: M. for Copy of Contract * (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
St. Maurice, River Dam: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
——— Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 2286 (i), 5904 (iii).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

St. Maurice, Dredging Eastern Channel: in Com. of Sup., 13469 (vi).
——— Slides, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii).
St. Michel de Bellechasse, Pier: in Com. of Sup., 13494 (vi).
St. Nicholas Pier, Rebuilding, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5905 (iii).
St. Ours Canal, Landing Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
——— Stop Logs: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
St. Pierre Pointe Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
St. Simeon Wharf, Extension: in Com. of Sup., 13493 (vi).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 3534 (ii).
——— Acting Warden, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*), 10831 (v).
——— Hospital, Management, &c.: Ques. (Mr. (*Lemieux*) 13669 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14284 (vi).
——— Warden's Resignation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 286 (i).
Sabrevois Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13485 (vi).
Sacré Coeur Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13478 (vi).
Saguenay River, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 13472 (vi).
Savard, Mr. R. V., Emplymt. by Govt: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6895 (iii).
Seven Islands Pulp & Lumber Co., Wharf *re*: Remarks in Com. of. Sup., 13480 (vi).
——— Quebec and Murray Bay Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14456 (vi).
——— Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13479 (vi).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13079 (vi).
Shoemakers Federated Union, Res. *re* Slater Shoe Co.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 14666 (vi).
Sorel, Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i), 3374 (ii), 5921 (iii), 12845 (vi).
——— Cor. *re*: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Pope*) 2302 (i).
Soulanges Canal, Compensation to Geo. Goodwin: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
——— Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iii).
——— Contractor Stewart's Claims: in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vi).
——— O'Leary Claims: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).
——— Repairing Breach in Bank: in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).
Southeastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Tarte*) 451 (i).
South Shore Ry., Complaint *re* Safety: Remarks (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 205 (i).
——— Working, &c.: M for Cor. (Mr. *Tarte*) 448 (i).
Submarine Cable to Island of Orleans: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 11186 (v).
——— M. (Mr. *Talbot*) for Ret.* 11301 (v)
See 'Island of Orleans'.
Telegraph Lines, Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).
——— St. Lawrence: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii).
Terrebonne, Indian Reserve: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 288 (i).
——— Post Office Buildings, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 289 (i).
——— Public Building, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).
Thetford Mines Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 441 (i).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*
THREE RIVERS, CUSTOM HOUSE, HEATING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).
——— RETAINING WALL: in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).
——— HARBOUR, ADDITIONAL WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 2296 (i).
TOBIN CO.'S PULP MILL: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14462 (vi).
TOULADIE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 2286 (i).
TRACHOMA HOSPITAL IN QUEBEC: in Com. of Supt., 14245 (vi).
See 'Agriculture'.
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, *re* SOREL WHARF: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) in Com. of Sup., 12849 (vi).
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES, *re* ST. LAWRENCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).
See 'St. Lawrence, &c'.
TRAP NETS, GULF ST. LAWRENCE, PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2917 (ii).
TROTTIER, LOUIS M., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Quest. (Mr. *Morin*) 8488 (iv).
TURNPIKE TRUST, MONTEEAL, INDEBTEDNESS, &C.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Monk*) 672 (i).
TWO MOUNTAINS DISTRICT RAILWAY FACILITIES: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Ethier*) 7567 (iv).
VALLEYFIELD, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5905 (iii).
———POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 443 (i).
———POST OFFICE, ERECTION, PURCASE OF SITE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 98 (i).
———TENDERS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 11187 (v).
See 'Loy, &c.'
———STRIKE, PAY OF MILITIA: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3586, 3753, (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13371 (vi).
———STRIKE, 1900: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2759 (ii).
VERTE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
VICTORIA BRIDGE, MONTREAL, AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret. *(Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
See 'Bonaventure'.
VILLE MARIE WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
WIALLARD, PAUL, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 11188 (v).
WIRELESS TELEGRAPH STATIONS: *See* 'Marconi, &c.'
YAMASKA LOCK, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13498 (vi).

Queen's College, Kingston B. No. 190 (Mr. *Harty*) 1°*, 3864; 2°*, 4404 (ii).

QUEENS, WEST, P.E.I., REPRESENTATION *re*: Remarks: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13378 (vi).

QUESNEL-ATLIN TELEGRAPH BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

QUESNEL DAM, B.C., OBSTRUCTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*), 11557 (v).

QUESNEL, JULES, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 7203 (iii).

QUES. OF ORDER, ON APPNMT. OF JUDGES: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker, Dcp.*), 209 (i).
See 'Order,' &c.

QUESTIONS PUT BY MEMBERS, ANSWERS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 544 (i).

QUINTE BAY BUOYS, PAYMENTS, &C. FOR SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*), 5587 (iii).

RACETTE, V., PURCHASE OF LAND BY GOVT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 3231 (ii).

RACINE BROS. CLAIMS *re* CONTRACTORS OF NELSON P.O., B.C., in Com. of Sup., 7168 (iii).
———AGREEMENT WITH CONTRACTORS: Read (Mr. *Monk*), 7162 (iii)
———LETTERS READ FROM DEP. MINISTER OF LABOUR, &C., 7164 (iii).
See 'Nelson P. O.'

"RAGGING" IN THE BRITISH ARMY: Remarks (Mr *Charlton*) on M. for Sup., 3130, 3134 (ii).

RAIL POWER SAW CUTTER: in Com. of Sup., 12607 (v).

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS, DUTIES OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 1032 (i).

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS IN CAN., APPNMT. OF OFFICIAL INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 9217 (iv).
———INVESTIGATION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
———INVESTIGATION INTO: Remarks on M. for Sup., (Mr. *Clarke*), 1329 (i).
——— LOSS OF LIFE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 873 (i).
See 'Belmont,' 'West Lorne,' 'Windsor Jn.' &c.

Railway Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. No. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*), 1° m., 93; 2° m., 552; M. to ref. to Ry. Com., agreed to (Y. 99; N., 53) 565 (i), wthdn., 7203 (iii).

Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. No. 21 (Mr. *Blair*), 1° m., 244 (i); 2°*, 2585; M. for Com., 2585; in Com., 2591, 3538, 3713, 3830, 3882, 3974, 3984, 4120, 4564, 4691, 4728 (ii), 5243, 5322, 5513, 5560, 5679, 5765, 6071, 6170, 6172, 6202, 6271, 7299 (iii), 7609, 8125; 3° m., 8334 (iv); Sen. Amts., 13834, 14519, 14663, 14690, 14734, 14740, 14760, 14762, 14844 (vi); Salaries of Ry. Commissioners, &c., Res. prop., 8085; in Com., on Res., 8119 (iv). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 58).
ACCIDENTS, INVESTIGATION, &C., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5550 (iii).
———NOTICE, &C., penalties, 5549, (iii), ret. *re*, 15772 (iii).
ACTS REPEALED, 5772 (iii).
APPEALS FROM AWARDS, PRACTICE, &C., 4574, 4575, 4693; Amt. (Mr. *Lancaster*), 4578 (ii).
———FROM DECISION OF BOARD, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5773 (iii).
APPEALS TO HIGH COURTS, 3975 (ii).
APPLICATION OF ACT, 2608, 3536 (ii).
ARBITRATION, DISQUALIFICATIONS, &C., 4574 (ii).
ARBITRATION PROCEEDINGS, &C., 4566 (ii).
ARBITRATORS' AWARDS, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 4691 (ii).
ASSETS, &C., RETURNS *re* TO BOARD, 5772 (iii).
AUTHORITY TO SELL OR CONVEY LANDS, 4131 (ii).
AWARDS, APPEALS, &C., 4574; Amt. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 4574, 4693 (ii).
See 'Appeals.'
BALLAST PITS, &C., 4131 (ii).
BEACH LANDS, &C., 4125 (ii).
BELL AND WHISTLES, 5259, 5342 (iii).
BELL TELEPHONE AND C.P.R. AGREEMENT, 5514 (iii).
BOARD OF RY. COMMISSIONERS FOR CAN., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3854 (ii).
BOARD'S DUTIES, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3859 (ii).
BOARD'S SESSIONS, &C., 3859, 3862 (ii).
See 'Staff,' 'Vacancies,' &c.
BONDS, MORTGAGES, ISSUE OF, &C., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3993 (ii).
BRANCH LINE CONSTRUCTION, 4694 (ii); Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6080 (iii).
BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION, PERMISSION, &C., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5251 (iii).

RAILWAY ACT.—*Con.*

BY-LAWS, PRINTED, 5563 (iii).
CANAL CROSSINGS, &c., 4125 (ii).
CATTLE GUARDS *re* CROSSINGS, 5774 (iii).
CATTLE GUARDS, FENCES, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*) 6220, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6222, Amt. (Mr. *Wade*) 6253 (iii).
CHARGES, 2602 (ii).
CHARTERS, APPLICATION FOR, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Davis*) 6322 (iii).
CLASSIFICATION OF FREIGHT, &c., 5577, 6284 (iii).
COMMERCIAL RATES, PRIVILEGES, 5680 (iii).
COMMISSIONERS' DISQUALIFICATION, &c., Amt, (Mr. *Blair*) 3857 (ii).
COMMISSIONERS, NUMBER, 3857, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 3887 (ii).
COMMISSIONERS' RESIDENCE, 3859, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 3887 (ii).
COMPENSATION FOR LANDS AND DAMAGES, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 4568 ; Amt. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 4568 (ii).
COMPENSATION *re* DAMAGE BY FIRE, Amt. (Mr. *L. P. Demers*) 6299 (iii).
CONSTRUCTION, &c., BUILDINGS, &c., 3999 (ii).
CONSTRUCTION, TIME LIMITED, 3997 (ii)
COUNTY DIVISIONS, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3882 (ii).
CROSSINGS, APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS *re*, 3843 (ii).
CROSSINGS OR RUNNING ON PUBLIC HIGHWAYS, &c., 4697 (ii).
CROSSINGS, PROVISIONS *re*, 3843, 4697 (ii).
See 'Bells,' 'Highways,' 'Level Crossing', &c.
CROWN LANDS, &c., 4125 (ii).
DECISIONS OF BOARD, RULES OF COURT, 3975 (ii).
DEVIATIONS OF LINE, Amt., (Mr. *Blair*), 4121 (ii).
DIRECTORS' QUALIFICATIONS, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5774 (iii).
DISCRIMINATING FREIGHT RATES, 6284 (iii).
DISCRIMINATION *re* TOLLS, 5564-8 (iii).
DIVIDENDS AND INTEREST, 3984 (ii); Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 6074 (iii).
DIVIDENDS *re* CAPITAL, 3985 (ii).
DOCUMENTS AS EVIDENCE, PROCEDURE, &c., 3974 (ii).
DOM. AND PROVINCIAL RYS., CROSSING, 3846 (ii).
DRAINAGE ACROSS OR UNDER RYS., COMPENSATION &C , 4728 (ii); Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6177 (iii); Amt. (Mr. *Cowan*) 4735 (ii), 6186; Amt. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 6197 (iii).
ELECTRIC RYS, TRAMWAYS, RIGHT OF MUNICIPALITIES, &c., 6080 (iii).
EQUIPMENT OF CARS *re* SAFETY OF EMPLOYEES, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Ingram*) 6259 (iii).
EXPRESS COMPANIES, RATES, &c., 2596, 2608, 3538 ; Amt. (Mr. *Barker*) 3725 (ii).
EXPROPRIATION, &c., NOTICE, SERVICE, &c., 4566; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 4691 (ii).
EXPROPRIATION OF LAND, &c., 2591, 4564 (ii).
See 'Land,' &c.
EXTENSION OF TIME SPECIFIED IN ORDER, 3976 (ii).
FARM CROSSINGS, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Cowan*) 5774 ; Amt. (Mr. *Holmes*) 6202 ; Amt. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 6204 (iii).
FIRE GUARD ALONG THE RIGHT OF WAY, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6071, 6318; Amt. (Mr. *Scott*) 5783, 6321 (iii).
FIRE GUARDS ALONG LINE, PENALTIES *re* DAMAGE, Amt. (Mr. *Demers*) 6299 (iii).
FIRE SCREENS, 3894 (ii).
FORFEITURE OF SHARES, 3988 (ii).
——— Sale of, 3989 (ii).
FREE TRANSPORTATION, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5776 (iii).
FREIGHT CLASSIFICATION, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5577 (iii).
FREIGHT RATES, &c., 3538 (ii), 5568 (iii).

RAILWAY ACT.—*Con.*

FREIGHT RATE DISCRIMINATION, PENALTIES, 6284 (iii).
See 'Discrimination.'
FREIGHT RATE STANDARD, 5578 (iii).
GATES, &c., *re* UNIMPROVED PROPERTY, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6255 (iii).
GOVT. RYS., JURISDICTION, 3563 (ii).
HEADWAY OF BRIDGES, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5251 (iii).
HIGHWAY CROSSINGS, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5243, 6080, 6173 (iii).
See 'Municipalities,' &c. 'Bells,' &c., 'Ry.,' 'Watchmen,' &c.
HIGHWAYS, FARM CROSSINGS, &c., 3883 (ii).
INSPECTING ENGINEERS, 5251 (iii).
I.C.R. : *See* 'Govt. Rys.,' &c.
INTEREST CALLS, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 6075 (iii).
JUDGES JURISDICTION, 2591 ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 3885 (ii)
JUDICIAL DECISIONS, CITATIONS, &c., 3886 (ii)
JURISDICTION OF BOARD TO MAKE ORDERS, 3976 (ii)
LAND EXPROPRIATION, 4000, 4120 (ii).
LANDS OF OTHER COMPANIES, 4130 (ii).
See 'Expropriation.'
LEVEL CROSSINGS, PROTECTION, &c., 6256 ; Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) 6257 (iii)
See 'Highway,' 'Rails,' &c.
LOCATION OF LINE, 4120 (ii).
MEETINGS, NOTICE OF, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3981 (ii).
MINES UNDER RY., &c., 4124 (ii).
MINUTES, CERTIFIED COPIES, 3981 (ii).
MORTGAGE BONDS, PENALTIES, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6077 (iii).
MUNICIPAL RIGHTS *re* CROSSING, &c., 4697 (ii).
MUNICIPAL RIGHTS *re* HIGHWAY CROSSING, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5243, 6080 (iii).
See 'Highway'.
ORDERS, NOTICE OF, DUTIES OF CO., Amt. (Mr. *Lancaster*), 3974 (ii).
OVERHEAD BRIDGES, WIDTH, &c., 4712 (ii).
PAID-UP STOCK ISSUED FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 6072 (iii).
PASSENGER TRAFFIC ON RYS, 2 CENT RATE, 6271, Amt., (Mr. *Macleau*) 6274 (iii).
PASSES : *See* 'Free Transportation.'
PENALTIES RECOVERED UNDER THIS ACT, 5767 (iii).
PENALTIES *re* VIOLATION OF ACT, 5765 (iii).
PENALTIES *re* VIOLATION OF ACT AS TO TOLLS, 5692 (iii).
PLANS AND MAPS, 2593, 4120 (ii).
PROMISSORY NOTES AND BILLS, 3995 (ii).
PROTECTION GENERALLY, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3895 (ii).
RAILS *re* LEVEL CROSSINGS, 4709 (ii) ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5250 (iii).
RYS. CONSTRUCTED, GENERAL ADVANTAGE OF CAN., 3840 (ii).
RY. CROSSING ANOTHER LINE, 4697 (ii).
RAILWAY EXPRESS COMPANIES, &c., 2596 (ii).
RY. FACILITIES FOR INDUSTRIES, &c., 4695 (ii).
RY. OR HIGHWAY CROSSING, &c., 4697 ; Amts. (Mr. *Blair*) 4697 (ii).
RY. INSPECTION, 5252; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5253 (iii).
RATES *re* FREIGHT, &c., 5568 (iii).
See 'Freight,' 'Tolls, &c.' 'Two cent,' &c. Tariff.
REGULATIONS *re* BOARD, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3888 (ii).
RETURNS, ANNUAL, 5770 (iii).
ROLLING STOCK, 2598 (ii).
See 'Train, &c.'
SAFETY APPLIANCES, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5254 (iii).

RAILWAY ACT.—*Con.*

SAFETY EQUIPMENTS FOR EMPLOYEES, Amt. (Mr. *Ingram*) 6259 ; Amt. (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*) 6325 (iii).
SHAREHOLDERS' LIABILITY, &c., 3992 (ii).
SHAREHOLDERS' MEETINGS, 3980 (ii).
SHAREHOLDERS' RECORD, 3993 (ii).
SHARES FORFEITED, SALE, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6075 (iii).
See 'Forfeited,' 'Paid-up Stock,' &c.
SIGNBOARDS AT LEVEL CROSSINGS, PENALTY, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 4715 (ii).
SITTINGS OF BOARD, 3862 (ii).
SPECIAL ACT, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3885 (ii).
SPECIAL ACT, EXCEPTIONS, 3830 ; Amt. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 3835 (ii).
SPEED OF TRAINS THROUGH TOWNS, &c., 3888 (ii), 5322 (iii) ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3888 (ii), 5323 (iii).
STAFF OF BOARD, SALARIES, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3887 (ii), 14155 (vi).
STATIONS ON LINES NOT SUBJECT TO AUTHORITY OF PARLT., 5780 (iii).
STOCK PURCHASED IN OTHER COMPANIES, 5767 (iii).
STREET RYS. AND TRAMWAY CROSSINGS, 3850 ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3887 (ii).
TARIFFS, JOINT, FILING AND PUBLICATION OF, 5681 (iii).
See 'Rates,' &c.
TELEGRAPH, &c., PROCEDURE, &c., 4721 (ii).
TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE CONSTRUCTION, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6173 (iii).
TELEGRAPH OR TELEPHONE WIRES, &c., Amt. Mr. *Lancaster*) 4717 (ii).
TELEGRAPHS, &c., 5513, 5561, 5680 (iii).
TELEPHONES AND TELEGRAPH, GOVT. USE, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*), 5346, 5513 (iii).
See 'Bell,' 'Telegraph.'
TIME-TABLES, RULES, &c., 5561 (iii).
TOLLS, APPORTIONMENT BY LAND AND WATER, 5575 (iii).
TOLLS, CLASSIFICATION, &c., 3538, 3713 (ii).
TOLLS, DISCRIMINATION, &c., 5568 (iii).
TOLLS LEVIED, BY-LAW FIXING, 5564 (iii).
TOLL, TRAFFIC, 2602 (ii).
See 'Penalties,' &c.
TRAFFIC ARRANGEMENTS, 5700 (iii).
TRAFFIC PROVISIONS, 5680 (iii).
TRAIN EQUIPMENT, POWER OF BOARD, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5258 (iii).
TRAINS STANDING ON LEVEL CROSSINGS, PENALTY, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5340 (iii).
TRANSPORT PASSENGERS, &c., 4000 (ii).
TREES, REMOVAL, &c., 4000 (ii).
TWO-CENT RATE *re* PASSENGER TRAFFIC, Amt. (Mr *Maclean*) 6271 (iii).
See 'Passenger' &c.
VACANCIES BY DEATH, &c., 3981 (ii).
VIOLATION OF BY-LAWS, PENALTIES, &c., 5765 (iii).
WATCHMEN AT CROSSINGS, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5260 (iii).
WEEDS, REMOVAL BY CO., 5552, 6299 ; Amt. (Mr. *Lennox*) 5554, 5560, 6311 (iii).
WITNESS FEES, 3978 ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3979 (ii).
WORKING EXPENDITURES, 2604 (ii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21, Res. from Senate *re* Appnmt, of Managers : Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 14519 (vi).
——— (Mr. *Fielding*) appointing Managers, 14663, 14690, 14734 (vi).
———FORMALITIES, &c.: 'Bourinot' quoted, 14760 (vi).
——— MESS. FROM SENATE, Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 14760 (vi).
——— PROGRESS REPORTED, (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 14740, 14844 (vi).

Ry. Commission : *See* 'Ry. Act B. 21'.
Ry. Debts : *See* 'Exchequer Court', &c.
Ry. Drainage : *See* 'Drainage.'
Railway Act (employees safety) Amt. B. No. 74, (Mr. *Guthrie*) 1° m., 814 (i) ; 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 3247 (ii).
Railway Act (employees safety) Amt. B. No. 77 (Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*) 1° m., 872 2°, and ref. to. Sel. Com., 2387 (i) ; wthdn., 7203 (iii).
Railway Act (fire damages) Amt. B. No. 23 (Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*) 1° m. 283 ; (i) ; 2° m., 2780 (ii) ; wthdn., 7203 (iii).
Railway Act (fire guards) Amt. B. No. 16 (Mr. *Scott*) 1° *, 114 ; 2°, 871 (i) ; wthdn., 7203 (iii).
Railway Act (fire guards) Amt. B. No. 181 (Mr. *German*) 1° m., 3391 (ii).
Railway Act (telephones) Amt. B. No. 5 (Mr. *Maclean*) 1° m., 92 ; 2° m., 701 (i).
See 'Telephone B. 4'.
Railway Labour Disputes Settlement B. No. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) 1° *, 114 (i) ; 2° m., 2535 ; in Com., 2923 ; 3° *, 3298 (ii) ; Sen. Amts., 5653 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 55).
Railway Subsidies B. No. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*), 1° m., 92 ; 2° m., 545 ; in Com., 550 ; ref. back to Sel. Com. on Rys., 700 ; in Com., 1059 ; 3° m., 1199 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 56).
——— **Subsidies B. No. 270** (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 13549 ; in Com. on Res., 14313, 14428 ; 1°*, 14519 ; 2° and in Com., 14735, 14740 ; 3°*, 14741 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 57).
——— RES. 4, PAYMENT TO COS., SAFEGUARDS, &c.: in Com. on Ry. Res., 14511 (vi).
———RES. 5, NOTICE TO MUNICIPALITIES *re* LOCATION : in Com., on Res., 14513 (vi).
———RES. 6, RUNNING POWERS, TRAFFIC ARRANGEMENTS, &c. : in Com., on Res , 14515 (vi).
———RES. 8, PRODUCTION OF BOOKS OF COS., &c.: in Com., on Res., 14516 (vi).
Railway Act (supplies to govt. rys.) Amt. B. No. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 8332 (iv) ; Res. wthdn., 10715 ; Res. prop., 11189 ; in Com. on Res., 12574 ; 1°*, of B., 12584 (v) ; 2°*, and in Com., 12944 ; 3°*, 12983 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 59).
RAILWAY SUBSIDIES, STATEMENT *re* GRANTS TO PROVINCES : Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 14687 (vi).
———STATEMENT : laid on Table (Mr. *Fielding*) 14852 (vi).
See 'Subsidies to Rys.'
RAILWAYS CONSTRUCTED WITHOUT GOVT. AID, MAN. AND N.W.T. : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 8487 (iv).
RY. LAND GRANTS, MAN. AND N.W.T., AREAS EARNED, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2102 (i).
———AREA UNPATENTED : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2583 (ii).
———VOTED &c., GOVTL. ACTION *re* SELECTION : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 4831 (ii).
RAILWAY POLICY OF GOVT., DELAY IN BRINGING DOWN: M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7109 (iii). *See* 'G.T.P. Ry.'

RAILWAY POLICY OF MR. BORDEN, PETS. RECEIVED: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 13028 (vi).

RY. RATES, GOVT. CONTROL OF: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*, *Victoria*) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14502 (vi).

RAILWAYS:

ACCIDENTS IN CAN., APPNMT. OF OFFICIAL INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9217 (iv).

ACCIDENTS, DUTIES OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1032 (i).

——INVESTIGATION INTO: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1329 (i).

——INVESTIGATION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup. 14154 (vi).

——LOSS OF LIFE, &C.,: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 873 (i).

See 'Belmont,' 'West Lorne,' &c.

AIR BRAKES FOR FREIGHT CARS, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7527 (iii), 8281 (iv).

ALBANY STATION AND LAND PURCHASE, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).

ALBERTON, P.E.I. RY. STATION: in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).

AMQUI STATION, I.C.R., ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).

ATLANTIC AND LAKE SUPERIOR RY. SUBSIDY, CLAIMS AGAINST, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil*, *Bonaventure*) 3229 (ii).

BELL TELEPHONE AND C.P.R. AGREEMENT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 5513 (iii).

BELMONT ACCIDENT, GRATUITIES TO VICTIMS: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 13546, 14155 (vi).

See 'Windsor Junction.'

BLAIR, HON. A. G., RESIGNATION: Announcement (*Sir Wilfrid Laurier*) 6540 (iii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6522 (iii).

—— Explanation (*Sir Wilfrid Laurier*) 6735 (iii).

BLUESHANK, P.E.I., STRAIGHTENING CURVE: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 14133 (vi).

BONAVENTURE STATION, TERMINAL FACILITIES, AMOUNT PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).

See 'G.T.R.,' 'Victoria Bridge.'

BORDEN, MR., RY. POLICY:

See 'G. T. Pacific.'

BROOKFIELD STATION, I.C.R., ENLARGEMENT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).

CALGARY AND EDMONTON RY., REGULATIONS *re* MORTGAGE DEEDS: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 13024 (vi).

See 'Qu'Appelle.'

C. A. RY., STRIKE OF SECTIONMEN: Remarks (Mr. *Schell*) 2303 (i).

CAN. CENTRAL, AND OTTAWA AND BROCKVILLE RYS., AMALGAMATION, COMPENSATION TO CERTAIN MUNICIPALITIES: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).

CAN. FREIGHT CLASSIFICATION, APPROVAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 3537 (ii).

See 'Freight.'

CAN. NORTHERN RY., COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND MACKENZIE & MANN: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 916 (i).

CANADIAN NORTHERN RY. CO.: Ret. *re* cost, laid on Table, 5052 (ii).

C.P.R., ARRANGEMENTS WITH JAMES BAY RY. CO., &C.: Remarks in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).

—— BELL TELEPHONE AGREEMENT: *See* 'Telephone,' &c.

—— CAR SHORTAGE, &C., in N.W.T.:

See 'Ry. Traffic,' &c.

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

C.P.R., EXPENDITURE FOR ROLLING STOCK: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 2311 (i).

——AND GREAT NORTHWEST CENTRAL RY. CO.'S AGREEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 2306 (i).

—— LANDS EXEMPT FROM TAXES IN MAN. AND N. W. T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 916 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 667 (i)

—— PRIVATE CAR NO. 001, IMPROVEMENTS, PAYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Demers, St. John*) 14282 (vi).

—— TRANSCONTINENTAL TRAINS, WATER SUPPLY: Remarks (Mr. *Wright*) 9455 (iv).

CANSO FERRY SERVICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7525 (iii), 12602 (v), 14093 (vi).

CAR SHOPS, I.C.R., NEW MACHINERY: in Com. of Sup.. 14106 (vi).

CATTLE GUARD COMMISSION, APPOINTMENT OF MR. GEO. ROBERTSON, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 668 (i).

—— APPOINTMENT OF MR. HOLT AND RETIREMENT OF MR. ROBERTSON, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lennox*) 1059 (i).

—— NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 874 (i).

—— REP. OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1199 (i).

—— REP. LAID ON TABLE, PRINTING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 14758 (vi).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. *Lennox*) 669 (i), 3396 (ii).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. *Pringle*) 14686 (vi).

—— WITHDRAWAL OF MR. ROBERTSON, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 1034 (i).

'CHAPMAN' BALL-BEARING APPARATUS, REP. *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup. 7524 (iii), 8283 (iv).

CHARLOTTETOWN, P.E.I., STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup. 14131 (vi)

—— REBUILDING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4442 (ii).

CHAUDIÈRE JUNCTION, ENGINE HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 8314 (iv), 12594 (v), 14106 (vi).

CHIGNECTO MARINE RY., SETTLEMENT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Logan*) 4404 (ii).

CLERGUE WORKS, SAULT STE. MARIE, CONTRACT FOR RAILS WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross, Ont.*) 13668 (vi).

——Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

——Remarks *re* Subsidies to, in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14397 (vi).

'CLEVELAND' CYLINDER PATENT *re* I.C.R.: Remarks, (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 8284 (iv).

COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS, PRIVILEGES, FARES, &C.: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Bill (Mr. *Clarke*) 5680 (iii).

DEMURRAGE REGULATIONS, I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 4672, 4959 (ii).

DISCRIMINATING RATES, G. T. RY. CO., BETWEEN CANADIANS AND AMERICANS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 10745 (v).

DIXON, F. A., PROMOTION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2726-2753 (ii).

——PROMOTION AS CHIEF CLERK, COR. &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Lennox*) 1058 (i).

——CHIEF COR. CLERK: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 5318 (iii).

DOUBLE TRACKING PARTS OF I.C.R. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 14062 (vi).

DRAW-BARS EXCHANGE ON FREIGHT CARS, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8288 (iv).

DRUMMOND COUNTY RY., RENTALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vi).

DRUMMONDVILLE, RY. SIDING, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14055 (vi).

EASTERN EXTENSION RY., N.B., BALANCE OF INTEREST *re* AWARD: in Com. of Sup., 7528 (iii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

EASTERN EXTENSION RY. AWARD, FEES OF STENOGRAPHER, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7529 (iii).
EEL RIVER, STATION, I.C.R., AGENT'S HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 12600 (v).
ELMIRA BRANCH LINE, P.E.I. RY., : in Com. of Sup., 12835 (vi).
FIRE PROTECTION OF STATIONS, RESTAURANTS, &C., I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 14663 (vi).
FIRE REGULATIONS, N.W.T.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6775 (iii).
See 'Ry. B. 21'.
FREIGHT CARS, I.C.R., ON CONNECTING LINES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Haggart*) 3805 (ii).
FREIGHT CLASSIFICATION (CANADIAN), O.Cs. &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 3302 (ii).
See 'Can. Freight.'
FREIGHT RATES ON OCEAN STEAMERS, DISCRIMINATION BETWEEN CAN. AND U.S. FREIGHTS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 13674 (vi).
See 'Ry. B. 21.'
GATES OVER RY. CROSSINGS: Remarks in Com. on Bill (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 5775 (iii).
See 'Ry B. 21.'
GOVT. OFFICIAL, &C., CARS, AMOUNTS PAID FOR HAULAGE: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9682 (iv).
See 'Private.'
GOVT. RY. POLICY, DELAY, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7298 (iii).
See 'G.T.P.Ry.'
GRAIN CARRIED BY C.P.R. TO ST. JOHN, QUANTITY, &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).
GRAND NARROWS BRIDGE PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14094 (vi).
G.T.P. RY., ALTERNATIVE POLICY OF MR. BORDEN, HALIFAX: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 13028 (vi).
——BILL, DISTRIBUTION TO MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Wilson*) 8918 (iv).
——BILL, FRENCH TRANSLATION OF: Remarks (Mr. *Leonard*) 8118 (iv).
——COMPARISON WITH DIFFERENT RY. SYSTEMS: Remarks (Mr. *Ca gill*) in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).
——CONTRACTS *re* EASTERN PORTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 13027 (vi).
——GOVT. POLICY, DELAY, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden. Halifax*) 6805, 6921, 7298, 7399 (iii).
——GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7399 (iii).
——Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 7487 (iii).
——Remarks (*Sir Wilfrid Laurier*) 8086 (iv).
——M. for Cor. (Mr. *Tarte*) 447 (i).
——MEMBER READING SPEECH: Ques. of Order (Mr. *Johnston, C.B.*) 10249; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 10250 (v).
——MOUNTAINS CROSSED: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8117 (iv).
——PARISHES CROSSED FROM LEVIS TO TEMISCOUATA: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8117 (iv).
——PETS. FROM BAGOT AND DORCHESTER: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil, Bagot*) 12941 (vi).
——PETITIONS SIGNATURES, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Talbot*) 12715; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 12715 (vi).
——M. (Mr *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13265 (vi).
——Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) 13266; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 13266 (vi).
——MEETINGS OF COM. ON PRIVS. AND ELECTS.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13559, 13671 (vi).
—— AFFIDAVITS, &C., PAR. IN MONTREAL 'STAR': Remarks (Mr. *Talbot*) 14845; Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14846 (vi).
—— SUBSIDY FROM GOVT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 671, 1031 (i).
—— PAR. IN OTTAWA 'JOURNAL' *re* SUBSIDY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*), 5733 (iii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

G.T.P. RY., PAR. IN TORONTO 'GLOBE' *re* SUBSIDY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*), 5892 (iii).
—— SURVEYS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi).
—— Mr. Hays' Statement *re*, Par. in *Star*, 14648 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 14765 (vi).
—— SURVEYS, BUSINESS SYSTEM, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*), in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14355 (vi).
—— SURVEYS, &C. : in Com. on Ways and Means, 14765 (vi).
—— SURVEYS, PLANS, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 8230 (iv).
—— AND TRANS CANADA, SALE, &C. PAR. IN TORONTO 'NEWS': Read (Mr. *Monk*), 7566 (iv).
—— TWO-CENT RATE, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*), 10462 (v).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*), 11556 (v).
G.T.RY. AND C.P.R. FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*), in Com. of Sup., 12884 (vi).
—— DISCRIMINATING RATES BETWEEN CANADIANS AND AMERICANS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*), 10745 (v).
——LOANS BY DOM. GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*), 2920 (ii).
—— RENTALS FROM I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vi).
—— STE. ROSALIE TO MONTREAL, &C. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*), 706 (i).
—— TERMINALS AT ST. JEAN DES CHAILLONS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13495 (vi).
——TRAFFIC ARRANGEMENTS WITH I.C.R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*), 2759 (ii).
See 'Bonaventure'.
GREAT NORTH WEST CENTRAL RY. AND C.P.R. CO.'S AGREEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*), 2306 (i).
HALIFAX COTTON, LOAN OF RAILS TO, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*), in Com. on Ry. Res., 14477 (vi).
HALIFAX, ELEVATOR, LAND PURCHASE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12825, 12874 (vi).
——IMMIGRATION BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13033 (vi).
—— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 8316 (iv), 12597 (v), 12824, 14080, (vi).
——Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12874 (vi).
HALIFAX AND SOUTH-WESTERN RY., CLAIMS FOR LABOUR, MATERIAL, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14332 (vi).
HAULAGE OF GOVT. &C. CARS., AMOUNTS PAID, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9682 (iv).
HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE, P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 12829, 14108, 14115 (vi).
—— AGREEMENT, AMOUNT PAID, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2758 (ii).
—— CONTRACTORS NAME, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2584 (ii).
——PREPARATION OF CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4444 (ii).
I. C. R., PASSES: *See* 'Passes.'
See 'I.C.R.'
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. SUBSIDY, &C. : Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 872 (i).
KELLEY'S CROSS P. O., P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 6064 (iii).
KENSINGTON STATION ACCOMMODATION, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 12840 (vi).
KINGSTON LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONTRACTS FOR I. C. R. : Remarks (Mr *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

KINKORA STATION ACCOMMODATION, P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
LAND GRANTS TO RYS. IN MAN. AND N. W. TERS. : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1197 (i).
LAND GRANTS TO RYS., MAN., N. W. T., AREAS, NAMES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2101 (i).
——MILEAGE : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 1677 (i).
——AREA RESERVED, PATENTED, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2307 (i).
—— UNEARNED, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 3797 (ii).
—— UNPATENTED : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2583 (ii).
LEGAL EXPENSES *re* RYS. AND CANAL DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 12911 (vi).
LEVIS ACCOMMODATION, I. C. R. STATION : in Com. of Sup., 3703 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES, CARS, &c., I. C. R., PURCHASE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 4361 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES CONSTRUCTED AT MONCTON, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
LORNE SIDING, I. C. R , TRAFFIC, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 2918 (ii).
MACHINERY FOR CAR SHOPS, I. C. R. : in Com. of Sup., 14106 (vi).
MANAGERS *re* RY. CONFERENCE : *See* 'Railway Act B. 21.'
METAPEDIA STATION IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 14096 (vi).
METIS STATION, DIVERTING ROAD, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 12604 (v), 12828 (vi).
MIRAMICHI BRIDGE SUPERSTRUCTURE : in Com. of Sup., 8307 (iv).
MONCTON, CAR SHOP EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 8312 (iv).
——INCREASED SHED ACCOMMODATION FOR I. C. R. : in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
——STATION ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 12599 (v).
MONEY SUBSIDIES TO RYS., I. C. R., &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*), 1197 (i).
MONTAGUE BRIDGE SURVEY, P. E. I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).
MONTREAL LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONTRACTS FOR I.C.R. : Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*), in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
MONTREAL SUBWAY CO., O. Cs. COR., &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tarte*), 705 (i).
MORDEN BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* WHEAT FREIGHT RATES : Ques. (Mr. *Stewart*), 12074 (v).
MOUNT STEWART FREIGHT HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii).
MUHLFELD, MR., REP. *re* 'CHAPMAN' BALL BEARING APPARATUS : Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*), in Com. in Sup., 8283 (iv).
See 'Chapman.'
MUNICIPALITIES, COMPENSATION FOR AMALGAMATION OF CAN. CENTRAL, AND BROCKVILLE AND OTTAWA RYS. &c. : in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
MUNICIPAL RIGHTS *re* TRAMWAY COS., &c. : Remarks in Com. on Ry. Bill, 6081 (iii).
See 'Ry. Bill 21.'
MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH P.E.I. RY. : in Com. of Sup., 7530, 7801 (iv), 12829, 14108, 14115 (vi).
See 'Hillsborough.'
NAPANEE AND TAMWORTH RY., CHARTER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Porter*), 8084 (iv).
NEW GLASGOW, EXTENSION TO FREIGHT SHED, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 14095 (vi).
NORTHAM AND RICHMOND STATIONS, P.E.I. RY. : in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
NORTH SYDNEY STATION ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 12597 (v).
O'LEARY'S STATION, P.E.I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 7536 (iii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

O'LEARY'S STATION, P. E. I. RY., BRANCH LINE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*), 6168 (iii).
—— Remarks, (Mr. *Hackett*), in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).
OUELLE RIVER BRANCH, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 7526 (iii), 12599 (v).
—— BRANCH LINE TO ST. DENIS WHARF : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 10496 (v).
PASSENGER RATES ON G.T.R. :
See 'Discriminating'.
PASSES, I.C.R. : M. (Mr. *Bell*), for Ret., 2337 (i).
PETIT DE GRAT AND I.C.R. TERMINUS AT MULGRAVE, SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 14249 (vi).
PICTOU, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 8317 (iv), 12827, 14088 (vi).
PINTSCH GAS EQUIPMENT for I.C.R. CARS : in Com. of Sup., 8291 (iv).
POINT TUPPER IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 8309 (iv).
P.E.I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 7801 (iv), 12608 (v), 12828 (vi).
—— GENERAL VOTE : in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).
—— MISREPRESENTATION *re* TOTAL COST : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*, *P.E.I.*), 1679 (i).
—— MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH AND HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 14108, 14115 (vi).
—— SALE OF TICKETS : (Mr. *Hackett*), 2503 (ii).
—— SEMAPHORE LIGHTS, DISCONTINUANCE OF, &c. : Ques., (Mr. *Hackett*), 4443 (ii).
—— STATION AGENTS, SALARIES, &c. : Ques., (Mr. *Hackett*), 4361 (ii).
—— STEEL RAILS : in Com. of Sup., 7802 (iv).
—— SUBSIDIES BY GOVT. : Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*), in Com. on Ry. Res., 14472 (vi).
—— WATER SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
—— WORKING EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).
PRIVATE CARS PURCHASE BY GOVT., &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 2309 (i).
See 'Govt. &c.'
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. BONDS, ATTACK ON MR. E. B. OSLER : Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Scott*), *re* 'Lowering Tone of Debates', 14583 (vi).
—— MEMORANDUM FROM MR. KINGSMILL : Read (Mr. *Osler*), 14588 (vi).
—— LAND GRANT : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*), 2338 (i).
—— MORTGAGE DEEDS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*), 13024 (vi).
See 'Regina', &c.
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters, 10497 (v).
—— Ret. laid on Table, 7297 (iii).
RY. ACT AMT. BILL : Remarks (Mr. *Lennox*) 7201 (iii).
See general heading.
RY. CARRIAGE OF MAILS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6268 (iii).
RAILWAY COMMISSION OF CAN., SALARIES AND EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).
RY. CONFERENCE WITH SENATE, &c., FORMALITIES, &c. : 'Bourinot' quoted, 14760 (vi).
—— Mess. from Senate : Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 14760 (vi).
RAILWAYS CONSTRUCTED WITHOUT GOVT. AID, MAN. AND N.W.T. : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 8487 (iv).
RAIL CONTRACT WITH GOVT. : *See* 'Clergue.'

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Ry. Dept., Chief Clerk, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 5318 (iii).
——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 333 (i), 14055 (vi).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. *Blair*) 92 (i).
——— Estimates, Insufficiency of Detail, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Barker*) in Com. of Sup., 14055. 14081 (vi).
——— I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8269 (iv), 12593 (v), 12823, 14646 (vi).
Ry. Lands voted, &c., Govtl. Action *re* Selection: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 4831 (ii).
See 'Lands,' &c.
Ry. Mail Clerks: in Com. on Post Office B. 208, 5659 (iii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 5926, 6136 (iii).
——— Increased Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iii).
——— Man. and N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 14041 (vi).
Ry. Mail Service in N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup. 5934 (iii).
——— Post Office Inspectors, Supt. of, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14001 (vi).
Ry. Mail Transfer Agents: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6136, (iii).
Ry. Policy, Announcement by Govt.: in Com. of Sup., 6426 (iii).
——— Delay in bringing down: M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7109 (iii).
See 'G.T.P. Ry.'
Railway Policy of Mr. Borden, Pets. received: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 13028 (vi).
Rail Power Saw Cutter: In Com. of Sup., 12607 (v).
Ry. Rates, Govt. Control of: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14502 (vi).
See 'Ry. B. 21'.
Ry. Supplies voted for one Estimate, transferred to another: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14055, 14081, (vi).
Ry. Traffic in N.W.T., Blockade, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for Sup., 2424 (i).
Rathbun Co.'s Ry., Charter, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 8084 (iv).
Regina, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Surveys of reserved Lands: in Com. of Sup., 6939 (iii).
Renfrew, Horton and Admaston Municipalities:
See 'Can. Central'.
Restaurants, Stations, I.C.R., Fire Protection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 14663 (vi).
Restigouche Bridge Superstructure: in Com. of Sup., 8303 (iv).
Rhodes, Curry & Co., Contract for Rolling Stock, I.C.R.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14100, (vi).
Richmond and Northam, P.E.I. Ry. Station: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).
Riviere du Loup, Engine House: in Com. of Sup., 8314 (vi), 12593, (v)
——— Freight Yard: in Com. of Sup., 8309, (iv).
——— I.C.R. Shops, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*), 12497, (v).
Robertson, Geo. *re* Cattle Guard Commission: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 874 (i)
See "Cattle Guards Commission".
Rolling Stock, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8292, (iv).
St. Cyril Station Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Ste. Flavie Station Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12602 (v).
St. John, Increased Accommodation I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8315 (iv), 12596 (v), 12823, 14063 (vi).
St. Louis, Elmsdale, Coleman and Conway Station Agents, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4361 (ii).
Scotch Hill Station, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 872 (i).
Sidings along Line of I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 14055, 14081, 14107 (vi).
Southport and Murray Harbour Ry., Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey* 2584 (ii).
South Shore Ry. Working, &c.: M. for Cor (Mr. *Tarte*), 448 (i).
——— Complaint *re* Safety: Remarks (Mr. *Geoffrion*), 205 (i).
Steel Rail Contract with Govt.:
See 'Clergue'.
Stellarton, Increased Accommodation I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8295 (iv).
Subsidies for Public Highways, Pets., &c.: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*), 591 (i).
Subsidies, to Rys., Govt. Policy: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*), 14352 (vi).
——— Remarks, (Mr. *Richardson*), in Com. of Sup., 14345 (vi).
——— Inquiry for, (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 12805 13005 (vi).
——— Interest payable, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*), 3970 (ii).
——— for Man.: Remarks (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com. on Res., 14494 (vi).
——— for N. S.: Remarks (Mr. *Gourley*) in Com. on Res., 14491 (vi).
——— (Money) paid by Govt. since Confederation: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*), 1198 (i).
See 'Money.'
——— per miles of rys. in N.W.T., and Man.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*), 1677 (i).
——— Res., aggregate Vote for each Prov., &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*), in Com. on Res., 14481 (vi).
——— Statement *re* Grants to Provinces: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*), 14687 (vi).
——— Statement laid on Table: (Mr. *Fielding*), 14852 (vi).
——— Total Amount for ten Years: Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*), 13934 (vi).
——— Voted by Parlt. 1901-1903: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*), 2306 (i), 12842, 13259, 13934 (vi).
——— Voted by Parlt. for 1900, 1901, 1902. Amount paid for 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*), 13027 (vi).
Ry. Transportation in N.W.T.:
See 'Ry. Traffic'.
Summerside Coal Sheds: In Com. of Sup., 12828 (vi).
——— Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12828 (vi).
Sussex, N. B., Roundhouse, Gates, &c: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 4672 (ii).
——— Station Grounds: Remarks, (Mr. *Fowler*), in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).
Sydney Accommodation, Extension: in Com. of Sup., 3696 (ii).
See 'I.C.R. and general heading.
Sydney, North, Station Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 14089 (vi).
Telephone Agreement with C.P.R.: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Bill (Mr. *Maclean*), 5513 (iii).
See 'Ry. B. 21.'
Ties imported for Govt. Rys., Cost, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*), 1679 (i).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

TRANS-CANADA RY. CO., APPLICATION TO GOVT. FOR SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 1026 (i).
——— CONTRACT WITH GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*), 2759 (ii).
——— Personal Explanation (Mr. *Blair*) 2794 (ii).
——— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Tarte*) 672 (i).
TRANS-CANADA RY. AND G. T. PACIFIC: Par. in Toronto '*News*' (Mr. *Monk*), 7566 (iv).
TRANSCONTINENTAL RY. DECLARATIONS BY MINISTERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).
——— GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 5765 (iii).
TRANSCONTINENTAL RY. AND SIR WM. MULOCK'S SPEECH: Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 367 (i).
——— PROPOSALS TO GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 874 (i).
——— REPRESENTATIONS *re* MILITARY PURPOSES: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 541 (i).
See 'G. T. Pacific.'
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, APPNMT. OF: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 1199 (i), 3129 (ii).
——— APPNMT. OF CHAIRMAN: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9582 (iv).
———APPNMT. OF SIR WM. VANHORNE: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 7297 (iii).
———SIR WM. VANHORNE'S VIEWS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 8330 (iv).
——— APPNMT. OF COMMISSIONERS: Notification (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5137 (iii).
——— EXPENDITURE *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13362 (vi).
——— FORMATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden Hfx.*) 9819 (iv).
——— FURTHER ARRANGEMENTS, &c.: Remarks Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 9458 (iv).
——— INSTRUCTIONS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4120 (ii).
——— MEETINGS, BUSINESS TRANSACTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13027 (vi).
——— O.C., *re* APPNMTS.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 1324 (i).
———AND TARIFF INQUIRY, PAR IN MONTREAL "HERALD": Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), 853 (i).
———PERSONNEL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 7206 (iii).
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES, GOVT. POLICY *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 3432 (ii).
———*re* ST. LAWRENCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).
TRANSPORTATION POLICY, *re* SPEECH FROM THRONE: Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*), 6404 (iii).
TRURO STATION ACCOMMODATION, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 12603 (v).
TWO CENT FARE CLAUSE, G. T. RY., REPEAL OF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*), 11828 (v).
———Amt. in Com. on G. T. P. Ry. Bill, 12221 (v).
———RATE, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) in Com. on Ry. Act Amt. Bill, 6271 (iii).
TWO MOUNTAINS DISTRICT, RAILWAY FACILITIES: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Ethier*), 7567 (iv).
VESTIBULES ON PASSENGER CARS: I.C.R. in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12600 (v).
VICTORIA BRIDGE, MONTREAL, AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*), 706 (i.)
See 'Bonaventure,' &c.
WATER SUPPLY on C.P.R. TRANSCONTINENTAL TRAINS: Remarks (Mr. *Wright*), 9455 (iv).
WEST LORNE RY. ACCIDENT, REP. OF COMMISSON: Remarks, (Mr. *Clarke*) 5088, 5242 (iii).
——— COMMISSIONER'S REP.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*), on Adjnmt., 4726 (ii).
———COMMISSION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 6168 (iii).
———JURY'S VERDICT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 3231, (ii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

WHARF CONNECTIONS AND RY. SUBSIDIES BY GOVT: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Res., 14463 (vi).
WHEAT, EXPORT FREIGHT RATE TO MONTREAL FROM ONT. POINTS: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*), 11188, 11425 (v).
———RES. OF MORDEN BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Stewart*), 12074 (v).
WHITE, ALBERT S., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 4673 (ii).
WINDSOR JUNCTION RY. ACCIDENT, I. C. R.: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Clarke*), 3496, 3712 (ii).
WINDSOR, N.S., NEW STATION, RENTAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).
See 'I. C. R.,' &c.

RAINY RIVER MAIL SERVICE: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6889 (iii).
RAMA INDIANS, CONTRIBUTION *re* ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 13781 (vi).
See 'Indians,' &c.
RAMY'S POINT, WELLAND CANAL, REMOVAL OF OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vi).
RAND'S MICMAC DICTIONARY: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v).
RAPIDE PLAT, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 12898 (vi).
RATES FOR LIVE STOCK AND COAL, I.C.R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*), 1857 (i).
See 'Ry. B. 21', 'Freight Rates', &c
Rathbun Co.'s B. No. 122 (Mr. *Harty*), 1° *, 1675; 2° *, 1853 (i); in Com., and 3° *, 5100 (ii), (3 Edward VII, c. 180).
RATHBUN CO.'S RY., CHARTER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 8084 (iv).
REBELLION OF 1885, CLAIMS OF SETTLERS: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*), on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).
RECEIVER GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 12584 (v).
——— ADDITIONAL VAULT: in Com. of Sup. 5842 (iii).
RECIPROCITY WITH U.S. AND JOINT HIGH COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 14053 (vi).
See "Joint High", &c.
RED DEER COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup.. 960 (i).
Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Co.'s B. No. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1° *, 1295; 2° m., 1812; 2° *, 1853 (i); in Com., 5892; 3° *, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 181).
REDISTRIBUTION BILL, COR. WITH N.B. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 1110 (i).
REDISTRIBUTION IN ONT., REDUCTION, &C.; COR. &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Sproule*), 2337 (i).
——— *re* P.E.I. AND N.B., COR., RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 876 (i).
REDISTRIBUTION BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 204, 208 (i).
Redistribution Bill: *See* 'Representation'.
Reformatory Prisons Act Amt. B. No. 221 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 6427 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 8087; 3° *, 8087 (iv). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 51).
REGINA JAIL, ADDITIONAL LAND PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup. 5135 (ii).

Regina and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 43 (Mr. *Scott*) 1° m, 591; 2°*, 852 (i); in Com., and 3° *, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 182).

REGISTRAR, EXCHEQUER COURT, EDITING REP.: in Com. of Sup., 3407 (ii).

Registrar of Supreme Court B. No. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) Res. prop. 13670; in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; 2°, and in Com., 14300, 14403; 3°*, 14405 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 69).

RENFREW, HORTON AND ADMASTON MUNICIPALITIES, &C.: *See* 'Can. Central.'

REPATRIATION Agents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6700 (iii).

REPENTIGNY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

REPORTS, DEPTL. TRANSLATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 479 (i).

REPORTS PRESENTED:

AUDITOR GENERAL'S: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 89 (i).

CIVIL SERVICE LIST: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 125 (i).

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13373 (vi).

INDIAN AFFAIRS: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 89 (i).

INLAND REVENUE: Presented (Mr. *Bernier*) 89 (i).

INTERIOR: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 89 (i).

JUSTICE: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 90 (i).

LIBRARY OF PARLT.: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 6 (i).

MARINE: Presented (Mr. *Prefontaine*) 244 (i).

MILITIA: Presented (Sir *Frederick Borden*) 283 (i).

NORTH WEST MOUNTED POLICE: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 92 (i).

PENITENTIARIES: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 90 (i).

POSTMASTER GENERAL'S: Presented (Sir *Willtam Mulock*) 89 (i).

PRINTING AND STATIONERY: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1102 (i).

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 89 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland*) 6 (i).

RAILWAYS AND CANALS: Presented (Mr. *Blair*) 92 (i).

SECRETARY OF STATE: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 125 (i).

TRADE AND COMMERCE: Presented (Sir *Richard Cartwright*), 92 (1).

Representation in the House of Commons B. No. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 1° m., 708; 2° m., 1207; ref. to Sel. Com., 1294 (i); rep. of Sel. Com. (presented), 7293 (iii); M. for Com., 10832, 10903; in Com., 10911, 10958, 11087, 11427, 11567, 11692, 12293; 3° m., 12372, 12492, (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 60).

Representation in the House of Commons B. No. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 2° m., 1207, 1265; Amt. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1284; Neg. (Y. 37, N. 72) 1292 (i). Deb. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1207, 1265, 1290; (Mr. *Northrup*) 1219; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick* 1230; (Mr. *Barker*) 1241: (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1250; (Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*) 1257; (Mr. *Haggart*) 1259; (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 1269; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1282, (amt). 1284 (i). 3° m., 12372; Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) 12404; Neg. (Y. 28; N. 65, 12431; Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) 12432; (ruling) Mr. *Speaker*, 12432, 12435; Amt. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 12454; Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 12459; Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 12476; Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12481; Amt. (Mr. *Clancy*) 12486; Amt. (Mr. *Lennox*) 12488; Amt. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 12492 (v).

REPRESENTATION—*Con.*

In Com.,

BRANDON, 11032 (v).

BRANT, 11087 (v).

B. C., 11034 (v).

CAPE BRETON AND VICTORIA, 11028 (v).

CHAMPLAIN, 11035 (v).

DAUPHIN, 11748 (v).

ELGIN, 11517 (v).

FRONTENAC, 11114 (v).

GREY, 11525. 12293 (v).

HASTINGS, 11542, 12294 (v).

HURON, 11003 (v).

KENT, 11004 (v).

KING'S, P.E.I., 11030 (v).

LAMBTON, 11009, 11584 (v).

LEEDS, 11479 (v).

LENNOX AND ADDINGTON, 11114 (v).

LISGAR, 11033 (v).

MACDONALD, 11033, 11781 (v).

MANITOBA, 11032 (v).

MIDDLESEX, 11585 (v).

MUSKOKA, 11114 (v).

NEW-BRUNSWICK, 11809 (v).

NIPISSING, 11156 (v).

NORFOLK, 11114, 11117, 11427; Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 11427 (v).

NORTHUMBERLAND, 11010, 11584 (v).

NOVA SCOTIA, 11793, (v).

PETERBOROUGH, 11013, 11624 (v).

PERTH, 11013, 11623 (v).

PICTOU, N.S., 11028 (v).

PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE, 11781 (v).

QUEBEC, 11034, 11792 (v).

ST. JOHN AND IBERVILLE, 11034 (v).

SOURIS, 11034 (v).

TORONTO, 11693 (v).

VICTORIA AND HALIBURTON, 11497 (v).

WATERLOO, 11641, 12294 (v).

WELLINGTON, 11027 (v).

WINNIPEG, 11784 (v).

YORK, 11665 (v).

REPRESENTATION BILL, RESOLUTIONS, (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) moved in Sel. Com., 11441 (v).

——EVIDENCE *re* COMMITTEE: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 11423 (v).

——REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. *Hyman*) 7293 (iii).

——STMNT. OF HON. MR. PUGSLEY *re* N. B.: Read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 941 (i).

REPRESENTATION OF P.E.I. AND N.B. IN H. OF C., LAW OFFICERS' OPINION: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 5316 (iii).

See 'Redistribution.'

RESTAURANTS, STATIONS, I.C.R., FIRE PROTECTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 14663 (vi).

RESTIGOUCHE BRIDGE, SUPERSTRUCTURE: in Com. of Sup., 8303 (iv).

Restigouche Boom and Log Co.'s B. No. 116 (Mr. *Logan*) 1° *, 1575; 2° *, 1816 (i).

Retiring Allowances of Judges Bill: *See* 'Judges.'

RETS. INQUIRIES FOR: (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 5413 (iii)

See general headings.

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE FOR 1903, AMOUNTS COLLECTED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 12715, 1337 (vi).

Revised Statutes of Canada B. No. 265 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 13667 ; 2° *, and in Com., 14297 ; 3° *, 14299 (vi), (*3 Edward VII c. 61*).

REVISION OF DOM. STATUTES, PAYMENTS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 14643 (vi).

RHODES, CURRY & CO., CONTRACT FOR ROLLING STOCK, I.C.R. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14100 (vi).

RICHELIEU RIVER INUNDATIONS, &c., PET. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 10496 (v).

RICHIBUCTO HARBOUR, N.B., PIER : in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).

—— —NORTH PIER EXTENSION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).

———POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 412 (i).

Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 115 (Mr. *Tobin*), 1°*, 1575 ; 2°*, 1816 ; in Com. and 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 183).

RICHMOND AND NORTHAM STATION, P.E.I. : Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).

RICHMOND BAY, P.E. I., WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).

RICHMOND, QUE., RIVER ST. FRANCIS ICE PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 2282 (i).

RIDEAU CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 7808 (iv).

———CONCESSION STREET BRIDGE, OTTAWA : in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).

——— EMPLOYEES, DELAY IN PAYMENT : Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*), 13302 (vi).

——— SWING BRIDGE AT HOG'S BACK : in Com. of Sup.,, 12904 (vi).

RIDEAU HALL AND GROUNDS, REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5006 (ii), 13087 (vi).

——— DRAINAGE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 647 (i).

——— LIGHTING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1005 (i)

——— MAINTENANCE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 993 (i).

RIFLE ASSOCIATIONS, GRANTS TO : in Com. of Sup., 3767 (ii).

RIMOUSKI, EXTENSION PIER AND TIDAL BASIN : in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

RITCHIE, MR., U.S. IMMIGRATION AGENT : in Com. of Sup., 6848 (iii).

RIVERS, ROBERT, DISMISSAL FROM MISCOU LIGHTHOUSE : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3631 (ii).

RIVER ST. LAWRENCE, WOLFE ISLAND CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i), 13252 (vi).

RIVER VERTE, IMPROVEMENTS, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).

RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, ENGINE HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 8314 (iv), 12593 (v).

——— FREIGHT YARD : in Com. of Sup., 8309 (iv).

——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13476 (vi).

——— I.C.R. SHOPS, CONSTRUCTION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 12497 (v).

——— WHARF IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 2281 (i).

RIVIÈRE DU NORD, CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).

——— FISH LADDERS, &c. : M. for copies of Reps.* (Mr. *Ethier*) 2778 (ii).

RIVIERE OUELLE, BRANCH LINE, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 7526 (iii), 12599 (v).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 541 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10490 (v).

See 'Ouelle River.'

RIVIÈRE AUX PUCES, REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).

RIVIÈRE AUX RENARDS, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 2279 (i).

ROACH, MR., CENSUS ENUMERATOR FOR N. ONTARIO : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7083 (iii).

ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).

——— CONSTRUCTION, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iii), 13323 (vi).

——— RECONSTRUCTION, &c., in Com. of Sup. 2690 (ii).

——— YUKON : in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

See ' Pub. Works,' &c.

ROBIN, COLLAS CO., LANDING PIER AT PASPEBIAC : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13464 (vi).

ROBERTSON, GEO., and CATTLE GUARD COMMISSION : Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 874 (i).

See ' Cattle Guards Commission '.

ROBERT VS. KING, CLAIMS *re* FLOODING ON LAKE ST. LOUIS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13473 (vi).

ROBERVAL TO JAMES BAY RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

ROBINSON INDIAN TREATY, PAYMENTS TO INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).

ROBSON, MICHAEL, RESIGNATION AS POSTMASTER AT AYR : Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1195 (i).

Rocky Mountains Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. No. 197 (Mr. *Costigan*), 1°*, 4262 ; 2°* 4404 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5560 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 184).

ROLLING STOCK, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 8292 (iv), 14100 (vi).

RONAN, MR., AND OTTAWA SUPPLY CO. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).

RONDEAU HARBOUR, PIER IMPROVEMENT, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i).

ROOMS FOR MEMBERS, FURNITURE, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 5265 (iii).

See ' H. of C. '

ROSEAU RIVER RESERVE, SALE OF LOTS : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5319 (iii).

ROSEDALE WHARF, TRENT CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).

ROSSLAND, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).

——— PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

ROSS RIFLE FACTORY, ESTABLISHMENT AT QUEBEC ; M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 109 (i).

——— IMPERFECT RETURN : Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2109 (i).

ROSS RIFLE, EXAMINATION BY EXPERTS : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2758 (ii).

——— MANUFACTURE OF : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).

ROUNDHOUSE, I.C.R., GATES, &c. AT SUSSEX, N.B. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 4672 (ii).
See 'I.C.R,' 'Sussex,' &c.
ROYAL ASSENT : *See* 'Bills.'
ROYAL CANADIAN FIELD ARTILLERY, KINGSTON : Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com. of Sup., 13128 (vi).
See 'Kingston.'
ROYAL CANADIAN REGIMENT, NUMERICAL STRENGTH, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 3801 (ii).
ROYAL COMMISSION *re* INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 6984 (iii).
See 'Labour.'
ROY, GEO., INSPECTOR OF HIDES, QUEBEC : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3627 (ii).
ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE : in Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii).
——— DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 13094 (vi).
See 'Kingston.'
ROYAL MINT, OTTAWA : in Com. of Sup., 344 (i).
See 'Mint.'
Royal Trust Company's B. No. 103 (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1°*, 1295 ; 2°*, 1512 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 185).
RULES OF HSE., REVISION, &c. *re* PETS. FOR PRIVATE BILLS : M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Demers*) 4441 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) to amend, 12216 (v).
See 'Private Bills.'
RURAL MAIL DELIVERY, FREE ESTABLISHMENT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*), 285 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*). 13259 (vi).
RURAL MAIL DELIVERY, P.E.I., PAR. IN CHARLOTTETOWN "PATRIOT" : Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*), 13806 (vi).
RURAL MAIL DELIVERY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 506 (i), 6137 (iii) ; Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*), 511 (i).
RUSSELL ELECTORAL DIVISION : Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*), 1023 (i).
RUTHERFORD, DR., DUTIES IN ENGLAND : in Com. of Sup., 5509 (iii).
ST. AGNES TELEGRAPH LINES : in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vi).
ST ALEXIS BAIE DES HA HA, PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2289 (i).
ST. ALPHONSE HA HA BAY, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
ST. ANDRÈ DE KAMOURASKA PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i), 13492 (vi).
ST. ANDREWS' LOCKS, MAN., CONTRACT, COMPLETION, &c. ; Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*), 287 (i).
ST. ANDREWS' RAPIDS, RED RIVER : in Com. of Sup., 3354 (ii).
——— IMPROVEMENTS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*), 10490 (v).
——— REPORT *re* CONSTRUCTION : Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*), 14284 (vi).
ST. ANDREWS, N.B., WHARF, REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 5894 (iii).
STE. ANNE DE LA PERADE, PROTECTION WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE, PIER RECONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
STE. ANNE DE SAGUENAY, TEL. LAND LINE : in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vi).
——— WHARF IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
STE ANNE DE SOREL, ICE PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
See 'Sorel.'
ST. ANN'S, N.S., NORTH GUT, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
——NORTH RIVER WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
STE. ANNE TO LAC CLAIR, TEL. SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).
ST. BONIFACE, MONEY ORDER BRANCH, CLOSING : Ques. (Mr. *LaRiviere*) 5321 (iii).
———POSTAL FACILITIES : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1858 (i).
ST. CATHARINES DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 13106 (vi).
ST. CATHERINE'S BAY AND TADOUSAC SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13695 (vi).
St. Chrysostome Railway Co.'s B. No. 158, (Mr. *Brown*) 1°*, 2582 ; 2°*, 2956 (ii) ; ref. back to Sel. Com., 7369 (iii) ; in Com., 7771 ; 3*, 7772 (iv). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 186).
ST. CYRIL STATION IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).
ST. DENIS WHARF AND MURRAY BAY, FERRY SERVICE Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10496 (v).
ST. EUSTACHE TO ST. PLACIDE RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).
STE. FAMILLE, PIER EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
STE. FIDÈLE, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13493 (vi).
STE. FLAVIE, STATION ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 12602 (v).
ST. FRANCIS LAKE, TO COMPLETE DAM : in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
ST. FRANCIS RIVER, ICE PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 2282 (i).
ST. FRANCIS RIVER (YAMASKA) RY. BRIDGE SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).
ST. FRANCOIS PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).
ST. FULGENCE, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
ST. GÉDÉON ISLANDS, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
ST. GODEFROI DE NOUVELLE, BREAKWATER : in Com. 13489 (vi).
ST. HYACINTHE, DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 13067 (vi).
———POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
ST. IRENE WHARF, HEADBLOCK : in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i).
ST. JAMES ELECTORAL DIVISION, ISSUE OF WRIT, &c. Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 13376 (vi).
——— M. (Mr. *Monk*) 707, 940 (i).
———Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13303 (vi).

St. James Electoral Division, Judgment of Sup. Court : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

——Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 1023 (i).

——Vacancy : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 409 (i), 6995 (iii).

St. Jean des Chaillons, Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 13494 (vi).

St. Jerome, Lake St. John Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i), 5909 (iii).

St. John, N.B., and Belfast SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7731 (iv).

——and Digby SS Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7739 (iv).

——and Glasgow SS Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7730 (iv), 13673 (vi).

——and Halifax SS Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7742 (iv).

——and London SS Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).

See ' Allan,' &c., ' Atlantic Fast SS Service,' &c.

——and W. Indies SS Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7740 (iv).

See ' Trade and Commerce.'

St. John, N.B., Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 13042 (vi).

——Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 1181, 1183 (i).

See ' I.C.R.' &c.

——Immigration Building : in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13040 (vi).

——Increased Accommodation, I.C.R. in Com. of Sup., 8315 (iv), 12596 (v), 12823, 14063 (vi).

——Quarantine Station : in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).

——Water and Drainage Service : in Com. of Sup., 414, 486 (i).

See ' N.B.', &c.

St. John River and St. Mary's River Indians, Pet. *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iii).

St. John River and Tributaries, Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 5895 (iii).

St. John River Tributaries : in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).

St. John River Wharfs, Tidal Waters : in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).

St. John's, Que., Customs Building : in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).

——Drill Hall, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*), 12496 (v).

—— Examining Warehouse : in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).

St. John Valley and River du Loup Ry. Co.'s Subsidy : in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).

St. John Valley Ry. Co. and C.P.R. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14322 (vi).

St. Joseph Transportation Co.'s B. No. 151 (Mr. *Calvert*) 1°* 2396 (i); 2°*, 2720 (ii).

St. Joseph's Wharf, Lake Huron : in Com. of Sup., 3382 (ii).

St. Laurent Wharf, Isle of Orleans : in Com. of Sup., 5906 (iii).

See ' Island of Orleans,' &c.

St. Lawrence, Cable and Tel. Lines : in Com. of Sup., 2989 (ii).

—— Equipment for Transportation Facilities : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), in Com. of Sup., 12845-7 (vi).

—— and Fast Atlantic Service : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7584 (iv).

——Gulf Fishing, Pet. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*), 2917 (ii).

——Islands Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).

——Lighthouses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi).

—— and Lloyds, Cor. *re* : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13698 (vi).

—— Lower Removal of Rocks : in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i).

——Obstruction to Navigation, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).

——Pilots, Retirement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*), 2915 (ii).

See ' Pilots ', &c. ' Shipping Casulties B.'

——Rep. *re* Navigation, Obstructions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Clarke*), 4133 (ii).

—— Route : in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).

—— Shipping Interests, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Monk*) 5758 (iii).

—— Ship Channel : in Com. of Sup., 3218 (ii).

—— Ship Channel, Dredging, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3304 (ii).

—— Telegraph Lines : in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii), 13332 (vi).

—— Wireless Telegraphy *re* : *See* ' Marconi '.

St. Louis, Elmsdale, Coleman and Conway Station Agents, P.E.I. Ry., Salaries, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4361 (ii).

St. Louis Exhibition, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4599 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3001 (ii).

—— Live Stock Exhibit : in Com. of Sup. 4602 (ii).

—— Live Stock Exhibit, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 4837 (ii).

St. Louis Lake, Hydrographic Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).

St. Louis de Mile End, Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).

St. Louis River Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 13473 (vi).

St. Mary's Current Wharf, Contract with Poupore & Malone : M. for copy of Contract* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).

See ' Montreal ', &c.

St. Mary's, Ont., Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 13109 (vi).

St. Mary's River Railway Co.'s B. No. 139 (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 2236 (i); 2°*, 2544 (ii); in Com., 4588; 3°*, 4591 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 187).

St. Mary's River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).
St. Maurice River, Dam: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
——— Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 2286 (i), 5904 (iii).
——— Dredging Eastern Channel: in Com. of Sup., 13469 (vi).
———Slides, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii).
St. Michel de Bellechasse, Pier: in Com. of Sup., 13494 (vi).
St. Nicholas Pier, Rebuilding, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5905 (iii).
St. Ours Canal, Landing Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
———Stop Logs: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
St. Patrick's Day, Public Holiday: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1858 (i).
St. Peters to Louisbourg Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).
St. Philippe d'Argenteuil to Brownsburg, Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14457 (vi).
St. Pierre Pointe, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
St. Regis Lockup: in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iii).
See 'Indians'.
St. Simeon, Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 13493 (vi).
St. Stephen and Back Bay Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 7759 (iv).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 3534 (ii).
———Acting Warden, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 10831 (v).
———Hospital Management, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 13669 (vi).
———Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14284 (vi).
———Warden's Resignation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 286 (i).
Sabrevois, Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13485 (vi).
Sacré-Cœur, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13478 (vi).
Saddles and Bridles for last S.A. Contingent, Contract, &c.: (Mr. *Monk*) 1675 (i).
Safety of Ships Act Amt. B. No. 179 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) 1° m., 3298 (ii); 2° *, and in Com., 6918; 3° *, 6921 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 63).
Saguenay Pilots: *See* 'Pilotage' and 'Shipping Casualties Bills'.
Saguenay River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 13472 (vi).
Sale of Tickets, P.E.I. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).
See 'P.E.I.' &c.
Salmon Canning Industry in B. C.: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v)
——— Commissioners, B.C.: (Mr. *Préfontaine*) for Rep., 7109 (iii)
——— Hatcheries, B.C., Increased Capacity: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 12073 (v).
Salmon Industry, Fraser River, B.C., Tels. from Canners Association, &c.: Read (Mr. *Earle*) 9968 (iv).
See 'B.C.' &c.
———Salmon shipped to France from B.C., Tariff *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).
Sand, Indian Boy adopted by Mr. Johnston: in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iii)
Sandy Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
San José Scale: Remarks in Com. of Sup, 4434 (ii)
Sarnia, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13117 (vi)
Saskatchewan Election, Proclamation in Prince Albert 'Advocate': in Com. of Sup., 14268 (vi).
Saskatchewan Land Co., Sections acquired, &c.: M. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) for Cor., 2338 (i).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*). 4863 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lennox*) 7108 (iii).
——— Sales, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2502 (ii).
——— Sections, &c.: (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 2306 (i).
——— Surveys of reserved Lands: in Com. of Sup., 6939 (iii).
Saturday Sittings of House: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13264 (vi).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 113 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., 3225; 3°*, 3225 (ii). (*3 Edward VII*, c. 88.)
Sault Ste. Marie, Canal, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iii), 12904 (vi).
——— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup. 13252 (vi).
——— Labour Disturbances, Par. in Newspaper (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 12610 (vi).
——— Par. in Montreal 'Star' *re* Militia: (Sir *F. W. Borden, Kings*) 12939 (vi).
———Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13107 (vi).
Saunders, Dr. C. E., Appnmt. at Experimental Farm: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*), 1676 (i).
Savard, Mr. P. V., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*), 6895 (iii).
Schedules *re* Census of 1891: in Com. of Sup., 705. (iii).
See 'Census.'
Schell, J. T., M. P., Goods supplied Govt.: Ques. (Mr *Fowler*), 4959 (ii).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Schell*), 5416 (iii).
——— 1st Rep. of Sel. Com.: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*), 5511 (iii).
See 'Privileges', &c.
Schooley, William Francis, Relief B. No. 128 (Mr. *Boyd*), 1°*, 2100; 2°m., 2305 (i); in Com., 3223; 3°*, 3224 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 189).

SCHOOLEY, WM. FRANCIS, RELIEF B. No. 128 (Mr. *Boyd*), in Com., 3223; M. to ret. Evidence to Senate, 3224 (ii).

SCHOOLS, B. C., INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iii) 13786 (vi).

——— MAN. AND N.W.T., SALES, AMT. PAID, &c.: M for Ret. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*), 706 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 6893 (iii).

——— PAYMENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*), 6169 (iii).

——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
See 'Indians'.

SCHOOLS OF NAVIGATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Préfontaine*), in Com. of Sup., 13535, 13545 (vi).
See 'Naval Reserve'.

SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS AND HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).

SCOTCH HILL STATION, I.C.R., Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*), 872 (i).

SCOTCH IRON MOULDERS AND TORONTO CAN. FOUNDRY CO.'S STRIKE: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*), in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iii).
See 'Can. Foundry'.

SCOTTISH DEMONSTRATION AT GLENGARRY, TEL. TO LORD DUNDONALD: Remarks (Mr. *Schell*), 10536 (v). *See* 'Dundonald'.

'SCOTIA' STR., SALVAGE SERVICES BY ANCHOR LINE, CONPENSATION: in Com. of Sup., 14107 (vi).

——— Remarks on M. for Sup., (Mr. *Osler*), 7150 (iii).

——— Stmnt. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), 7266 (iii).

SCOTT'S BAY, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).

SECORD, DR., MEDICAL ATTENDANT ON INDIAN RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
See 'Indians.'

SECRETARY OF STATE.

'ADVOCATE' PRINCE ALBERT, PAYMENTS FOR PRINTING *re* ELECTIONS PROCLAMATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 14268, 14652 (vi).

ALIEN LABOUR ACT, PROSECUTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3971 (ii).

CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINERS LIST: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 479 (i).

——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 125 (i).

——— DEPTL. SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 222 (i), 14254 (vi).

ELECTIONS IN SASKATCHEWAN, PAYMENT TO PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE': in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).
See 'Advocate,'

ELECTORAL LISTS, N.S., PRINTING, &c., CHANGES MADE: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 8331 (iv).

ELECTORAL LISTS, PRINTING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 288 (i).

ELECTION PROCLAMATIONS PRINTING:
See 'Saskatchewan Election.'

NATURALIZATION ACT, EXPENDITURE *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6952 (iii)

——— REGULATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Larivière* 2015 (i).

——— RETURNS, N. W. T.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 3804 (ii).

SECRETARY OF STATE—*Con.*

PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE,' PROCLAMATION *re* SASKATCHEWAN ELECTION: in Com., of Sup., 14268 (vi).
See 'Advocate.'

PRINTING AND STATIONERY, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1102 (i).

PRINTING BUREAU, COMPOSITORS AND TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4182, 4444 (ii).

——— INDEBTEDNESS OF MEMBERS, &c.: Ques (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 4180 (ii).

——— PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 12587 (v).

——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 223 (i).

PRINTING BUREAU AND UNION LABELS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Brock*) 4179 (ii).

SEED GRAIN, RELIEF TO INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 6417, 6420 (iii).

SEED INSPECTION BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 5845 (iii).

Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. No. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) 1° m., 4442; in Com. on Res., 5084 (ii); 2° & in Com., 6463, 7210 (iii); wthdn, 12493 (v).

SELKIRK WHARF MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i.)

SEMAPHORE LIGHTS, P.E.I. RY., DISCONTINUANCE OF, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4443 (ii).

Senate Representation of N.W.T.:
See 'N.W.T.'

SENATE REPRESENTATION IN MAN. AND N.W.T., LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*), 1297 (i).

SENATE, SALARIES, CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup. 5264 (iii).

SESSIONAL CLERKS, H. OF C.: in Com. of Sup. 14242 (vi).

——— INCREASES TO, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) in Com. of Sup., 14113 (vi).

SESSIONAL MESSENGERS: in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).

SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE, DATE OF MEETING: M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 462 (i), 14853 (vi).

SETTLERS' CLAIMS *re* REBELLION, 1885: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).

SETTLERS EFFECTS *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6727 (iii).

SEVEN ISLANDS PULP & LUMBER CO., WHARF *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13480 (vi).

SEVEN ISLANDS, QUEBEC AND MURRAY BAY RY. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14456 (vi).

SEVEN ISLANDS, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13479 (vi).

SHEDIAC AND COAST RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 14325 (vi).

SHEGAWAKE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13479 (vi).

SHEPHERD, B., FISHERY INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 5127 (ii).
See 'Fisheries.'

SHERBROOKE DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13079 (vi).

SHERIFFS, CLERKS, &c., YUKON, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 3410 (ii).

———FEES, YUKON, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3507 (ii).

———LIVING ALLOWANCES: in Com. of Sup., 3414 (ii).
See 'Yukon.'

SHIELDS, MR. C., LETTER *re* GLACE BAY WHARF: Read (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 13186 (vi).
See 'Glace Bay,' &c.

SHIPPEGAN HARBOUR, PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1183 (i).

SHIPPERS OF FROZEN FISH CLAIMS, AGAINST GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*), 13373 (vi).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.

Shipping Casualties Act 1901, Amt. B. No. 263 (Mr. *Préfontaine*), in Com. on Res., 12801; 1°* of B., 12805; 2°, and in Com., 12994; 3° m., 13560 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 64.)

Shipping Federation of Canada Incorp. B. No. 93 (Mr. *Bickerdike*), 1°*, 1193; 2° m., 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2956 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 190.)

Ships Safety:
See 'Safety of Ships.'

SHIVES, MR., PRIVATE WHARF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1166 (i).

SHOEMAKERS FEDERATED UNION, RES. *re* SLATER SHOE CO.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), 14666 (vi).

SHORT BEACH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).

SHUTT'S REPORT *re* SOFT PORK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4556 (ii).

SIDINGS ALONG LINE OF I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 14055 (vi).

——AND INCREASED FACILITIES FOR I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 14081, 14107 (vi).
See I.C.R.

SIGNAL MARINE SERVICE, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).
See 'Marine.'

SILLS, E. H., PAYMENT *re* STORAGE OF FISH NETS: in Com. of Sup., 5128 (ii).

SIMCOE COUNTY CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4825 (ii).

SIMCOE LAKE, FLOODING OF LANDS IN MARA, &C.: M. (Mr. *Grant*), for Reps., 2762 (ii).

SINCLAIR, MR. D., DISMISSAL AS FOREMAN OF COLUMBIA RIVER WORKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).

'SIR WILFRID LAURIER' DREDGE, SINKING IN LAKE ONTARIO: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson Grey*), 5587 (iii).

SISAL USED IN BINDER TWINE, AVERAGE PRICE: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 8085 (iv).
See 'Binder Twine,' &c.

SITTINGS OF HSE.:
See 'Sessions.'

SKINNER'S COVE N. S., PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).

SKINNER'S POND, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13308 (vi).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).

SLATER SHOE CO. AND ALIEN LABOUR, RES. OF SHOEMAKERS UNION: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 14666 (vi).

SLIDES AND BOOMS, GENERAL REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).

—— IMPROVEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii).

—— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2974 (ii).

SMALL-POX OUTBREAK ON BRANT INDIAN RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).

——N.W.TER. RESERVES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6350 (iii).

—— PATIENTS, EXPENSES INCURRED BY GLOUCESTER COUNTY, N.B.: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 14688 (vi).

—— QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5007, (ii), 5491 (iii).

SMITH, F. H., P. O. DEPT., SALARY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14000 (vi).

SMITH, WM., LATE M.P., AND POLITICAL CORRUPTION: Remarks (Mr. *Cowan*) 894 (i).

SNAG BOAT, SELF-PROPELLING, MAN.: in Com. Sup., 2672 (ii).

SNOWSTORMS IN N. W. TER., REPORTS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 11822 (v).

SONGHEES INDIANS, REMOVAL TO RESERVE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7258 (iii).

SOREL, DEEP WATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i), 3374 (ii), 5921 (iii), 12845 (vi).

—— COR. *re*: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Pope*) 2302 (i).

SOULANGES CANAL, COMPENSATION TO GEO. GOODWIN: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).

—— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iii).

—— CONTRACTOR STEWART'S CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vi).

—— O'LEARYS' CLAIMS, PAYMENT OF: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).

—— REPAIRING BREACH IN BANK: in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).

SOURIS KNIGHT'S POINT BREAKWATER, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).

S. AFRICA AND CAN. SS SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 7746 (iv).
See 'Can. and S. Africa,' &c.

S. A. COLONIES, AND PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, RES. OF WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 1678 (i).

S. A. CONTINGENTS AND GOVT. EMPLOYEES, REINSTATED, &C: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1026 (i).

——M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2337 (i).

—— PENSIONS TO BY DOM. GOVT: Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 14590 (vi).

—— SADDLES AND BRIDGES, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1675 (i).

S. A. CONSTABULARY, &C., INFORMATION *re* GRIEVANCES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 1027 (i).

——PURCHASE OF DISCHARGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 14287 (vi).

——MEDALS PBESENTED BY KING, PET. *re* FROM NON-COM. OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 10491 (v).

——REGULATIONS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*), on M. for Sup., 8264 (iv).

——Remarks (*Sir Frederick Borden*) 8319 (iv).

——MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION GRANT: in Com. of Sup., 6992 (iii).

——PENSIONS FROM IMP. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2920 (ii).

——SUPPLIES PURCHASED BY IMP. GOVT.: M. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) for Copies of O.Cs. &c., 2760 (ii).

SOUTHAMPTON HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1428 (i).
SOUTHEASTERN VALLEY AND UNITED COUNTIES RY., SAFETY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Tarte*) 451 (i).
Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 152 (Mr. *Riley*) 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 7770 (iv). (*3 Edward VII.*, c. 191).
SOUTH INGONISH, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SOUTHPORT AND MURRAY HARBOUR RY., TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2584 (ii).
SOUTH SHORE RY., WORKING, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Tarte*) 448 (i).
——COMPLAINT *re* SAFETY: Remarks (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 205 (i).
SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: M. (*Sir Wilfrid Laurier*) 5 (i).
——Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 4 (i).
SPEECH OF GOV. GEN.: *See* Gov. Gen.'s Speech.
SPEECH FROM THRONE: Prorogation, 14861 (vi).
SPRINGHILL, N. S., ARMOURIES, CARETAKER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1856 (i).
——BOILER EXPLOSION IN DOM. BUILDING: Remarks (Mr. *Logan*) 13257 (vi).
——PUBLIC BUILDING, REPAIRING: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
SPRY BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
SQUATTERS CLAIMS ON DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 6925 (iii).
STAFFORD & CO.'S RENTAL OF DOCK BUILDINGS, MIDLAND: in Com. of Sup., 13247 (vi).
See 'Midland', &c.
STAMPING LETTERS BY MINISTERS, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6936 (iii).
Standard Car Truck Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 105 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512; in Com., and 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 192.)
STANDARD CHEMICAL CO., LONGFORD: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5363, 5373 (iii).
—— CONTRACT: Read (Mr. *Bernier*) 5375 (iii).
—— PURCHASE OF WOOD ALCOHOL; in Com. of Sup., 227 (i).
See 'Inland Revenue', &c.
"STANLEY", STR., AND P.E.I. WINTER COMMUNICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4006 (ii).
—— MR. MACMILLAN'S REP. *re* REPAIRS: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 4050 (ii).
See 'Govt. Steamers'.
STATION AGENTS, P.E.I. RY., SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4361 (ii).
See 'P.E.I.', &c.
STATUTES, B.C., DISALLOWANCE: M. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) to print, 2675 (ii).
See 'B.C.', &c.
Statutes Publication, Act Amt. B.No. 11 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 94; 2°*, 634; in Com., 634; 3°*, 635 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 65).
STATUTES, REVISION COMMISSION, NAMES, PROGRESS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1029 (i).
Statutes Revision: *See* 'Revised Statutes'.
Steamboat Inspection Act (Marine Engineers) Amt. B. No. 136 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 2100 (i); 2° m., 3288 (ii).
—— **(Regulation of Naptha Yachts, &c., Fees, &c.) Amt. B. No. 225** (Mr. *Préfontaine*) Res. prop., 6270; in Com. on Res., 6541; 1°* of B., 6543; 2°, and in Com., 6915; 3°*, 6917 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 66.)
—— **(Coal Oil as Fuel) Amt. B. No. 237** (Mr. *Prefontaine*) 1° m., 12494 (v); 2°, and in Com., 12777; 3°*, 12779 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 67.)
STEAMBOAT INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 4119 (ii).
—— TORONTO DISTRICT: in Com. Sup., 13648 (vi).
STEAM LAUNCH FOR INDIAN AGENT, B.C.: in Com. o Sup., 13787 (vi).
Steel and Iron Bounties Act Amt. B. No. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*), Res. prop., 6629 (iii); in Com. on prop. Res., 7923; 1°*, of B., 7988 (iv); 2°*, and in Com., 10799; 3°*, 10802 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 68).
Steel, James Reid, Relief B. No. 195 (Mr. *McCreary*), 1°*, 4178; 2°*, 4404; in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 193).
STEEL RAILS AND FASTENINGS, CONTRACT WITH CLERGUE SYNDICATE: in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Ross, Ont.*), 13668 (vi).
See 'Clergue'.
STEEL RAILS, CONTRACT, PRICES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 285 (i).
—— FASTENINGS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5005 (ii).
—— I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5005 (ii).
—— P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 7802 (iv).
STEEL SHELVING, &c., OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13087 (vi).
STEEL SHIPBUILDING, BOUNTY TO AID: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
STELLARTON, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 8296 (iv).
Sterling Bank of Canada Incorp, B. No. 100 (Mr. *Calvert*), 1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512; in Com., and 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 194).
STEWART, MR., APPNMT. as SUPT. OF CANALS: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*), in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
—— INSPECTOR OF MURRAY CANAL: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*), in Com. of Sup., 14146 (vi).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Schell*), 14599 (vi).
STEWART VS. KING, LEGAL EXPENSES, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12912 (vi).
STEWART, E., FOREST INSPECTOR, TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6416, 6774 (iii).
Stewart River Development Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 160 (Mr. *Davis*), 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 7487 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 195).
STOCK EXCHANGE SPECULATIONS: Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7005 (iii).

Debate: (Mr. *Osler*) 7024; (Mr. *Fielding*) 7025; (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) 7027; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7029; (Mr. *Lemieux*) 7032, 7045; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 7034, 7047; (Mr. *Monet*) 7035, 7043; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 7035; (Mr. *Monk*) 7036; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 7038; (Mr. *Holmes*) 7038; (Mr. *Henderson*) 7040; (Mr. *Maclean*) 7042; (Mr. *Sproule*) 7046; (Mr. *Speaker*) members remarks checked, 7044; (Mr. *Tarte*) 7051; (Mr. *Ingram*) 7052 (iii).

STRATFORD ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13125 (vi).

STRATHCONA HORSE BARRACKS: in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).

STRATHROY AND WESTERN COUNTIES RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 14314 (vi).

STUART, CAPT. D.C., HALIFAX, DISMISSAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4353 (ii).

STURGEON FALLS, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1431 (i).

SUBMARINE CABLE, ISLE OF ORLEANS: M. (Mr. *Talbot*), for Ret., 11301 (v).

———Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*), 11186 (v).

See 'Island of Orleans.'

SUBSIDIES FOR PUBLIC HIGHWAYS, PETS., &C.: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*), 591 (i).

SUBSIDIES, RYS., AGGREGATE VOTE FOR EACH PROV., &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*), in Com. on Res., 14481 (vi).

————BONUSES VOTED BY PARLT., 1900, 1901, 1902: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*), 13934 (vi).

———GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*), 14352 (vi).

———Remarks (Mr *Richardson*), in Com. of Sup., 14345 (vi).

———INTEREST PAYABLE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*), 3970 (ii).

———Inquiry for (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 12805, 13005 (vi).

———Inquiry for (Mr. *Monk*), 10955 (v).

———Inquiry for (Mr. *Sproule*), 11422 (v).

SUBSIDIES FOR MAN.: Remarks (Mr. *McCreary*), in Com. on Res., 14494 (vi).

SUBSIDY FOR N.W.T. GOVT., INCREASE: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).

———FOR N.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Gourley*), in Com. on Res., 14491 (vi).

SUBSIDY FOR P.E.I. RY.: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*), in Com. on Ry. Res., 14472 (vi).

SUBSIDIES (MONEY) PAID BY GOVT. SINCE CONFEDERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*), 1198 (i).

SUBSIDIES PER MILES OF RYS. IN N.W.T. AND MAN.: (Mr. *Scott*) 1677 (i).

SUBSIDIES, TOTAL AMOUNT FOR TEN YEARS; Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*) 13934 (vi).

SUBSIDIES VOTED BY PARLIAMENT, 1901-1903: Ques. (*Mr. Wilson*) 2306 (i), 12842, 13027, 13259, 13370 (vi).

SUBSIDIES, &C.: *See* 'Provincial.'

Subsidies to Railways: *See.*

ATLANTIC, QUEBEC & WESTERN RY. CO.
BAY OF QUINTE RY. CO.
BEERSVILLE COAL & RY. CO.
BRUCE MINES & ALGOMA RY. CO.
CANADA STEEL CO.
C. P. RY., ELKHORN BRANCH,
C. P. RY., EXTENSION TO WINNIPEG BEACH.
CAPE TORMENTINE RY.
CHATEAUGUAY AND NORTHERN RY. CO.
CHATEAUGUAY RY. CO.
CUMBERLAND RY. AND COAL CO.
DAWSON CITY TO STEWART RIVER RY.
DEBERT COAL MINES RY.
DOM. ATLANTIC RY. CO.
EDMONTON, YUKON AND PACIFIC RY. CO.
ELKHORN AND MOOSOMIN RY.
HALIFAX AND SOUTH-WESTERN RY. CO.
HARVEY AND SALISBURY BRANCH RY.
HAWKESBURY, ONT., TO SOUTH INDIAN RY.
'HOT AIR' LINE RY.
INDIAN RIVER RY. AND LAKE MEGANTIC.
INGERSOLL TO STRATFORD RY.
INTERNATIONAL RY. CO. OF N.B.
INTERPROVINCIAL AND JAMES BAY RY. CO.
INVERNESS RY. AND COAL CO.
JAMES BAY RY. CO.
JOGGINS RY.
JOLIETTE AND LAKE MANUAN RY.
JONQUIERES TO HA HA BAY RY.
KETTLE RIVER VALLEY RY. CO.
KLONDIKE MINES RY. CO.
KOOTENAY CENTRAL RY. CO.
LAC BOUCHETTE AND QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.
LAKE ST. JOHN RY. AND LA TUQUE RY. CO.
LAKE SUPERIOR, LONG LAKE AND ALBANY RY. CO. TO PENINSULA HARBOUR.
LAKE TEMISKAMING AND JAMES BAY RY. CO.
LIME RIDGE AND MEGANTIC RY.
MABOU AND GULF RY. CO.
MACKENZIE AND RENOUF FALLS RY.
MANITOULIN AND NORTH SHORE RY. CO.
MATANE AND GASPE RY.
MEDICINE HAT RY.
MIDDLETON AND VICTORIA BEACH RY. CO.
MIDLAND RY. CO., TRURO BRANCH.
MONTFORT AND GATINEAU COLONISATION RY. CO.
MONTREAL AND ATLANTIC RY. CO.
NEPIGON RY. CO.
NICOLA, KAMLOOPS AND SIMILKAMEEN COAL AND RY. CO.
NICOLET RIVER BRIDGE.
NOVA SCOTIA EASTERN RY. CO.
ORFORD MOUNTAIN RY. CO.
OTTAWA, NORTHERN AND WESTERN RY. CO.
PARRSBORO AND SPRINGHILL RY.
PASPEBIAC TO GASPE RY.
QUEBEC CENTRAL RY. CO.
QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.
ROBERVAL TO JAMES BAY RY.
ST. EUSTACHE TO ST. PLACIDE RY.
ST. FRANCIS RIVER (YAMASKA) RY. BRIDGE.
ST. JOHN VALLEY AND RIVER DU LOUP RY. CO.
ST. JOHN VALLEY RY. CO. AND C.P. RY. CO.
ST. MARY'S RIVER RY. CO.
ST. PETERS TO LOUISBURG RY.
ST. PHILIPPE D'ARGENTEUIL TO BROWNSBURG RY.
SEVEN ISLANDS, QUEBEC AND MURRAY BAY RY.
SHEDIAC AND COAST RY. CO.
STRATHROY AND WESTERN COUNTIES RY. CO.
STURGEON FALLS PULP AND LUMBER CO.
TILSONBURG, LAKE ERIE AND PACIFIC RY. CO.
TILSONBURG TO WOODSTOCK RY.
TIMIGAMI RY. CO. TO STURGEON FALLS.
TOBIN CO.'S PULP MILL.
TORONTO AND JAMES BAY RY.
TORONTO, LINDSAY AND PEMBROKE RY.

Subsidies to Railways—*Con.*
TROIS PISTOLES BRIDGE TO MACKENZIE AND RENOUF FALLS RY.
WALKERVILLE BRIDGE CO. RY.
WALTHAM STATION TO FERGUSON POINT RY.
WELLINGTON TO UNION BAY RY.
WINNIPEG BEACH TO ICELANDIC RIVER RY.
WOODSTOCK, N.B. AND FREDERICTON RY.
WOODSTOCK RY.
YAMASKA RIVER AND ST. GUILLAUME RY.
YAMASKA TO LOTBINIERE RY.
YORK AND CARLETON RY CO.
YUKON, EDMONTON AND PACIFIC RY. CO.

SUDBURY COAL, DISCOVERY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6824 (iii).

SUGAR ENTERED FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, TOTAL AMOUNT 1903, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 14285 (vi).

SUGAR IMPORTED INTO CANADA 1902: M. (Mr. *Madore*) for Stmnt. *, 3236 (ii).

SUMMERSIDE, BREAKWATER, P.E.I., COMPLETION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3234 (ii).
—— BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
—— COAL SHEDS: in Com. of Sup., 12828 (vi).
—— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 3367 (ii), 13227 (vi).
—— WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 12828 (vi).

SUMMERVILLE, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).

SUNBURY, N.B., CENSUS *re* RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 4005 (ii).

Superior Court, Quebec: *See* 'Judges of Sup. Court'.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES: Inquiry for (Mr. *Monk*) 10832 (v).
See 'Estimates.'

SUPPLIES FOR RYS. VOTED FOR ONE ESTIMATE, TRANSFERRED TO ANOTHER: Remarks (Mr. *Barker*) in Com. of Sup., 14055, 14081 (vi).

Supply B. No. 206 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 5243 (iii). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 1).
—— **No. 218** (Mr. *Fielding*) Remarks, 6170; 1°*, 2°*, 6170; in Com., 6171; 3°*, 6172 (iii). (*3 Edward VII., c.* 2).
—— **No. 241** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 8404 (iv). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 3).
—— **No. 271** (Mr. *Fielding*) M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 14765; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 14768 (vi). (*3 Edward VII., c.* 4).

SUPPLY BILL, VOTE *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 5995 (iii).
—— Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 6003 (iii).
—— Remarks *re* one-fifth Vote (Mr. *Fielding*) 6408 (iii).

SUPPLY: Conc., 5238 (iii).

SUPPLY:
COMMITTEE:
Administration of Justice: *See* 'Justice.'
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:
Aid to Agricultural Societies, 4432 (ii)
Archives, 4429 (ii), 13503 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics—Con.
Census, 4594, 4635, 4800 (ii), 7053 (iii).
Cold Storage, &c., 4671 (ii), 7610 (iv).
Criminal Statistics, 4429 (ii).
Exhibitions, 4599 (ii).
Experimental Farms, 4548 (ii).
Fumigating Stations, 4434 (ii), 13502 (vi).
General Statistics, 4429 (ii).
Historical Data of Acadians, 13505 (vi).
Imperial Institute, Can. Exhibit, 4435 (ii), 13508 (vi).
Osaka Exhibition, 4626 (ii).
Patents, Classifying Canadian, 4433 (ii).
Toronto Exhibition, Grant, 13501 (vi).
Year Book, 4429 (ii).
Charges of Management, 12584 (v).
Additional Amount for Dom. Notes, 5135 (ii).
Public Debt, Conversion of, Expenses *re*, 14253 (vi).
Civil Government:
Agriculture, 4349 (ii), 14255 (vi).
Auditor General's Office, 224 (i).
Contingencies:
Agriculture, 4349 (ii).
Finance, 226 (i).
Indian Affairs, 13760 (vi).
Marine and Fisheries, 341 (i), 5033 (ii),
Public Works, 5824 (iii).
Trade and Commerce, 7573 (iv).
Customs, 319 (i).
Finance, 224 (i).
Geological Survey, 12592 (v), 13769, 13966 (vi).
Governor General's Secretary's Office, 207 (i).
High Commissioner's Office, 12585 (v), 13772 (vi).
Indian Affairs, 272 (i).
Inland Revenue, 227 (i).
Interior, 267 (i), 13761 (vi).
Mines Branch, 13762 (vi).
Justice, 207 (i), 14255 (vi).
Labour Gazette, 7151 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries, 341 (i), 13663 (vi).
Clement, Jules, &c., 13664 (vi).
Militia and Defence, 221 (i).
North-west Mounted Police, 224 (i), 13760 (vi).
Post Office:
Allowance to J. W. T. Dixon, Winnipeg, 13995 (vi).
Higman, O., Report *re* Pneumatic Tube used in U. S. &c, 13998 (vi).
Junior second-class Clerkships, Salaries, 13995 (vi).
Smith, F. H., Salary Increase, 14000 (vi).
Transfer of Temporaries to Permanent Staff, 13994 (vi).
Privy Council Office, 207 (i).
Public Printing and Stationery, 223 (i).
Public Works, 333, (i).
J. B. Hunter, Salary, 13499 (vi).
Chief Architect's Salary, 13498 (vi).
Railways and Canals, 333 (i), 14055 (vi).
Additional second-class clerkship, 14055, (vi).
Secretary of State, 222 (i).
Additional junior second-class clerkships, 14254 (vi).
Trade and Commerce, 7573 (iv).
Culling Timber:
General Vote, 7798 (iv).
Customs:
Amount required for Yukon, 3968 (ii).
Kilroy, T., Amount *re* Services, 13993 (vi).
Miscellaneous, 3962 (ii).
Preventive Services, 3949 (ii).
Salaries, Contingencies, &c., 3782, 3897, 3949 (ii), 13980 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Dominion Lands—Capital:
Surveys, &c., 6758, 6939 (iii), 13776 (vi)
Dominion Lands—Income:
Commissioners' Salary, 6765 (iii).
Protection of Timber Lands, 6773 (iii).
Salaries, &c., 13772, 13966 (vi).
Travelling Expenses, Contingencies, &c., 6766 (iii).
Tree and Timber Planting, 13775, 14272 (vi).
Dominion Police:
General Vote, 3511 (ii).
Excise:
Adulteration of Food, 5389 (iii).
Further Amount for Electric Light Inspectors, 5407 (iii).
Inspectors of Distilleries, Salaries, &c., 13974 (vi.)
Methylated Spirits, 5373 (iii).
Minor Revenues, 5404 (iii).
Salaries, &c., 5363 (iii), 13967 (vi).
Stamps for Tobacco, 5373 (iii).
To reimburse E. Forrest, 5405 (iii).
To pay J. M. Ferguson, 5412 (iii).
To pay Assistant Inspector Kelly, 5405 (iii).
To compensate A. Guay for Horses, 5406 (iii).
Travelling Expenses, &c., 5373 (iii); Additional amounts, 5404 (iii).
Weights and Measures:
Salaries, 5381 (iii).
Fisheries:
Behring Sea Arbitration, 13568 (vi).
B. C., New Steamer, 5278 (iii).
Building Fishways, &c., 4174 (ii).
Canadian Fishery Exhibit, 4174 (ii), 5308 (iii).
Fish-breeding Establishments, &c., 4174 (ii) 13660 (vi).
Fisheries Intelligence Bureau, 5277 (iii).
Investigation *re* Sardine, Oyster Fisheries, Dog-fish, &c., 13649 (vi).
Licenses to U. S. Fishermen, 5309 (iii).
Protection Services, B.C., 4174 (ii).
Salaries, &c., of Fishery Officers, 5050, 5122 (ii).
Steamers to replace *Acadia* and *Petrel*, 13658 (vi).
Geological Survey:
Compiling of field-notes, &c., 6826 (iii).
General Vote, 6815 (iii).
Geologist to International Boundary Survey, Salary, 6825 (iii).
Metallurgical, Petrographical Assistance, 13778 (vi).
Printing, Engraving, &c., of Maps, 13778 (vi).
Government of North-west Territories:
Further Amount for Assistance in Registry Offices, 6888 (iii).
General Vote, 6946 (iii), 13787 (vi).
Lethbridge, Bridge over Belly River, 13367 (vi).
McLeod, Bridge over Old Man's River, 13367 (vi).
Government of Yukon Territory:
Checking flow of Eldorado Gusher, 6949, 7274 (iii).
General Vote, 6802 (iii), 13367 (vi).
Roads and Bridges, 7283 (iii).
St. Mary's Hospital, Dawson, 7291 (iii).
Immigration:
Agents' Salaries, Can., G. B. and Foreign Countries, 6615 (iii).
Further Amount required, 2299 (i), 6847 (iii).
General Expenses in Can. and G. B., &c., 6658 (iii).
Indians:
British Columbia:
Additional Amount for Salaries, 13785 (vi).
General Vote, 6425 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Indians—Con.
British Columbia—*Con.*
Hazelton Hospital, 13787 (vi).
Industrial Schools, 7254 (iii).
Medical Attendance, 13785 (vi).
Schools, &c., 13786 (vi).
Steam Launch for Agent, 13787 (vi).
Generally:
Indians, Generally, 6425 (iii).
Manitoba and N.W.T.:
Amount for Triennial Clothing, 13783 (vi).
General Expenses, Dr. C. H. West, &c., 13784 (vi).
General Vote, 6350, 6422 (iii).
Implements, Purchase of, 13782 (vi).
Schools, Additional Amount, 13784 (vi).
Surveys, Additional Amount, 13784 (vi).
Maritime Provinces:
Schools, 6409 (iii).
New Brunswick:
Additional Amount for Salaries, 13782 (vi).
To pay Fire Damage at Edmundston, 13782 (vi).
Nova Scotia:
Medical Attendance, &c., 6421 (iii).
Purchase of Lands for Reserves, 13781 (vi).
Relief and Seed Grain, 6417 (iii).
Ontario and Quebec:
Blankets and Clothing, 6409 (iii).
Doncaster Reserve, Squatters' Improvements, 13779 (vi).
General Legal Expenses, 6416 (iii).
Land Management Fund, 6415 (iii).
Lock-up at St. Regis, 6415 (iii).
Medical Attendance, &c., Ontario and Quebec, 6408 (iii).
Medical Attendance, &c., Ontario, 6326, 6409 (iii).
Medical Attendance, &c., Quebec, 6326, 6408 (iii).
Rama Indians, Repairs to Roads, 13781 (vi).
Repairs of Roads, &c., 13779 (vi).
Robinson Treaty Annuities, 6410 (iii).
Salaries of Chiefs, Cape Croker & Gibson, St. Regis, 6410 (iii).
Schools, Ont. and Que., 6409 (iii).
Surveys of Reserves, 6410 (iii).
Yukon:
Education of Indians, 7270(iii).
Relief for Destitute Indians, 7270 (iii).
Inspection of Staples:
Chief Inspectors, &c., 7762 (iv), 13698 (vi).
Inspection of Binder Twine, 7763, 7772 (iv).
Manitoba Grain Act, Expenditure, 7798 (iv).
Insurance:
General Vote, 12586 (v).
Justice, Administration of:
Allowance to ad hoc Judges, 3402 (ii).
Divorce Court, N.B., 3400 (ii).
Exchequer Court, Additional to Registrar, 3407 (ii).
Admiralty, Quebec, Registrar, 3408 (ii).
Accommodation for Court, 3408 (ii).
Contingencies, &c., 3407 (ii).
Junior 2nd class Clerks, 3406 (ii).
Legal Decisions, Report of, 3407 (ii).
Expenditure under R.S.C., c. 181, 3401 (ii).
Miscellaneous, including N.W.T., 3398 (ii), 14257 (vi).
Additional Judge of Superior Court, N.W.T., 14257 (vi).
Prince Albert Court House, &c., 3401 (ii).
Retiring Allowance, Judge Henry, 14662 (vi).
Salary of County Court Judge, District No. 7, N.S., 14259 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Justice, Administration of—Con.

Miscellaneous—*Con.*
Salary of Junior Judge, Nipissing, 14258 (vi)
Travelling Allowances, Judges, B.C., 3399 (ii).
Manitoba, 3399 (ii).

Supreme Court :
Contingencies, &c., 3404 (ii).
Law Books, &c., 3402, 3405 (ii).
Printing and Binding, 3405 (ii).
Reporter's Salary, 3402 (ii).
Salary of E. R. A. Taschereau, 14257 (vi).
To assist L. W. Coutlee, 'Digest of Judgments,' 14256 (vi).

Yukon :
Clerk's Salary, 3410 (ii).
Judges' Travelling Allowances, 3409 (ii).
Law Books, &c., 3506 (ii), 14267 (vi).
Living Allowances, 3411 (ii).
Living Allowances, Generally, 3414 (ii).
Miscellaneous Expenses, 3507 (ii).
Salary of Deputy Sheriff, &c., 3411 (ii).
Stenographers, 3411 (ii).

Legislation :

General :
Printing Paper and Binding, 5267 (iii).
Voters' Lists, 5274 (iii).

House of Commons :
Debates, Amanuenses, 14243 (vi).
Increases to Clerks, 14112 (vi).
Sessional Clerks, 14242 (vi).
Sessional Messengers, 14243 (vi).
Tradesmen and others, 14115 (vi).

Library :
Salaries, 5267 (iii).

Senate :
General Vote, 5264 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service :
Aids to Navigation, 4173 (ii), 5735 (iii), 13633 (vi).
Halifax Harbour, Land Purchase for Buoy Service, 13638 (vi).
Lurcher's Shoal Lightship, 4173 (ii).
Maintenance and Repairs, &c., 13632 (vi).
Montreal Agency, &c., 13632 (vi).
Montreal Pilot Commissioners' Court, 4173 (ii).
Repairs to Wharfs, &c., 4174 (ii).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 4132 (ii).
Telephonic Communication, Atkinson Lighthouse and Vancouver, 13638 (vi).
Wireless Telegraph Stations, Equipment, 13639 (vi).

Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions :
Canada and Australia, 5880 (iii), 13677 (vi).
Canada and G. B., 5997 (iii), 7573, 7728 (iv), 13672 (vi).
Canada and South Africa, 5878 (iii), 7746 (iv).
Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie, 7756 (iv).
Gaspé Basin and Paspebiac, 13694 (vi).
Grand Manan and Mainland, 7742 (iv).
Halifax and Canso, 6002 (iii).
Halifax, Nfld. and Liverpool, 7730 (iv).
Magdalen Islands, 7741 (iv), 13675 (vi).
Manchester and Canada, 7745 (iv).
Petit de Grat and I. C. R. Terminus at Mulgrave, 14249 (vi).
P. E. I. and G. B., 7744 (iv).
P. E. I. and Mainland, 7741 (iv).
P. E. I. and Nfld., 13676 (vi).
St. John and Digby, 7739 (iv).
St. John, Dublin and Belfast, 7731 (iv).
St. John and Glasgow, 7730 (iv), 13673 (vi).
St. John, Halifax and London, 7734 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Mail Subsidies and Steamship Conventions—Con.
St. John, Halifax, W. I. and South America, 7740 (iv).
St. John and Halifax *via* Yarmouth, 7742 (iv).
St. Stephen, Campobello and Back Bay, &c., 7759 (iv), 13695 (vi).
Services of Str. *Lord Strathcona*, 6002 (iii), 13697 (vi).
Sydney to Bay St. Lawrence, &c., 13677 (vi).
Tadousac and St. Catharine's Bay, 13695 (vi).
Victoria and San Francisco, 7741 (iv).
Victoria and West Coast Vancouver Island, 13694 (vi).

Militia :
Annual Drill, 3603, 5005 (ii).
Contingencies, 3778 (ii).
Coronation Contingent, Further Amount, 6950 (iii).
Dominion Arsenal, 7089 (iii).
Esquimalt Defences, 3778 (ii).
General Statement, 13379 (vi).
Grants to Associations, 3767 (ii).
Hamilton, Drill Hall, Additional Land, 6949 (iii).
Military Asylum, Pensions, 6788 (iii).
Military Properties, 3611 (ii).
Pay and Allowances, 3584 (ii), 13379 (vi).
Royal Military College, 3778 (ii).
Salaries and Wages, 3608 (ii).
To pay Lieut. Col. Cole, 6950 (iii).
Transport and Freight, 3752 (ii).
Winnipeg Barracks, Paving Streets, 6949 (iii).

Miscellaneous :
Alaska Boundary Commission, 6931 (iii), 13957 (vi).
Arbitration, Can., Ont. and Que., 12590 (v).
Art Academy, 12589 (v).
Astronomical Observatory, 6791 (iii).
Astronomical Work of Interior Dept., 6790 (iii).
Can. Mining Institute, Publication of Documents, 12591 (v), 13965 (vi).
C.P.R., Transportation of Sir Edmund Barton, 6952 (iii).
Classification of Records, Privy Council Office, 12592 (v).
Engraving, &c., of Maps of Can. and N.W.T., 6800 (iii).
Keewatin Govt. Expenses, 6798 (iii).
Maintenance of Lunatics, 6798 (iii).
Labour Dept., &c., 7197 (iii).
Labour Troubles, B.C., Royal Commission, 6984 (iii).
Litigation, Costs, 6794 (iii).
Maintenance of Assay Office, Vancouver, 6799 (iii), 13965 (vi).
Maintenance of Roads, &c., Banff Park, 6788 (iii).
Bath House, &c., 13955 (vi).
Museum Building, 6927 (iii).
Martineau Defalcations, Expenses of Commission *re*, 6991 (iii).
Middleton, late T. W., *re* Shortage, 6931 (iii).
Naturalization Act, Expenses *re*, 6952 (iii).
N.W.T. Govt., Protection of Bow River Bridge, Canmore, 6925 (iii).
Paris Agency, 12589 (v).
Petersen, Tate & Co., Return of Deposit, 6953 (iii).
P. O. Savings Bank, Defalcation, Compensation *re*, 14274 14655 (vi).
Prince Albert *Advocate*, Payments, 14268, 14652 (vi).
Printing Bureau Plant, 12587 (v).
Rand's Micmac Dictionary, 12592 (v).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Miscellaneous—Con.

St. Lawrence River, Improvements *re* Thousand Islands, 14661 (vi).
South African Memorial Association, Can. Grant, 6992 (iii).
Statutes, Revision, 14643 (vi).
Teulon Road, Man., Construction, 6927 (iii).
To compensate Canadian Bank of Commerce, Yukon, 14274 (vi).
To meet Expenses *re* the King *v.* Bank Note Co., 14279 (vi).
To pay Amos Barnes *re* River Lots, Man., 6922 (iii).
To pay Wm. Perkins for Evidence *re* Lisgar Election, 14251 (vi).
To pay Casca Trading and Transportation Co., 6926 (iii).
Trade Combination *re* Lumber, Expenses *re* Commission, 14654 (vi).
Tuberculosis, Prevention, Grant *re*, 13517 (vi).
Turtle Mountain, Land Slides, Expenses *re*, 13965 (vi).
Unforeseen Expenses, Additional, 6951 (iii), 12588 (v).
Victoria Memorial, London, England, 14655 (vi).
Yoho Park Reserve, Construction of Roads, &c., 6790 (iii).

Mounted Police:

Compensation for Injuries, 5264 (iii).
Pay of Force, 5262 (iii).
Services in Yukon, 5003 (ii), 5262 (iii).

Ocean and River Service:

Cattle Inspection, 4116 (ii).
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance, &c., 4041, 5033 (ii).
Surveys, &c., of Coasts of Northern Canada, 13760 (vi).
Tidal Service, 4114 (ii).
Unforeseen Expenses, 4116 (ii).

Penitentiaries:

General, 3511 (ii).
Kingston, 3511 (ii).
Manitoba, 3534 (ii).
Regina Jail, Additional Land, 5135 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul, 3534 (ii).

Pensions:

To Lady Lafontaine, 14252 (vi).

Post Office:

Mail Service, 6065 (iii).
Outside Service, Salaries, &c., 5924, 6004 (iii), 14010 (vi).
Salaries, &c., 6136 (iii).
Salaries of fourth-class Clerks, &c., Increase, 14002 (vi).
Salaries of P. O. Inspectors, &c., Increase, 14001 (vi).
Temporaries in various cities, Appointment as fourth-class Clerks, 14001 (vi).
To pay Arrears Postmasters' Salaries, 5921 (iii).
To provide for Appointment of Additional Mail Clerks, 14041 (vi).
To provide for Promotions in City Offices, 14009 (vi).
Transfer of Temporaries to Permanent Staff, 13994 (vi).
Vancouver Division, Asst. P. O. Inspector 14000 (vi).
Winnipeg, Additional senior second-class clerkship, 14001 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Public Works—Capital:

Buildings:
Ottawa:
Astronomical Observatory, 342 (i).
Parliament Buildings, Addition, &c., 13006 (vi).
Royal Mint, 344 (i).
Victoria Memorial Museum, 353 (i), 14243 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers:
Kingston Graving Dock, 13023 (vi).
Port Arthur, Dredging, 3341 (ii), 13012 (vi).
Port Colborne, Harbour Improvements, 3368 (ii), 13024 (vi).
Quebec, Harbour Improvements, 3336 (ii).
River Kaministiquia, 5825 (iii).
St. Andrew's Rapids, 3354 (ii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 3218, 3304 (ii).
St. Mary's Current, Montreal Harbour, &c., 3365 (ii).
Telegraph Lines, Quesnel-Atlin, &c., 5826 (iii).
Trails, Roads and Bridges:
Yukon:
To pay Trading and Exploring Co., Ltd., 5826 (iii).

Public Works—Collection of Revenue:

Esquimalt Graving Dock, Special Constables, 5919 (iii).
Slides and Booms, 2974 (ii).
Gatineau River, 2977 (ii).
Repairs and Working Expenses, 2978 (ii).
Upper Ottawa Improvement Co., 2974 (ii).
Telegraph Lines:
B. C., 2992 (ii).
Working Expenses, 13368 (vi).
Lower St. Lawrence, 2989 (ii).
N.W.T., 2991 (ii).
P.E.I. and Mainland, 2988 (ii).
SS. *Tyrian*, &c., 5007 (ii).
Yukon Territory:
Ashcroft-Dawson, &c., 2992 (ii).
Working Expenses, 14041 (vi).

Public Works—Income:

Buildings:
British Columbia:
Nelson Public Building, 13131 (vi).
Rossland Armoury, 13133 (vi).
Public Building, 13131 (vi).
Vancouver, Public Building, 13132 (vi).
Generally:
Construction of Armouries, 965 (i).
Experimental Farms, New Buildings, 972 (i).
General Vote, 961 (i).
Immigrant Buildings, 14247 (vi).
Salaries to Resident Clerks of Works, &c., 963 (i).
Manitoba:
Winnipeg, Immigration Buildings, &c., 5844 (iii), 13126 (vi).
Military Buildings, N.C.O.'s Quarters, 13127 (vi).
Military Building, Magazine, 13127 (vi).
Military Stores Buildings, 13126 (vi).
Public Building, Addition, 13127 (vi).
Maritime Provinces:
Dominion Public Buildings, Repairs, &c., 421 (i).
New Brunswick:
Buildings, Generally, 421 (i).
Campbellton, Public Buildings, 13037 (vi).
Fredericton Military Building, New Officers' Stables, 13041 (vi).
Sergeant Major's Quarters, 13041 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Public Works—Income :—Con.

Buildings—*Con.*

New Brunswick—*Con.*

Marysville, Public Building, 5841 (iii).
Moncton, Public Building, 13038 (vi).
Newcastle, Public Building, 13038 (vi).
Richibucto, Public Building, 412 (i).
St. John, Drill Hall, 13042 (vi).
Immigration Building, 412 (i), 13040 (vi).
Quarantine Station, Water Service, 414, 486 (i), 13041 (vi).
Tracadie Lazaretto, Improvements, &c., 13038 (vi).
Woodstock, Armoury and Gun Shed, 13039 (vi).
Public Building, 13041 (vi).

North West Territories :

Court Houses, Police Accommodation, &c., 958 (i).
Edmonton Jail, 13129 (vi).
General Repairs, 958 (i).
Macleod Court House, 959 (i).
Moosejaw, Public Building, 13130 (vi).
Prince Albert Court House, &c., 13129 (vi).
Red Deer, Court House, &c., 960 (i).
Strathcona Horse Barracks, 13130 (vi).
Yorkton, Court House, &c., 961 (i).

Nova Scotia :

Antigonish, P. O. Fittings, 13034 (vi).
Arichat, Public Building, 5827 (iii).
Digby, Public Building, 13034 (vi).
Guysborough, Public Building, 5839 (iii).
Halifax, Immigration Building, Addition, 13033 (vi).
Public Building, 411 (i), 13031 (vi).
Quarantine Station, Lawlor's Island, 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
Middleton, Armoury, 5841 (iii).
North Sydney, Public Building, &c., 13035 (vi).
Springhill, Public Building, 14247 (vi).
Sydney, Public Building, Addition, 13035 (vi).
Sydney Mines, Public Building, 13028 (vi).

Ontario :

Alexandria, Public Building, 487 (i).
Belleville, Armoury, 13082 (vi).
Bowmanville, Public Building, 507 (i).
Brantford, Drill Hall, 13108 (vi).
Bridgeburg, Public Building, 13113 (vi).
Clinton, Public Building, 518 (i).
Cobourg, Armoury, 540 (i).
Improvements, 13118 (vi),
Deseronto, Public Building, 5842 (iii), 13112 (vi).
Dom. Buildings, Generally, 636 (i).
Fort William, Public Building, 636 (i).
Guelph, Armoury, 13083 (vi.)
Public Building, 637 (i).
Hamilton, Public Building, Alterations, 13113 (vi).
Hawkesbury, Public Building, 13119 (vi).
Kingston, Military Buildings, 638 (i), 5842 (iii).
R. C. F. A. Barracks, 13118 (vi).
Royal Military College, Drill Hall, 13094 (vi.)
R. M. C. Stable, 13117 (vi).
London, Drill Hall, &c , 641 (i).
Military Buildings, Magazine, 13115 (vi).
Oshawa, Public Buildings, 13110 (vi).
Ottawa, Bacteriological Laboratory, 5842 (iii).
Electric Lighting, &c., 5842 (iii).
New Coal Sheds, 13115 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Public Works—Income :—Con.

Buildings—*Con.*

Ontario—*Con.*

Ottawa—*Con.*

New Elevator for West Block, 13115 (vi),
Paving in front of Parliament Buildings, 13119 (vi).
P. O. and Customs House, 5844 (iii), 13117 (vi).
Rideau Hall, Drains, 647 (i).
Rideau Hall and Grounds, Repairs, &c., 13087 (vi).
Steel Drawers, &c., 13087 (vi).
Western Block, Heating Apparatus, &c., 13087 (vi).
Peterborough, Armoury, 13083 (vi).
Picton, Public Building, 13113 (vi).
St. Catherines, Drill Hall, 13106 (vi).
St. Mary's, Public Building, 13109 (vi).
Sarnia, Public Building, 13117 (vi).
Sault Ste. Marie, Public Building, 13107 (vi.)
Stratford Armoury, 13125 (vi).
Toronto, Asst. Receiver-General's Office, Vault, 5842 (iii).
Custom House, 547 (i).
Dom. Buildings, Generally, 650, 956 (i).
Drill Hall, Addition for new Corps, 13086 (vi).
Drill Hall, Paving Armoury Street, &c., 13115 (vi).
Examining Warehouse, Addition, 13118 (vi).
Military Buildings, Magazine, 13115 (vi).
Engineer Company's Building, 13086 (vi).
Post Office, 956, (i), 5842 (iii).
P. O., Additional, 13112 (vi).
P. O., Additional Story, &c., 13096 (vi).
P. O., Station "C", 5920 (iii).
Toronto Junction, Public Building, 650 (i).
Windsor, Public Building, 13113 (vi).
Wingham, Public Building, 13120 (vi).
Woodstock, Armoury, 13125 (vi).
Public Building, 13108 (vi).

Prince Edward Island :

Charlottetown, Armoury, &c., 13035 (vi).
Dom. Building, Improvements, &c., 13036 (vi).

Quebec :

Actonvale, Public Building, 13059 (vi).
Dom. Public Buildings, Repairs, &c., 422 (i).
Grosse Isle, Quarantine Station, 425 (i).
L'Assomption, Public Building, 427 (i).
Levis, Public Building, 431 (i), 13053 (vi).
Longueuil, Public Building, 13069 (vi).
Magog, Public Building, 13081 (vi).
Montmagny, Public Building, 5841 (iii), 13066 (vi).
Montreal, Barracks for Permanent Corps, 13076 (vi).
Examining Warehouse, Repairs, &c., 438 (i), 13058 (vi).
New Postal Station, 13080 (vi).
Post-office Improvements, 13067 (vi).
Public Building, 436 (i).
Quebec, Citadel, Drill Shed, &c., 13053 (vi)
Drill Hall, 13077 (vi).
Hospital for Trachoma, 14245 (vi).
Iron Foundry, 14247 (vi).
Marine and Fisheries Public Stores, 13053 (vi).
Military Buildings, Dom. Arsenal, &c., 13054 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Public Works :—*Income*—Con.

Buildings—*Con.*

Quebec—*Con.*

St. Hyacinthe, Drill Hall, 13067 (vi).
Public Building, 439 (i).
St. John's, Examining Warehouse, 13069 (vi).
Public Building, 13059 (vi).
St. Louis de Mile End, Public Building, 13080 (vi).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall, 13079 (vi).
Terrebonne, Public Building, 13059 (vi).
Thetford Mines, Public Buildings, 441 (i).
Three Rivers, Custom House, New Heating Apparatus, 13069 (vi).
Retaining Wall, 13080 (vi).
Valleyfield, Public Building, 443 (i).

Rents, repairs, &c.:

Dom. Buildings, Caretakers, &c., Salaries, 1016 (i).
Electric Power, 1067 (i).
Heating, &c., 1065 (i).
Lighting, 1067 (i).
Rents, 989 (i), 13133 (vi).
Water, 1067 (i).
Ottawa, Dom. Buildings, Rents, &c., 973, 989 (i).
Elevators, Attendance, 1011 (i).
Fuel, Light, &c., 1005 (i).
Furniture, 1006 (i), 5007 (ii).
Grounds, 1015 (i).
Heating, Engineers' Salaries, &c., 1008 (i).
Lighting, &c., 1012 (i), 5845 (iii).
Major's Hill Park, 1015 (i).
Rideau Hall, Maintenance, &c., 993 (i), 5006 (ii).
Telephones, &c., 1013 (i).

Yukon :

White Horse, Public Building, &c., 13133 (vi).

Dredging :

British Columbia :

To replace Snag Boats, *Samson* and *Mudlark*, 13311 (vi).
Tug and Hopper Scows, 13318 (vi).

Manitoba :

New Tug, 13311 (vi).

Maritime Provinces :

Additional Amount for Dredging, 13309 (vi)
Hydraulic Dredge, 13312 (vi).

New Plant :

Generally, 2673 (ii).
Manitoba, 2672 (ii).
Mar. Provinces, 2665 (ii).
Ont. and Quebec, 2671 (ii), 13318 (vi).
Ont. and Quebec, 2674 (ii).
P.E.I., New Dredge, 13313 (vi).
Repairs, Generally, 2612 (ii).
Manitoba, 2665 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers :

British Columbia :

Anderson and Kennedy's Lake, Clearing Outlets, 1451 (i).
Columbia River above Golden, Pile Driver, 13304 (vi).
Above Golden, Opening Channel, 13304 (vi).
Above Revelstoke, 1451 (i).
Arrow Lakes, Dredging Machinery, 13305 (vi).
Arrow Lakes Improvements, 13304 (vi).
Fraser River Improvements, 13305 (vi).
Hardy Bay Wharf, 5916 (iii), 13305 (vi).
Quatsino City Wharf, 13305 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Public Works—Income—Con.

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

British Columbia—*Con.*

Victoria Harbour, Removal of Rock, 13306 (vi).
William's Head Quarantine Station, Wharf, 13306 (vi).

Generally :

General Vote, 13308 (vi).

Manitoba :

General Repairs, 1448 (i).
Gull Harbour, 1448 (i).
Hnausa, Wharf Extension, 1448 (i).
Lake Dauphin, Lowering, &c., 1448 (i).
Lake Francis, Outlet, 1449 (i).
Lake Manitoba, Outlet *via* Fairford River, 1449 (i).
Selkirk, Wharf Extension, 1450 (i).
White Mud River, Dredging, 1450 (i).
Winnipeg Lake, Gimli Wharf, 1450 (i).

Mar. Provinces :

General Repairs, &c., 1185 (i).

New Brunswick :

Anderson's Hollow, 1163 (i).
Bay du Vin, Wharf, 1164 (i).
Black Brook, Additional Wharf, 13227 (vi).
Campbellton, Wharf, &c., 1164 (i), 13005, 13229 (vi).
Campobello, Breakwater, 13228 (vi).
Cape Tormentine, Improvements, 13228 (vi).
Caraquet, Wharf, 1173 (i).
Chatham, Slip, &c., 13231 (vi).
Cocagne Wharf, Compensation *re* Schr. *Morning Star*, 13231 (vi).
Dalhousie, Harbour Improvements, 13233 (vi).
Dipper Harbour, Breakwater, 13233 (vi).
Great Salmon River, Groyne and Breakwater, 1177 (i).
Hopewell Cape Wharf, Repairs, &c., 13233 (vi).
Lord's Cove Wharf, 1177 (i).
Miscou Harbour, Wharf, 13234 (vi).
North Head, Grand Manan, Breakwater, 13234 (vi).
Petit Rocher, Breakwater, 13234 (vi).
Point du Chene, Breakwater, Repairs, 13235 (vi).
Richibucto, North Piers, &c., 1177 (i), 13235 (vi).
River St. John, 1177 (i).
Oromocto Wharf, 1181 (i).
Wharfs on Tidal Waters, &c., 1178 (i), 5895 (iii).
St. Andrews, Wharf Repairs, 5894 (iii).
St. John Harbour, Negro Point Breakwater, 1181 (i).
Protection of Fort Dufferin, 1183 (i).
Shippegan Harbour, Protection Works, 1183 (i).
Upper Salmon River, Alma Pier, 1184 (i).

North-west Territories :

General Repairs, 1450 (i).

Nova Scotia :

Abbott's Harbour, Addition to Beach Protection, 13141 (vi).
Abram's River, Wharf, 13141 (vi).
Amagandus, Wharf, 1068 (i).
Bailey's Brook, 1072 (i).
Baxter's Harbour, Reconstruction of Breakwater, 13143 (vi).
Bayfield Harbour Works, Repairs and Improvements, 13141 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Nova Scotia—*Con.*
Benoit Cove, Improvement to Boat Landing, 13143 (vi).
Big Harbour (Port Bevis), Wharf, 13143 (vi).
Big Pond, Wharf, 1071 (i).
Breton Cove, Boat Landing, 13151 (vi).
Bridgewater Dredging, 1074 (i).
Caribou Island, Causeway, 13179 (vi).
Chegoggin Pier, Training Dam, 13179 (vi).
Cheticamp Point, Wharf, 13179 (vi).
Cheverie, Breakwater Extension, 1078 (i).
Church Point, Breakwater, Repairs, 1078 (i).
Cow Bay Breakwater, 1078 (i), 13178 (vi).
Digby, Pier Renewals, 1083 (i).
Donald's Head, Breakwater Repairs, 13179 (vi).
Drumhead, Breakwater, 1083 (i), 13179 (vi).
Duncan's Cove, Wharf, 13179 (vi).
East Bay, Wharf, 13180 (vi).
East Berlin, Breakwater, 13180 (vi).
East End, Cape Sable Island, Boat Harbour, 13180 (vi).
East Jeddore, 13179 (vi).
Economy, Wharf Extension, 1087 (i).
Finlay Point, Wharf, 13181 (vi).
Five Islands Wharf, Repairs, 13180 (vi).
Fort Lawrence, Landing Pier, 1087 (i), 13181 (vi).
Freeport, Landing Pier, 13182 (vi).
Friar's Head, Boat Harbour, 1087 (i).
Frude's Point, Wharf, 13180 (vi).
Gabarus, Breakwater Extension, &c., 13182 (vi).
Georgeville Wharf, 13198 (vi).
Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements, 1087 (i).
Wharf, 13184 (vi).
Grand Etang, Bridge Works, 1095 (i).
Grand Narrows, Wharf Repairs, 1094 (i), 13198 (vi).
Grand River, Entrance, 1094 (i).
Granite Village, Mooring Pier, 13182 (vi).
Green Cove, Boat Harbour, 1100 (i).
Hall's Harbour Improvement, 13198 (vi).
Hawke Point Inlet, Boat Channel, 1102 (i).
Herring Cove, Breakwater, 1102 (i).
Indian Harbour Wharf, 13199 (vi).
Inverness, Harbour Works, 13199 (vi).
Iona, Wharf, 13200 (vi).
Janvrin's Island, Wharf, 1102 (i).
Judique, Breakwater Repairs, 1103 (i).
Ketch Harbour, Entrance, 13202 (vi).
Kingsport, Pier Reconstruction, 1103 (i), 13202 (vi).
L'Ardoise, Breakwater, 13201 (vi).
Larry's River, Breakwater, 1104 (i).
Lingan, Beach Protection, 1105 (i).
Livingston's Cove, Breakwater, 13200 (vi).
Lunenburg, Dredging, 1106 (i).
McKay's Point, Wharf, 13201 (vi).
McNutt's Island, Beach Protection, 13201 (vi).
Main-a-Dieu, Breakwater, 13201 (vi).
Malagawatch, Boat Channel, 13203 (vi).
Malignant Cove, Harbour, 13201 (vi).
Margaree, Improvements, 1133 (i).
Margaretville, Breakwater, 13202 (vi).
Melbourne, Wharf, 13203 (vi).
Meteghan Cove, Breakwater, 1133 (i).
Middle River, Pier Dam, 13202 (vi).
SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Nova Scotia—*Con.*
Musquodoboit Harbour, Wharf, 13203 (vi).
Necum Teuch, Wharf, 1137 (i), 13203 (vi).
Neil's Harbour, Breakwater, 1139 (i).
New Campbellton, Ballast Wharf, 1142 (i).
New Harbour, Breakwater Repairs, 1143 (i).
Noel, Wharf, 13204 (vi).
North Gut, St. Ann's Wharf, 13203 (vi).
North River, St. Ann's, 13203 (vi).
Ogden's Pond, Channel Protection, 1145 (i), 13204 (vi).
Oyster Pond, Beach Protection, 13204 (vi).
Parrsboro, Landing Pier, 13205 (vi).
Pembroke, Breakwater, 13205 (vi).
Petit de Grat, Protection Work, &c., 1146 (i).
Pickett's Pier, 13205 (vi).
Pictou Light Beach, Protection Works, 13205 (vi).
Pleasant Bay, 13205 (vi).
Poirierville, Wharf, 1146 (i), 13205 (vi).
Porter's Lake Channel, 13205 (vi).
Port George Breakwater, 1146 (i), 13210 (vi).
Port Greville, Breakwater, 13210 (vi).
Port Hastings, Wharf, 1146 (i).
Port Hawkesbury, Wharf, 1146 (i).
Port Hood, Harbour, 13206 (vi).
Pier Repairs, 13206 (vi).
Port Howe, Wharf, 13210 (vi).
Port Latour, Breakwater, 13210 (vi).
Port Maitland, Breakwater, &c., 13211 (vi).
Port au Pique, Wharf, 13210 (vi).
Sandy Cove, Breakwater, 1149 (i).
Scott's Bay, Breakwater, 13211 (vi).
Short Beach, Breakwater, 1149 (i).
Skinner's Cove, Channel, &c., 13213 (vi).
South Ingonish, Wharf, 1149 (i).
Spry Bay, Wharf, 13213 (vi).
Summerville, Wharf, 13213 (vi).
Sydney, Quarantine Station, 13213 (vi).
Tenecape, Breakwater, 13213 (vi).
Three Fathom Harbour, Beach Protection Works, 1149 (i).
Tiverton, Breakwater, 1149 (i).
Victoria Beach, Wharf, 13213 (vi).
Wallace Harbour, 13216 (vi).
Washabuck Centre, Wharf, 1150 (i).
Wedge Point, Breakwater, 13217 (vi).
Wentworth, Wharf, 13216 (vi).
West Arichat, Breakwater, 13217 (vi).
West Baccaro, Harbour Improvements, 1150 (i).
West Bay, Wharf, 13217 (vi).
West Chezzetcook, Breakwater, 13217 (vi).
White's Cove, Breakwater, 13217 (vi).
Windsor Harbour, Sheer Dam, &c., 14248 (vi).
Wolfville, Wharf, 13217 (vi).
Yarmouth Bar, Repairs, &c., 13218 (vi).
Ontario:
Amherstburg, Dredging, 1185 (i), 13235 (vi).
Barrie, Wharf Construction, 1186 (i).
Barry's Bay, Wharf, 13236 (vi).
Bayfield, Extension of South Pier, 1188 (i).
Belle Rivière, Sheet Piling, 1191 (i).
Bowmanville, Breakwater Repairs, 1352 (i).
Bracebridge, Wharf, 13236 (vi).
Bronte Harbour, Improvements, 1354 (i), 13236 (vi).
Bruce Mines, Dredging, 5911 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Public Works—Income—Con.

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

Ontario—*Con.*

Burke's Falls, Magnetawan River, 1358 (i).
Burlington Channel, Repairs to Piers, &c., 1359 (i), 13237 (vi).
Cobourg, Completion of Repairs, 5909 (iii).
Collingwood, Harbour Improvements, 13239 (vi).
Cumberland, Wharf, 13238 (vi).
Depot Harbour, Breakwater, 1359 (i), 13239 (vi).
Georgian Bay, Point au Baril Route, 1365 (i).
Goderich, Harbour, 1365 (i), 13240 (vi).
Gore's Landing, Wharf, 13244 (vi).
Grand Bend, Pier, &c., 13239 (vi).
Hawkesbury, Dredging, 5909 (iii).
Improvements, Repairs, &c., 1369 (i).
Kingsville, Breakwater, 13244 (vi).
Lake Temiscamingue, Wharfs, 1376 (i).
Leamington, Wharf, 13246 (vi).
Little Bear Creek, Dredging, 13245 (vi).
Little Current, Channel, 13245 (vi).
Midland Harbour, Dredging, 1376 (i), 5909 (iii), 13246 (vi).
Oakville Pier, Repairs, 1376 (i).
Orillia, New Wharf, 1377 (i).
Owen Sound Harbour, Dredging, &c., 1377 (i).
Parry Sound, Wharf, 13248 (vi).
Pembroke, 13248 (vi).
Petawawa Narrows, Ottawa River, 1425 (i), 13251 (vi).
Pickering Harbour, Dredging and Repairs, 1377 (i).
Point Edward, Dredging, 13249 (vi).
Port Arthur, Breakwater, 13249 (vi).
Port Burwell, Harbour, 13249 (vi).
Port Elgin, Dredging, &c., 1424 (i).
Port Hope, Pier Repairs, &c., 1425 (i).
Port Perry, Harbour, 13249 (vi).
Port Stanley, Dredging, 13249 (vi).
Prescott, Dredging, 5915 (iii).
Rivière de Puces, Pile Work, 1425 (i).
River St. Lawrence, Wolfe Island Channel, 1427 (i), 13252 (vi).
Rondeau, Harbour, 1427 (i).
Rosedale, Wharf, 13249 (vi).
St. Joseph, Wharf, 3382 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie, Harbour, &c., 13252 (vi.)
Southampton, Harbour Improvements, 1428 (i).
Sturgeon Falls, Wharf, 1431 (i).
Sydenham River, Improvements, &c., 13250 (vi).
Thessalon, Breakwater, 13254 (vi).
Thornbury Harbour Works, 1432 (i).
Toronto Harbour, Eastern Entrance, 1433 (i), 13254 (vi).
Magann & Phin's Claims, 13255 (vi).
Trenton, Dredging, 1434 (i).
Victoria Harbour, Dredging, 13255 (vi).
Washago Works, Repairs, 13252 (vi).
Wendover, Wharf, 1434 (i).
Wiarton Wharf, 13256 (vi).

Prince Edward Island:

Beach Point, Widening boat Channel, 13218 (vi)
Belfast Pier, Dredging, 1153 (i)
Canoe Cove Breakwater, Repairs, &c., 13218 (vi).
Cape Traverse, Carleton Head, Survey, 13218 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Public Works—Income—Con.

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

Prince Edward Island—*Con.*

Cascumpec Harbour, Closing Breach, 1153 (i).
Cove Head Harbour, Entrance Channel, 1155 (i), 13222 (vi).
Creosoted Timber for Piers, &c., 1155 (i).
Gaspereaux, Fisherman's Harbour, 155 (i).
Higgin's Shore Pier, Reconstruction, 1159 (i), 13222 (vi)
Lewis Point Pier, Repairs, 13223 (vi).
Lower Montague, 1159 (i).
New London, Breakwater, Repairs, 1160 Improvement to Clifton and French Rivers, 13223 (vi).
North Cardigan Pier, Extension, 13223 (vi).
Point Prim Island, Wharf, 13223 (vi).
Repairs to Piers, &c., 1160 (i).
Richmond Bay, Reconstruction of Wharf near Grand River, 13223 (vi).
Souris, Knight's Point. Breakwater, 1162 (i).
Summerside Harbour, Breakwater, 13223 (vi).
Tignish Harbour, Breakwater, 1162 (i).

Quebec:

Anse aux Gascons, Wharf Extension, 13345 (vi).
Anse aux Gris Fonds River, Improvements 13445 (vi).
Anse St. Jean, Wharf Extension, 13445 (vi).
Barachois de Malbaie, Breakwater, 13445 (vi).
Bois Brulé Training Pier, &c., 13448 (vi).
Bonaventure East, Breakwater, 13446 (vi).
Cacouna, Wharf Extension, 5896 (iii), 13448 (vi).
Caplan, Breakwater, 13448 (vi).
Chambord, Wharf, 13454 (vi).
Chateau Richer, Harbour Improvements, 13454 (vi).
Crane Island, Repairs to Wharf, 1513 (i).
Cross Point, Isolated Landing Pier, 1512 (i).
Deschambault, Wharf, 13457 (vi).
Desjardins, Allumette Wharf, 13457 (vi).
Doucet's Landing, Dredging, 5907 (iii).
Douglastown, Isolated Block 13457 (vi).
Father Point, Landing Pier, 1513 (i).
Gatineau River, C.P.R. Bridge Protection 13457 (vi).
General Repairs, 5907 (iii), 2241 (i).
Grande Rivière Wharf, New Covering, 13457 (vi).
Grand Valley Pier, 1514 (i).
Hull, Wharf, 5900 (iii).
Isle aux Coudres, Wharf, 2242 (i).
Isle Grosbois, Dredging Channel, 5902 (iii).
Kamouraska, Pier Extension, 13457 (vi).
Lake Nomininge, Wharf, 13460 (vi).
Lake St. John, Wharf, Dredging, 2243 (i), 13459 (vi).
Lake Temiscamingue, Improvements, 2246 (i), 14248 (vi).
Laprairie Ice Piers, &c., 2248 (i), 13460 (vi).
Le Tableau, Wharf, 2249 (i).
L'Ile d'Alma, Removal of Rocks, 2257 (i).
Lotbinière, Wharf Improvements, 13460 (vi).
Lower St. Lawrence, Removal of Rocks, 2257 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Magdalen Islands, Breakwater, 2264 (i).
Maguasha, Landing Pier, 13461 (vi).
Maria, Pier, 2265 (i).
Mistook (Delisle), Wharf, 13461 (vi).
Mont Louis, Wharf, 13461 (vi).
Murray Bay, Wharf, 2266 (i).
Newport Breakwater Extension, 2277 (i), 13462 (vi).
New Richmond, Breakwater, 13463 (vi).
Nicolet River, Dredging, 2278 (i).
Notre Dame du Portage, Wharf, 13463 (vi).
Paspebiac, Landing Pier, 13464 (vi).
Perce, Extension Pier, North Cove, 13467 (vi).
Pierreville, Wharf, 13468 (vi).
Pointe aux Esquimaux, Wharf, 2278 (i).
Pointe aux Trembles, Wharf, 13468 (vi).
Pointe Fortune, Wharf Improvements, 13468 (vi).
Point St. Pierre, Breakwater, 2278 (i).
Port Daniel, Extension Wharf, 13468 (vi).
Repentigny, Wharf, 13468 (vi).
Rimouski, Pier Extension, Tidal Basin, 13468 (vi).
River Batiscan, Channel, 2280 (i).
River Chateauguay, Dredging, 2280 (i), 3208 (ii).
River Fox, Breakwater, 2279 (i).
Rivière Jesus, Dredging, 13470 (vi).
Rivière du Loup, Wharf, 2281 (i).
Harbour Improvements, 13476 (vi).
Rivière Ouelle, Pier Repairs, 13470 (vi).
River St. Francis, Ice Piers, 2282 (i).
River St. Louis, Improvements, 13473 (vi).
River St. Maurice, Dredging Eastern Entrance, 2286 (i), 5904 (iii). 13469 (vi).
Grand Piles and La Tuque, 2285 (i), 13491 (vi).
River Saguenay, Dredging, 13472 (vi).
River Touladie, Improvements, 2286 (i).
St. Alexis, Ha Ha Bay, Pier, 2289 (i).
St. Alphonse, Baie de Ha Ha, Wharf, 13489 (vi).
St. André Kamouraska, Pier Extension, 2290 (i), 13492 (vi).
St. Andrew's Landing, Dredging, 5907 (iii)
Ste. Anne de la Perade, Bank Protection, 13488 (vi).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, Pier Reconstruction, 13489 (vi).
Ste. Anne du Saguenay, Wharf Improvements, 13488 (vi).
Ste. Anne de Sorel, Ice Piers, 13489 (vi).
Sainte Famille, Pier Extension, 13488 (vi).
St. Fidèle, Wharf, 13493 (vi).
St. Francis Pier, Orleans Island, 2290 (i).
St. Fulgence, Wharf, 13491 (vi).
St. Gédéon Islands, Wharf, 13491 (vi).
St. Godefroi de Nouvelle, Breakwater, 13489 (vi).
St. Irene, Wharf, &c., 2291 (i).
St. Jean des Chaillons, Wharf, 13494 (vi).
St. Jerome, Wharf, 2291 (i), 5909 (iii).
St. Laurent, Wharf, 5906 (iii).
St. Michel de Bellechasse, Pier Repairs, 13494 (vi).
St. Nicholas, Strengthening Pier, 5905 (iii).
St. Simon, Wharf Extension, 13493 (vi).
Sabrevois, Wharf Improvements, 13485 (vi).
Sacré Cœur, Wharf, 13476 (vi).
Seven Islands, Wharf, 13479 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Shegawake, Harbour Improvements, 13479 (vi).
Sorel, Deep Water Wharf, 2291 (i), 3374 (ii), 5921 (iii), 12845, 12869 (vi).
Three Rivers, Harbour, Wharfs, 2296 (i).
Valleyfield, Dredging Channel in Bay, 2298 (i), 5905 (iii).
Ville Marie, Wharf, 14248 (vi).
Yamaska Lock Dredging, 13498 (vi).
Yukon :
Lewes and Yukon Rivers, Improvements, 13306 (vi).
Miscellaneous :
Arbitrations and Awards, Payments *re*, 13339 (vi).
Chief Architect's Office, Salaries, 2747 (ii).
Chief Engineer's Office, Salaries, &c., 2726 (ii), 13340 (vi).
Insufficient Appropriations, 2925 (ii).
National Art Gallery, 2725 (ii).
Surveys and Inspections, 2715, 2720 (ii).
Surveys, Ottawa River Headwaters, 13340 (vi).
Temporary and Clerical Assistance, 2753 (ii).
Transportation Commission, 13362 (vi).
Transportation Facilities, Port Colborne, 13024 (vi).
Roads and Bridges :
Bryson Bridge, 13 21 (vi).
Edmonton Bridge, 13323 (vi).
Generally, 2701 (ii).
Hull Slides and Union Bridge, 13321 (vi).
North Shore, Telegraph Line, 13322 (vi).
Ottawa City, Dufferin and Sappers Bridges, 13321 (vi).
Ottawa City and Vicinity, 2700 (ii).
Peace River to Pelly River, Pack Trail, 13323 (vi).
Portage du Fort, Bridge, 2690 (ii).
Slides and Booms :
Generally, 2690 (ii).
St. Maurice River, 2677 (ii).
Telegraph Lines :
B.C., Alberni—Clayoquot, 5918 (iii).
Kamloops—Nicola, Poles, &c., 13337 (vi).
Vancouver Island—Salt Springs Extension, 13337 (vi).
Mar. Provs. :
Cable Lines, 2701 (ii).
Chatham to Tracadie, 13325 (vi).
Deer Island—Eastport, Me., 13325 (vi).
N.W.T. :
Alexander Indian Agency, TelephoneLine, 5918 (iii).
Edmonton — Athabasca Landing, 13335 (vi).
Edmonton to Edmonton Indian Agency, 13334 (vi).
Victoria to Andrews, 13335 (vi).
Wood Mountain Post—Willow Bunch, 13335 (vi).
Quebec, Anticosti, Fox Bay—Bescie River, 13325 (vi).
Belle Isle and Mainland, 2712 (ii).
Bersimis to Godbout, 13332 (vi).
Bryon Island and Anticosti, 5917 (iii).
Chateau Bay—Belle Isle, Marconi, 13325 (vi).
Chicoutimi, Ste. Anne to Lac Clair, 13333 (vi).
Godbout, 2711 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income--Con.
Telegraph Lines—*Con.*
N.W.T—*Con.*
Island of Orleans, &c., Ste. Famille, 13330 (vi).
Magdalen Islands, Land Lines, 2714 (ii).
Murray Bay to St. Catharines Bay, Second Wire, 13326 (vi).
Petite Rivière, St. Agnes, 13334 (vi).
Ste. Anne du Saguenay—Descente des Femmes, 13331 (vi).
Quarantine :
Cattle Quarantine and Veterinary Division, 5502 (iii).
Public Health, &c., 5007 (ii), 5490 (iii).
Public Works Health Act, 4440 (ii).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 4439 (ii).
Railways and Canals :
Canals :
Chambly, Electric Station By-wash, 12906 (vi).
Land Damages, 12908 (vi).
Macadamizing Tow Path, 12906, 14151 (vi).
Cornwall, Electric Plant for Lock Gates, 14134 (vi).
Compensation for Geo. Heath, 14155 (vi).
Enlargement, 12895 (vi).
Farran's Point, Acetylene Gas Plant, 14155 (vi).
Enlargement, 7565 (iii), 12898, 14150 (vi).
Galops, Enlargement, 7803, 8268 (iv), 12899, 14141, 14644 (vi)
Generally, Operating Expenses, &c., 12920, 14157 (vi).
Salaries, Contingencies, Collectors' Offices, 12933 (vi).
Sunday Service, 12929 (vi).
Grenville, 12909 (vi).
To pay Henry Tucker *re* Investigation, 14156 (vi).
Lachine, Electrical Appliances, 7806 (iv), 14142 (vi).
Enlargement, &c., 12903 (vi).
Gratuity to Family of late F. Guilbault, 14157 (vi).
Lock Gate Protection, 14142 (vi).
Paving Mill St., 14153 (vi).
Renewing Masonry of Lock No. 2, 12906 (vi).
Lake St. Francis, Protection to South Side, 14152 (vi).
Lake St. Louis, 12904 (vi).
Murray, To purchase W. H. Johnson's House, 14143 (vi).
Wire Fencing, 14150 (vi).
North Channel, Dam, &c., 7803 (iv), 12899, 14142 (vi).
St. Ours Lock, 12908 (vi).
Landing Wharfs, 12908, 14154 (vi).
Rapide Plat, 12898 (vi).
Rideau, Brasses' Point Bridge, 7808 (iv).
Concession St., Ottawa, Bridge, 14150 (vi).
Hog's Back, Swing Bridge, 12904 (vi).
Sault Ste. Marie, Construction, &c., 7560 (iii), 12904 (vi).
St. Lawrence Canals, Surveys, Lifting Boulders, &c., 12900 (vi).
Soulanges, Construction, &c., 7549 (iii).
To pay Geo. Goodwin *re* Contract, 14142 (vi).
To pay J. and M. O'Leary *re* Claim, 14651 (vi).
To repair Breach in Bank, 14153 (vi).
Trent, Construction, 7551 (iii), 14645 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Railways and Canals--Con.
Canals—*Con.*
Trent--*Con.*
Peterborough, &c., Entrance Piers, 14645 (vi).
Repairs and Dredging, 14645 (vi).
To pay Corry and Laverdure *re* Claim, 14651 (vi).
Welland, Deepening Long Level, 14148 (vi).
Dunnville Dam, &c., 7809 (iv).
Electric Light Plant, 12900, 14148 (vi).
Foundations for Elevator, Port Colborne, 14149 (vi).
Improvements at Port Colborne Entrance, 12902 (vi).
Improving Drainage along Feeder, 12905 (vi).
Land Damages, Grand River, 7805 (iv).
Lock Valves, &c., 12905 (vi).
Lowering Mitre Sills, &c., 7804 (iv), 14149 (vi).
Removing Obstructions, 7804 (iv), 12902 (vi).
Rock Cut, Port Colborne to Humberstone, 14148 (vi).
Stone Protection to Banks of old Canal, 12904 (vi).
Summit Level Deepening, Port Colborne to Thorold, 12903 (vi).
Surveying Lands, &c., 12905 (vi).
Williamsburg, Gate Lifter, 14149 (vi).
Overseer's House, 14150 (vi).
Working Scow, 14154 (vi).
Miscellaneous :
Investigations into Ry. Accidents, 14154 (vi).
Litigation, 12911 (vi).
Ry. Commission, Salaries, &c., 14155 (vi.)
Salaries of Engineers, Draftsmen, &c., 12910 (vi).
Works not provided for, 12910 (vi).
Railways :
C.P.R., Canada Central and Brockville & Ottawa Rys., Amalgamation, 14133 (vi).
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry., Surveys, &c., 14646 (vi).
Grand Trunk Ry., Rental, 12887 (vi).
Intercolonial Ry. :
Additional Sidings, Facilities, &c., 14055, 14081, 14107 (vi).
Air Brakes on Freight Cars, 7527 (iii), 8281 (iv).
Passenger Cars, &c., 8311 (iv).
Amqui, Increased Accommodation, 12601 (v).
Anchor S.S. Line, Salvage *re* "Scotia," 14107 (vi).
Chaudière Jn., Engine House, 8314 (iv), 12594 (v), 14106 (vi).
Double Tracking, 14062 (vi).
Drawbars of Freight Cars, 7520 (iii), 8288 (iv).
Eastern Extension Ry. of N.B., Award, 7528 (iii).
Arbitrators' Fees, &c., 7529 (iii).
Eel River Station, Agent's Dwelling, 12600 (v).
Ferry Service, Strait of Canso, 7525 (iii), 12602 (v), 14093 (vi).
General Vote, 12873 (vi).
Grand Narrows Bridge, Protection, 14094 (vi).
Gratuity to Mrs. W. P. Brown, 14155 (vi).
Halifax, Increased Accommodation, 12597 (v), 12824, 14080 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—Con.
Railways—*Con.*
Intercolonial Railway—*Con.*
Halifax, Dredging at Deep Water Terminus, 14646 (vi).
Lévis, Accommodation, 3703 (ii), 7520 (iii).
Little Metis Station, Improvements, &c., 12604 (v), 12827 (vi).
Metapedia, New Station, Improvements, &c., 14096 (vi).
Miramichi Bridge, South-west, 8307 (iv).
Moncton, Extension of Freight Car Shop, 8312 (iv).
Increased Accommodation, 12599 (v), 14090 (vi).
New Glasgow, Extension of Freight Shed, &c., 14095 (vi).
New Machinery for Shops, 8290 (iv), 14106 (vi).
North Sydney, Improvements, 14089 (vi).
Operating Expenses, 7811 (iv).
Original Construction, 3698 (ii).
Passenger Cars, Vestibules, 7520 (iii), 12600 (v).
Pictou, Increased Accommodation, 8317 (iv), 12827, 14088 (vi).
Pintch Gas Apparatus, 8291 (iv).
Point Tupper, Improvements, 8309 (iv).
Power Saw, for Sawing Rails, 12607 (v).
Restigouche Bridge, New Superstructure, 8303 (iv).
River du Loup, Shops, &c., 8314 (iv), 12593 (v).
Yard, 8309 (iv).
River Ouelle Branch, 7526 (iii), 12599 (v).
Rolling Stock, 8292 (iv), 14109 (vi).
Ste. Flavie, Increased Accommodation, 12602 (v).
St. John, Increased Accommodation, 8315 (iv), 12596 (v), 12823, 14063 (vi).
Steel Rails, 5005 (ii), 14097 (vi).
Stellarton, Increased Accommodation, 8296 (iv).
Strengthening Bridges, 3699 (ii), 8269 (iv).
Sydney, Accommodation, 3696 (ii), 12597 (v).
To pay M. Connolly Interest *re* Dredging, 14103 (vi).
Truro, Increased Accommodation, 12603 (v), 12823 (vi).
Windsor, New Station, &c., 14097 (vi).
Prince Edward Island Ry. :
Albany, Station and Land, 14133 (vi).
Alberton, New Station, 14132 (vi).
Blue Shank, To straighten Line, 7530 (iii), 14133 (vi).
Charlottetown, Increased Accommodation, 14131 (vi).
General Vote, 12608 (v), 12891 (vi).
Kensington, Increased Accommodation, 12840 (vi).
Kinkora, Increased Accomodation, 12841 (vi).
Montague Bridge, Survey, &c., 14132 (vi).
Mount Stewart, Freight House, 7530 (iii).
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, 7530 (iii), 7801 (iv), 12829, 14108, 14115 (vi).
Northam and Richmond, New Stations, 12841 (vi).
Steel Rails, &c., 7802 (iii).
Summerside, Wharf and Coal Sheds, 12828 (vi).
Water Service, 12841 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Scientific Institutions :
General Vote, 4118 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection :
General Vote, 4119 (ii), 13648 (vi).
Gratuity to Capt. R. M. MacGregor, 6993 (iii).
Time Ball at Halifax, 6993 (iii).
Superannuation :
To ex-lockmaster W. J. Casselman, 14272 (vi).
Trade and Commerce :
Chinese Immigration Act, 7759 (iv).
Commercial Agencies, 7760 (iv).
International Customs Tariffs Bureau, 7760 (iv).
Iron and Steel Bounties, 7762 (iv).
Law Costs, 7795 (iv).
Unprovided Items :
Generally, 6992 (iii).
CONCURRENCE :
Fisheries, Salaries, &c., 6069 (iii).
Galops Rapid, 8374 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers, Quebec, 6070 (iii).
Grand Vallee, Pier, 6070 (iii).
Post Office, Additional Amount for Outside Service, 14764 (vi).
Supreme and Exchequer Court Act (jurisdiction) Amt. B. No. 22 (Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*), 1° m., 283 ; 2° m., 2351 (i).
Supreme and Exchequer Court Act : *See* 'Judges Retiring', &c.
SUPREME COURT CONTINGENCIES, DISBURSEMENTS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3404 (ii).
—— LIBRARY, PURCHASE OF BOOKS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3402, 3405 (ii).
—— N. W. TERS., ADDITIONAL JUDGE : in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
—— REGISTRAR : *See* 'Registrar'.
—— REPORTER'S SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 3402 (ii).
—— REPORTS, BINDING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3405 (ii).
—— SALARY OF MR. E. R. A. TASCHEREAU : in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
Surtax, German, &c. :*See* 'Curtoms Tariff Act'.
—— *See* 'Customs Act', 'Customs Tariff', &c.
SURVEYS AND INSPECTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 2715, 2720 (ii), 13784 (vi).
SURVEYS FOR G.T.P.RY. in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi). *See* 'G.T.P.Ry',
SURVEYS, INSTRUMENTS, PURCHASE, &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iii).
SUSSEX, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 965 (i).
—— CONSTRUCTION, &C., OVERSEER'S QUALIFICATIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 8331 (iv).
—— BRIGADE CAMP : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 3235 (ii).
—— ROUNDHOUSE, GATES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 4672 (ii).
——STATION GROUNDS, I. C. R. : Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*), in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).
SWAMP LANDS, CONSTRUCTION OF ROAD, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).
SWIM'S POINT, N. S. : WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
SWINEHAMMER, GEO., LIGHTKEEPER AT PEGGY'S COVE : Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 2312 (i).

Swing Bridges Control: *See* 'Navigable'.

SYDENHAM RIVER IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 13250 (vi).

SYDNEY ACCOMMODATION, EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 3696 (ii).
See 'I.C.R.'

SYDNEY AND BAY ST. LAWRENCE SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 13677 (vi).

Sydney (North) Harbour Act Amt. B. No. 262 (Mr. *Prfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12304; wthdn., 12492 (v); in Com. on Res., 12800; 1°*, of B., 12801; 2°, and in Com., 12993; 3°*, 12994 (vi). (*3 Edward VII c.* 39).

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. Bill (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res. 12304; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 12306 (v).

SYDNEY, POST OFFICE, ADDITION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).

——QUARANTINE STATION, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).

SYDNEY MINES, N.S., POST OFFICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13028 (vi).

SYDNEY, NORTH, STATION IMRROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 14089 (vi).

TADOUSAC AND ST. CATHERINE'S BAY SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 13695 (vi).

TARGET PRACTICES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3772 (ii).

TARIFF BILL: *See* 'Customs Bills, 174 and 273' (i).

TARIFF CHANGES: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 1406; (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 1489 (i).

TARIFF, CHANGES, FREE LIST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 817 (i).

——MANUFACTURERS' DELEGATION *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) 265 (i).

TARIFF NEGOTIATIONS WITH FRANCE: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4957 (ii).

TARIFF POLICY OF THE GOVT.: Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4843, 4875; Neg. (Y. 50; N. 102) 4955 (ii).

Debate: (Mr. *Brock*) 4880; (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 4884; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 4889; (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) 4901; (Mr. *Sproule*) 4908; (Mr. *Bell*) 4912; (Mr. *Gourley*) 4919; (Mr. *Johnston, C.B.*) 4921; (Mr. *Ross, Victoria*) 4926; (Mr. *Osler*) 4929; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4931; (Mr. *Fielding*) 4920, 4937; (Mr. *Johnston, Cardwell*) 4943; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 4945; (Mr. *Northrup*) 4951 (ii).

——Remarks (Mr. *Tarte*) 4263 (ii).

TARIFF PROTECTION, GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) in Com. of Sup., 6684, 6707 (iii).

——PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. on Binder Twine B 233: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*), 7304-7392 (iii).

TARIFF REVISION, COR. *re*: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Tarte*), 3003 (ii).

TARIFF TAXATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., on Immigration, 6861 (iii).

TAYLOR, GEO. L., POLICE MAGISTRATE, YUKON, SALARY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3415 (ii).

TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONES, in Com. on Ry. Act Amt. B., 5513 (iii).

TELEGRAPH LINES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2701 (ii).

——B.C., in Com. of Sup., 2952 (ii), 5826 (iii), 13337 (vi).

——WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 13368 (vi).

——N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 2991 (ii).

——P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vi).

——P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: in Com. of Sup., 2988 (ii).

——P.E.I., RES. OF BOARD OF TRADE: in Com. of Sup., 2702 (ii).

——QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).

——ST. LAWRENCE: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii).

——WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 14041 (vi).

TELEGRAPH OPERATORS, SALARIES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3418, 3509 (ii).

Telephone Companies B. No. 4 (Mr. *Maclean*) 1°*, 92; 2° m., 700 (i).

——*See* 'Railway Act'.

Telephones, &c.: *See* 'Canadian Telephone,' &c.

TELEPHONE AGREEMENT WITH C.P.R.: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Bill (Mr. *Maclean*) 5513 (iii).

TELEPHONE COS. IN MAR. PROVS., NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2585 (ii).

TELEPHONES IN OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).

TELEPHONE LEGISLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 291, 409 (i).

——N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).

——N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).

——SERVICE LONG DISTANCE IN H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 5088 (ii).

TELESCOPE FOR OTTAWA OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 6792 (iii).

TEMISCAMINGUE LAKE, REPAIRS TO WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i), 14248 (vi).
See 'Lake Temiscamingue.'

TEMPORARIES IN P.O. DEPT., TRANSFER TO PERMANENT STAFF: in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).

TENDERS *re* GOVT. CONTRACTS, INJUSTICE TO ENGLISH FIRMS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 8405 (iv).

TENECAPE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup. 13213 (vi).

TENTS FOR IMMIGRANTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6849 (iii).

TENTS FOR N.W. MOUNTED POLICE, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3804 (ii), 5764 (iii).

TERREBONNE, INDIAN RESERVE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 288 (i).

——POST OFFICE BUILDINGS, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 289 (i).

——PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).

TEULON NORTH, CONSTRUCTION ROAD: in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).

Textile Fabrics Regulation and Inspection B. No. 137 (Mr. *Scott*) 1°m., 2101 (i); 2°m., 3294 (ii).

THANKSGIVING DAY ADJOURNMENT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13790 (vi).

THESSALON BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13254 (vi).

THETFORD MINES, POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 441 (i).

THOMPSON, MR. P., 'LABOUR GAZETTE', COR., TORONTO, REMUNERATION : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 7152 (iii).

THORNBURY HARBOUR WORKS, REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1432 (i).

THREE FATHOM HARBOUR BEACH WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).

THREE RIVERS, CUSTOM HOUSE, HEATING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).

—— RETAINING WALL : in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).

—— HARBOUR, ADDITIONAL WHARVES : in Com. of Sup., 2296 (i).

TICKET OF LEAVE ACT, RELEASE, &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 566 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 96 (i).

TIDAL SERVICE, SALARIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4114 (ii).

See 'Marine' &c.

TIES, ISSUED, PURCHASED, USED ON I.C.R., &c. : M. for Ret,* (Mr. *Haggart*), 3805 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*), 1679 (i).

TIGNISH BREAKWATER, RUBUILDING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).

TILSONBURG, LAKE ERIE AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14314, 14345 (vi).

—— Amt. (Mr. *Henderson*), 14737, 14739 (vi).

TILSONBURG TO WOODSTOCK RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14511 (vi).

TIMBER AND TREE PLANTING, PROTECTION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 13775, 14272 (vi).

See 'Tree Planting'.

TIMBER LICENSES GRANTED TO CANE BROS. : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*), 2757 (ii).

TIMIGAMI RY. TO STURGEON FALLS, SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14428 (vi).

TIVERTON BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).

TOBACCO AGENT, MR. DUGAS, AMTS. PAID TO : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 1034 (i).

TOBACCO COMBINE, CHAIRMAN'S REP. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 1297 (i).

—— EXPENDITURE : in Com. of Sup., 8267 (iv).

TOBACCO DUTIES COLLECTED IN 1902, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*), 2103 (i).

—— COLLECTED IN 1903 : Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*), 12217 (v).

—— DUTY ON FOREIGN LEAF, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*), 446 (i).

—— EXCISE DUTIES, PAR. IN TORONTO 'GLOBE' *re* INCREASE : Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*), 5701 (iii).

—— STAMPS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5373 (iii).

TOBIN CO.'S PULP MILL : Remarks in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14462 (vi).

TORONTO, ADDITIONAL POSTAL STATION : in Com. of Sup., 13112 (vi).

TORONTO, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 972 (i), 13086 (vi).

—— PAVING, &c. ; in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).

TORONTO ARMOURY, LETTERS *re* ENLARGEMENT : Read (Mr. *Clarke*), in Com. of Sup., 3614 (ii).

TORONTO BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* GRAIN STANDARDS : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*), 11177 (v).

TORONTO CUSTOM HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 647, 957 (i).

—— CUSTOMS PORT OF ENTRY, APPNMTS., SALARIES : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).

TORONTO ELECTRIC ST. RY. CO. : Remarks *re* running rights (Mr. *Clarke*) 6083 (iii).

Toronto and Hamilton Railway Co.'s B. No. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 2396 (i) ; 2°*, 2756 ; in Com., 4672 ; Order for Com., 4868 (ii), 5555, (remarks) 5882, 6198 (iii), ref. back to Sel. Com., 7812 ; in Com., 9419 ; 3°*, 9431 (iv). (*3 Edward VII*, c. 196).

TORONTO AND HAMILTON RY. CO.'S INCORP. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. to resume adjnd. Deb., 5882, 6198 (iii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* running rights, 6091 (iii).

Toronto Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Co.'s B. No. 203 (Mr. *Calvert*) M. to receive Pet., 4261 ; 1°*, 4727 (ii) ; 2°*, 5139 ; in Com. and 3°*, 6399 (iii) (*3 Edward VII, c.* 197).

TORONTO HARBOUR, EASTERN ENTRANCE : in Com. of Sup., 1433 (i), 13254 (vi).

—— MAGANN AND PHIN, CLAIMS : in Com. of Sup., 13255 (vi).

—— TOTAL AMOUNT PAID BY GOVT. ON HARBOUR, &c. : M. for Stmnt * (Mr. *Grant*). 534, 1203 (i).

TORONTO INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITION, GOVT. AID TO : in Com. of Sup., 13501 (vi).

TORONTO ISLAND, DAMAGE BY STORMS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5589 (iii).

TORONTO AND JAMES BAY RY. SUBSIDY : Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) 14358, 14443 (vi).

TORONTO LABOUR COUNCIL AND TEL. *re* MECHANICS FROM ENG. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1854 (i).

See 'Can. Foundry Co.' &c.

TORONTO, LINDSAY AND PEMBROKE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

TORONTO, MILITARY BUILDINGS FOR MAGAZINE : in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).

—— STOREHOUSES : in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).

—— POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).

—— ADDITIONAL STORY : in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).

—— BRANCH OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 5920 (iii).

—— ENLARGEMENT, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 956 (i).

—— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 956 (i).

—— PUBLIC WORKS EMPLOYEES, DELAY IN PAYMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5588 (iii).

TORONTO JUNCTION POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 650 (i).

TOULADIE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 2286 (i).

"TOWNSEND" VALVE, *re* LOCK GATES, WELLAND CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
TRACADIE, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 543 (i).
——— LAZARETTO : in Com. of Sup., 4439 (ii), 13038 (vi).
TRACHOMA, EPIDEMIC *re* IMMIGRANTS : in Com. of Sup., 5493 (iii).
——— HOSPITAL IN QUEBEC : in Com. of Sup., 14245
——— IMMIGRANTS, MEDICAL INSPECTION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6662, 6695, 6843 (iii).
TRACKMEN'S INCREASE OF WAGES, I.C.R. : Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 1297 (i).
——— INCREASE OF SALARIES : Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. on B. 257, 12558 (v).
See 'North Atlantic.'
——— INCREASE OF WAGES : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12874, 14083 (vi).
TRADE COMBINATIONS, INVESTIGATION EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 14654 (vi).
See 'Lumber.'
TRADE COMMISSIONER IN LONDON, ENG. : Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 3497 (ii).
TRADESMEN'S ACCOUNTS FOR H. OF C. : in Com. of Sup., 14115 (vi).

TRADE AND COMMERCE :

ALLAN'S CONTRACT *re* ATLANTIC SERVICE, DISCRIMINATING RATES *re* CAN. FREIGHT : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13674 (vi).
See 'Atlantic Fast SS.'
ALLAN LINE STEAMSHIPS WITHDRAWN FROM ST. JOHN : Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 13937, 14064 (vi).
ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE, ALLAN'S CONTRACT : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv), 13672 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Hfx.*) 7091 (iii).
ATLANTIC FAST SERVICE, WITHDRAWAL OF ALLAN STEAMERS FROM ST. JOHN : Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 13937, 14064 (vi).
See 'C.P.R.'
ATLANTIC FAST SERVICE, GOVT. POLICY : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4007 (ii).
——— Inquiry (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) for Stmnt., 4445 (ii).
——— PETERSEN, TATE & CO.'S DEPOSIT : in Com. of Sup., 6953 (iii).
——— Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) to Com. of Sup., 14158 (vi).
——— Remarks *re* Amt. to Sup. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 13948 (vi).
——— TENDERS : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 3882, 4120 (ii).
AUSTRALIA AND CAN. SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 5880 (iii), 13677 (vi).
BINDER TWINE, BOUNTIES, &C. : Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7305 (iii).
BINDER TWINE, CIRCULAR ISSUED *re* SALES : Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 4180 (ii).
BINDER TWINE INSPECTION, ADMINISTRATION OF, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 7763, 7772 (iv).
——— APPNMT. OF INSPECTOR, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 4959 (ii), 5588 (iii).
——— METHODS OF COLLECTING PENALTIES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 14684 (vi).
——— QUANTITY IMPORTED FROM U.S. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 7565 (iv).
——— M. (Mr. *Douglas*) to conc. in Rep. on Agriculture, &c. 13788 (vi).
See general heading.
CAN. AND AUSTRALIA MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 5880 (iii), 13677 (vi).

TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*

CAN. AND G. B. MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 7728 (iv).
See 'G. B. and Can.'
CAN. AND S. AFRICA MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 5878 (iii), 7746 (iv).
C.P.R. STEAMERS LEAVING ST. JOHN : Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. of Sup., 14076 (vi).
See 'Allan'
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE IN PARIS, COR., &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1297 (i).
CHINESE IMMIGRATION ACT, ADMINISTRATION OF : in Com. of Sup., 7759 (iv).
COMMERCIAL AGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 7760 (iv).
——— DUTIES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 4360 (ii).
DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 92 (i).
DEPTL. VOTE : in Com. of Sup., 7573, 7759 (iv).
FAST MAIL LINE :
See 'Atlantic.'
FRANCE AND CANADA SS. SERVICE : Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4957 (ii).
See 'Ocean Steamship Subsidies Bill.'
FREIGHTS ON OCEAN VESSELS : *See* 'Freight Rates.'
FREIGHT RATES BETWEEN CAN. AND G.B. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7582 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) in Com. of Sup., 7582 (iv).
——— PROVISION IN CONTRACT *re* DISCRIMINATION : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13677 (vi).
FURNESS-WITHY CO.'S SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).
GASPÉ AND DALHOUSIE SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7756 (iv).
GRAIN SHIPMENTS FROM PORT ARTHUR AND FT. WILLIAM : Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 542 (i).
GRAND MANAN AND MAINLAND AND SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7742 (iv).
G B. AND CAN. MAIL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 7573, 7728 (iv).
G.B. AND CANADA SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13672 (vi).
See 'Atlantic Fast SS. Service,' &c.
HALIFAX AND CANSO MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 6002 (iii).
HALIFAX AND LIVERPOOL *via* NFLD, MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 7730 (iv).
HAYCOCK, JOS., APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR OF BINDER TWINE : Ques. (Messrs *Wilson* and *Taylor*) 4959 (ii).
——— APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR OF BINDER TWINE : in Com. of Sup. 7763, 7772 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5588 (iii).
HIDES INSPECTIONS, TEL. FROM W. F. MACLEAN, M. P. : Read (Mr. *Sproule*), 3969 (ii).
HIDES INSPECTOR AT QUEBEC, GEO. ROY, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 3627 (ii).
HIDES, TRADE WITH AUSTRALIA : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*), 7748 (iv), 13678 (vi).
MAGDALEN ISLANDS SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7741 (iv), 13675 (vi).
MAIL SUBSIDIES AND SS. SUBVENTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 5878, 5997 (iii), 7573, 7728 (iv), 13672, 14249 (vi).
MANCHESTER AND MONTREAL SS. SUBVENTIONS : in Com. of Sup.. 7745 (iv).
PARIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE :
See 'Chamber of Commerce.'
PASPEBIAC AND GASPÉ BASIN SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13694 (vi).
PETERSEN, TATE & CO.'S DEPOSIT CHEQUE : in Com. of Sup., 6953 (iii).
PETIT DE GRAT AND I.C.R. TERMINUS AT MULGRAVE, SS. SUBVENTION : in Con. of Sup., 14249 (vi).

TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*
P.E.I. AND G.B. MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 6001 (iii), 7744 (iv).
P.E.I. AND MAINLAND SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7741 (iv).
P.E.I. AND NEWFOUNDLAND SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13676 (vi).
ST. CATHERINE'S BAY AND TADOUSAC SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13695 (vi).
ST. JOHN AND BELFAST SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7731 (iv).
———AND DIGBY SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7739 (iv).
———AND GLASGOW SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7730 (iv), 13673 (vi).
———AND HALIFAX SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7742 (iv).
———AND LONDON SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).
ST. JOHN AND W. INDIES SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7740 (iv).
ST. LAWRENCE ROUTE AND FAST ATLANTIC SERVICE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7584 (iv).
See 'Marine,' etc.
ST. STEPHEN AND BACK BAY SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7759 (iv).
S. AFRICA AND CAN. SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 5878 (iii), 7746 (iv).
SYDNEY AND BAY ST. LAWRENCE SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13677 (vi).
TADOUSAC AND ST. CATHERINE'S BAY SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13695 (vi).
TRADE COMMISSIONER IN LONDON, ENG. : Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 3497 (ii).
'TUNISIAN' AND 'BAVARIAN,' RATE OF SPEED, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13672 (vi).
VICTORIA, B. C., AND VANCOUVER ISLAND, SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13694 (vi).
VICTORIA AND SAN FRANCISCO SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7741 (iv).

TRADING AND EXPLORING COMPANY'S EXPENSES *re* YUKON TRAIL : in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

TRAFFIC IN N. W. T., BLOCKADE, &c. : Remarks (Mr *Scott*) on M. for Sup., 2424 (i).

TRAFFIC RATES, I. C. R. : Inquiry for Papers (Mr *Bell*) 3712 (ii).
See 'I. C. R.'

TRANS-CANADA RY. CO., APPLICATION TO GOVT. FOR SUBSIDY : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1026 (i).

TRANS-CANADA RY. AND G. T. PACIFIC, PAR. IN TORONTO 'NEWS' *re* SALE : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 7566 (iv).
——— CONTRACT WITH GOVT., &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 2759 (ii) ; Personal Explanation (Mr. *Blair*) 2794 (ii).
——— M. for Cor (Mr. *Tarte*) 672 (i).
See 'G. T. P. Ry.', &c.

Transcontinental Ry. B. No. 235, 1°m, 7658 (iv).
———Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) 7726 (iv).
———AND SIR WILLIAM MULOCK'S SPEECH : Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 367 (i).
——— DECLARATIONS BY MINISTERS : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).
———GOVT. POLICY : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 5765 (iii).
———PROPOSALS TO GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 874 (i).
——— REPRESENTATIONS *re* MILITARY PURPOSES : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 541 (i).
See 'G. T. Pacific.'

R

TRANSLATION OF PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS : Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*), 545 (i).

TRANSLATORS OF DEBATES, RENTAL OF OFFICES : Ques. (Mr. *Blain*), 3799 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 2311 (i).

TRANSPORT AND FREIGHT FOR MILITARY PURPOSES : in Com. of Sup., 3752 (ii).

TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION AND TARIFF INQUIRY, PAR. IN MONTREAL "HERALD" : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), 853 (1).

TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, APPNMT. OF CHAIRMAN : Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 9582 (iv).

TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, &c., APPNMT. OF COMMISSIONERS : Notification (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 5137 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 1199 (i), 3129, 4840 (ii), 9819 (iv).
——— APPNMT. OF SIR WM. VANHORNE : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 7297 (iii).
——— DISCUSSION OF *re* SOREL WHARF : Remarks (Mr *Brock*), in Com. of Sup., 12849 (vi).
——— EXPENDITURE *re* : in Com. of Sup., 13362 (vi).
———FORMATION, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 9819 (iv).
———FURTHER ARRANGEMENTS, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 9458 (iv).
———INSTRUCTIONS, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 4120 (ii).
———MEETINGS, BUSINESS TRANSACTED, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 13027 (vi).
———O. C. *re* APPNMTS. : M. for Copies (Mr. *Tarte*), 1324 (i).
———PERSONNEL, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 4727 (ii), 7206 (iii).
———SIR WM. VANHORNE'S VIEWS *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Barker*), 8330 (iv).

TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES, GOVT. POLICY *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 3432 (ii).
Debate : (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 3438 ; (Mr. *Sproule*), 3442 ; (Mr. *Haggart*), 3444 ; (Mr. *Tarte*), 3451 ; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*), 3456 ; (Mr. *Charlton*), 3459 ; (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*), Irregularity of debate, 3470, 3499 ; (Mr. *Casgrain*), 3471 ; (Mr. *Oliver*), 3479 ; (Mr. *Bickerdike*), 3483 ; (Mr. *Kemp*), 3486 ; (Mr. *Osler*), 3490 ; (Mr. *Pringle*), 3493 ; (Mr. *Bell*), 3497 ; (Mr. *Clare*), 3505 (ii).

TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES, PORT COLBORNE : in Com. of Sup., 13024 (vi).
——— *re* ST. LAWRENCE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).

TRANSPORTATION FROM THE N.W.T. : *See* 'Ry. Traffic', &c.

TRANSPORTATION POLICY *re* SPEECH FROM THRONE : Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*), 6404 (iii).

TRAP NETS IN GULF ST. LAWRENCE, PET. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*), 2917 (ii).

TREADGOLD AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, INQUIRY, *re* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4840 (ii).
——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4960 (ii).

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS: Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*), to Com. of Sup., 2796; Neg. (Y. 52; N. 95), 2914; (Amt.) 2826 (ii).

Debate: (Sir *William Mulock*), 2826; (Mr. *Pringle*) 2842; (Mr. *Blair*) 2863; (Mr. *Porter*) 2873; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2889; (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 2887; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 2898; (Mr. *Barker*) 2906; (Mr. *Osler*) 2912 (ii).

——— Notice of Motion (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2424 (i).

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS, INSTRUCTIONS TO COMMISSION, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4486; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 88) 4546 (ii).

Debate: (Sir *William Mulock*) 4499; (Mr. *Monk*) 4505; (Mr *Borden, Hfx.*) 4509; (Mr. *Blair*) 4513; (Mr. *Tarte*) 4522; (Mr. *Northrup*) 4525; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 4533; (Mr. *Haggart*) 4536; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4541; (Mr. *Davis*) 4544 (ii).

TREADGOLD COMMISSION, APPNMT., &C.: Notification (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5137 (iii).

———AND DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE, MEMORIAL *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 1224 (i).

——— APPNMT. OF COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 3298, 3303, 3713 (ii).

——— APPNMT. OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*), 3864 (ii).

——— CORRECTED ANSWER (Mr. *Sifton*), 6803 (iii).

——— ENGINEER'S REP. TO MIN. OF JUS., 2798 (ii).

——— FREE REPRESENTATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 5990 (iii).

——— FREE REPRESENTATIONS: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6427 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 3397 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Rep. of Commissioner (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 13134, 13258 (vi).

——— INSTRUCTIONS TO COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 4120, 4564 (ii), 5242 (iii).

——— LETTER FROM DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE, 2818 (ii).

——— LETTER FROM HON. J. H. ROSS *re* LIB. CONVENTION, 2817 (ii).

——— LETTER TO SENATOR WOOD FROM HOLME, MILLER & CO., 2807 (ii).

——— LIBERAL ASSO'CN, PET., 2821 (ii).

——— LIB. PLATFORM, CONVENTION, 2842 (ii).

——— PLEDGES OF HON. J. H. ROSS, 2843 (ii).

——— 'MORNING SUN', QUOTATIONS, &C., 2804 (ii).

——— 'MORNING SUN', REPS. OF DAWSON CITY MEETING, 2808 (ii).

——— NAMES OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4727 (ii).

——— PAR. IN DAWSON NEWSPAPERS *re* EVIDENCE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 11064 (v).

——— PERSONNEL: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6638, (iii).

——— PET. BY YUKON CITIZENS TO GOV. GEN., 2798 (ii).

——— PRINGLE, MR., Speech at Bonanza, 2822 (ii).

——— REPRESENTATIONS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6638 (iii), 7927 (iv).

——— RESOLUTIONS OF DAWSON CITIZENS' MEETING 1902, 2810 (ii).

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS, RESOLUTIONS *re* LIBERAL CONVENTION, 2815 (ii).

——— SEC. 14, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4593 (ii).

——— TAPPAN ABNEY'S REMARKS IN "HARPERS WEEKLY", 2849 (ii).

——— TEL. FROM DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE *re* PETS &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1195 (i).

——— TEL. FROM BOARD OF TRADE, DAWSON: Read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 8085 (iv).

——— TEL. FROM W. A. BEDDOE *re* COMMISSIONER'S REFUSAL TO PRODUCE FILES: Read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 9818 (iv).

——— Remarks *re* (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 9979 (iv).

TREADGOLD EXHIBITS, GLASGOW EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 4612 (ii).

TREADGOLD, HYDRAULIC LEASES, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bell*), 288 (i).

TREASURY BOARD: *See* 'Auditor General.'

TREE CULTURE, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6773 (iii).

TREE PLANTING: in Com. of Sup., 13775 (vi).
See 'Timber.'

TRENT CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7551 (iii), 14645 (vi).

———EMPLOYMENT OF MEDICAL OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*), 8117 (iv).

———HASTINGS AND TRENTON, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*), 129 (i).

———MESSRS. CORRY & LAVERDURE, INTEREST *re* ARBRITATION: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).

———PAYMENT TO THOS. DODDS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*), 8118 (iv).

———PETERBOROUGH ENTRANCE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).

———REP. OF W. MCLEOD, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*), 12716 (vi).

———ROSEDALE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).

———SPECIFICATIONS, REPS., &C.: M. (Mr. *Ward*), for Copies, 2313 (i).

TRENTON HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1434 (i).

TROIS PISTOLES BRIDGE TO MACKENZIE AND RENOUF FALLS, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).

TROTTIER, LOUIS M., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*), 8488 (iv).

TRURO TO PARRSBOROUGH, RY. SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Gourley*), in Com. on Ry. Res., 14491 (vi).

TRURO STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12603 (v).

Trust Co.: *See* 'Royal Trust.'

Trust Corporation: *See* 'Consolidated.'

Trust Funds, Moosonee Diocese B. No. 148 (Mr. *Osler*), 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2720; in Com., and 3°*, 3795 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 157).

TUBERCULOSIS, AID TO CAN. ASSOCIATION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13517 (vi).

TUCKER, HENRY, PAYMENT *re* INVESTIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 14156 (vi).

'TUNISIAN' AND 'BAVARIAN,' STRS., RATE OF SPEED, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13672 (vi).

TURNPIKE TRUST, MONTREAL, INDEBTEDNESS, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Monk*) 672 (i).
TURTLE MOUNTAIN LAND SLIDE, INVESTIGATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13965 (vi).
See 'Frank.'
TWO-CENT FARE CLAUSE, G. T. RY., REPEAL OF, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 11828 (v).
——— Amt. in Com. on B. 235, 12221 (v).
See 'Ry. B. 21.'
TWO MOUNTAINS DISTRICT, RAILWAY FACILITIES: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Ethier*) 7567 (iv).
TYERMAN, P. D., PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 286 (i).
UNFORESEEN EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6951 (iii), 12588 (v).
United Empire Life Insurance Co.'s B. No. 163 (Mr. *Thompson*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956; in Com., 3796, 3983; 3°*, 3984 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 198).
U. S. COASTING LAWS, BONDING PRIVILEGES, &c., REGULATIONS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Paterson*) 13135 (vi).
——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12714 (vi).
U. S. IMMIGRATION OFFICERS, NEWPORT VT., TREATMENT OF ENGLISH DELEGATES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12495 (v).
U. S. INDEMNITY TO FISHERMEN, COR. &c.: M. (Mr. *Lemieux*) for Cor.*, 3236 (ii).
U. S. INSTRUCTIONS TO MASTERS OF VESSELS *re* CUSTOMS MANIFEST AND POSTAGE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 5664 (iii).
UNPROVIDED ITEMS: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).
UPPER OTTAWA IMPROVEMENT CO.: in Com. of Sup., 2974 (ii).
UPPER SALMON RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).
VACANCIES IN ELECTORAL DISTRICTS: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
VALIQUETTE, Mr. J. A., APPNMT. AS STENOGRAPHER IN YUKON: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 4005 (ii).
VALLEYFIELD, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5905 (iii).
——— ELECTION: *See* 'Beauharnois.'
——— LABOUR STRIKE, PAYMENT OF MILITIA: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13371 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE, ERECTION, PURCHASE OF SITE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 98 (i).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 443 (i).
——— POST OFFICE, TENDERS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 11187 (v).
——— STRIKE, PAY OF MEN, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3586, 3753 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2759 (ii).
Vancouver and Coast Kootenay Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 87 (Mr. *Macpherson*) 1°*, 1111; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., 4587; in Com., and 3°*, 4672 (ii) (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 199).
Vancouver Harbour, Lands B. No. 76 (Mr. *Macpherson* 1°*, 872; 2°*, 1026 (i).
VANCOUVER ISLAND TO SALT SPRINGS ISLAND TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).
VANCOUVER POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
——— P.O., INSPECTOR, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 14000 (vi).
VANKLEEK HILL POSTAL SERVICE, COMPLAINTS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Hfx.*) on conc., 14764 (vi).
VEGETABLES IMPORTED FROM U.S., DUTY COLLECTED AT TORONTO AND MONTREAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden*, *Hfx.*) 1058 (i).
See 'Market'.
VENIOT, P.I., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT BATHURST: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3629 (ii).
VENTILATION IN H. OF C.: in Com. of Sup., 488, 975 (i).
———Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) in Com. of Sup., 13006 (vi).
——— FANS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 4362 (ii), 6406 (iii).
VESTIBULE EQUIPMENT FOR I.C.R. CARS: in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12600 (v).
VETERANS, CANADIAN, PET. *re* MILITARY SERVICE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 11188 (v).
VETERINARY, CHIEF INSPECTORS, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1591 (i).
VETERINARY DIVISION, QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5502 (iii).
VICTORIA BRIDGE, MONTREAL, AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret. * (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
VICTORIA AND SAN FRANCISCO S.S. SUBVENTION: in Com of Sup., 7741 (iv).
VICTORIA, B.C. AND VANCOUVER ISLAND, SS SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 13694 (vi).
VICTORIA GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM: in Com. of Sup., 365 (i), 14243 (vi).
See 'Public Works, &c.'
VICTORIA MEMORIAL, LONDON, CONTRIBUTION OF CANADA: in Com. of Sup., 14655 (vi).
VICTORIA, N.W.T. TO ANDREWS, TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).
VICTORIA, N.S., BEACH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
VILLE MARIE WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
VISITORS IN H. OF C. CORRIDORS: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Lennox*) 11427, 11557 (v).
VOLUNTEERS OF MAN. AND N.W.T., LAND SCRIP, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 820 (i).
VOTERS' LISTS, CONTINGENT EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 5274 (iii).
See 'Electoral Lists.'
VOWELL, MR., INDIAN SUPT., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13785 (vi).
WABY, INDIAN PRISONER, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6418 (iii).
WADSWORTH, MR., INDIAN INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
WAGNER, D. J., SALARY INCREASE: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 14256 (vi).
WALKERVILLE BRIDGE CO., SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14509 (vi).
WALLACEBURG POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 505 (i).

WALLACE, DAVID WARDROPE, MEMBER FOR ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF RUSSELL: Introduced, 1642 (i).

WALLACE HARBOUR, N.S., FERRY LANDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13216 (vi).

WALPOLE CUSTOMS HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3961 (ii).

WALPOLE ISLAND INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).

WALTHAM STATION TO FERGUSON POINT, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14448 (vi).

WASHABUCK CENTRE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).

WASHINGTON, MR. HECTOR, REP. *re* LAND VALUES: Remarks *re* in Com. of Sup., 4430 (ii).

WATER SUPPLY FOR DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).

WATER SUPPLY ON C. P. R. TRANSCONTINENTAL TRAINS: Remarks (Mr. *Wright*) 9455 (iv).

WATSON, JOHN, PRES. OF LIB. ASSOCIATION, NESBITT, MAN: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 1195 (i).

WAYS AND MEANS: German Surtax in Com. on B. 273, 14755 (vi).

——— Res. for Com. (Mr. *Fielding*) 89, 1378 (i).

——— Financial Statement, 1378 (i).

——— DEBATE: *See* 'Budget'

WEDGE POINT, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).

WEEKLY PUBLICATIONS, 'JESSE JAMES' SERIES, CUSTOMS DUTIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 11426 (v).

Weigh Masters Bill: *See* 'General Inspection.'

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. No. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°m, 203; 2°m., 2338 (i), 3245 (ii).

——— **(scales) Amt. B. No. 188** (Mr. *Bernier*) 1°*, 3708; 2°*, 4009; in Com., 4009, 4187; 3°*, 4203 (ii) (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 72).

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES INSPECTORS: Salaries in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).

WELLAND CANAL, DEEPENING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv).

——— DRAINAGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).

——— ELECTRIC LIGHTING, &c.; in Com. of Sup., 14148 (vi).

——— ELECTRIC LIGHT PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).

——— LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 7805 (iv).

——— LOCK TENDERS, SALARIES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12921 (vi).

——— LOWERING MITRE SILLS: in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv), 14149 (vi).

——— ROCK CUT: *See* 'Colborne.'

——— STONE PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).

——— SURVEYS *re* GOVT. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).

——— WATER POWER, O. Cs. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1859 (i).

——— WATER POWER, REP. OF BOARD OF TRADE OF ST. CATHARINES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 668 (i).

WELLINGTON TO UNION BAY, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14491 (vi).

WENDOVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1434 (i).

WENTWORTH, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13216 (vi).

WEST BACCARO, BOAT HARBOUR CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).

WEST BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).

WEST, DR., MEDICAL INSPECTOR OF INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).

Western Alberta Railway Co.'s B. No. 205 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 5238; 2°*, 5362; in Com., and 3°*, 6657 (iii) (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 200).

Western Assurance Co.'s B. No. 244 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 8406; 2°*, 8559 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 10903 (v), (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 201).

Western Canada Mortgage, &c. Bill: See 'Canada Permanent.'

WEST LORNE RY. ACCIDENT, COMMISSION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 6168 (iii).

——— JURY'S VERDICT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3231 (ii).

——— REP. OF COMMISSIONER: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) on Adjmnt., 4726 (ii).

——— REP. OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 5088 (ii), 5242 (iii).

Westminster Bridge Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 249 (Mr. *Morrison*) M. to receive Pet., 10489 1°, 10744; 2°*, 10903 (v).

WEST POINT, U.S.: Remarks (Col. *Hughes*) in Com. of Sup., 13095 (vi).

WHARFS, &c., BUILDING BY GOVT.: Remarks in Com of Sup., 13143, 13449 (vi).

WHARF CONNECTIONS AND RY. SUBSIDIES BY GOVT Remarks in Com. on Ry. Res., 14463 (vi).

WHARFS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii).

——— PRIVATE, GOVT. EXPENDITURE, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1352-1377 (i).
See 'Public Works.'

WHEAT, BLOCKADE IN N.W.T.; *See* 'Ry. Traffic,' 11425 (v).

——— EXPORT FREIGHT RATES PER HUNDRED POUNDS: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 11188, 11425 (v).

——— FREIGHT RATES, RES. OF MORDEN BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Stewart*) 12074 (v).

——— SHIPMENTS FROM PORT ARTHUR AND FT. WILLIAM: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 284 (i).

———Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 542 (i).
See 'Grain,' &c.

WHITBY PUBLIC BUILDING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13111 (vi).

WHITE, ALBERT S., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 4673 (ii).

WHITE'S COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).

WHITE, MR., EXPENSES *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6732, 6853 (iii).

WHITE HORSE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).

WHITE, MR., INLAND REVENUE, PRESCOTT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13970 (vi).

WHITE MUD RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
WHITNEY PIER, N.S., SALARY OF POSTMASTER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 130, 668 (i).
WIALLARD, PAUL, EMPLYMT, BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 11188 (v).
WILLIAMSBURG CANALS, APPNMT. of SUPT., &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*), in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
——— COLLECTOR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 12934 (vi).
——— GATE LIFTER: in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).
——— OVERSEER'S HOUSE; in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
——— WORKING SCOW: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
See 'Galop'.
WILLIAM'S HEAD, B. C., QUARANTINE STATION WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).
WILSON'S BEACH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).
Wilson, Stephen, Relief B. No. 228 (Mr. *Wade*), 1°*, 7922; 2°*, 8264; M. for Com., 9149; in Com., and 3°*, 9152 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 202).
Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 26 (Mr. *Costigan*), 1°*, 367; 2° m., 630, 664 (i).
WINDSOR HARBOUR, N.S., SHEER DAM, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
WINDSOR JUNCTION ACCIDENT, I. C. R, EVIDENCE *re*: Remark (Mr. *Clarke*), 3301, 3398, 3496, 3712 (ii).
WINDSOR, N.S, NEW STATION, RENTAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).
WINDSOR, ONT., CUSTOMS PORT OF ENTRY, SALARIES, &c.; Remarks in Com. of Sup.. 3907 (ii).
WINDSOR, ONT., POST OFFICE, LETTER BOXES: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
WINGHAM, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13120 (vi).
Winnipeg Bank: *See* 'Bank of Winnipeg'. &c.
WINNIPEG BARRACKS, STREET PAVING: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).
WINNIPEG BEACH TO ICELANDIC RIVER RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).
Winnipeg City Water Power Bill: *See* 'Assiniboine River'.
WINNIPEG, IMMIGRATION BUILDINGS AND POSTAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13126, (vi).
———LAND OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 6767 (iii).
———MILITARY MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13127 (vi).
———MILITARY STORES: in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
———POST OFFICE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 438 (1), 13127 (vi).
———P.O. INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 14001 (vi).
———P.O., REVENUE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 666 (i).
Winnipeg Western Land Corporation Co.'s Limited B. No. 61 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°* 707; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2720 (ii) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 204).
WINNIPEGOSIS, CHANNEL DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
WINTER COMMUNICATION BY STR. 'STANLEY', P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4006 (ii).
———M. for Copies of Pets., &c., (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2765 (ii).
———CONSTRUCTION OF STR.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett* 6895 (iii).
———COR. WITH GOVT.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) 1036 (i).
———M. for Memorials, &c. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2765 (ii).
See 'P.E.I.,' &c.
WIRE FENCING, MURRAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
See 'Canals,' &c.
WIRELESS STATIONS ON MARINE COASTS: in Com. of Sup., 13639 (vi).
See 'Marconi,' &c.
WOLFE ISLAND, DREDGING SHOAL: in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i), 13252 (vi).
WOLFVILLE, N.S., WHARF REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WOOD ALCOHOL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5373 (iii).
——— MANUFACTURE IN CANADA, OUTPUT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 98 (i).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 227 (i).
See 'Standard,' &c.
WOODS, J. W., RENTAL OF BUILDINGS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5764 (iii).
——— TENDER FOR TENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3804 (ii).
———Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5764 (iii).
Woodmen of the World, Can. Order B. No. 31 (Mr. *Calvert*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 632; in Com., 1854; 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 206).
WOOD MOUNTAIN POST, TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).
WOODSTOCK, N. B. AND FREDERICTON RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).
WOODSTOCK, N. B., ARMOURY AND GUN SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13039 (vi).
———DRILL SHED, PURCHASE OF SITE: M. (Mr. *Hale*) for Cor.,* 3236 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden Hfx.*) 4563 (ii), 5735 (iii).
——— Remarks *re* Ret. (Mr. *Borden Hfx.*) 4593 (ii).
——— REPAIRS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hale*) 705 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 672 (i).
WOODSTOCK, N. B. TO U.S. BOUNDARY, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14322 (vi).
WOODSTOCK, ONT., ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13125 (vi).
———PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13041, 13108 (vi).
Woolf Valve Gear Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 161 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5560 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 205).
WORKING EXPENSES, I. C. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 12873 (vi).
———P. E. I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).

WRECKING PLANT, STR. 'LORD STRATHCONA,' MAINTENANCE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6003 (iii), 13697 (vi).

WRECKS, INVESTIGATION *re* : in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13524, 13514 (vi).

See 'Marine.'

WRIGHT, MR. A. W., AMOUNTS PAID TO BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 8116 (iv).

YAMASKA LOCK, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13498 (vi).

YAMASKA TO LOTBINIÈRE, RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14318 (vi).

YAMASKA RIVER AND ST. GUILLAUME, RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14486 (vi).

YARMOUTH, N.S., BAR, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).

'YEAR BOOK' : in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

YOHO PARK, ROAD CONSTRUCTION, &C : in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).

YORK AND CARLETON RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14488 (vi).

YORKTON COURT HOUSE, in Com. of Sup., 961 (i).

YUKON, COMPENSATION TO CAN. BANK OF COMMERCE : in Com. of Sup., 14274 (vi).

YUKON, EDMONTON AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).

Yukon Territory Act (Jurors) Amt. B. No. 9 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°m., 94 ; 2°*, 313 ; in Com., 313 ; 3°*, 314 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 73).

Yukon Ter. Act (Court of Appeal) Amt. B. No. 254 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°m., 11692 ; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 12301 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 74).

YUKON :

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE : In Com. of Sup., 3409 (ii).

ADMINISTRATION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 13367 (vi).

BRITTON, JUDGE, CHARGES *re* INVESTIGATION OF TREADGOLD COMMISSION, PAR. IN DAWSON NEWSPAPERS, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), 11065 (v).

BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).

CLERKS, &C., TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3409 (ii).

COMPENSATION TO CAN. BANK OF COMMERCE : in Com. of Sup., 14274 (vi).

COURTS, PURCHASE OF LAW BOOKS : in Com. of Sup., 3506 (ii).

CUSTOMS EXPENDITURE : in Com. of Sup., 3968 (ii).

DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE, MEMORIAL *re* TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS : Remarks (Mr *Borden, Halifax*), 1024 (i).

DAWSON TEL. LINE : in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii).

DISTRICT NEWSPAPERS, AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT. : M. for stmnt.* (Mr. *Monk*), 706 (i).

DOM. LAND REGULATIONS : in Com. on Res., 13791 (vi).

DUGAS, JUDGE, REFUND TO DEPT. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3411 (ii).

EILBECK, SHERIFF, FEES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3507 (ii).

——— SALARY, LIVING ALLOWANCE, FEES, &C. : in Com., of Sup., 3414 (ii).

ELDORADO GUSHER, EXPENDITURE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6949, 7275 (iii).

GOLD COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, DAWSON CITY, DEFALCATIONS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iii).

GOVTL. EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 6802, 6949 (iii), 13367 (vi).

HARBOURS AND RIVERS : in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).

YUKON—*Con.*

HOSPITAL GRANTS : in Com. of Sup., 7291 (iii).

HYDRAULIC LEASES : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bell*) 288 (i).

——— M. for Copies* (Mr. *Ross, Yukon*), 1323 (i).

INDIANS, GENERAL EXPENDITURE : in Com. of Sup., 7272 (iii).

——— RELIEF, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 7270 (iii).

JUDGES' LIVING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3411 (ii).

———TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3409 (ii).

———LAW LIBRARY : in Com. of Sup., 14267 (vi).

LEWES AND YUKON RIVER IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).

LITHGOW, MR., CONTROLLER : in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iii).

MIDDLETON, T. W., GOLD COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, DEFALCATION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iii).

MOUNTED POLICE, SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5262 (iii).

NEWSPAPERS, AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT. : M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Monk*), 706 (i).

N. W. MOUNTED POLICE, SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 5003 (ii).

OFFICIALS, LIVING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3509 (ii).

POLICE MAGISTRATES, LIVING ALLOWANCES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3415 (ii).

POST OFFICE DEFICIT : Remarks (Sir *William Mulock*), in Com. of Sup., 14014 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 13133, 13306 (vi).

REGULATIONS *re* DOM. LANDS, APPROVAL, &C. : in Com. on Res., 13791 (vi).

ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 5826, 7283 (iii).

SHERIFFS, CLERKS, &C. SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 3410 (ii).

SHERIFFS FEES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3507 (ii).

———LIVING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3414 (ii).

STENOGRAPHERS, APPNMT. OF J. A. VALIQUETTE : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*), 4005 (ii).

———SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3411 (ii).

SUPPLIES, PURCHASE, &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6930 (iii).

TAYLOR, GEO. L., POLICE MAGISTRATE, YUKON, SALARY, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3415 (ii).

TEL. LINES : in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii).

——— MANAGEMENT, &C., PAR. IN 'POST INTELLIGENCER' *re* : Remarks (Mr. *Morrison*) 7003 (iii).

——— WORKING EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 14041 (vi).

TELEGRAPH OPERATORS, SALARIES : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3418, 3509 (ii).

TRADING AND EXPLORING COMPANY'S EXPENSES *re* YUKON TRAIL : in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

TREADGOLD AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, INQUIRY *re* : (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4840 (ii).

———Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4960 (ii).

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS, Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2796 ; Neg. (Y. 52 ; N. 95) 2912 ; (Amt.) 2826 (ii).

———Letter from Dawson Board of Trade, 2818 (ii).

———Letter from Hon. J. H. Ross *re* Liberal Convention, 2817 (ii).

———Letter to Senator Wood from Holme, Miller & Co., 2807 (ii).

——— Liberal Association, Pet., 2821 (ii).

——— Liberal Platform, Convention, 2842 (ii).

———Pledges of Hon. J. H. Ross, 2843 (ii).

——— '*Morning Sun*' Quotations, &c., 2864 (ii).

——— '*Morning Sun*' Reps., Dawson City Meeting, 2808 (ii).

YUKON—*Con.*

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4486 (ii).
———APPNMT. OF COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 3298, 3303, 3713 (ii).
———APPNMT. OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3864 (ii).
———APPNMT. &C.: Notification (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5137 (iii).
———AND DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE, MEMORIAL *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 1024 (i).
———CORRECTED ANSWER (Mr. *Sifton*) 6803 (iii).
———ENGINEER'S REP. TO MIN. of JUS., 2798 (ii).
———EXHIBITS, GLASGOW EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 4612 (ii).
———FREE REPRESENTATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 5990 (iii).
——— FREE REPRESENTATIONS: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6427 (iii).
———HYDRAULIC LEASES, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bell*) 288 (i).
———O. Cs. &C.: M. for Copies * (Mr. *Ross, Yukon*).
———Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 3397 (ii).
———Inquiry for Rep. of Commissioners (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13134, 13258 (vi).
———INSTRUCTIONS TO COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4120, 4564 (ii), 5242 (iii).
———Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 5243 (iii).
———NAMES OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 4727 (ii).
——— Notice of Motion (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2424 (i).

YUKON—*Con.*

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS, &C., O. C. 12th June 1901, 2800 (ii).
———O. C. 7th Dec. 1901, 2801 (ii).
———O. C. 21st April, 1902, 2803 (ii).
———PAR. IN DAWSON NEWSPAPERS *re* EVIDENCE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 11064 (v).
———PERSONNEL: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6638, 7297 (iii).
———REPRESENTATIONS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6638 (iii).
———SEC. 14, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.* 4593 (ii).
——— TEL. FROM DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE *re* PETS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1195 (i).
——— TEL. FROM BOARD OF TRADE, DAWSON: Read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 8085 (iv).
——— TEL. FROM W. A. BEDDOE *re* COMMISSIONER'S REFUSAL TO PRODUCE FILES: Read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 9618, 9979 (iv).
———TAPPAN ABNEY'S REMARKS "IN HARPERS' WEEKLY," 2849 (ii).
VALIQUETTE, MR. J. A., APPNMT. AS STENOGRAPHER IN YUKON: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5005 (ii).
WHITE HORSE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).
YUKON ITEMS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13500 (vi).

Yukon Ry.: *See* 'Canadian Yukon'.
Yukon Ry.: *See* 'Coast'.

ERRATA.

Bazinet, Mr.
Joliette and Lake Manuan Ry. Co.'s (B. 52) 1°*, 654; 2°*, 977; in Com. and 3°*, 2050 (i).

Blain, Mr.
Blankets, &c., read 10102 for 10101 (v).

Blair, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5144 for 5139 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5139 for 5138 (iii).

Bourassa, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5149 for 5145 (iii).

Clarke, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5141 for 5139 (iii).

Davis, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5148 for 5145 (iii).

Fielding, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5151 for 5147 (iii).

Fitzpatrick, Mr.
Dorchester Penitentiary, read 10102 for 10101 (v).

Fowler, Mr.
Supply—Public Works, Buildings, Ottawa (census building) read 992 for 982 (i).

Haggart, Mr.
Bonding Privileges with U.S., read 12757 for 12751 (vi).

Heyd, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5152 (iii).

Ingram, Mr.
Dorchester Penitentiary, read 10102 for 10101 (v).

Kemp, Mr.
Supply—Pub. Works, Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Wendover wharf) read 1439 (i), and delete 1439 for Que. Harbour Improvements.

LaRivière, Mr.
Private Bills, read 5138 for 5137 (iii).

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid.
Blankets, &c., read 10102 for 10101 (v).
Private Bills, read 5139 for 5137 (iii).

McCarthy, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5139 for 5138 (iii).

Murray, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 235, read 10111 for 1011.

SUBJECTS.

Page clxii first line for "Census Buildings" read "Census, Cost," &c.